

Variability in the collective behaviour of England fans at Euro2004: 'Hooliganism', public order policing and social change

CLIFFORD STOTT^{1*}, OTTO ADANG^{1,2},
ANDREW LIVINGSTONE³ AND
MARTINA SCHREIBER^{1,2}

¹*School of Psychology, University of Liverpool, UK*

²*Police Academy of the Netherlands,
The Netherlands*

³*School of Psychology, Cardiff University, UK*

Abstract

This paper presents an analysis of collective behaviour among England football fans attending the European football championships in Portugal (Euro2004). Given this category's violent reputation, a key goal was to explore the processes underlying their apparent shift away from conflict in match cities. Drawing from the elaborated social identity model of crowd behaviour (ESIM) data were obtained using semi-structured observations and interviews before, during and after the tournament. Qualitative analysis centres first on three key incidents in match cities where the potential for violence was undermined either by 'self-policing' among England fans, or by appropriately targeted police intervention. These are contrasted with two 'riots' involving England fans that occurred in Algarve during the tournament. A phenomenological analysis of England fans' accounts suggests that the contexts created by different forms of policing helped bring to the fore different understandings of what constituted proper and possible behaviour among England fans, and that these changes in identity content underpinned shifts toward and away from collective conflict. The implications of this analysis for the ESIM, understanding public order policing, social change and social conflict are discussed. Copyright © 2006 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

The association between England football fans and collective violence, or 'hooliganism', is strikingly pervasive—so much so that 'hooliganism' itself has been referred to as the 'English disease' (Frostick

*Correspondence to: Dr C. Stott, The Henri Tajfel Laboratory, School of Psychology, University of Liverpool L69 7ZA, UK.
E-mail: c.stott@liverpool.ac.uk

Contract/grant sponsor: Economic and Social Research Council; contract/grant number: RES-000-23-0617.
Contract/grant sponsor: U.K. Home Office.

& Marsh, 2005; p. 3). This reputation for collective violence has developed on the back of incidents of serious 'disorder' involving England fans at international football tournaments across Europe, and has accompanied them for many years (Frosdick & Marsh, 2005; Stott & Reicher, 1998a; Stott, Hutchison, & Drury, 2001). The almost total absence of collective 'disorder' among England fans in cities hosting matches at the European Football Championships in Portugal (Euro2004) therefore belied this violent reputation (Independent Football Commission, IFC, 2004). This in itself poses significant questions relating to why and how this marked shift away from collective 'violence' among England fans occurred. In turn, the issue is immediately complicated by the occurrence of two 'riots' during the tournament involving England fans in Albufeira, a small resort town in Algarve, the southernmost region of Portugal (IFC, 2004).

The emergence of such a contrast within the same social category and within the same football tournament make Euro2004 a rich context in which to examine critical issues relating to the psychology of collective action and social change. In particular, any account of the collective behaviour of England fans must address both the absence of collective 'violence' in match cities *and* the presence of collective 'violence' in Albufeira. The present paper provides such an account through an overview of key incidents involving England fans in conjunction with a phenomenological analysis of England fan accounts. It approaches this task from the theoretical standpoint of the elaborated social identity model of crowd behaviour (ESIM: Drury & Reicher, 2000; Reicher, 1996a, 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998a). This paper builds upon existing research by highlighting the ability of the ESIM to account for both the presence and absence of 'disorder' involving the same social category. In so doing, it is hoped that the value of the model for the development of public order policing policy will be demonstrated. First, however, it is necessary to present an outline of the ESIM and its previous applications to understanding collective 'disorder'.

Social Psychology and Social Change

The issue of normative change in the structure of collective action has always presented social psychology with a major theoretical challenge (Gergen, 1973; Moscovici, 1972; Turner, 1987). This is partly because it forces theory to tackle the issue of social change and therefore to confront what has been defined as the 'master problem' of the discipline (Asch, 1952; Reicher, 1982; Turner, 1987). It is this concern with social change that is central to the ESIM (Reicher, 1996b). The model has its roots firmly in the social identity tradition, drawing on principles from social identity theory (SIT: Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorisation theory (SCT: Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987; Turner, 1985—see also Haslam, 2004; Turner, 1999 for overviews of the relationship between SCT and SIT) to explain the dynamics of crowd events.

Like SIT, the ESIM recognises social identity as embedded within intergroup relations defined by group members in terms of legitimacy and power (Ellemers, 2001; Spears, Jetten, & Doosje, 2001; Turner, 1999). It also shares with SCT a model of social categories as context-dependent social judgements, based upon a social actor's background ideology and motivations, and that are dynamic in both form and content (Brown & Turner, 2002; Haslam & Turner, 1992; Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty, & Hayes, 1992; Reicher, 2001; Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). Moreover, the ESIM proposes that changes in the form and content of a social category lead to changes in the category 'prototype' and therefore, through a process of 'induction', who or what behaviours can become influential among crowd participants (e.g. Reicher, 1984, 1987). However, while the ESIM accepts that social categories are meaningful *reflections* of intergroup relations, it also emphasises that acting on the basis of social categories can in turn *change* those intergroup relations. The ESIM therefore proposes that to understand the dynamics of crowd events, it is necessary to conceptualise social identity as an

ongoing *process* in which the form and content of an identity and the dynamics of intergroup interaction are mutually determining over time (cf. Turner & Giles, 1982).

A specific example of how this process can be used to explain the origins of collective conflict is provided by Stott & Drury's analysis of the 'anti-poll tax riot'. Stott and Drury (2000) argue that demonstrators initially understood themselves to be engaged in legitimate and non-violent protest and differentiated themselves from those who were seeking conflict with police. Subsequent to a sit-down protest on the route of the demonstration, the police understood the whole crowd to be posing a threat to public order and intervened using relatively indiscriminate coercive force (Stott & Reicher, 1998a). Subsequently, demonstrators redefined their social identity in terms of a common relationship to 'illegitimate' and 'violently indiscriminate' police action. As a consequence, conflict with the police came to be understood by demonstrators as legitimate. Moreover, those demonstrators seeking conflict with the police, who had been previously differentiated from the social category, came to be seen as 'prototypical' ingroup members. This more inclusive and changing self-categorisation was the basis from which demonstrators also felt *empowered* to collectively resist police action (Drury & Reicher, 1999; Stott & Drury, 1999). The subsequent escalation in conflict validated police assessments of a uniformly hostile crowd, and led to increasing levels of police intervention until this intergroup process was broken.

The key issue here is that because of a mutually determining relationship between intergroup dynamics and social identity processes the ESIM proposes that 'riots' can be instigated by specific forms of police intervention (Reicher, 1996a; Stott, 1996; Stott & Drury, 2000). In other words, by acting upon their understandings of such the police can help to *create* a uniformly hostile crowd where one did not previously exist.

ESIM and Football Violence

An important feature of ESIM-based analyses has been the model's utility in explaining the emergence of 'rioting' involving England football fans, and latterly the *absence* of disorder among Scotland fans attending the 1998 football World Cup finals ('France98'). These ESIM-based analyses suggest that 'rioting' involving England fans at previous international tournaments can best be understood as an outcome of specific patterns of intergroup interaction where England fans have understood outgroups to have been behaving toward them in an indiscriminately 'violent' manner (Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998b). Taken together these analyses suggested that the illegitimacy perceived in such interactions was for England fans part of an ongoing pattern of conflictual social relations between their own and other social categories, predominantly police and local youths (e.g. FSF, 2004). As a consequence, a key speculation of the ESIM analysis was that in this ongoing social relational context, 'hooligan' fans were emerging as prototypical for the social category and were thus empowered to live out, and to attempt to recreate, their confrontational understanding of intergroup relations (Stott et al., 2001; p. 371).

Conversely, in the context of France98 Scotland fans exhibited 'non-violent' norms and understood their social relations with police and other groups as non-confrontational and characterised by legitimate behaviour on all sides. It was suggested that this also represented a high degree of historical continuity such that Scotland fans in turn expected *positive* social relations in the future as long as these legitimate behaviours were maintained. Moreover, this context was one in which 'hooligan' behaviour was defined as non-prototypical for the social category. Here a key speculation of the ESIM analysis was that this ongoing history of non-confrontational intergroup relations helped to facilitate the emergence of 'self-policing' such that Scotland fans collectively prevented the expression of 'hooligan' activity by other Scotland fans (Stott et al., 2001; p. 374).

The Present Paper: Objectives, Background and Structure

Despite the considerable contributions of these analyses, empirical support for the ESIM is restricted in two key ways. First, the analysis of the presence and absence of large scale football related ‘disorder’ is currently based upon pre-existing differences *between* different social categories (Scotland and England fans). Second, where normative change has been analysed the focus has been upon shifts *towards* collective conflict. What therefore remains to be explored is change *within* a previously ‘violent’ social category *away* from conflict. Put more straightforwardly, the challenge for ESIM research is to provide an empirically validated account of the processes through which a group previously associated with ‘violence’ (England fans in this case) can undergo a cultural shift toward ‘peaceful’ intergroup relations.

In the 3 years leading up to Euro2004, the U.K. Home Office funded a programme of collaborative research between the University of Liverpool and the Police Academy of the Netherlands. This research was designed to further refine the exiting ESIM analyses and develop a model of ‘good practice’ for policing English football fans travelling abroad. Based upon a programme of 34 semi-structured observations at football matches involving English fans across nine European Union states, Stott and Adang (2003a) developed an understanding of those police philosophies, strategies and tactics that corresponded with low levels of ‘disorder’. Moreover, by gathering data from both police and fans this research was able to provide further confirmatory evidence of the importance of social identity and intergroup dynamics in managing ‘disorder’ in the context of football matches with an international dimension.

More specifically, Stott and Adang (2003a) argue that ‘disorder’ appeared to emerge when policing profile was disproportionate to the levels of ‘risk’ fans perceived themselves to be posing to ‘public order’. When police strategy was based merely upon the reputation of English fans as uniformly ‘violent’ police tactics tended to be ‘reactive’ (i.e. engaging with fans primarily *after* conflict had developed) and reliant upon the highly visible use of ‘riot police’ who were themselves tactically dependent upon the use of relatively indiscriminate coercive force. If crowds of English fans encountered such ‘high profile’ policing (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001) at times when fans perceived themselves as posing little, if any, threat to ‘public order’ it appeared to generate shared understandings in the crowd of the *inappropriateness* of police action. Within such social relational contexts fans previously ‘non-violent’ social identity appeared to change such that conflict became more acceptable, ‘conflictual’ fans were more likely to be seen as common ingroup members and some fans actually sought to provoke and engage in ‘disorder’. In contrast, police strategy and tactics based upon information gathered during the crowd event concerning fans’ manifest behaviours tended, in the first instance, to utilise officers in ordinary police uniform (or plain clothes). Such policing tended to be ‘proactive’ (i.e. engaging with fans prior to any forms of conflict) and to be more discriminate or targeted when, and if, force was used. It is argued that when fans encountered this ‘low profile’ policing (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001) it tended to generate shared understandings of police action as *appropriate* or legitimate and that levels of ‘disorder’ were correspondingly lower. Moreover, in the ‘low profile’ policing contexts fans tended not only to describe themselves as different from ‘hooligans’ but there was also evidence of increased levels of ‘self-policing’ (Stott & Adang, 2003a).

These findings combined with the results of previous research on police deployment and crowd dynamics (e.g. Adang & Cuvelier, 2001; Stott & Drury, 2000; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998b) served as the basis for the development of the model of ‘good practice’. The model was made available to police forces across the European Union and was subsequently utilised by the Polícia de Segurança Pública (PSP) in Portugal as a basis for their security policy for Euro2004 (e.g. Adang & Stott, 2003, 2004; Stott & Adang, 2003b). However, Portugal has two main police forces. The PSP has jurisdiction over all of Portugal’s major cities, and was therefore responsible for all match venues involving the England team. The Guarda Nacional Republicana (GNR) has jurisdiction over Portugal’s rural areas and

small towns, including Albufeira. These two police forces developed different public order policies, strategies and tactics for the tournament. Thus, in contrast to the GNR, the PSP approach was directly informed by ESIM principles, particularly in its emphasis on 'low profile', information led graded, proportional and specifically targeted deployment (Coordinating and Planning Committee for Euro2004 (PSP), 2003). This strategy contrasted with a strategy more reliant upon 'high profile', reactive and generally targeted forms of deployment associated with the escalation of violence at previous tournaments (Stott & Reicher, 1998b), but favoured by the GNR (Adang & Stott, 2004; Fernandes, 2003).

Given the involvement of ESIM research in strategic planning, the differences in policing philosophy, and the variability in collective behaviour the tournament therefore provided an excellent opportunity to address the relationships between public order policing, social identity processes and 'disorder'. More specifically, this paper examines variability in England fans' social identity during the tournament and the extent to which such variability is associated with differences in the surrounding intergroup context and nature of 'public order' policing. To achieve this, the paper reports first on three incidents in match cities in which collective 'violence' may have developed but did not, and contrast this with the escalation of collective conflict into a 'riot' on the second night of 'disorder' in Albufeira. The paper then presents a phenomenological analysis of England fans' accounts of their pre-tournament expectations, unfolding intergroup relations and collective identity. Before this it is necessary to outline the strategy employed in the collection and analysis of the data.

METHOD AND ANALYTIC STRATEGY

The data reported in this paper were obtained as part of a larger, multinational cross-cultural research project involving a wide range of different methodological techniques designed to address a range of theoretical, empirical and practical questions (see Stott & Adang, 2005). For reasons of analytical focus (and journal space), the present paper reports only aspects of this broader project, namely a qualitative account of police deployment and behavioural norms among crowds of England fans and a phenomenological analysis of England fans' accounts.

Following the established traditions of ESIM crowd studies, ethnography was the primary method used to gather the data reported here. For a full discussion of the advantages of the ethnographic methodological framework for studying crowd events see Drury & Stott (2001). Suffice to say here that ethnography offered the flexibility necessary to directly observe collective action and to gather contemporaneous data on its underlying processes in an opportunistic manner, from multiple sources, during unpredictable and sometimes dangerous events (see Burgess, 1982; Green, 1993; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Milgram & Toch, 1969; Whyte, 1984).

Semi-Structured Observations

Using this framework the current authors conducted semi-structured observations throughout the tournament while 'participating' in crowd events surrounding all matches involving the England national team, and on the second night of 'rioting' involving England fans in Albufeira. Observations record the approximate chronology of events and the observers' qualitative impressions of fan behaviour, fan group interactions, police deployment (numbers, uniform, behaviour, etc.), fan and police interactions and any other aspects of the situation judged at the time by the observer to be

theoretically relevant. These data were recorded directly onto audio recorders and later transcribed. Photographs and video were also used to record events when this was possible.

Fan Data

The ethnographic framework also allowed for England fans to be interviewed opportunistically and contemporaneously throughout the tournament. A semi-structured schedule was developed prior to the tournament and was used as the basic theoretical framework for the interviews (see Appendix). England fans were interviewed while gathered in crowds, bars, cafés and campsites. On almost all occasions fans were informed that they were being interviewed for research purposes and their contributions were recorded directly onto audio recorders. During moments of 'rioting' and potential conflict the use of the schedule, direct recording and informed consent were impractical and dangerous. On these occasions fan interviews, while unstructured, were still driven by specific theoretical concerns and made relevant to the, often rapidly developing, surrounding events. The verbal content of these interactions was recorded onto audio recorders as soon as was practical. Approximately 74 England fans were interviewed or spoken to using this method.

Data were also gathered before, during and after the tournament via web-based questionnaires that facilitated anonymous responses, and via an email survey. The web-based questionnaire included two open ended questions¹ (see Appendix). England fans were recruited in a number of different ways; through small articles on the Football Association's (FA) official 'EnglandFans' website, in five editions of 'Freelions' (a Magazine of the Football Supporters Federation), through email distributions 'loops' set up by independent Fan organizations,² and through flyers that were randomly distributed by hand during the tournament advertising our research and website URL. In addition, before the tournament the first author attended seven meetings held by England fan organisations where fans were encouraged to complete the web-based questionnaires both before and after the tournament. One hundred and two questionnaires were submitted, 39 pre-tournament and 63 within 1 month of the end of the tournament.

England fans have provided data to the first author via the website in connection with previous research. Twenty of these fans were contacted by email following the tournament and provided with a series of questions (see Appendix). Fourteen of these fans responded.

Analytical Techniques

As with previous ESIM research on crowd events, the analysis is broken into two sections (cf. Drury & Reicher, 2000; Reicher, 1984, 1987, 1996a; Stott & Drury, 2000; Stott & Reicher, 1998b; Stott et al., 2001). The first provides a behavioural account of incidents involving England fans during the tournament. This account is constructed with the explicit aim of drawing out aspects of this behaviour that are relevant to the subsequent phenomenological analysis. Again following the precedent of previous ESIM research this account is 'consensual' where 'consensus' is operationalised through triangulation of multiple sources (cf. Denzin, 1989). These different sources include data obtained through the direct observation of events by the present authors supplemented by data obtained through

¹The questionnaire gathered both quantitative and qualitative data but given the focus and scope of the current analysis it is only the qualitative data that is reported here.

²For example, www.londonenglandfans.co.uk, www.4england.org

interviews with; (a) senior police officers from the Portuguese police services, (b) police based at the Police National Information Centre,³ (c) the senior commanders from the U.K. Police delegation, (d) the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS), (e) a team of nine observers recruited to conduct observations of England matches as part of the wider project,⁴ (f) security officials for the English F.A., (g) officials from the British Consulate. These observations and interviews were also cross-referenced with photographs and video obtained by the current authors, and supplemented by video broadcast by BBC, Sky and ITN news. Unless otherwise stated, the behavioural account is based upon agreement between two or more of these independent sources. Where sources diverge or only one provides data that cannot be confirmed by video or photographic evidence, a specific reference to that source is given prior to a description of the behavioural episode.

The second section presents the phenomenological analysis of fans' accounts (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003; Smith & Osborne, 2003). These data were not used in compiling the behavioural account. Again in line with previous ESIM analyses participants' accounts were subjected to a thematic analysis (Kellehear, 1993; cf. Reicher, 1984, 1987, 1996a; Stott & Reicher, 1998a, 1998b). This analysis explores the evolving content of fans' social identity and the relationship of this content to understandings of the surrounding social contexts. Our initial approach to these data was therefore informed by our theoretical framework and linked to the analytical questions. These data were read and then organised by the first and third authors around a set of relevant themes. These were; (a) pre-tournament expectations; (b) how fans defined themselves and their social relations in the context of match cities and the Algarve; (c) the content of their collective identity, particularly in terms of what actions were understood as appropriate and possible; (d) who counted as 'ingroup' and who as 'outgroup'. Once organised in this way accounts were then further sub-divided around emergent themes until a best 'fit' was achieved between the thematic analysis and the data (Smith & Osborne, 2003). It was this thematic analysis that was used to create the structure of the broader analysis. Extracts are presented on the basis that they provide the best example to illustrate the analytical point and are followed by a reference to the source of the data.

Our analytical technique is based upon the assumption that fans' descriptions of events are indicative of their representations. Therefore a fan's account demonstrates that a particular interpretation was present among our sample and therefore that corresponding representations may have been available to participants within the events described. Although controversies exist as to whether participants' accounts represent evidence of cognitive representations, particularly concerning 'violent' crowd events (e.g. Edwards & Potter, 1992; Wetherell & Potter, 1989) it is our contention that the empirical techniques employed here permit a parsimonious theoretical explanation of the events themselves and are therefore justified (Haslam & McGarty, 2001).

BEHAVIOURAL ACCOUNT

The Establishment and Maintenance of Non-Violent Norms: Three Key Incidents

The first major gathering of England fans occurred on Saturday the 12th of June on the evening prior to England's opening game against France. A crowd of around 400 to 500 England fans gathered in the southwest corner of the Rossio Square in central Lisbon. Approximately 15 police officers were visibly

³Which recorded all significant incidents, police deployments and 'intelligence' that took place throughout Portugal during the tournament.

⁴These were the fourth author and a team of eight observers (four female and four male). Four of these observers were final year students at the National Police Academy and four were final year students in Psychology Departments in Portuguese Universities. All were bilingual.

present, all of whom were in standard uniform.⁵ However, a small number of police in plain clothes were also present. At approximately 11 p.m. this crowd, many of whom appeared drunk, were boisterously chanting songs but also spilling out onto the roadway, thereby blocking the route of traffic through the Square. The police officers in standard uniform initially withdrew from the area but then returned shortly afterwards with riot helmets attached to their belts. They formed a line and gradually but non-violently forced the fans onto the pedestrian area in the centre of the Rossio, thus clearing the roadway. During this manoeuvre, some booing was heard and one or two plastic glasses were thrown from the crowd at the police. At some point, some of the uniformed police put on their helmets and drew their batons. During this period between two and four England fans—one of whom was later charged with assaulting a French fan—were forcefully and visibly detained by a group of four to five uniformed police (including the Commander for the Rossio). In response some England fans began to throw missiles at the police who were making the detentions. The police were then reinforced by an intervention squad wearing their protective equipment.⁶

Around this time a group of between 15 and 30 England fans then emerged together from the crowd and made their way towards the police line. Our field notes record that some were verbally encouraging others in the group to confront the police. As they approached the police, one England fan ran from the surrounding crowd. Facing the confrontational group, he shouted aggressively at them 'We're English, where's your pride?'. The advancing fans stopped. Other fans then intervened, encouraging those fans present not to engage in conflict with each other. There is consensus that the previously confrontational group then moved away into an adjacent street in the southeast corner of the Rossio. The situation rapidly calmed, the police consulted with their U.K. colleagues and reduced the number of uniformed police in the area. The confrontational group continued to cause minor disruption in the adjacent street.

The second incident occurred on the 21st of June, again in the Rossio Square in Lisbon, just prior to England's final group qualification match against Croatia. Earlier in the day the Police Intelligence Services had received information concerning a large group of Croatian 'hooligans' who were intending to confront England fans at some point. By early afternoon the Rossio was crowded with at least 3000 England fans. Once again there were only a handful of officers deployed in the Rossio, all in standard uniform, but these were supported by a small number of plain clothed officers. Our field notes record that at around 3 p.m., an organised group of approximately 75 young male Croatian fans walked through Lisbon city centre and into the southeast corner of the Rossio. They began to chant in the direction of the crowd of England fans, some covered their faces with scarves and collected together bottles, as if preparing for a violent confrontation.

England fans on the southeast edge of the crowd turned towards the Croatians and started to chant. As this took place a group of approximately 100 to 150 male England fans were sitting outside a café bar on the east side of the Rossio. Our field notes record that three or four fans from this bar walked to about 10 m from the Croatian fans and, standing and looking at them, discussed among themselves the situation and their potential responses to it. Our field notes record that their conversation indicated that they were expecting to be confronted by the Croatian fans, and were preparing to respond with 'violence'. This went on for approximately 10 minutes before one England fan who had been sitting in the bar approached a police officer in standard uniform, who was positioned with four colleagues close by (including the Commander for the Rossio). There is direct evidence that this fan expressed his concerns to the police regarding the behaviour and intentions of the Croatian fans. Throughout the

⁵Standard uniform consisted of boots, trousers, a shirt and baseball cap, sometimes accompanied by a leather 'bomber style' jacket. These officers were normally armed with a baton and a pistol.

⁶Intervention squads are units of police officers that are trained to intervene in 'violent' crowd situations. They are equipped with batons helmets, shields and other protective equipment.

conversation the police officers pointed and looked toward the Croatian fans. Shortly afterwards, the Croatian fans dispersed from the area.⁷

The third series of events began early in the morning of the 22nd of June, when an England fan named Steven Smith was fatally stabbed by a pickpocket in central Lisbon. By 3 p.m. on the 24th of June the Rossio Square was once again busy with England fans just prior to their Quarter Final knock out match against Portugal. A large number of fans were once again drinking outside the café bar on the east side of the Rossio. At approximately 4 p.m. two fans from this group climbed the base of a central monument where they attached a flag of St George. Across the horizontal bar was written a reference to the murder which read '*STEVEN SMITHS TRAGIC DEATH*'. A more extensive message was displayed across the remainder of the flag, which indicated the historical continuity of the murder and the manner in which England fans have been consistently misunderstood and misrepresented by the Government. This message read:

I suppose you are going to blame this on football hooliganism Mr Blair. It's about time you defended us for a change instead of condemning us. How many English fans have to die abroad before you are shamed into action? We are more English than you will ever be and REVENGE IS SWEET.

At approximately 5 p.m. one of these fans then climbed the fountain at the south of the Square to attach another flag of St George displaying an almost identical message. Before finally attaching the flag he displayed its message to fans in the Square who responded with quiet but widespread applause.

Following England's defeat, large numbers of Portugal and some England fans gathered in the Rossio. At approximately 11:15 pm a Portugal fan climbed onto the fountain in the south of the Square and tried to remove the flag of St George containing the written message. A group of approximately ten England fans were gathered in a café on the west side of the Rossio, two of whom had earlier attached the flag to the fountain. Our field notes record that they shouted to each other 'that's our flag'. There is consensus that these fans then ran into the crowd and began to attack the Portugal fan on the fountain by throwing missiles. Almost immediately a large group of Portugal fans retaliated, and the England fans retreated inside the café on the west side of the Rossio. Very quickly around thirty police officers, some in plain clothes and some in standard uniform, and all wearing fluorescent tabards indicating that they were police, formed a cordon around this café. They stood facing the crowd of Portugal fans, with batons sheathed, and prevented them from further attacking the England fans gathered inside.

The police then instructed the England fans in the cafe to move away from the Rossio. Our field notes record that the England fans refused unless the police provided some protection since they claimed that during the confrontation they had been threatened with a knife by a Portugal fan. There is consensus that after a few minutes, unmarked police cars arrived and escorted the England fans inside the cordon from the area. The England fans were then released in an adjacent street. Throughout these events positive interactions between England and Portugal fans continued in the rest of the Rossio Square. Some 10 minutes afterwards some of the England fans from the café reappeared on a street adjacent to the southeast corner of the Rossio Square. There were around 20 England fans gathered at this café, surrounded on all sides by singing Portugal fans. Our field notes record that around half of these England fans were standing, singing England football songs in good-natured response to, and periodically joining in with, the chants of the Portugal fans. The remaining England fans comprised those who were involved in the fountain attack. They were sat quietly beside the singing group, disengaged from and, our field notes record, apparently uninterested in the positive interactions going on around them.

⁷According to police reports, a similar group of Croatian fans were involved in an incident approximately 4 hours later in which a flare was ignited on a subway train and England fans were assaulted.

Incidents of 'Disorder' in Albufeira

The first night of 'disorder' involving England fans occurred in the central 'strip' of bars in Albufeira in early morning of 15th of June, 2004. According to the GNR a small number of officers attending an incident were attacked as they passed through a crowd gathered on the roadway outside Reno's and La Bamba's bars at the south end of the main 'strip' in Albufeira. According to the doorman of Reno's bar the police had previously instructed the bar owner to close which had subsequently forced the fans out onto the roadway. According to video evidence cars were still passing along the roadway through the crowd at the time conflict occurred. There is consensus that following the closure of the bar there were a series of escalating confrontations between England fans and GNR 'intervention squads'. Media reports indicate that up to 400 fans of different nations were involved. During the evening 12 England fans, 1 Portuguese national and a Russian fan were arrested and subsequently charged.

At approximately 2.00 a.m. on the following evening, a crowd of approximately 400 England fans had gathered either in Reno's and La Bamba's bars or on the roadway between them. Twelve GNR 'intervention squad' officers who were not wearing protective equipment were standing in two groups observing events. A group of approximately 50 England fans began to chant towards the group of police officers to the immediate north of the crowd. At around 2.10 a.m., a group of four males who, as our field notes record, did not appear to be English stood on a wall adjacent to Reno's and began to video the crowd. There is video evidence that a group of approximately 20 England fans closest to this group then began to chant 'who are you?',⁸ throw beer and then physically attack this group. The four males then jumped down from the wall and ran up an adjacent street. At around this time video footage details two fans throwing beer over and spitting in the face of the owner of Reno's bar who was also standing close to the wall. The bar owner retreated into Reno's and there is consensus that approximately 20 England fans then began to attack the bar with chairs and tables.

The two groups of police who were present baton charged those England fans attacking the bar. According to our field notes, as this occurred the majority of England fans present moved south just as the police were reinforced by approximately 20 colleagues in full protective equipment. Several of these England fans could be heard criticising those involved in the attack on the bar. One, who was heard to say of those attacking the bar, 'fucking twats, fucking twats, they had to kick off today, didn't they. Fucking idiots' was then struck to the ground by a police baton. There followed several similar instances of police baton attacks against individual fans in this group. This culminated in a baton charge on the entire crowd after a plastic chair was thrown by an unidentified individual among this group toward the GNR. As these fans dispersed some began to agitate and violently confront the GNR. One England fan involved in the initial attack on the bar physically challenged other England fans urging them to get involved in attacks against the GNR, shouting 'come on, we can fucking have them, we can fucking do them if we stand'.

There is consensus that approximately 20 minutes after the initial attack on Reno's bar further police reinforcements, in full protective equipment, had contained approximately 150 England fans outside an adjacent bar. Several fans within the cordon were arrested. Our field notes record that on a road junction to the north of the cordon a group of England fans, several of whom had been involved in the initial bar attack, were shouting abuse and throwing missiles at the GNR. Four GNR cavalry officers charged from the direction of the cordon toward this group and dispersed them north along the strip. During this time, another group of approximately 20 to 30 England fans, had also gathered on this road junction. The cordon adjacent to Reno's bar was relaxed and some of the fans who had previously been contained either dispersed or gathered on the road junction and chatted to each other about events.

⁸A chant common in English football grounds use to belittle opposition fans.

According to our field notes the situation then calmed. Then at 2.55 a.m., approximately 20 GNR in protective equipment walking from the direction of the cordon began to baton strike fans gathered on the road junction and several individuals were injured. England fans around the junction immediately dispersed but as they moved away from the area many turned to shout abuse, confront and throw missiles at the police. However, again according to our field notes, throughout these events many England fans that were present in the area were vocally critical of the fans that were behaving confrontationally but did not act further.

Issues Arising from the Behavioural Accounts

The events described above raise a number of issues relevant to our analysis. First, they indicate that confrontational or 'hooligan' fans were present in both match cities and Albufeira. Despite this, widespread 'disorder' involving England fans did not develop during any of the three incidents in Lisbon, an area controlled by the PSP. Moreover, the data suggest the PSP adopted a 'low profile' police presence and that there was an almost total absence of 'intervention squads' throughout these incidents although large numbers were positioned close by being kept deliberately out of sight. In the first and second of these three events, there was also evidence of 'self-policing' among England fans, defined here in terms of a willingness and capability among sections of the England support to act to protect and *enforce* non-violent norms. In the third event, a group of England fans who had earlier sought to promote a message to other England fans about the confrontational nature of their surrounding intergroup relations *was* later involved in violent confrontation. Once again, during this incident police action did not involve 'intervention squads', was targeted specifically at those involved in conflict and was sensitive to the emerging intergroup interactions. Subsequently, conflict did *not* generalise and the situation calmed. Finally, when this confrontational group were 'released' they did not subsequently seek to re-engage in conflict and appeared marginalised from the wider group of England fans.

By stark contrast, there were 'riots' involving England fans in Albufeira. The data suggest that in Albufeira the GNR adopted a 'high profile' police presence in that prominent use was made of 'intervention squads' who adopted a more generally targeted form of intervention. This was in turn associated with the rapid escalation of a relatively localised conflict to involve previously 'non-violent' fans. The data also suggest that in this context, and in contrast to Lisbon, acts of norm enforcement were still evident but performed by individuals who sought to *maintain* confrontational norms in relation to the police. Correspondingly, there was no evidence of any acts of 'self-policing', despite the presence of many England fans that were critical of those fans who engaged in confrontation.

PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF FAN ACCOUNTS

Expectations of Intergroup Relations in Portugal

To explain these broad differences in fan behaviour we turn first to England fans' expectations before the tournament. In line with their historical experiences, some described an expectation that the police in Portugal would hold a stereotype of *all* England fans as hooligans.

I am concerned that England fans will be all seen as hooligans by the police. (Pre-tournament web questionnaire, respondent 7.)

Respondents characterised this stereotype as inaccurate and unjustified, being based upon the reputation and activity of only a minority of England fans. None the less there was evidence of an expectation that should this minority actually engage in acts of 'hooliganism' then this could lead to an indiscriminate clamp down by the police.

The danger is that the actions of a few might provoke an over reaction by the authorities in which the innocent majority are caught up. (Pre-tournament web questionnaire, respondent 12)

One England fan described how he/she expected the police to be nervous around England fans. This anxiety was also characterised as increasing the likelihood that the police could attack England fans for simply engaging in 'harmless' behaviours, such as singing loudly in large groups.

I fully expect the Portuguese Police to be very edgy and just the breakout of a song by 200 English fans in a pub could see batons being thrown. (Pre-tournament web questionnaire, respondent 13)

Thus the presence of 'hooligans', the heavy drinking boisterousness of England fans combined with the nervousness of police was described as holding the potential to provoke indiscriminate and violent responses from the police. Such policing was also characterised as capable of interacting with the retaliatory nature of England fan identity and that this interaction could determine whether or not widespread 'hooliganism' actually occurred.

As a race, though, we do generally drink too much and when provoked will fight back rather than turning a cheek . . . If things kick off in Portugal this time, then, the question will be how will England fans react and what will be the response of the police. (Pre-tournament web questionnaire, respondent 24)

Illustrated in the extract above is an understanding that quite different forms of social relations were possible. On the one hand, a historically dominant experience of inappropriate and illegitimate or 'high profile' policing. On the other, a recognition that a more positive 'low profile' style of policing was possible. Each with very different consequences for fan behaviour.

I think the main issue is how the police are going to treat England supporters. The low-key affair is my preference as I feel that this leads to less conflict between police and fans. The heavy-handed approach seems to have people on the edge and leads to confrontation between fans and police. (Pre-tournament web questionnaire, respondent 8)

Experiences of Intergroup Relations in Match Cities

Despite the evidence of more negative expectations, England fans described very positive experiences on arrival in Portugal.

I was pleasantly surprised when we first arrived in Lisbon for the France game. There was no way I was going to go near the Rossio Square as I expected something to 'go off'. Thankfully I was wrong. I thoroughly enjoyed my time there. (Post-tournament email survey, RH)

In turn, this positive ingroup behaviour was described as occurring in a context of intergroup relations, which were positive and friendly, both with fans from other nations and the local population.

There was a mix of fans there watching matches. . . and everyone was in a superb mood. I was playing table football with some Swedish and German guys, and we all brought each other beer. There were no rows, no punches being thrown and no violence. (Post-tournament email survey, SM)

Most significantly, and contrary to the more pessimistic expectations, England fans also characterised relations with the PSP as non-confrontational.

I have only good things to say about the way we were policed, it was mostly in the background, mostly observing. There was no in-your-face threatening police action, they were very helpful, easily approachable, probably my best experience of police control at an England match abroad. (Post-tournament email survey, NC)

England fans described PSP deployment as designed specifically to facilitate, rather than seeking to prevent, positive ingroup norms such as large gatherings of boisterous England fans.

They were prepared to accept the English taking over Lisbon, particularly the Rossio Square, on match days in the full knowledge that things would soon return to normal. (Post-tournament email survey, KC)

Even when the PSP did act against England fans, there were descriptions of these interventions as differentiated, proportionate and appropriate.

I like the way the police managed the kicking of footballs in the square, they waited until the ball came to them, put it straight in the car and took it away. No negotiation and no heavy-handed method of getting it. (Post-tournament email survey, SE)

Thus, given the pre-tournament accounts indicating that two very different forms of social relations with the PSP were possible, the evidence points toward an experience among England fans of appropriate and legitimate policing. Not only was this contrasted with a history of aggressive and indiscriminate policing, it was also described by some to be fulfilling the potential for positive relations that had been suggested by encounters with this 'low profile' policing at previous tournaments.

Int: What do you think about the way England fans were policed?

All the fans were policed very well, it was obvious they had done their homework, were not out to cause rather to deter trouble, unlike certain other forces, Belgium and Slovakia, to name but two. They had learnt from the way that the Dutch [Police] worked so well in [Euro] 2000 and should be commended . . . if only we could experience it wherever we went in Europe. (Post-tournament email survey, RH)

Psychological Outcomes in Match Cities

One outcome associated with this positive characterisation of intergroup relations was that, despite the fact that some England fans described themselves as more passionate and vociferous than fans of any other nation, they nevertheless described considerable similarities between themselves and other national fan groups.

Int: Do you see yourself as similar or different from fans of other nations who you saw in Portugal?

On the whole similar to all other fans, we want to watch good football and hopefully see our team win. But undoubtedly England has the biggest away following and generally seems more passionate about their team. (Post-tournament email survey, HC)

This similarity between national groupings was defined in terms of common sets of values and norms relating to non-violent and inclusive football fandom.

The majority of all nations there were all law abiding fans who were taking a holiday whilst watching their nation. Met some great Germans, Swedes and Dutch and they knew their football and knew how to enjoy themselves, just like our group. (Post-tournament email survey, SE)

Those fans seen to be acting in a way that was contrary to these shared norms were characterised as existing outside the boundaries of the national fan identity and thus as differentiated from the social group.

Int: Do you see yourself as similar or different to those fans in the Algarve that were arrested during the incidents that occurred?

Different. I am a supporter of England—they are not. (Post-tournament email survey, SG)

The data therefore suggest the emergence of a social identity among England fans that was defined in terms of positive social relations with the PSP, positive relations with other national fan groups and differentiation from 'hooligan' activity.

Such identity content is consistent with the episodes of 'self-policing' outlined in the behavioural account. In the first of these an England fan aggressively confronted a group of other England fans who were seeking to attack the police on the evening prior to England's opening match against France in the Rossio Square in central Lisbon. Thus, in a context where England fan identity appears to have been defined in terms of positive and appropriate social relations with the PSP, England fans also acted to maintain 'non-violent' norms in the face of shifts toward conflict by other England fans. The key point here is that it is difficult to understand this incident of 'norm enforcement' without acknowledging some understanding on the part of the intervening fan that conflict with the PSP was improper and, judging by that fan's utterances, specifically 'un-English' or non-prototypical.

The second 'self-policing' incident involved an England fan approaching the PSP in the face of a threat to 'non-violent' norms posed by a large group of Croatian fans, again in the Rossio Square in Lisbon. An interview was conducted with this England fan immediately following his conversation with the PSP:

C: Why did you go and speak to the police?

EF: If something kicks off they [England fans] will all be in. This is fantastic [points toward England fans in Rossio], this is England. But if something kicks off they'll all be in and we'll get the blame and it's fucking wrong.

C: So did you go and explain that to them?

EF: I don't care what you say its in the heart [bangs his hand on his chest] we are all fucking hooligans [gesticulates toward the Rossio and the bar where he had been sitting] and if somebody has a go at your country, we've been bred for the last 2000 years to fight, we're all going to have a go back. I saw them lads come around and it was fucking obvious that they [the Croatians] were going to have a go. I mean all credit at least they [the PSP] are doing something about it now but why has it taken them so long. So I got up and did something about it, to get the police to move them Croatians before the England boys sussed out what was going on because if they did it would have gone off. (Conversation England Fan, Rossio Square, Field Notes CS)

It is evident from this account that this fan believed that under different conditions, widespread violent confrontation with the Croatian fans would have developed. However, what prevailed was a 'non-violent' strategy involving an 'alliance' between a self-defined 'hooligan' and the PSP which appears aimed at protecting 'non-violent' norms that this fan described as prototypical for the wider crowd of England fans.

Intergroup Relations in Albufeira

England fans drew negative comparisons to policing in match cities when describing policing in Albufeira. For example, one fan described policing in Albufeira as indiscriminately confrontational toward England fans.

Int: How was policing in the Algarve? Was it similar or different to policing in match cities?

It was different and more intimidating. Police appeared to be more 'in your face', and we had and saw several examples of where police came and stood one yard away from us with their riot gear on because we were English. (Post-tournament email survey, SE)

Fans described the action of the GNR as designed to *prevent* England fans from engaging in positive ingroup norms, in this case the singing of songs in large groups. Moreover, they characterised this policing as the basis upon which a lack of 'respect' from England fans toward the GNR was governed and the basis from which the 'rioting' developed. Once again this was contrasted sharply with fans' experiences of the PSP in match cities.

F1: Its okay here [Lisbon], I'll give respect to the police here but it's different to Albufeira. There the police don't know what they are doing. Here it's been really cool and calm hasn't it.

F2: Yeah, its been proper, proper, celebrations. But there [Albufeira], useless man I tell you. . . When you are celebrating like in there [Rossio Square] last night it were brilliant. No hassle no riot police coming in or anything. In Albufeira you stand in that road you were getting knocked onto that kerb and a baton over your head.

F1: Everything has been brilliant with supporters hasn't it, its been proper good. . . There's been no fucking hassle in Albufeira with fans or anything. Its all been the police. The police have been causing a load of shit by not letting people celebrate. Last night they let us celebrate and that is what it is about. (Conversation England fans, Rossio Square, Field Notes, CS)

These England fans went on to describe their experiences of the interventions by the GNR on the first evening of 'disorder' as unjustified, disproportionate and indiscriminate.

Int: What's it been like in Albufeira then?

F1: Kicked off over nothing. I watched it, I was there. It was just a little mistake. Cars come into a no go area really, when England were dancing in the street. The next thing is that they [local Portuguese] got out of the cars. There is that many English the car can't get up there. The next thing it just went. . . This woman, I've got pictures of this woman being held down on the floor while two police were smashing her fucking head in with riot batons.

Int: This was on the Monday?

F2: Monday, yeah.

F1: Thing is English have always been on their best behaviour and we just get singled out. (Conversation England fans, Rossio Square, Field Notes, CS)

Consequently, the events on the first evening came to frame fans descriptions of events on the second evening. For example, the area outside Reno's bar was described by England fans as a focal point for common category members who wished to confront the GNR for their actions on the previous evening.

Rumours went round of English being badly treated (even heard of one English fan being beaten to death) by the police, and one trait common amongst the English is that we are not backward in defending ourselves or perceived injustices. Therefore more wanted a night out on the strip after that. (Post-tournament email survey, SE)

England fans also described the actions of the GNR during interventions on the second evening as unjustified and indiscriminate. Following a baton charge by the GNR an England fan in the crowd gathered on the road junction just south of Reno's bar was overheard expressing his views about police activity.

What a bunch of c*** . . . we weren't (sic) doing fuck all (Conversation, England Fans, Albufeira, Field notes AL)

Thus, GNR interventions were described across both evenings in a manner that was consistent with fans' more negative pre-tournament expectations about 'high profile' policing, as disproportionate, unjustified and indiscriminately confrontational.

Psychological Outcomes in Albufeira

As conflict escalated on the second evening 'violent' actions against the police came to be described by some previously non-confrontational England fans as appropriate. One England fan interviewed during the 'riot', argued that he had thrown a glass and a table at the GNR in order to protect himself from a baton charge.

I was sitting in the bar and the police came in and I had to chuck my pint glass and shove my table in their way just to get away (Conversation, England Fans, Albufeira, Field notes, AL)

During GNR interventions fans also began to express identification with, and increasing normalisation of, 'violent' activity.

They [generic reference to police/authority] fucking talk about trouble, and they wonder why they get it (Conversation, England Fans, Albufeira, Field notes AL)

Meanwhile, others were clear in their condemnation of the indiscriminate nature of the interventions by the GNR and argued that, as a consequence, it was the police who were responsible for the overall levels of 'disorder'.

Do you know why there is trouble because they are causing trouble, the riot police. We were walking along, I'm a family man with four kids, looking for a drink. I'm sober. I'm going to England games. They [The GNR] are causing trouble themselves. There's lads here now, genuine. They [the GNR] are causing trouble. (England fan, ITN news broadcast, 17.06.04)

The data therefore suggest the emergence of a social identity among England fans in Albufeira that was defined in terms of negative social relations with the GNR and the increasing appropriateness of and identification with 'hooligans' and 'hooligan' activity, in this case conflict with the GNR.

DISCUSSION

This paper set out to explore the extent to which a phenomenological analysis of England fan accounts could inform theoretical understanding of the social psychological processes that underpinned the relative absence of 'disorder' among England fans in match cities during Euro2004 and the 'rioting' involving England fans in the Algarve. The analysis suggests that in match cities policing was 'low profile' and was in line with England fans' positive pre-tournament expectations.

In match cities a form of England fan identity was apparent that was defined in terms of 'non-violent' football fandom, similarity with fans of other nations and positive social relations with the police. The absence of collective 'disorder' occurred in spite of the presence of self-defined 'hooligans' and at least three incidents during which some fans sought to instigate conflict. Rather than leading to more widespread 'disorder', these attempts were instead undermined—in two cases by the 'self-policing' actions of England fans attempting to maintain non-confrontational norms, and in the third case by a 'proportionate' and specifically targeted police intervention. The first and second of these incidents were indicative of an understanding of the (non-)prototypicality and (in)appropriateness of 'hooligan' activity, and of the ability of those seeking to protect 'non-violent' norms to act upon such understandings. Thus, the data suggest that intergroup relations surrounding England fans in the match cities were experienced as legitimate. It also suggests that in this social relational context identity content for England fans was such that 'hooliganism' was seen as non-prototypical and those fans seeking to initiate 'disorder' were psychologically differentiated and subsequently marginalised. Match cities also appear to have provided a context for England fans in which 'self-policing' was understood to be proper and possible social action.

In contrast, the evidence suggests that policing in Albufeira was relatively 'high profile' and resonated with fans' previous experiences of 'indiscriminately violent' police action. In this intergroup context, two 'riots' occurred that were characterised by the escalation of conflict against the GNR, the involvement of initially peaceful fans and the concurrent escalation of relatively undifferentiated coercive police intervention. In contrast to the match cities the identity evident among England fans in Albufeira was defined in terms of the inappropriateness or illegitimacy of police action. Correspondingly, there was some evidence of an increasing sense of the perceived appropriateness of confrontation with the police and identification with 'hooligans', even among those who were previously avoiding conflict. Moreover, while forms of norm enforcement were also apparent during the 'disorder' in Albufeira they were undertaken by those seeking to compel England fans *towards* conflict with the GNR. Inversely, those England fans avoiding conflict, while verbally expressing their anger about 'hooligan' fans, apparently did not do anything to attempt to prevent conflictual actions by other England fans. Compared to match cities, then, Albufeira provided an intergroup context within which a very different sense of what constituted proper and possible behaviour for England fans was evident.

Implications for the ESIM Analysis of Football-Related 'Disorder'

Although it has been argued that the low levels of 'disorder' at Euro2004 were the outcome of the 'Football Banning Orders' (FBO's: e.g. BBC News, August 12th, November 5th, 2005), a piece of legislation used to prevent over two and half thousand fans from leaving the UK during the tournament, the present analysis indicates that such an explanation is overly simplistic (see also Stott & Pearson, *in press*). Instead, it provides further empirical support for the ESIM-based analysis of large scale football-related 'disorder' at international tournaments (Stott & Adang, 2003a,b; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998b). The current study develops upon this previous research by providing evidence that social identity and intergroup processes can underpin both the presence and the absence of large-scale 'disorder' among the same social category at an international football tournament (Stott & Adang, 2003a; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998a).

The current analysis also develops the existing research by suggesting that the broad differences in collective behaviour between match cities and Albufeira was associated with the respective dominance, or availability, of different forms of England fan identity, the form and content of which consisted in large part of different understandings of the category's intergroup relations with the

police. The relative dominance, in manifest terms at least, of each version of identity content was therefore associated with observed differences in public order policing tactics. Thus the current study also allows us to contribute to theoretical debates regarding how understandings of the intergroup context interact with dynamics of power to produce particular outcomes (e.g. Drury & Reicher, 2005). With regard to 'self-policing', the subjectively positive social relations in match cities appear to have empowered category members to actively defend a 'non-violent' prototype, such that even self-defined 'hooligans' felt able to undermine shifts towards conflict through providing information to the police. In contrast in Albufeira, where relations with the police appear to have been experienced as negative, it was those fans who sought conflict that not only felt able to act but also to impose 'normative pressure' upon other England fans around them. To put this in theoretical terms, the evidence suggests that fans' experiences of the legitimacy of intergroup relations with the police interacted with identity content in ways that affected the dynamics of power within the category to facilitate or undermine 'self-policing'. Thus, while previous ESIM analyses of football 'disorder' have focussed on the extent to which 'self-policing' was understood by Scottish fans as *prototypical* (Stott et al., 2001), the present analysis emphasises the extent to which 'prototypicality' interacts with power to actually make 'self-policing' *possible*.

Developing this theoretical speculation further, the evidence also suggests that concurrent processes of *disempowerment* might have been equally important. Intergroup relations in match cities appear to have also undermined the attempts of a confrontational group to influence the wider England fan base toward conflict. In other words, those fans attempting to create confrontation and violence were apparently *disempowered* in a context of subjectively appropriate policing. In contrast, in the context of subjectively inappropriate policing it was non-confrontational fans that were apparently disempowered and no longer able to act to undermine shifts towards conflict. It may therefore be that shifts toward collective conflict among fans were taking place not just because of the empowerment and prototypicality of 'hooligans', but also because of the perceived inability of different elements within that fan group to act to resist those shifts. In other words, in the context of illegitimate intergroup relations, while resistance to 'hooliganism' may well have been seen as *proper* behaviour by some fans, it was not *possible* for them to act.

Limitations of the Current Analysis

The current paper has presented a phenomenological analysis of a cross sectional sample of fans' accounts. These data provide a rich insight into social and psychological processes that may have been at work during the tournament. Nonetheless, we are sensitive to the limitations of these data and have necessarily sought to be cautious in our interpretation of them. This is especially so when we start to consider the precise mechanics of the psychological processes underlying particular outcomes. For example, it is possible that England fans came to differentiate themselves from 'hooligans' by re-categorising and excluding them from the category (cf. Castano, Palladino, Coull, & Yzerbyt, 2002; Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988), or through sub-typing them within the category (e.g. Devine & Baker, 1991; Hewstone, 1996), or a combination of both, or indeed neither of these possibilities. The point that we would make here is that while a more in-depth, fine-grained analysis would indeed reduce uncertainty about the precise mechanics of this process, it would shift the analytical focus away from the broader contexts in which such processes are embedded.

This point notwithstanding, additional forms of data would of course increase our confidence in the existence of and relationship between the processes outlined in the current analysis. Foremost among these would be quantifiable data on the extent to which fans shared a perception that intergroup relations in match cities were legitimate and the extent to which fans in match cities developed a

super-ordinate identification with fans of other nations and differentiated themselves from 'hooligans'. Since we propose that these processes were dependent upon particular forms of intergroup interaction, the analysis would also benefit from systematically gathered, quantifiable data on the nature of police deployment, and data on the policies and psychology governing such deployment (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001; Drury, Stott, & Farsides, 2003; Reicher, Stott, Cronin, & Adang, 2004; Stott, 2003; Stott & Reicher, 1998a). Such data is available from the wider project (see Stott & Adang, 2005) and will be the focus of separate complementary analyses.

Finally, our arguments regarding changes in identity could be made with greater certainty if we had been able to follow the same fans across the duration of the tournament—to use experimental terminology, by employing a within-subjects design. While we fully acknowledge this, we would nevertheless reiterate our concern with broader patterns and processes. Moreover, we would point toward the sampling biases inherent when recruiting participants prepared to take part in a longitudinal study across a whole tournament. Indeed, it is our contention that ethnographic cross-sectional sampling using multiple techniques has captured data from a diverse range of England fans, many of whom might otherwise have refused to make the effort to take part in the research. By using this cross-sectional technique it is evident that there were marked differences between match cities and Albufeira in the extent to which confrontational definitions of England fan identity were manifested. Given that there is no evidence of or reason to assume *a priori* differences between the fans in these two contexts, this suggests that the differences *emerged* as a function of contextual variation. We feel that—to use experimental terminology again—this between-subjects approach therefore still provides considerable support for our contentions regarding underlying processes.

Returning to the strengths of the present approach the ethnographic method enabled an interpretative analysis of key events and broader processes in a manner that, would not have been possible using alternative methods (Bar-Tal, 2004). While alternative interpretations of these data are of course possible it is also our contention that the theoretical model presented here is the most parsimonious and powerful. Moreover, whilst sampling 'biases' undoubtedly occurred—for example, our data from Lisbon is more comprehensive—any methodological limitations must be balanced against the demands of gathering data in these challenging research environments and the responsibility that social psychology has to provide theoretical explanations of contemporary social phenomenon (Israel & Tajfel, 1972).

Implications for Policing

The present study echoes previous ESIM analyses by emphasising once again the importance of police tactics in shaping the dynamics of crowd events (e.g. Drury & Reicher, 1999; Stott & Drury, 2000; Stott & Reicher, 1998a,b). The current analysis goes beyond previous research by providing evidence of the effectiveness of a 'low profile' policing approach, particularly when that approach is based upon a model of 'good practice' derived from empirical research (Adang & Cuvelier, 2001; Adang & Stott, 2004; Stott & Adang, 2003a,b; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998b). The analysis suggests that the 'high profile' policing adopted by the GNR in Albufeira was associated with shared understandings among England fans of the conflictual nature of police action and two 'riots'. In contrast, the PSP's 'low profile' approach was associated not only with lower levels of 'disorder' but evidence of 'self-policing' and shared understandings of the non-conflictual nature of police action. The analysis therefore provides support for the idea that 'low profile' public order policing is effective because it maintains (and can possibly even create) perceptions of the legitimacy of fans' collective relationship with police, a collective relationship which in turn promotes

'self-policing' and low levels of conflict among previously 'high risk' groups (Stott & Adang, 2003a, 2004).

This study also points toward the longer term impacts of these differing strategic and tactical responses. 'High profile' forms of policing have been, and continue to be, used against England fans attending international tournaments and matches abroad (FSF, 2004; Stott, 2003; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998b). Therefore the 'high profile' tactics of the GNR may have served to continue a historical context of perceived illegitimate intergroup relations between England fans and the police that in turn sustained and validated conflictual forms of England fan identity. Moreover, the 'low profile' policing evident in match cities may have served to break this historical cycle of perceived illegitimacy and thus contradict and undermine those who sought to promote a confrontational England fan identity. In other words, while the overwhelming and indiscriminate use of force may quell 'disorder' in the short term, it may also create forms of social identity that entrenches 'hooligans' within the social category enabling them to sustain and justify their attempts to re-create conflict in future social contexts (Stott et al., 2001). However, 'low profile' policing may create social relations that make an antagonistic identity content less sustainable which in turn serves to marginalise and disempower 'hooligans' over the longer term. Of course, such an analysis has important implications for those planning future international tournaments.

Implication for Theories of Social Change

Framing the present analysis in more general theoretical terms, it begins to expose how particular forms of identity content become dominant within a particular social category. Material social realities constructed through the exercise of power by one group may in turn create a history for another group that validates or undermines different understandings of one's position in a set of social relations and the actions that are proper and possible given that position (Drury & Reicher, 2000). We therefore concur with Reicher (2004) that while it is important to understand the 'autonomy of the rhetorical process' (p. 939), particular versions of category content may come to dominate because of the way that particular rhetorical strategies are constrained or facilitated by the surrounding intergroup context (Haslam, 2004; Haslam & Platow, 2001; Reicher & Haslam, 2006; Reicher & Hopkins, 1996a,b, 2001).

Conclusion: Intergroup Relations, Legitimacy and Social Change

This paper set out to address one of the critically important questions in social psychology: what are the social psychological factors involved in leading a previously 'violent' group toward peaceful relations? What we see from Euro2004 is evidence that public order policing informed by the ESIM approach engendered a sense of legitimacy in social relations over the course of the tournament that in turn facilitated cultural change among England fans; a change in which 'hooligan' fans and behaviour appear to have become increasingly isolated, marginalised and disempowered. If we should learn one lesson from this, then it may well be that addressing the long-term maintenance and entrenchment of 'non-violent' norms among football fans requires a long-term and international change in the nature of public order policing.

More generally, the current analysis has shed new light on how it might be that the intergroup context may affect the perceived legitimacies of different forms of intragroup behaviour. Moreover, it has identified how such perceived legitimacies might then interact with the dynamics of power and social influence to shift social groups toward and away from 'violence' (see also Stott & Drury, 2004).

Consequently, our analysis reinforces the argument that an adequate understanding of social conflict requires a conceptualisation of identity as a social and psychological process; that at any given point contains *in situ* understandings of the surrounding intergroup relations, the appropriateness of particular forms of intragroup behaviour given those social relations, and the perceived ability to shape future social relations (Drury & Reicher, 2000; Spears et al., 2001; Turner et al., 1994). We thus agree with Reicher (1996b) that without a definition of identity that encompasses the past, the present and the future of social relations in this way, an adequate understanding of collective conflict and social change is impossible (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Data collection was made possible through the long-term co-operation of the U.K. Home Office especially David Bohannon and Martin Goodhay; the Portuguese Public Security Police especially José Leitão, Paulo Pereira, José Neto, Luis Simões and João Pires; the British Consulate in Portugal especially Gary Fisher and Glynne Evans; the Euro2004 Organising Committee especially Paulo Gomes and Luís Trindade Santos; the Football Supporters Federation especially Kevin Miles; the numerous England fans that have supported our research. Thanks should also be extended to the U.K. Police Euro2004 delegation especially David Swift; to four anonymous reviewers and Prof. John Turner who provided commentaries upon an earlier draft of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Adang, O. M. J., & Cuvelier, C. (2001). *Policing Euro2000: International police co-operation, information management and police deployment*. Ubbergen: Felix-Tandem.
- Adang, O. M. J., & Stott, C. J. (2003). *Policing football matches with an international dimension*. Paper presented at CEPOL-seminar Sports Violence, Instituto Superior de Ciências Policiais e Segurança Interna, Lisbon.
- Adang, O. M. J., & Stott, C. J. (2004). *Preparing for Euro2004: Policing international football matches in Portugal*. Unpublished report for the Portuguese Public Security Police.
- Asch, S. E. (1952). *Social psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2004). The necessity of observing real life situations: Palestinian-Israeli violence as a laboratory for learning about social behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*, 677–702.
- Brown, P. M., & Turner, J. C. (2002). The role of theories in the formation of stereotype content. In C. McGarty, V. Y. Yzerbyt, & R. Spears (Eds.), *Stereotypes as explanations: The formation of meaningful beliefs about social groups* (pp. 67–89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burgess, R. G. (1982). Approaches to field research. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), *Field research: A sourcebook and field manual*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Castano, E., Palladino, M. P., Coull, A., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2002). Protecting the ingroup stereotype: Ingroup identification and the management of deviant ingroup members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 365–385.
- Coordinating and Planning Committee for Euro2004 (PSP). (2003). *Planning directive No/03. Level of Police Intervention to be adopted for Euro2004*. PSP Coordinating and Planning Committee for Euro2004. National Directorate, Ministry of Internal Administration.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Devine, P. G., & Baker, S. M. (1991). Measurement of racial stereotype subtyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 44–50.

- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (1999). The intergroup dynamics of collective empowerment: Substantiating the social identity model of crowd behaviour. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 2, 1–22.
- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. D. (2000). Collective action and psychological change: The emergence of new social identities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 579–604.
- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 35–58.
- Drury, J., & Stott, C. (2001). 'Bias' as a research strategy in participant observation: The case of intergroup conflict. *Field Methods*, 13, 47–67.
- Drury, J., Stott, C. J., & Farsides, T. (2003). The role of police perceptions and practices in the development of 'public disorder'. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1480–1500.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Ellemers, N. (2001). Individual upward mobility and the perceived legitimacy of intergroup relations. In J. T. Jost, & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fernandes, M. (2003). *The used of combined means to increase police power on crowd control*. Paper presented at CEPOL-seminar Sports Violence, Instituto Superior de Ciências Policiais e Segurança Interna, Lisbon.
- Frosdick, S., & Marsh, P. (2005). *Football Hooliganism*. Cullumpton: Willan.
- FSF. (2004). *Fans' dossier summary: Protest at police brutality toward England fans in Madrid*. Football Supporters Federation. November 2004.
- Gergen, K. (1973). Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26, 309–320.
- Giorgi, A., & Giorgi, B. (2003). Phenomenology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. London: Sage.
- Green, P. (1993). Taking sides: Partisan research in the 1984–1985 miners' strike. In D. Hobbs, & T. May (Eds.), *Interpreting the field: Accounts of ethnography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Haslam, S. A. (2004). *Psychology in organisations: The social identity approach* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (2001). A hundred years of certitude? Social psychology, the experimental method and the management of scientific uncertainty. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 1–21.
- Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2001). The link between leadership and followership: How affirming social identity translates vision into action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1469–1479.
- Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 2: The relationship between frame of reference, self-categorization and accentuation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 251–277.
- Haslam, S. A., Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., McGarty, C., & Hayes, B. K. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 1: The effects of intergroup relations as mediated by social change and frame of reference. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 3–20.
- Hewstone, M. (1996). Contact and categorization: Social psychological interventions to change intergroup relations. In C. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 323–368). New York: The Guildford Press.
- Independent Football Commission. (2004). *Report on Euro2004*. www.theifc.co.uk
- Israel, J., & Tajfel, H. (Eds.). (1972). *The context of social psychology: A critical assessment*. London: Academic Press.
- Kellehear, A. (1993). *The unobtrusive researcher: A guide to methods*. Allen & Unwin.
- Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., & Leyens, J. P. (1988). The "Black Sheep Effect": Extremity of judgments towards ingroup members as a function of group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, 1–16.
- Milgram, S., & Toch, H. (1969). Collective behavior: Crowds and social movements. In G. Lindzey, & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 4, 2nd ed.). Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.
- Moscovici, S. (1972). Society and theory in social psychology. In J. Israel, & H. Tajfel (Eds.), *The context of social psychology: A critical assessment*. London: Academic Press.
- Reicher, S. D. (1982). The determination of collective behaviour. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Reicher, S. D. (1984). The St. Paul's riot: An explanation of the limits of crowd action in terms of a social identity model. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 1–21.
- Reicher, S. D. (1987). Crowd behaviour as social action. In J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reicher, S. D. (1996a). 'The Battle of Westminster': Developing the social identity model of crowd behaviour in order to explain the initiation and development of collective conflict. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 115–134.

- Reicher, S. D. (1996b). Social identity and social change: Rethinking the contexts of social psychology. In P. W. Robinson (Ed.), *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Reicher, S. (2001). Crowds and social movements. In M. Hogg, & S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Group processes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Political Psychology*, 25, 921–945.
- Reicher, S. D., & Haslam, S. A. (2006). Rethinking the psychology of tyranny: The BBC Prison study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 1–40.
- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (1996a). Seeking influence through characterizing self-categories: An analysis of anti-abortionist rhetoric. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 297–311.
- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (1996b). Self-category constructions in political rhetoric: An analysis of Thatcher's and Kinnock's speeches concerning the British miners' strike (1984–5). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 353–371.
- Reicher, S. D., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London: Sage.
- Reicher, S., Stott, C., Cronin, P., & Adang, O. (2004). An integrated approach to crowd psychology and public order policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 27, 558–572.
- Smith, J. A., & Osborne, M. (2003). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. London: Sage.
- Spears, R., Jetten, J., & Doosje, B. (2001). The (il)legitimacy of ingroup bias: From social reality to social resistance. In J. T. Jost, & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stott, C. J. (1996). *The inter-group dynamics of crowd behaviour*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Exeter.
- Stott, C. (2003). Police expectations and the control of English soccer fans at "Euro2000". *Policing: An international Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 26, 640–655.
- Stott, C. J., & Adang, O. M. J. (2003a). *Policing Football Matches with an International Dimension in the European Union: understanding and managing risk*. Unpublished report to the U.K. Home Office.
- Stott, C. J., & Adang, O. M. J. (2003b). *Crowd psychology and public order policing*. Paper presented at PSP Euro2004 Strategy meeting, Instituto Superior de Ciências Policiais e Segurança Interna, Lisbon.
- Stott, C. J., & Adang, O. M. J. (2004). 'Disorderly' conduct: Social psychology and the control of football 'hooliganism' at 'Euro2004'. *The Psychologist*, 318–319.
- Stott, C. J., & Adang, O. M. J. (2005). Crowd dynamics, policing and 'hooliganism' at 'Euro2004'. Research Report for the Economic and Social Research Council. Grant reference: RES-000-23-0617.
- Stott, C. J., & Drury, J. (1999). The intergroup dynamics of empowerment: A social identity model. In P. Bagguley, & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Transforming politics: Power and resistance*. Basingstoke, New York: Macmillan.
- Stott, C. J., & Drury, J. (2000). Crowds, context and identity: Dynamic categorization processes in the 'poll tax riot'. *Human Relations*, 53, 247–273.
- Stott, C. J., & Drury, J. (2004). The importance of social structure and social interaction in stereotype consensus and content: Is the whole greater than the sum of its parts? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 11–23.
- Stott, C. J., Hutchison, P., & Drury, J. (2001). 'Hooligans' abroad? Inter-group dynamics, social identity and participation in collective 'disorder' at the 1998 World Cup Finals. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 359–384.
- Stott, C. J., & Reicher, S. D. (1998a). Crowd action as inter-group process: Introducing the police perspective. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 509–529.
- Stott, C. J., & Reicher, S. D. (1998b). How conflict escalates: The inter-group dynamics of collective football crowd 'violence'. *Sociology*, 32, 353–377.
- Stott, C. J., & Pearson, G. (in press). Football banning orders, proportionality and policing public order. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes* (pp. 77–122). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1987). Introducing the problem: Individual and group. In J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self categorisation theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Turner, J. C., & Giles, H. (1982). The social psychology of Intergroup behaviour. In J. C. Turner, & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 454–463.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1989). Narrative characters and accounting for violence. In J. Shotter, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Texts of identity*. London: Sage.
- Whyte, W. F. (1984). *Learning from the field*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

APPENDIX: FAN INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Are you enjoying the tournament?
What kind of things have you been doing in order to have a good time?
What is good about being here as an England fan for you?
Do you travel much as an England fan?
Where have you been before?
How does being in Portugal as an England fan compare to other venues you have been?
Who is the most relevant other group for you as England fan in this situation? (group X)
How would you describe England fans as a group?
How have you been getting on with other England fans?
Are you like other England fans?
In what way? Why?
How do you think England fans are seen by others in Portugal? Who? Why?
Is the behaviour of England fans better, worse or the same as you expected? In what way?
Why do you think England fans are behaving in the way they are?
Have you seen or heard about any England fans doing things you think are out of order?
What were those things?
Why do you think they were doing it?
Do you see yourself as different from those fans/fans who engage in trouble?
In what way are you different/similar?
How would you describe the Portuguese police?
How have the police been treating you as an England fan?
How do you think the police have been treating England fans in general?
Have you seen any instances where the police have treated any England fans unfairly?
Where was this and what happened?
Why do you think the police have behaved in the way that they have?
Is this better or worse than you expected?
How do you think that compares to other venues you have been to as a football fan?
How have the police been treating fans of other countries (Germany, Holland, Portugal, Group X)?
Is this different from how they are treating England fans?
Why is this?
How have you been getting on with other fans from: Germany, Holland, Portugal?
Why have relations been like that?
Are fans from these nations similar or different to England fans as a group?
In what ways?
How have you been getting on with the local population?
Why have relations been like that?

How would you describe the local population?
How have you been getting on with group X?
How would you describe the local population?
Have you seen or heard about any trouble involving football fans in Portugal during the tournament?
Who else was involved?
What happened?
Who or what started it?
What was it about?
Were the police involved?
What did the police do & was this appropriate to the situation?
Do you see yourself as similar or different to those who got involved in the trouble?
In what ways & why?
Prompt about the website footballfans.org.uk

OPEN ENDED ITEMS ON WEB-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE

We would also very much like to hear from you in your own words about your experiences as an England fan during your time in this host city. If you are willing to provide us with your views then please type your responses to the questions in the relevant text box below.

1. Please provide any opinions you have about issues or events that were relevant to you or other England fans during events surrounding this match.
2. If you have not already done so please describe your views upon the overall quality of the policing or stewarding of England fans.

QUESTIONS FOR EMAIL SURVEYS TO FANS

1. How would you describe the behaviour of England fans during the tournament overall? Do you think England fans were well behaved? Why do you think that England fans behaved in the way they did?
2. Did you witness any incident of trouble involving England fans (including even minor incidents such as a fight)? If so can you describe these?
3. Did you witness any England fans preventing any incidents of disorder or minor problems? For example, did you witness anyone stopping other England fans from being anti-social? If so can you describe what happened?
4. Did you see yourself as similar or different to those fans in the Algarve that were arrested during the incidents that occurred there? Why do you think this? Can you describe how you feel about these incidents?
5. Did you see yourself as similar or different from fans of other nations who you saw in Portugal? Why do you think this?
6. What do you think about the way England fans were policed? What was good or bad about this style of policing? Were there any specific incidents of policing that you think were good or bad? Can you describe these?

7. How would you compare the policing of Euro2004 to other England games you have attended? For example, would you say the policing was similar to the style of policing you have experienced elsewhere?
8. Overall did you think that Portugal made you feel different about what it means for you to be an England fan? Do you think a different type of England fan was present in Portugal than is normal for England games abroad? Or do you think England fans now felt differently about violence?
9. Is there anything else you'd like to add?