

ISSN 2040-5847

SPORT & EU
REVIEW

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

Volume 6 – Issue 2 – Autumn 2014

Sport&EU Review

Copyright © 2014 by Sport&EU, The Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union: <http://www.sportandeu.com>. ISSN 2040-5847.

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

Co-Editors: Alexander Brand, Simon Ličen and Arne Niemann

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

Sport&EU Review is published two times per year, in April (Spring) and October (Autumn).

Guidelines for contributors

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Forum contributions are shorter, usually up to 1,000 words including references. They are not peer-reviewed, but are intended as short items of general interest to the readership of Sport&EU Review. These include, but are not limited to debate/opinion pieces, conference reports, calls for papers, brief updates on key developments in the field and reviews of publications. Concerning language standards

and style of referencing, the same guidelines as for longer contributions apply. Forum contributions, however, follow a slightly different schedule; they have to be submitted by 31 January (Spring issue) and 31 July (Autumn) to allow for eventual smaller revisions.

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

1. EDITORIAL

How time flies! For the Sport&EU community, the peak of 2014 was the Conference held in Cologne in June. The event drew over 60 presenters, as well as dozens of participants interested in hearing from scholars and practitioners. The presence of researchers and policy-makers from Europe and beyond can be a source of pride for the community. As the conference report in this issue of the *Sport&EU Review* details, a steady growth of the network has followed an ever increasing attendance rate at the Annual Conference. We might actually be witnessing a crucial period in European integration in general, and in the development of a ‘European dimension’ in sport in particular. There is a heightened awareness among the broader academic community that sport has become more of a focal point of European politics. We can acknowledge with satisfaction that the academic community interested in matters of European and global sports governance has grown considerably. But where is the place of the *Sport&EU Review* in all this?

The editors of this publication tend to think that it should be positioned at the frontier of current research and commentary. And the esteemed readership has indeed suggested in a survey (see Editorial of issue 1/14) that the Review is thought of as an important engine for strengthening common efforts, too. However, as some readers pointed out, there are already numerous outlets for publishing research. And as long as the Review somewhat lacks in ‘prestige’ and standing, especially outside the inner ranks of the Sport & EU community, people will flock elsewhere to publish their latest commentary, research, and review essays. On the other hand, editors are somewhat restrained in taking the Review to the next level (e.g., pursuing the indexing of the Review in online article databases beyond EBSCOhost and the International Platform of Sports Law Journals) since there is no constant stream of submissions for publication. These matters were discussed at length at the Cologne conference: Shall we carry on soliciting articles by emailing, encouraging, and virtually targeting, specific individuals? Shall we return to a newsletter format (without indexing – or increased prestige)? Simply encouraging people to submit promising papers presented at conferences attended by the editors has generated limited results. The editors would thus like to reiterate that, indeed, the future of the *Sport&EU Review* is heavily dependent upon support and commitment from its readership, the Sport&EU community! Therefore, please consider submitting your work (in progress), and encourage PhD candidates and excellent MA students to submit to this journal.

On a personal note, this is the last issue of the Sport&EU Review co-edited by Simon Ličen. The adventure he embarked on in the fall of 2010, first as an interim co-editor and later as a full-fledged one, turned out to be extremely gratifying and rewarding for him. Four years and one intercontinental move later he steps aside to make room for a new co-editor; despite his continuing efforts to change this, days still only have

24 hours. He claims the Sport&EU community has given him much more than he has been able to contribute in return. In an attempt to make up for the difference, he promises to remain active around Europe in general, and in the Sport&EU community in particular. He sincerely thanks everyone in this community for the support and opportunities provided to him, and is especially grateful to the co-editors he has had the privilege of working with throughout the years. The last two in particular were very collegial and willing to tolerate delays that were not always caused by time zone differences alone. Simon hopes to keep representing Sport, the European Union, and the intersection of the two to the best of his abilities. A call for aspiring co-editors willing to fill the role left vacant will be circulated soon through the Sport&EU mailing list.

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

2. FORUM

Why this Australian supported Germany to win the World Cup

Catherine Ordway*

When I was asked for my tips ahead of the 2014 FIFA men's football World Cup finals, I put on record that I hoped that Germany would reign supreme (Ordway, 2014). I appreciate that it is not very patriotic for an Australian to not only acknowledge that our team was the lowest ranked coming into the tournament, and to also propose a novel rationale for supporting Germany ahead of other favoured contenders. Going into the final, Germany had earned a FIFA ranking of number 2, undoubtedly assisted by having one of the best national premier leagues in the world, so they represent a solid pick.

However, football skills are only one factor to consider when determining a tournament-winning formula. The predictor methodologies outlined by University of Canberra Adjunct Professor Lyons in his *The Conversation* articles (Lyons, 2014a, 2014b), are compelling. This analysis, however, assumes that all matches are played to the highest standard, and all athletes play to the best of their ability. Purist performance analysis does not take into account that teams may deliberately 'throw' matches to assist their progression through the tournament (tanking²), or deliberately fix elements of the match (e.g., red cards, penalties) or otherwise the overall outcome of the match. My prediction, therefore, was not based on any hard quantitative analysis of performance, but rather, on my understanding of the German approach to corruption, and match-fixing particularly. The question is whether this vigilant, zero tolerance approach to match-fixing translates into a culture of integrity in German sport and the national football team.

* Ordway is Senior Lecturer in sports management in the Discipline of Sport & Exercise Science within the Faculty of Health and an Associate Member of the UC Research Institute of Sport and Exercise (UC-RISE) at the University of Canberra: Catherine.Ordway@canberra.edu.au

² Such as most recently been alleged against the Australian men's basketball team in their FIBA World Cup match against Angola; see on that: Golliver (2014).

Does Match-Fixing Present a Threat to Football's Integrity?

Hill's seminal work, "The Fix" (Hill, 2008), exposed the colossal reach of gambling fraud globally through hundreds of in depth interviews with players, referees, coaches/managers, fixers and gamblers in football and cricket. In 2009 the global anti-corruption organisation, Transparency International (TI), considered that the levels of corruption in sport were so serious that it published its first industry specific report (Transparency International, 2009). In June 2010, the then-President of the International Olympic Committee, Jacques Rogge, stated: "cheating driven by betting is undoubtedly the biggest threat to sport after doping" (Rogge, 2010). After two years of extensive research, the University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne and the International Centre for Sport Security released the Sport Integrity Report Executive Summary in 2014, and identified the following as key findings:

1. organised crime is estimated to launder over US\$140 billion annually through sport betting;
2. 80% of global sport betting is illegal; and
3. football and cricket proved to be most targeted sports by criminals (ICSS, 2014).

TI has also observed that if sports, such as football, are perceived to be led by a culture of corruption, they will have a higher probability of threats to their integrity.³

It could therefore be argued that it is naïve to predict the outcomes of the World Cup without factoring in the likelihood that matches may be 'fixed'. The phrase 'fixed' here means that the results, or events during a match, are orchestrated in advance in order to achieve a gambling fraud. Put at its simplest, as compared with doping, which is cheating to win, match-fixing is either cheating to lose, or artificially creating an in-game situation, which can be bet on. While only one team can win, not every match in the final is equal in terms of consequence or broadcasting interest (known as 'dead-rubbers'). For those numerous players not signed up with million dollar club deals and sponsorship arrangements, a lucrative incentive, such as a year's salary or more to 'throw' a game (or create an adverse incident) might seem tempting, particularly when the outcome of an individual match is inconsequential.

My argument is that creating a strict culture against match-fixing will mean that teams not only deserve to win morally, but may actually produce better results by making players more resilient to bribery; removing the temptation to deliberately 'throw' a game, or achieve negative in-game outcomes, such as red cards or other penalties. Teams will then be playing to their highest potential every time they enter the pitch.

³ For example, following the December 2010 announcement that Russia would host the 2018 Men's World Cup and Qatar the 2022 Men's World Cup, TI outlined a number of specific, concrete actions the international governing body of football, FIFA, could take to repair its reputation. See e.g. BBC News (2010) and Transparency International (2011).

Why Germany?

One of the integrity risks identified by Hill (2008, 2013) is not paying players in a fair and timely manner. If players are unable to meet their financial commitments, particularly where those pressures are exacerbated by addictive and/or illicit behaviours such as illegal drugs, prostitutes, problem gambling or alcoholism, then those players are more susceptible to the advances of fixers to ‘solve’ their problems through providing money for information, and/or specific on-field behaviour.

Football teams, even very wealthy clubs enjoying large memberships and/or generous financial backers, are not immune from political and economic forces exerted by the country they are based in. Clubs, or national teams, facing financial difficulties, may be tempted to delay or reduce payments to players. This uncertainty may lead to a sense of insecurity in the players, particularly those approaching the end of their careers, and may heighten the risk of match-fixing and gambling fraud. There have been examples of some representative teams entering into very public pay disputes with their national federations, including several on the eve of this tournament.⁴ This is not only disruptive for the teams’ preparation, but is also an invitation for fixers looking for vulnerable teams to approach. The German national team has not been reported as having a pay dispute with its national federation, and complaints relating to non-payments or delays within the German Professional Football League (DFL) are rare.

Supporting this industry perspective, the macro environment within Germany is relatively stable. Despite economic challenges within the European Union, Germany continues to enjoy a credit rating of 98.47 out of 100 (Trading Economics, 2014) and comes 5th in the world in the Sovereign Risk index (BlackRock, 2014). In TI’s Corruption Perception Index (CPI), Germany also ranks well at 12th in the world (CPI, 2013). In comparison with other countries appearing at the 2014 FIFA tournament, only Switzerland fares better on all these indices (except in the FIFA ranking). Hill is quick to point out that the CPI alone is a crude measure: for example, Singapore (at 5), whose national football league has effectively collapsed due to match-fixing, has a stronger anti-corruption ranking than countries widely regarded as having low levels of public corruption, such as Australia and Canada (at 9) (Hill, 2013, p. 233). It is therefore also useful to look at how German authorities have managed various sport integrity crises.

⁴ E.g., in 2014, the three countries Nigeria, Cameroon and Ghana “all had their tournaments undermined by disputes between players and officials over money”, cf. USA Today (2014).

The German Approach to Corruption in Sport

The German Government, and German sports associations and leagues, have, particularly in the last 10-15 years, increasingly taken a proactive and vigilant approach to protecting sport from the threats to its integrity. Some authors suggest that good governance and integrity in leadership can create a culture of integrity in their organisations and broader society (e.g. Hooijberg, Lane & Diverse, 2010). Opportunities for German authorities to demonstrate integrity leadership include the following key examples:

1. Following the widespread condemnation of the East German doping program, which came to light in 1990 (Ungerleider, 2001), and particularly since 2002, the National Anti-Doping Agency (NADA) has worked very closely with international anti-doping partners to develop a robust and transparent anti-doping program. It is now considered as one of the best in the world.⁵
2. German football referees, Robert Hoyzer and Dominik Marks were sentenced to 29 and 18 months in jail respectively in 2005 for match-fixing (Marks received a suspended sentence). The investigation by German authorities, which ultimately became known as the “Bochum investigation” (see below), was conducted following the German Football Federation (DFB) referring a number of unusually large bets placed on second division, regional league and Cup matches (Deutsche Welle, 2006).
3. In 2006, the Men’s European Clubs Handball Cup final was found to have been fixed when Russian customs officials found US\$50,000 in cash inside one of the two German handball referees’ suitcases after the match at (Associated Press, 2009).⁶ The European Handball Federation (EHF) initially banned the referees, Bernd Ullrich and Frank Lemme, for five years, which was subsequently reduced to two years. Following Lemme’s retirement, in what was promoted as providing the younger referee a second chance to redeem himself, but was otherwise criticised as a soft response, the German Handball Federation gave Ullrich the role of head of junior referee development in 2011 (Eggers, 2011).
4. The 2007 EHF Champions’ League Final was investigated when charges of corruption and breach of trust were filed against Uwe Schwenker, a former manager of German club, THW Kiel, and a former trainer, Zvonimir Serdarušić: “Schwenker was accused of having transferred 92.000 euros of THW Kiel money, to bribe the Polish referee in a match” (KEA European Affairs, 2012, p.30). Both men were finally acquitted of all charges by the German courts due to lack of evidence in 2013 (Spiegel, 2013).

⁵ Noting however that NADA does not exclusively conduct all the drug testing across the various professional leagues. See the NADA (2012, 2014) for more information.

⁶ The winners of the final, Russian club Chehovski Medvedi, were also excluded by the EHF from international competition for two years for failing to cooperate with investigating authorities.

5. The German Organised Crime Task Force has had a team dedicated to investigating match-fixing in football since 2008 (Hill, 2014). What started as an investigation into a trans-national prostitution and narcotics operation run out of Bochum, Germany, developed into the largest match-fixing case in Europe (Boniface, Lacarriere et al., 2011). The evidence compiled through phone tapping led to 50 arrests associated with the corruption of more than 320 football matches in ten European countries. These fixed matches included those played at the European Cup and international levels (ibid., p. 12-3).⁷
6. In November 2011, German prosecutors launched an investigation into an allegation that the International Handball Federation (IHF) President, and Egyptian national, Hassan Moustafa, was alleged to have received a cheque for €300,000 in April 2007 and a bank transfer of €302,000 in November 2007. Prosecutors allege that these amounts were paid as bribes and ‘reward’ for Moustafa giving the TV rights to German broadcaster Sportfive (Ahl, 2011; Weinreich, 2010). Despite reports of the investigation ‘stepping up’ in September 2013 (Ross, 2013), Moustafa, who has been IHF President since 2000, was granted a further four year term in October 2013 (Kicker Online, 2013). It appears that this matter has not yet been resolved by the German courts.
7. Anti-match-fixing education efforts have been enhanced through a partnership between TI’s chapter in Germany and the DFL. TI has been advising the DFL on the project “Transparency and Integrity in Football”, which focuses on how to prevent match-fixing. Germany was the first pilot country involved in the TI: “Staying on Side: How to Stop Match-fixing” trainings, workshops and media events (Transparency International, 2014).

These efforts are examples of how a culture of integrity in sport is being encouraged and developed in Germany. It is hoped that this culture is influencing the decision-making of the players in the professional sports leagues, including the DFL.

What influence could the DFL culture have on the FIFA World Cup?

There were 736 players competing for thirty-two national teams in the 2014 FIFA World Cup final. Sixteen of the 23-man German team at the World Cup were signed with clubs in the DFL. Additionally, there were a total of 76 players, across twenty-two national teams, playing at the World Cup with contracts to clubs in the DFL. Only the English and Italian premier leagues had more representatives in Brazil. Leaving aside the possibility of some players being ‘lent’ out to clubs outside

⁷ The head of the match-fixing operation, Croatian-German Ante Sapina, was eventually imprisoned for five years for his admission that he was involved in fixing more than twenty matches, cf. Uersfeld (2014) and FR Online (2014).

Germany at various times, the fact that almost eighty current players had exposure to the awareness campaigns and media associated with the anti-corruption prosecutions gives rise to the expectation that these players may be more resilient to bribery advances, and therefore more focused on playing to win.

Conclusion

The arguments I outline here might be (mis-)characterised as idealistic: that the most ‘morally defensible’ approach should be rewarded. Instead, my argument is that the approach by the German Organised Crime Task Force in prosecuting match-fixers, and TI and the DFL in educating players and raising awareness, together with a generally low perception of corruption within Germany, and high standard of living and player pay rates in Germany, would both dissuade fixers and make players more resilient and less likely to accept advances from fixers. The establishment of the Organised Crime Task Force in 2008 was a decisively proactive stance not undertaken elsewhere prior to this. Germany is arguably the leading country actively working to reduce the risk of global gambling fraud. Perhaps it is not too big a stretch to argue that Germany’s success in winning the 2014 World Cup supports my view that the German national team was the least at risk of being corrupted, and therefore the most motivated and worthy winner on merit alone.

Reference List

- Ahl, C. (2011). “IHF/Sportfive/UFA: will the evidence be found?”, *IHF News*, 12 November. Retrieved from <http://teamhandballnews.com/wordpress/author/cahl/page/13/>
- Associated Press (2009, July 30). “German handball referees banned for match-fixing”. USA Today. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/olympics/2009-07-30-2484202411_x.htm
- BBC News (2010, December 2). “England miss out to Russia in 2018 World Cup vote”. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport2/hi/football/9250585.stm>
- BlackRock (2014), *Sovereign Risk Index: First Quarter 2014*. Retrieved from <http://www.blackrock.com/corporate/en-us/literature/whitepaper/bii-bsri-q1-2014-us-version.pdf>
- Boniface, P., Lacarriere, S., Verschuuren, P., Tuailon, A., Forrest, D., Icard, J.-M., Meyer, J.-P., & Wang, X. (2011). Sports betting and corruption: How to preserve the integrity of sport. Retrieved from <http://www.sportaccord.com/multimedia/docs/2012/02/2012 - IRIS - Etude Paris sportifs et corruption - ENG.pdf>
- Spiegel (2013, April 10). “Kieler Handball-Prozess: Gericht spricht Schwenker erneut frei”. Retrieved from <http://www.spiegel.de/sport/sonst/handball-gericht-spricht-schwenker-erneut-frei-a-893673.html>

- Deutsche Welle (2006, December 15). "Disgraced Referee Hoyzer Jailed After Losing Appeal Hearing". Retrieved from <http://www.dw.de/disgraced-referee-hoyzer-jailed-after-losing-appeal-hearing/a-2273305>
- Eggers, E. (2011, August 26). "Umstrittener Schiedsrichter Ullrich: Zweite Chance beim DHB", *Spiegel Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.spiegel.de/sport/sonst/umstrittener-schiedsrichter-ullrich-zweite-chance-beim-dhb-a-782501.html>
- FR Online (2014, April 14). "Fünf Jahre Haft für Ante Sapina". Retrieved from <http://www.fr-online.de/sport/fussball-wettskandal-fuenf-jahre-haft-fuer-ante-sapina%2c1472784%2c26842888.html>
- Golliver, B. (2014, September 4) "Australia accused of 'fixing' in ugly loss to Angola at FIBA World Cup", *Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved from <http://www.si.com/nba/2014/09/04/australia-angola-tanking-goran-dragic-fiba-world-cup>
- Hill, D. (2008). *The fix*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Hill, D. (2013). *The insider's guide to match-fixing in football*. Toronto: Anne McDerimid & Associates.
- Hill, D. (2014, June 9). "Will match-fixers target World Cup in Brazil?". *The Star*. Retrieved from http://www.thestar.com/news/world/2014/06/09/will_matchfixers_target_world_cup_in_brazil.html
- Hooijerg, R., Lane, N. & Diverse, A. (2010). Leader effectiveness and integrity: Wishful thinking? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 18(1), 59-75.
- ICSS (University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne and the International Centre for Sport Security) (2014, May 15). *Sport Integrity Report, Executive Summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.theicss.org/astonishing-scale-of-betting-fraud-and-sport-corruption-confirmed-in-ground-breaking-scientific-report/>
- KEA European Affairs (2012). "Match-fixing in sport: A mapping of criminal law provisions in EU 27". Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/studies/study-sports-fraud-final-version_en.pdf
- Kicker Online (2013, October 26). "Hassan Moustafa bleibt IHF-Präsident". Retrieved from http://www.kicker.de/news/handball/startseite/594141/artikel_hassan-moustafa-bleibt-ihf-praesident.html
- Lyons, K. (2014a, June 5). "World Cup 2014 predictions: who will take the title?" *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/world-cup-2014-predictions-who-will-take-the-title-27387>
- Lyons, K. (2014b, June 19). "Round 1 of the World Cup, by numbers". *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/round-1-of-the-world-cup-by-the-numbers-28188>
- NADA (2012). *Annual Report of the National Anti-Doping Agency Germany 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.nada.de/fileadmin/user_upload/nada/Downloads/Jahresberichte/NADA_Annual_Report_2012_kl.pdf
- NADA (2014). *Website of the German National Anti-Doping Agency*. Retrieved from <http://www.nada.de/de/home#.U6mYqfmSySo>

- Ordway, C. (2014, June 19). "University of Canberra's expert tips for the World Cup: Catherine Ordway", online comment. Retrieved from <http://instagram.com/p/pbDIkrCREM/#>
- Rogge, J. (2010, June 24). *Comments by Jacques Rogge*. Retrieved from <http://www.olympic.org/news?articleid=92584>
- Ross, M. (2013, September 27). "Probe into IHF president Moustafa's agency dealings set to be stepped up after documents released". *ASOIF News*. Retrieved from http://www.asoif.com/News/News_Article.aspx?ID=3922
- Trading Economics (2014). *Credit Rating - Countries List (as at 21 June 2014)*. Retrieved from <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/country-list/rating>
- Transparency International (2009). *Corruption and sport: Building integrity and preventing abuses*. Retrieved from http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/pub/working_paper_no.03_2009_corruption_and_sport_building_integrity_and_prevention
- Transparency International (2011). *Safe hands: Building integrity and transparency at FIFA*. Retrieved from http://www.transparency.org/Whatwedo/pub/safe_hands_building_integrity_and_transparency_at_fifa
- Transparency International (2013). *CPI 2013 Ranking*. Retrieved from <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2013/results/>
- Transparency International (2014). *Staying on side: Education and prevention of match-fixing*. Retrieved from http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/activity/staying_on_side_education_and_prevention_of_match_fixing
- Uersfeld, S. (2014). "Sapina match-fixing sentence is reduced". *ESPN News*. Retrieved from <http://www.espnfc.com/story/1785621>
- Ungerleider, S. (2001). *Faust's gold: Inside the East German doping machine*. New York: St. Martin's Press/Macmillan.
- USA Today (2014, July 6). "Nigeria heading for FIFA Ban over Interference". Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/soccer/2014/07/06/nigeria-heading-for-fifa-ban-over-interference/12269793/>
- Weinreich, J. (2010, January 27). "Hassan Moustafa, Handball, Sportfive, Lobbyismus und Korruption", online comment. Retrieved from <http://www.jensweinreich.de/2010/01/27/Hassan-Moustafa-Handball-Sportfive-Lobbyismus-Und-Korruption/>

3. CASE NOTE

Case T-385/07, Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v European Commission, Judgement of General Court (Seventh Chamber), 17 February 2011

The European Court of Justice (ECJ) confirmed Member States' discretion to determine free to view sporting events

Alexander Lelyukhin*

1. Introduction

This case is a vivid illustration of EU fundamental freedoms being not absolute and represents the enforcement of an overruling mechanism. Major sport events broadcasting system in Europe was challenged by FIFA², the rightholder of 'FIFA World Cup' tournament. FIFA challenged European Commission's decision³, which had created obstacles for receiving maximum profits from sales of broadcasting rights in Europe. The particular concern was given to a Belgian list⁴ of sport events of major importance to the public, making all the 64 World Cup football matches available on national free-to-air TV. The existence of such list made it almost impossible for FIFA to sell the broadcasting rights on the territory of Belgium to companies from other EU Member States. European Commission found that such a list was fully compatible with EU law. Sports organizations, however, argue that they receive less money from free-to-air TV broadcasts, which in turn has a knock-out effect on investments and

* MSc in European Law, Maastricht University. Lawyer, journalist.

² FIFA (The Fédération Internationale de Football Association) is the international governing body of association football, futsal and beach football. With 208 member associations it is one of the largest international organisations in the world. For comparison, UN consists of 193 member states. According to Financial report 2010, FIFA ended the year 2010 with a net result of USD 202 million. Recorded revenue - USD 1,291. [http://www.fifa.com/mm/document/affederation/administration/01/39/20/45/web_fifa_fr2010_eng\[1\].pdf](http://www.fifa.com/mm/document/affederation/administration/01/39/20/45/web_fifa_fr2010_eng[1].pdf) (Last visited 20 July 2014).

³ Commission Decision of 25 June 2007 (2007/479/EC) on the compatibility with Community law of measures taken by Belgium pursuant to Article 3a(1) of Council Directive 89/552/EEC.

⁴ Decree of 27 February 2003 on broadcasting (MB No 137, 17.4.2003) and the Order of 8 June 2004 (MB No 318, 6.9.2004) for the French Community, and Decree of 25 January 1995 (DCFL No 1995-01-25/38) and the Order of 28 May 2004 (MB No 295, 19.8.2004) for the Flemish Community. A consolidated list of events of major importance for Belgium is contained in the agreement concluded between the French Community and the Flemish Community on 28 November 2003 and can be also found in Annex to Commission Decision 2007/479/EC.

attracting world-class players and hence the quality of the games. The question to answer is whether all of the 64 World Cup final stage football matches are really of major importance to the Belgian public and are reasonably included in the list? Had the Commission through its decision violated FIFA's property rights and EU fundamental freedom to provide services?

2. Relevant Facts and Legal Background

Belgian lists of various events being of major importance to the public under Directive 89/552/EEC⁵ were adopted in both Communities in 2003⁶ and further approved by the Commission. An action against the Commission was brought to ECJ by FIFA on 4 October 2007 with request to annul the Decision in question, concerning the pursuit of television broadcasting activities in Belgium, in whole or in part, in so far as it concerns the World Cup. In January 2008 three countries - Germany, Belgium and UK - intervened to support the Commission. The case was joined with case T-68/08 (alike Decision by the Commission in respect of UK measures) for the purposes of oral procedure. The Commission with the support of three countries contended that the Court had to dismiss the action⁷.

FIFA stated six separate pleas regarding multiple infringements of the Directive 89/552/ECC and EC Treaty, and a failure to state sound reasons for the importance of all World Cup football matches to Belgian society. The Directive 89/552/ECC as amended provides the legal framework for television broadcasting in the common market of EU. Its primary objective is to facilitate the free movement of television broadcasts within the European Community by laying down minimum rules by which the Member States are required to ensure that television broadcasters who come under their jurisdiction must comply. FIFA argued that the so-called 'non-primary' World Cup football matches should not be on the list⁸.

At the same time the Commission clearly stated that the Belgian measures appear to be proportionate so as to justify a derogation from the freedom to provide services on the basis of an overriding reason of public interest⁹. It also emphasized that the

⁵ Council Directive 89/552/EEC of 3 October 1989 on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the pursuit of television broadcasting activities as amended by Directive 97/36/EC of 30 June 1997.

⁶ See Case T-33/01, *Infront WM v Commission* within the relevance of the meaning of Art. 249 TEC (288 TEU)

⁷ Par. 28-30 of the Judgment

⁸ All 64 World Cup final stage football matches are divided into 'prime' and 'non-prime'. The prime football matches are: semi-finals, final, opening match and matches played by relevant national team.

⁹ Recital 17, preamble of Directive 89/552

number of listed events is not disproportionate so as to distort competition on the downstream free television and pay-television markets¹⁰.

3. FIFA's position

The argumentation by FIFA can be presented as follows:

- A. Is the World Cup a single event or a number of separate events within one tournament? Rather separate.
- B. Does the division of 'prime' and 'non-prime' football matches allow to separate matches of major public interest from other matches within the tournament? Yes it does.
- C. Certain football matches within World Cup final stage are of no real interest to Belgian public. For example, China-Paraguay face-off. The national measures should therefore be revised (lists in question - amended) in order to allow those 'non-primary' football matches to be shown exclusively on pay-TV.
- D. Such revision must be done through the annulment of the Commission's Decision, which wrongfully approved Belgian measures to be proportionate and transparent and fully compatible with EU law.

FIFA recalled that the Commission itself recognised both prime and non-prime categories of football matches in its working document CC TVSF(97) relating to the implementation of Article 3a of Directive 89/552.

FIFA stated several arguments:

1. Disputed measures are not consistent with their stated purpose, namely to ensure public access to events of major importance for Belgian society, since in the long term they 'impoverish' the sporting events in the list by reducing the revenue they generate and thus harm their 'preservation' as events of major importance for society¹¹.
2. They are disproportionate by the fact that the broadcasters themselves do not broadcast all matches live. That is supported by the particularly low viewing figures provided by Belgian research firm's database on World Cups 1998, 2002 and 2006¹².
3. Belgian legislation does not require television broadcasters to broadcast 'non-prime' matches, whereas such obligations are imposed for other events¹³.
4. Criterion on traditional free broadcasting is not appropriate since a wide range of programmes, such as films and comedies, would fulfil the same criterion¹⁴.

¹⁰ Recital 18, preamble of Directive 89/552

¹¹ Par. 80 of the Judgement

¹² Par. 89 of the Judgement

¹³ Par. 111 of the Judgement

5. Broadcasters established in other Member States cannot broadcast on an exclusive basis any World Cup match in Belgium because they do not fulfil certain conditions – language (Dutch or French) and population coverage (at least 90%). That is a clear violation of freedom to provide services (Art. 49 TEC (56 TEU)) and freedom of establishment (Art. 43 TEC (49 TEU)). The acquisition of non-exclusive broadcasting rights does not enable a small broadcaster to generate the revenues, subscribers and prestige necessary to establish itself in Belgium¹⁵.
6. The prohibition on selling exclusive rights for any World Cup match to broadcasters from another Member State annihilates the essence of FIFA's property right and, in any event, restricts such a right in a disproportionate and unjustified manner. It is FIFA's greatest source of revenue which is protected by the ECHR (Art. 1, First Protocol)¹⁶.
7. Belgian authorities acted arbitrarily and failed to provide explanations about the list of events of major importance for society. Flemish Media Council used the arbitrary method of composition of the list in question. On that basis the Commission could not legitimately conclude that the list had been drawn up in a clear and transparent manner¹⁷.

4. Commission's position

The Commission asserted that the action is inadmissible on the grounds that the contested Decision was not of direct or individual concern to FIFA. Any annulment of the contested Decision would not affect the validity of the national legislation at issue¹⁸. FIFA had already sold the broadcasting rights for the World Cup matches for 2010 and 2014 tournaments. Thus the position of FIFA in terms of the possibility of selling the broadcasting rights for those competitions to the broadcasters of its choice was not affected by the contested Decision. The Commission was assessing the compatibility of the Belgian measures with the Community law in the light of particular events and not of all World Cup tournaments which will take place in future. The annulment of the contested Decision could therefore benefit only the broadcasters established outside Belgium wishing to broadcast matches in Belgium.

¹⁴ Par. 88 of the Judgement

¹⁵ Par. 123 of the Judgement

¹⁶ Par. 132 of the Judgement

¹⁷ Par. 144 of Judgment

¹⁸ Par. 32 of Judgment

5. Court's reasoning

The court gave detailed reasoning on the rejection of all FIFA's pleas and dismissed the action in full. It also provided a clear legal justification of violation of fundamental freedoms. Thus the EU's legal order and public interests were simultaneously protected.

The court, however, found that the contested Decision was of direct and individual concern to FIFA¹⁹. All in all the only FIFA's assertion that the Court agreed with was that the property rights of FIFA were affected²⁰. Those rights are not absolute. An exercise of the right to property may be restricted, provided that those restrictions do in fact correspond to objectives in the public interest and do not constitute in relation to the aim pursued a disproportionate and intolerable interference, impairing the very substance of the right guaranteed. The ECJ concluded that the commercial value of those rights was not destroyed by the Commission's Decision, because firstly, it did not oblige FIFA to sell broadcasting rights on whatever conditions it could obtain and, secondly, FIFA is protected overall against collusive and abusive practices by Community law and national competition law²¹.

The making of a list of events of major public importance is at the discretion of a Member State²² and is no subject for harmonization. In Paragraphs 52-57 of the Judgment the most important conclusions are made. A public interest may therefore override EU's fundamental freedoms in the audiovisual sector. It constitutes a freedom of expression, and a freedom to receive information is part of a freedom of expression²³. The obstacles to the freedom to provide services created by Belgium are overruled by public interest and measures provisioned in Art 3a(1) of the contested Directive are therefore justified.

The court considered that FIFA World Cup should be rather regarded as one event and not a series of events. It is for the Member State to decide at its own considerable discretion which event (series of events) is of major importance to the public. Likewise results in 'non-prime' football matches may determine further progress of a national team in the tournament. At the same time, the FIFA World Cup is a popular

¹⁹ Par. 42 of Judgment

²⁰ Par. 137 of Judgment

²¹ Par. 142 of Judgment

²² Par. 150 of Judgement

²³ Art. 10 ECHR

event among the general public and not only among football fans²⁴. Thus FIFA's plea on the lack of the Commission's reasoning was rejected²⁵.

Nor did the Court accept FIFA's arguments based on viewing figures among 'Television audiences in Belgium for football World Cup matches, 1998 to 2006'. The document however confirmed rather than invalidated inappropriateness of differing 'prime' matches from 'non-prime' matches. Therefore, the document brought to the Court's attention by FIFA as an effective weapon simply backfired against them²⁶.

6. Conclusion

The battle for broadcasting rights between FIFA and Europe started in 2007. The judgment was delivered 4 years later in 2011 and could only affect the broadcasting of the 2018 World Cup tournament to be hosted in Russia.

In its present ruling the Court yet again gave a reminder that a public interest is a freedom of expression which is protected by ECHR and Article 11 of the Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the EU and in doing so can override the fundamental principles of EU market²⁷. And so it did to protect the EU television audience from FIFA's 'financial attack' in the audiovisual sector.

Upset by the judgment FIFA's management lodged an appeal to ECJ in April 2011. While the final decision was still pending following the Opinion of Mr. Advocate General Jääskinen²⁸ the experts were unanimous in their view that FIFA had little chance of reversing the decision of the General Court. And so it happened. On 18 July 2013 the appeal was fully dismissed²⁹. Eventually Switzerland lost a very important 'away match' to Luxembourg. The judgment will have a huge impact on the future of the audiovisual market in Europe. It can be assumed that FIFA since made significant adjustments to their business negotiations and contracts in relation to the selling of tournament broadcasting rights to the European market. At the same time due to the increased costs free-to-air national television would have to seek new financing schemes and build up new agreements with advertisers and possibly make new arrangement with pay-TV (sublicense broadcasting rights on recorded games and on

²⁴ In 2006 and 2010 Belgium did not qualify to the World Cup. In 2002 the team played 3 matches in a group and progressed to 1/8 final where it lost to Brazil, the future champion. Nevertheless, it does not undermine overall Belgian public interest in once-per-4-years grand event. World Cup 2014 where Belgium progressed to quarterfinal had certainly increased general public interest.

²⁵ Par. 71-75, 94 of Judgment

²⁶ Par 104-109 of Judgment

²⁷ See also Case C-250/06, United Pan-Europe Communications Belgium SA and Others v Belgian State, 13 December 2007.

²⁸ The full text of the Opinion is available at <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/celex.jsf?celex=62011CC0201&lang1=en&type=NOT&ancre> (Last visited 20 July 2014).

²⁹ See <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-204/11&language=en> (Last visited 20 July 2014).

the highlights or else). For now the end users are happy with the decision and the Belgian broadcasters have their rights on exclusive broadcasting of all 64 Soccer World Cup matches well protected. Other European countries might very well follow the Belgian example and make up their own 'long lists' of events of major importance to the public to be freely available on their television networks. The obstacles to making profitable arrangements with pay-TV in the European market will certainly entail an increase in prices for EU broadcasters as retaliation by FIFA. And in the end the national legislation might find it reasonable and appropriate to shorten those lists of events of major importance to the public which are freely available on national television.

4. THE *FREE* KICK (7)

Edited by Albrecht Sonntag*

'The FREE kick' is a column about Football Research in an Enlarged Europe, a European interdisciplinary research project in the social sciences (<http://www.free-project.eu>). The project runs from April 2012 to March 2015.

Dissemination and its Discontents

The impact dilemma

In times of tightening budgets and growing demands of accountability, public research funding agencies are increasingly scared of being accused of wasting the taxpayer's money. While research investments into nanoscience, biogenetics or information technology are by definition considered worthwhile – Growth! Jobs! Future! – the social sciences and humanities inevitably raise suspicious questions such as: Is this really 'useful research'? Or is it simply a way to squander public money in order to keep weird professors occupied in their ivory towers? And allow them to indulge in 'all-expenses paid' academic tourism?

Under the justification pressure of utilitarianism, the buzzword of the times is 'IMPACT'. In an age where politicians and public authorities prove more and more incapable of changing society for the better, social scientists are expected to promise in each and every funding application submitted to these same authorities that their work will have an impact.

It makes sense, of course, to expect expensive research projects to give something back to society. And, fortunately, this noble idea is actually shared by many social scientists in principle. The devil hides, as often, in the detail: On whom exactly are they expected to have this impact? How are they expected to demonstrate that they do have one? In what way can impact be reasonably measured?

Of course, you can always produce the charts from your 'citation index' and rant about the massive impact your work must have had on other academics. But if that is not precisely the ivory tower to be avoided, what is? Not to mention that running after citations breeds conformity and is therefore in flagrant contradiction with the demands to produce original, interdisciplinary work.

* Centre for European Integration, ESSCA School of Management, Angers.

Of course, you can present your results to the policy-makers themselves. But if you intend to do so, you are briefed to take into account that they do not have time to take part in a one-day conference and that you should not go beyond ten-minute exposés. And, since they do not have time to read books either, you are advised to reduce the complex thought they initially commissioned to easily digestible policy briefs.

And, of course, you may aim at having an impact on society at large. In other words: trying to inform people about themselves, by showing them what you have found out about the society they live in. Perhaps even engage a virtuous circle of reflexivity in the sense of 'late modernity' theory, by making them think about their own practices and interiorise new knowledge about socio-cultural phenomena. But it is difficult to reach a mass public other than by mass media. As a result, for projects based in the social sciences and humanities, 'having an impact' is increasingly understood as 'engaging in frantic dissemination activities'.

The dissemination imperative

In other words: if you want to have an impact, you will need to plunge into time-consuming dissemination efforts, from wooing condescending journalists – many of whom have become journalists precisely because they felt academic research was a pain in the neck – to cutting your thought into bits of 2000 characters maximum (spaces included!) or a few seconds of speaking time on a television panel (for which you pay your travel yourself). Not to forget putting up with a lack of respect and professionalism, such as in poorly transcribed interviews where your name is misspelt, the title of your project deleted, and the name of your university confused with another one... *'Oh, sorry, we didn't think that was important!'*

These minor mishaps notwithstanding, there obviously was no way of avoiding dissemination efforts for a project like FREE. Football is a social and cultural practice that ordinary people seem rather keen on understanding better, and it is a topic that is omnipresent in the media. At its high times, like before and during a football World Cup, the media are generally very eager to pick up original and differentiating content, which provides an opportunity for researchers to be listened to and, who knows, have a modest impact in case their work manages to trigger reactions and debate. How exactly such an impact is to be measured is another question.

For FREE, the 2014 World Cup in Brazil was part of the dissemination imperative, and at the same time a reminder of an explicit dissemination promise given before the project started. It also was an opportunity to reach out to a large audience and transmit some of our findings and analyses. And the work with all kinds of media turned out to be a very revealing learning experience. The following paragraphs will sum up three of the lessons learnt in this very special 'summer school'.

The triviality trap

Needless to say, we made mistakes. The first one was to accept the idea – suggested by a market survey institute – of using trivial news as bait for the mainstream media with the aim of raising interest in the real contents and findings of our studies. Following this advice we added (without additional costs) a few very trivial questions to our serious (and already quite expensive) CATI survey that was carried out at the end of 2013. In April and May 2014 we used these questions about how people in different countries anticipated the World Cup, what expectations and preferences they had with regard to the teams and players involved etc., in order to draft a press release with the objective of raising awareness among the public that beyond these trivia was a whole world of exciting research findings on European football out there.

The press release itself was rather well received. In the German-speaking countries many regional newspaper or sport websites seemed flabbergasted at the thought that, according to the figures from the poll, Austrians actually quite liked the German national team (unheard of!). In France, the comparison with the other four countries usually encompassed under the label ‘Big-5’ always raises interest and inevitably feeds the ‘declinist’ discourse the French media love to indulge in (with masochistic pleasure). And in Spain, the fact that the Spanish were the most confident among all Europeans concerning their own team, with almost 60% of the population believing their team would win the World Cup, was eagerly picked up by the media (no laughs, please!).

Unfortunately, this strategy of the trivial bait did not only hardly produce the expected interest in the research behind it – the press release provoked a rather low number of interview requests. It actually even backfired punctually, as the banality of the bait somewhat suggested that the rest of the work was of similar nature. A rather widely read online editorial, whose (anonymous) author had not bothered to research the topic properly, equated the FREE project with a huge waste of money, by sarcastically juxtaposing news from the press release with the ‘convoluted’ research objectives of the project as formulated on the website.

First lesson learnt: Knowing what I know now, I would advise all social scientists to refrain from mixing trivial with serious issues just to flatter the media and their superficial way of dealing with complex matters. Not worth it.

The interactivity experience

Another way of engaging with media is of course to write your own texts. Which is easier said than done. It is not every researcher’s cup of tea to write media-compatible texts. And it is not every newspaper’s cup of tea to open their columns – even the unlimited space of their online edition – to academics. But sometimes the opportunity comes up, and then both sides should seize it.

I had such an opportunity in May, when I was asked by *Le Monde* whether I wanted to contribute, ideally on a daily basis, to their online coverage of the forthcoming World Cup. Something like a column from an academic observer who each day would develop a reflective piece linked to the events of the previous evening.

What I knew at the time was that *Le Monde* still is a truly excellent newspaper, certainly one of the finest in Europe even if it is written in a dead language. I also knew I would be able to find the time in June and July to write ad-hoc pieces based on previous and ongoing research (and slipping in relevant bits and pieces from the FREE findings), but linked to what the World Cup would produce. What I did not realise was what interactivity in online media really meant.

It does not really mean informed debate or critical exchange. There was some of it, but most of the reactions I received to the overall twenty-six pieces I wrote for lemonde.fr during the World Cup weeks were anonymous, often angry, sometimes aggressive comments from readers who for some of them had very clearly not bothered to read the text fully and try to follow the argumentation.

Some topics are particularly sensitive. On the fifth day of the tournament, for instance, I took the opportunity offered by the breakdown of the loudspeakers before the France-Honduras match, as a result of which the national anthems were not played, to ask the question: 'Would we actually miss the national anthems before football matches?' I drafted what I thought was a rather relaxed discussion of this question, fed by field work observations from previous World Cups and some interesting data from the FREE surveys, and coming to the conclusion that there was no need for a heated debate as spectators tend to appreciate the anthems, without taking them too seriously, either. In my innocence I had no idea of the number of messages I was to receive, both on the comments section on the website and on my professional mailbox!

These are moments where comments tend to be underpinned by a kind of latent anti-intellectualism. The mere fact of being systematically introduced as a sociologist appears to be perceived as a provocation by some. There seems to be quite some accumulated anger out there against a disconnected 'élite' telling 'ordinary people' what to think. And even if this is clearly not the intention of the author, every op-ed piece perceived as being produced by such a 'smart-ass' is torn apart in righteous indignation.

Interactivity also plays games with your ego. Even knowing that readers' comments are what they are, you find yourself unable to ignore them. And once one of your contributions appears in the Top 5 list of 'most viewed', or 'most recommended' articles, you observe yourself eagerly checking the number of tweets or Facebook shares. But if you have six thousands 'likes' on facebook, does that mean that your article was an excellent one? More probably such figures simply reflect how 'hot' the topic was you dealt with. When I wrote about the nationality issue on the occasion of the encounter of the Boateng brothers in the Ghana vs. Germany game, emotions and

comments ran high again. Not because the article was particularly brilliant, but because the issue is hypersensitive in the climate of the current migration debate.

Interactivity, by the way, may not really be the right word for describing what is going on in the brave new world of online journalism. After all, there is hardly any truly ‘inter-active’ debate. Most of the time there are only ‘re-active’ one-way comments – how could it be otherwise? When readers start to discuss issues with each other, it is not very often in a constructive manner. And it does not really lead anywhere, even in the environment of a high-quality newspaper like *Le Monde*.

Overall, however, the *Le Monde* adventure was definitely worth it. Not only because it was a great opportunity to learn something about the reception, consumption and fake interactivity of online media, but also because the outreach of a brand as strong as *Le Monde* is remarkable. The articles triggered interview requests in the entire francophone world and beyond: from Canada to Brazil, and even exotic places like Switzerland. Moreover, the web editors prefaced each of the columns with an explanation on FREE and a link to the project website, which turned the exercise into a rather efficient dissemination activity. And in the case of a website that is consulted daily by over 1.5 million readers, you might even dream of some kind of ‘impact’.

Second lesson learnt: If you are regularly accused by fellow scholars to do ‘journalism’ rather than ‘serious research’, you might as well turn this apparent weakness into a strength and see what collaboration you could aim for with quality media. Be prepared for anti-intellectualism on the comment pages and take the insults as an always welcome training in serenity and humility. And have fun.

The quality gap

In the latest FREE Newsletter (Issue 6), Paul Dietschy, member of the FREE consortium and tireless disseminator in the French media, reflected on his own experience with media of all different sorts. According to him, ‘the degree of seriousness in engaging with academic research from the social sciences and humanities is very... let’s say: “variable”, especially on television...’.

He is right. Television almost always ends up having you say what THEY wanted to hear in the first place. If you are interviewed for a documentary, your statements are likely to be edited and cut (or deleted!) in a way that fits the intention of the journalists. If you are on a live panel, you generally have no chance of opposing complex thought and in-depth analysis to the quick, bland, clichéd opinions that are swirling across the table. As a result, you find yourself drawn into playing a part in a superficial talking shop. In both situations, your status as researcher is nothing more than a kind of ‘gravitas label’ that journalists want to stick on their own, previously held opinions.

Radio is hardly any better these days. The tendency, as Paul also confirms, is clearly ‘to favour short formats and a controversial tone’. Presenters are often interested in creating live disputes, the more aggressive the better. The one who shouts the loudest

wins the argument – ‘No time for losers’, as Freddy Mercury pointed out, and certainly no time for developing ideas or explain ambiguity. With two exceptions: the first is the regular news programmes of some quality radio stations that are in need of an explanation that their own journalists have trouble providing; the second is these last remaining one-hour cultural magazine radio formats – an endangered species on the verge of extinction – that give you plenty of time in an intelligent dialogue.

And the press? Rather a good surprise, depending of course on the type of paper or magazine you work with. More often than not the press is actually better than its reputation. To quote Paul Dietsch again:

There still is a written press, both printed and online, and including some titles of the sports press, that is capable and willing to think and share more demanding reflections with their readers. These media is what academic researchers should target in the first place when looking for avenues of effective dissemination.

From my experience with *Le Monde* I can only confirm. There was, on the part of the journalists, sincere interest in my work and the project’s research findings. The added value of a researcher’s contribution was clearly appreciated; there was encouraging and useful feedback, and first-class editorial fine-tuning. There was curiosity to learn about different interpretations. There was willingness to have conventional football wisdom be put into question. Most of all, there was respect for scholarly work and methods.

As becomes clear from the above, the World Cup not only ended up with establishing a momentary hierarchy among the world’s leading football teams. It also produced a very interesting hierarchy among different media, revealing a growing quality gap between the best and the poorest.

Third lesson learnt: Forget television. Or at least be hyper-choosy when it comes to saying yes to an invitation. On the other hand, do not be too hard on print and online journalists. More than once, there is reason to be impressed with the quality of the work that is delivered under tremendous time pressure. The quality press can be a real ally in your dissemination efforts. It is well worth adopting a positive and collaborative attitude to them: open-minded enough to adapt to their needs, and self-confident enough to insist on correct and appropriate citation of your name, project, and institution. With mutual respect, dissemination, rather than an obligation, can become a very rewarding undertaking.

The affinity prerequisite

Like it or not, the dissemination imperative and the impact dilemma are here to stay. Reaching out not only to the famous policy-makers but to society at large will be part and parcel of each serious research project in the social sciences and humanities in the future. It makes sense approaching this pressure with a positive attitude and taking it into account at the very moment you start drafting a project. The most

important question is, 'who?' There are some excellent researchers who are simply not made for writing blogposts, feeling at ease in a radio studio, or breaking down their work into media-compatible texts. But there are some who love this kind of challenge, and their affinity to journalism in the largest sense will definitely be an asset when it comes to keeping the dissemination promises you will inevitably make in the 'impact' section of your project proposal. Make sure you have them on board before taking off.

5. SPORT & EU CONFERENCE REPORT

Alexander Brand

Changes and Challenges of Sports Policy in Europe – Conference Report

Recent debates on sport mega events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup have brought issues of sport governance and wider socio-political importance to the fore. Be it questions of the sustainability of hosting such events (think of the recent wave of protests in Brazil, or the ballooning costs of this year's Winter Olympic Games in Russia), matters of corruption and commercialism in the wake of the bidding process or human rights abuses at construction sites of sports facilities (e.g. Qatar): most of these heated debates have shown that sport is far from isolated from public concerns and politics, for that matter. A somewhat different challenge to sports policy has surfaced in Europe, though. Here, we witness a time of introspection due to the Eurozone and multiple economic crises in several member states. As a by-product, the role and significance of sport in the context of European integration, and in particular for the future of European integration, has come under scrutiny as well. Last but not least, sport systems across Europe are likewise changing. The convergence between sport and other social areas (economy, culture, identity matters) only testifies to the fact that sport as such is becoming ever more important as a topic for scholars interested in European integration.

Against this background, the Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union (SEU) held its ninth Annual Conference at the German Sports University in Cologne from June 26 to 27, 2014. There could hardly have been a better place for hosting this convention given the university's international recognition as *the* leading research and teaching institution in Sports Studies in Germany. With 20 departments, ranging from Education and Humanities to Social Sciences and Biomedicine, the German Sports University is home to some 5.000 students from more than 60 countries. For this year's SEU Conference, jointly organised by the university's Institute of European Sport Development and the Jean Monnet Chair of European Integration at the University of Mainz, it also hosted more than 60 conference delegates and paper givers as well as three dozen more interested participants. As *Borja García-García*, one of the founders of the SEU network, underlined in his introductory remarks, the attendance rate of the Annual Conference has grown steadily over the years and by now almost quadrupled since 2006 when the Association held its first workshop meeting at Loughborough University. More than that, the SEU network itself has expanded considerably, currently counting more than 500 members from five continents.

In their respective welcoming remarks, both organisers – *Jürgen Mittag* on behalf of the German Sports University Cologne and *Arne Niemann* on behalf of the University of Mainz – referred to the importance of Sports Studies in the context of European integration. Concerning sports research in Europe and its relation to understanding European integration, *Arne Niemann* pointed to the fact that we witness a particular phase of the integration project. Accordingly, current politics within the EU can be said to have moved from a “permissive consensus” (with a largely disinterested public) to a “restraining dissensus” (as public disagreement and scepticism over the European project has grown over time). One important accusation in this regard is the often heard claim that “the EU” or “EU politics” is allegedly too far removed from the lifeworlds of the European people(s). In contrast, “sports” as a field of activity is comparatively close to many, especially on the emotional level. However, most people are not aware that there is a “European dimension” to sport, and more in-depth research on this relationship may challenge the notions of Europe entertained by large swaths of the public. On the internal dimension, *Jürgen Mittag* emphasised that there has been a growing academic apprehension of a research field that could be dubbed “Sport & EU Studies” lately. A growing number of PhD students across Europe work at the intersection of Political Science, Integration Studies, History and Media Studies in order to make important issues such as sport governance, legal frameworks for sport, doping, corruption and sport-related crime accessible and analysable. At the same time, there is a heightened awareness on behalf of European-level institutions, not least the European Commission, to researching sport as a topic of importance to the politics of integration. In the wake of the inclusion of sport in the Treaty of Lisbon, the demand for expertise and advice has grown, but so has the funding for sports-related research, especially funding that is intended to facilitate the establishment of lasting cooperation networks across Europe. A case in point here is the multi-annual FREE (Football Research in an Enlarged Europe) project funded under the 7th Framework Program by the Commission.

That there has been a substantial broadening of the thematic agenda of “Sport & EU Studies” has also been borne out by the programme of this year’s SEU conference. Seven panels comprising 25 papers and one public debate dealt with topics as diverse as the interrelationships of political institutions and sport governing bodies (SGBs), labour relations and human rights issues, crime and corruption related to sport (as well as measures to curb them), public opinion and media dynamics related to sport events, and the eventual European-wide convergence of sport systems at member-states level. Clustered into thematic blocs, five general topics emerged as the core of the convention’s discussions: History, Institutions/Governance, Legal Issues, Mega Events/Media, and the State of Affairs in European Sports Policy.

The conference started with a panel on historical approaches to sport and sport governance in Europe. Remarkably enough, this was the first time that the SEU convention featured a full panel exclusively devoted to issues of sport history, an effort lauded by several participants. What tied all four papers together was a strong focus on the European dimension of the issues under consideration. *Jean-Christophe Meyer* (Université de Strasbourg) reported his research on the early days of television

broadcasts of football in France and Germany and, in particular, how the press covered this novelty during the 1950s and early 1960s. Accordingly, there was a struggle between stakeholders that promoted such live broadcastings and those who did fear that the turnout of spectators would decrease to the detriment of the football clubs. Hence, it was the convergent efforts of both national public TV corporations and the respective football federations when it came to the broadcasting of mega events such as the World Cups (1954, 1958 and 1962) which turned the table. A crucial player in this regard was Eurovision/the European Broadcasting Union which established a transnational communication space. However, as *Meyer* pointed out in the subsequent discussion, since access to the archives is discretionary, and the quality of the documentation uneven, historical research faces hurdles in further investigating the matter. In the ensuing presentation, *Christian Salm* (University of Portsmouth) focused on the European Parliament's (EP) public hearing on violations of human rights in Argentina before the FIFA World Cup in 1978. Based on his analysis of EP debates and minutes of the EP's Political Committee, interviews and archival research, he demonstrated that there had been a vivid debate whether to hold such a hearing and what the implications of staging a hearing would be. More than that, it could be argued that the 1978 event also allows for a more general discussion of opportunities as well as limits of staging such (protest) hearings. On the positive side, there has been a discernible surge in media interest and coverage, the Argentinean authorities did react to this form of publicity (albeit on a low level), and it also set an example for similar hearings later on (e.g. Moscow 1980, or, more recently, in February 2014 related to human rights violations in the run-off to the FIFA World Cup 2022 in Qatar). On the negative side, according to *Salm*, it must be noted that the hearing itself did not stop human rights violations in Argentina and that the very issue quickly disappeared from the public agenda after the tournament ended. Hence, the potential to use such hearings as forms of protest – without leading to a boycott of the event itself, for instance – seems to be of very limited value.

Gregory Quin (DeMontford University Leicester) then picked up on the issue of the politicisation of sport during Cold War times. Pointing to the story of how Rhythmic Gymnastics (RG) became an Olympic discipline, he indicated that there had been two different notions of RG throughout Europe of what the sport was about. While in the Eastern European countries such as Russia and Bulgaria it had a long tradition as a competitive sport, in the Western countries an understanding of RG as an educational and aesthetic practice prevailed. Add in the domination of Eastern European athletes and trainers, and you can easily imagine that the issue of whether RG should become part of the Olympics also fell prey to the political and ideological rivalries of the 1960s and 1970s. But, as *Quin's* extensive research (again, interviews, archival research and document analysis) shows, there have also been different ideas of the role of RG within the Eastern bloc. While Bulgarian trainers and managers early on developed a more “European” attitude (going abroad, coaching gymnasts in other European countries), the Soviet athletes and functionaries rather attempted to keep the Soviet Union's dominant position by not going out. Finally, *Philippe*

Vonnard (University of Lausanne) asked the question of when actually the “Europeanisation” of football began. While recent research has mainly focused on the last two decades and what came after the Bosman ruling of the European Court of Justice (1995), he asserted that, from a historical perspective, there have been important precursors. Even before the founding of the UEFA and the establishment of competitions at the European level in the 1950s, the inter-war period was characterised by frequent exchanges between clubs and managers across Europe. In his presentation, *Vonnard* then focused upon the period from 1954 to 1972, and on the role of the UEFA in fostering the popularity of European tournaments in particular. As a second important Europeanising agent, media have to be taken into account, not least given the fact that by the 1980s, the so-called “week of Europe” had been established mainly due to the necessities of broadcasting (with different European-level competitions played on three consecutive days in a week in order to generate maximum attention).

The second panel of the conference, and an additional panel slated for the second day, tackled the theme of sport institutions/governance. *Arnout Geeraert* (KU Leuven), in his instructive and conceptually dense talk, introduced the principle-agent perspective as a tool to analyse the interplay between SGBs such as the UEFA or the FIFA and political institutions, namely the EU institutions. According to his account, the EU, and in particular the European Commission, can be conceptualised as a “shadow principal” acting in-between national leagues, associations and interest groups (the principals) and UEFA/FIFA (the agents). It can do so via two routes: the “EU law” route (establishing legal frameworks to which the actors have to abide) and the “EU sports policy” route (attempts at steering through dialogue and softer forms of governance such as agenda-setting, defining, monitoring). Concerning the question of good governance in international sports, *Geeraert* concluded that the sports policy route seems to be more promising not least given the fact that it seeks to involve relevant addressees. The usefulness of the principal-agent approach, however, remained contested as a heated discussion afterwards made clear. While some in the audience questioned whether one can really speak of a “delegation” of responsibilities or agents acting “on behalf of” principals with regard to the EU-SGB constellation (comprising a lot of other stakeholders as well which, at times, create networks), others sided with the author in stating that as long as there is both autonomy and forms of control, the principal-agent-concept does have value.

The EU’s ability to shape international sports was also picked up by the paper of *Henk-Erik Meier* (University of Münster) and *Borja García-García* (Loughborough University). Starting from the notion of the EU as a regulator of global sports, the paper discussed several cases where the EU has attempted to regulate issues related to international sport in an exploratory fashion. Three questions guided the authors’ efforts: Which objectives does the EU pursue in global sports regulation? Is the EU able to attain regulatory cohesion? And finally, how effective is the EU in accomplishing its objectives? Their case selection included issues such as ticket selling and tobacco sport sponsoring (sport consumer protection), player market regulation, and attempts to shape the governance of sport (the fight against doping

through the World Anti-Doping Agency, WADA). *Meier* and *García-García* cautiously concluded that, in sum, the EU cannot be seen as an effective regulator of global sports, since in most cases it failed to impose its regulations on SGBs. However, the EU represents a key actor whose preferences cannot completely be ignored. It attains regulatory cohesion mostly in those cases where competition policy is involved and can act more effectively when a political opportunity structure is already favourable (e.g. in the WADA case where other key actors show an interest in cooperation). WADA also played an important role in the next paper presented by *Mads de Wolff* (Loughborough University). He dealt with the question of how to explain different solutions to the institutional design of EU policy-making in the realm of sports. Since sport became an official competency for the EU with the Lisbon Treaty, EU member states have sought to establish procedures for the coordination and representation of common positions in institutions related to sports. In two case studies, *de Wolff* discussed the two contrasting institutional solutions of WADA and the Council of Europe (CoE), the latter being involved in an eventual convention to combat the manipulation of sport results. Strangely, the European Commission has been endowed with responsibilities in the CoE case while in WADA, only member states and their representatives participate. What the discussion afterwards revealed was that the peculiar structure of WADA might explain why the Commission did not push for an own seat. While some member states would clearly have liked the Commission on board of WADA, one could hypothesise that there would have been legal, financial and reputational risks in bringing the Commission in.

Regulatory issues in sport governance were also dealt with on the second day of the conference, particularly with regard to the combat against crime and corruption in global sports. *Jack Anderson* (Queen's University Belfast) pleaded for the broadening of the discussion on money laundering and match-fixing in sport. So far, he asserted, the debate is mostly about the so-called "integrity of sport" and its likely loss due to criminal activities. However, it is not only necessary to differentiate between manipulations for the primary purpose of sporting success and criminal activities solely for commercial purposes. One should also include the manifold conflicts of interests resulting from sport sponsorship through the gambling industry into analysis and not least, as *Anderson* underlined in his presentation, pay attention to how crime in sports is linked to physical abuse and abysmal working conditions of players, making sportspeople vulnerable to being complicit in criminal activities. In sum, crime and corruption in international sports should be placed within the discourse of transnational economic crime in order to better grasp the dynamics at play. *Simon Gardiner* (Leeds Metropolitan University) complemented this talk with his ideas on the possibility of the creation of a Global Sports Anti-Corruption Body. Drawing the parallel to WADA which, as he said, seems to become the world's Sport Integrity Agency, *Gardiner* explicated what it would mean to install a mechanism to combat corruption in sport in a coordinated manner. One crucial question in this is arguably where the specific political impetus for the creation of such an institution will come from. Although several existing political institutions such as the CoE have dealt with issues such as match-fixing, a comprehensive view of the corruption

problématique would have to transcend such narrow conceptions to include illegal payments, bribery and “problem gambling”, for instance. The latter point also illustrates that sport betting companies have got significant clout (vis-à-vis SGBs not the least) over these matters and hence are crucial players in any fight against corruption in sports.

Traditionally, considerable prominence at SEU conferences is awarded to people working in Legal Studies or (Sports) Law institutes and firms. This year’s event featured two panels with topics including EU state aid, labour relations and the status of sportspeople in non-Schengen states. *Kyrillos Nikolaou* (Panteion University Athens) started with his analysis of the migration policies for foreign athletes in Cyprus, Bulgaria and Romania. More specifically, he asked whether these policies are compatible with EU law and if not, whether there are signs that they are on the way of being harmonised with it. He alluded to how Cyprus has come to issue special visa to athletes from Russia and Ukraine, all the while Romania and Bulgaria eye on attracting athletes from the whole Black Sea region. With regard to the rules for obtaining short-term visa and (double) citizenship, consequently, the three countries differ markedly in their policies. Athletes and their relationship towards employers have been at the centre of attention in the paper presented by *Richard Parrish* (Edge Hill University) and *Vanja Smokvina* (University of Rijeka/Edge Hill University). In professional football, as they argued, we have witnessed the gradual evolution of the Social Dialogue as a consultation and negotiation mechanism between employers and workers and, as a first result, the 2012 Agreement on Minimum Requirements for Standard Player Contracts in the Professional Football Sector. This, however, only accentuates the problem that the club-player relationship is defined differently in various national contexts: While players in certain countries are defined as “self-employed”, the protections of art. 45 TFEU extend to “workers”. In their case studies, the authors referred mainly to Croatia (and, to a lesser degree, Serbia) to show that the working conditions of professional players are precarious to say the least, and precisely for the fact that they are only granted self-employed status. For instance, payments are often delayed, leading to a situation where – according to a survey of the Union of Croatian Football Players – 85 percent of the players would prefer the change of their legal status, even if that meant a decrease in wages. In his vivid report, *Smokvina* also highlighted that the Social Dialogue in Croatian football got a rather rocky start in 2013, and that the issue of the legal status of the players remains the most contentious one so far. *Bahdan Sarazhynski* (European Humanities University Vilnius), in his presentation on the case of the Alexander Martynovich, a Belarusian footballer who is playing at the Russian Premier Football League, highlighted that discrimination on the basis of nationality is still a pressing issue in European football, including outside the EU. What makes the Martynovich case peculiar is that the player had obtained Russian citizenship and was still subject to the newly introduced “legionary restriction” in Russian football since he had played for Belarus. Although Martynovich dropped his lawsuit (with the issue remaining unresolved for the time being), *Sarazhynski* hinted at the fact that the situation might change in 2015 when the Eurasian Economic Union (EEU) will come into

force. Since the EEU treaty includes provisions that prohibit restrictions to the free movement of workers similar to that of the EU, the “legionary clause”, if upheld in its current form, is almost certain to have the potential to become the Bosman case of the newly founded EEU.

Tackling a different set of legal issues, *Ben van Rompuy* (T.M.C. Asser Institute, The Hague) elaborated on the very timely topic of EU State Aid law and the public support for sport. Starting from the observation that public authorities in all EU member states, directly or indirectly, finance sport organisations, infrastructures or individual clubs over the years, he pointed out that the number of complaints against unlawful state aid (under EU criteria) has risen recently. While there may have been times when the European Commission stated, rather lamely, that “more cases are needed” to investigate the issue at all, this position has now become untenable. Yet there are hardly any signs for hugely increased activism on behalf of the Commission; it only acts in case a complaint is brought to it, and has established a threshold of 15 million EUR in order to be able to focus on the “bigger” cases, as the ensuing discussion made clear. Be that the result of a pragmatic decision to avoid subject overload or resource overstretch, as some commentators pointed out, it results in the fact that the enforcement practice of the EU only unfolds slowly. This, as *van Rompuy* explained, is arguably related to the peculiar forms state aid may take in the realm of sports (favourable loans, land swaps with questionable conditions, selective tax advantages). Even so, the general principle that state aid can be justified if it is in the “common interest” and deemed appropriate to fulfil such a public function, leaves enough leeway to evade sanctions. Instructive in this regard are the most recent cases of exemptions from EU State aid regulation granted to infrastructure projects in France, Belgium and Germany. Afterwards, *Marius Melzer* (German Sports University Cologne) directed the attention of the attendees towards the interesting case of youth development in German basketball. He based his analysis on the implicit comparison to football and how youth development was spurred there by secondary effects of Europeanisation. In contrast, German basketball exhibited a differently structured players’ market early on: less Europeanised, but more globalised. There have not been any limits to the use of foreign players in German (professional) basketball since 2005, but six out of 12 players on the roster have to be eligible for German national teams (with hardly any substantial effect in terms of fielding time, though). Interestingly, there has not been an inquiry into the compatibility of this rule with EU regulations on Free Movement. Quite similarly to football, however, the liberalisation of the players’ market has also spurred the investment in youth development for which the clubs themselves had to attain more responsibility. Finally, *Marco van der Harst* (T.M.C. Asser Institute, The Hague) presented part of his doctoral research on the relationship of EU and national law and SGBs, in particular their “right of autonomy”. In its most basic form, this relationship means that a SGB has to operate with due regard to national and EU law while having the right to set its own rules within these confines. In reality, however, as *van der Harst* things are not so clear-cut with the actors (SGBs like FIFA or the quasi-judicial body CAS, the Court of Arbitration for Sport) trying to push the

boundaries of their competencies. Inconsistencies between different assessments, e.g. by a national court and the CAS, may therefore provide SGBs with the opportunity to illegally set restrictions to fundamental freedoms of professional sportspeople for the time being.

A theme that surfaced in almost all discussions of this year's SEU conference was that of sport mega events and their implications in terms of the bidding process, the hosting and the costs for the respective societies. It also became apparent that papers on several panels touched upon these issues, and there was one panel entirely devoted to "Mega Events and Media Issues". *Simon Ličen* (Washington State University) introduced the topic with his analysis of the perceived impact and potential legacy of the European Basketball Championship for Men in 2013, the EuroBasket 2013. Arguing that this event could be classified as a "major" sport event – "mega" for the host cities but arguably smaller in terms of general public attention – he compared projected and realised benefits of this event for the host country Slovenia. (When asked, only three out of about 60 experts in the room attending the presentation knew where it had taken place.) According to his research, there has been a constant downscaling of the expectations in the run-up to the tournament: from the "best games ever" to the "best games possible" to the "best games we can". He also showed that the EuroBasket 2013 followed the typical pattern of ex-post figures disproving inflated ex ante-estimates in terms of expected benefits (tourist spending, host recognition, increased sport participation etc.). Particularly instructive were the public opinion data *Ličen* presented. An overwhelmingly positive popular perception of the events with more than 70% of the respondents feeling that the EuroBasket 2013 would indeed enhance Slovenia's recognition worldwide demonstrated that, at the level of the populace, this event was seen as a great opportunity to promote the national brand "Slovenia". However, as media analysis underscored, the greatest spike in media coverage in the wake of the event occurred in Slovenian media. At the same time contractual limitations on behalf of the International Basketball Association FIBA prevented an active display of the Slovenian official image campaign "I Feel S-Love-nia". (FIBA had a contract running with "Visit Spain" at the same time!) This, as *Ličen* argued, boils down to the conclusion that the local "feel good-effect" was perhaps the main positive achievement of the EuroBasket 2013. In a more general sense, *Danyel Reiche* picked up the ball and asked what the motivations of countries are not only to host but to participate in sport mega events such as the Olympics. According to his approach, there are at least four aspects which have to be taken into account: legitimacy (sporting success as indicator of a country's capabilities to achieve), the unifying moment (fostering internal cohesion), the quest for statehood (as there are more states recognised by the International Olympic Committee, IOC, than have gained membership in the United Nations), and the issue of soft power (gaining political weight through sporting success). In terms of hosting mega events, *Reiche* referred to the case of Qatar and the FIFA World Cup 2022 and remarked that the hugely important question of why Qatar wants to stage the tournament is only rarely asked. He explicated that this is arguably a matter of survival for Qatar, a tool to

communicate its existence to the outside world and secure it via reputational gain given the turbulent conditions in the Greater Middle East.

Qatar 2022, the recent Olympic Winter Games in Sochi 2014, and Russia's bid for the FIFA World Cup 2018 also provided the background of *Ryan Gauthier's* (Erasmus University Rotterdam) presentation on accountability in sport governance. Provocatively asking whether the IOC should be accountable for all the world's ills, *Gauthier* explored the issue of responsibility alongside sport mega events, be that for the prevention of human rights and workforce abuses or environmental degradation. He pleaded for a more differentiated approach towards the meaning of "accountability", but also argued that the IOC should be held accountable for issues such as the use of forced labour on Olympic construction sites given its clout in selecting the hosts and monitoring the games. However, as he pointed out, this does not solve the problem of how to make accountability operationalisable. This point drew many comments from the audience, not least since it seems that the IOC is well aware of the fact that the current format of a hyper-commercialised, profitable media mega event such as the Olympics inevitably leads to a situation in which only a handful of states are willing to host it. Those states are usually not the ones implementing high standards in workforce and environmental protection. As regards the latter, the obvious gap between the IOC's demands for "sustainable" games and the actual balance sheet of recent games springs to mind as well. A fourth inroad into the issue of sport mega events was provided by *Pavel Baravik* and his colleagues from the Studienkolleg zu Berlin. In their project based on extensive qualitative interviews and fieldwork in Belarus, Russia and the Ukraine, they assessed whether the hosting of sport mega events had spurred the development of a critical civil society in the post-Soviet space. In other words, did such events facilitate the articulation of protest on behalf of NGOs within the respective countries? Or does local suppression increase alongside forms of self-censorship and general passivity of those who are not immediately affected (e.g. through resettlement)? According to their research, an uneven picture emerges with stronger evidence of local disobedience in Ukraine than in the cases of Russia and Belarus, and more media coverage of the respective countries as hosts of the sport events in general. However, as regards the latter, it is by and large not the protests themselves that are increasingly reported, which rather disconfirms the idea of a protest movement gaining momentum alongside sport mega events in the post-Soviet space.

Closely related to the analysis of sport mega events is the question of TV broadcasting and publicity through media in general. *Andrea Cattaneo* (Edge Hill University) addressed broadcasting rights agreements in his presentation with a special emphasis on the role of consumers' benefit in such agreements. Hence, although legal provisions such as art. 101 TFEU and art. 12 TFEU give the issue of consumers' benefit a high priority, broadcasting rights agreements, in their reasoning, do not primarily (or directly) aim at the benefit of final consumers. A case in point is provided by the debate concerning collective selling rights which are defended on the basis of "competitive balance" and a "better product" from which a "consumer" might (or might not) benefit in the end. As the ensuing discussion revealed, one might also

ponder whether there is a conflict between consumer protection and art. 165 TFEU on the specificity of sport. Precisely because the latter might be interpreted as benefitting SGBs as custodians of this specific role of sport (and bearers of broadcasting rights), it need not be the case, that the ensuing agreements are the most beneficial for the consumer. Afterwards, *Adam Pendlebury* (also from Edge Hill University) and *Kevin Carpenter* (Hill Dickinson) broadened the debate to include social media. In their vivid presentation, they highlighted that the increased use of Twitter by athletes in the context of the UK has already given rise to a number of legal issues, be that instances of defamation, intellectual property issues or consumer protection from undisclosed advertisements. As SGBs are bent on protecting reputational issues, not least concerning the sport itself as well as their commercial sponsors, the Football Association as well has taken measures to curb misconduct in general. While in former times, these measures targeted mostly misconduct on the pitch, a sanctions regime for “social media misconduct” seems to be evolving which, however, appears to be still somewhat uneven as regards the level of fines and suspensions imposed. In addition, the issue of who is responsible for social media misconduct (in case athletes have employed social media managers or misconduct happens in the commentaries, not an original post) will likely keep lawyers and athletes alike busy in the future.

Two fine days of intense and prolific debate and presentation of state-of-the-art research culminated in a Public Debate and a last panel on the current state of affairs of sports policy in Europe. The public debate convened three designated experts on stage: *William Gaillard* (Director of Communications and Public Affairs for the UEFA, Senior Adviser to the UEFA President), *Folker Hellmund* (German Olympic Sports Confederation, European Olympic Committee EU Office, Brussels) and *Jacob Kornbeck* (Policy Officer, Sport Unit/DG Education & Culture, European Commission). Chaired by *Jürgen Mittag*, the debate set out to discuss the impact of the Lisbon Treaty on European sport policy, the general issue of sport mega events, and an appraisal of the most pressing issues facing sport policy today. Concerning the Lisbon Treaty, *Gaillard* described it, from the perspective of UEFA as a SGB, as a landmark event but also hinted at the fact that the practices of sports actors usually do not always change immediately. Moreover, as he stated, UEFA considers itself as “good European citizens” with a long history of engaging lawmakers at the European level. Hence, there should be no clouds on the horizon from the perspective of UEFA as a result of the Lisbon treaty. *Hellmund* then pointed to the fact that, for instance, art. 165 TFEU is not just about football but a range of sporting activities. Although this very article may have codified the peculiar role of sport in Europe (and contributed to the autonomy of sport in that sense), from a legal point, it did not lead to more certainty, as he argued. What the recent past has already shown, according to him, is that more formal structures have grown (such as the Council Experts Groups), and that sport is subject to new funding schemes (the new Erasmus Sport Chapter). *Kornbeck* expanded on this with a nod to the peculiar role of the European Commission and its self-understanding with regard to European sports policy. For years, as he explicated, the Sport Unit at the Commission had been rather a

“construction site”. It has undoubtedly spurred the process of developing a sports policy in the consultation process which led to the White Paper on Sport (2007), which however was based solely on existing EU law. Nowadays, the Sport Unit seems to have matured to a “normal structure” which sees itself as a partner of the Council and the European Parliament on matters of sport with both options – to act as in accordance or in opposition – depending on the issues being negotiated.

The hot topic of sport mega events also drew pointed commentaries from the stage. *Gaillard* referred to a UEFA study on the impact of hosting mega football events on the respective economies. While some hosts were able to spend less than one percent of their GDP on staging a tournament, examples of monstrous costs and accompanying burdens abound (Portugal, Ukraine, also the Athens Olympics). Such cases of immense overspending prove that, as he stated, past practices are no longer feasible. In this sense, the European Nations’ Cup 2016 in France will already see a marked change with little public money being invested and a huge investment effort on behalf of Public-Private Partnerships as well as the bigger clubs themselves. Even so, the decision to have the 2020 tournament played in different cities across Europe had much to do with thoughts on sustainability. It would have been completely unreasonable, said *Gaillard*, to have one host country bearing the costs in the wake of a still ongoing economic crisis in Europe. Asked whether this would also be a format for the future tournaments, he underlined that UEFA had not make up its mind in this issue but given the cost issue, burden sharing among several hosts seemed not the worst idea. In terms of a likely impact of such a tournament across several European cities, it was also mentioned that this change in format might contribute to a further “Europeanisation” given that hosting is then not an issue of nations anymore. *Hellmund* remarked that he sees two developments concerning the topic of sport mega events in parallel. On the one hand, the debate on such events and their political as well as social implications has now also reached the European Union level. It has, for instance, become a central topic at the meetings of the European Sport Ministers with the question being asked what the EU and the member states expect from sport in the end. At the level of the SGBs, he pointed to the IOC’s Agenda 2020 which had initiated a review of all parts of the process (bidding, sustainability) to be concluded at the end of 2014. For the IOC and for the Olympic movement in general, he said, taking stock of the experiences of the last two decades is needed to regain public support. One aspect of this is arguably that the PR and bidding costs for potential host cities of Olympic Games have quadrupled. Hence, one proposal could be to shorten the time of the bidding process considerably. *Kornbeck* described the role of the European Commission as that of an observer of the debate as well as the guardian of already agreed upon principles. While at the moment the debate on sport mega events is being driven by the Council, the Commission does some background work in organising thematic meetings and reminding all relevant stakeholders of the rules already established.

What lies ahead in sports policy at the European level? *Gaillard* opened the last round of debate and remarked, from the point of view of the UEFA executives, the EU might have evaded the most pressing issues so far. Hence, instead of state aid across

Europe, the EU should look at Sovereign Funds from the outside which tend to make an uneven playing field even more uneven. Even so, (more) EU activism as regards the issues of match-fixing, third party-ownership, and the multiple ownership of clubs is needed, as *Gaillard* pointed out. It might also be useful in this regard to look how the professional sports model is being protected in the United States. *Kornbeck* responded to this by referring to the manifold recent activities of the European Commission in the field of not-for-profit physical activity and health, e.g. the “Sport for all”-Initiative, funding under Erasmus+ or the project “European Week of Sport” (to be launched in 2015). On issues of crime and corruption, however, he urged to have a more realistic view of what political institutions might be expected to deliver (if at all, to curb such behaviour through appropriate frameworks). *Hellmund*, in conclusion, referred to the European Sport Ministers Work Plan 2014-17 which had been adopted recently and which emphasised match-fixing and “good governance” as main tasks to be worked on. Hence, the future debates in European sport policy will likely deal to a great extent with the issue of the “integrity of sport”.

Papers on the state of affairs in European sport policy and sport policies throughout Europe were also at the focus of the last panel as well as of one presentation at the first day of the conference. In a more general fashion, *Gabriel Kerth* (Esslingen, Germany) there pondered opportunities and boundaries of a Sport Policy in the European Union. On the basis of 19 semi-structured interviews with sport officials and document research, his paper attempted to answer the question what barriers exist to prevent the (further) development of a single EU sport policy. He argued that three conditions might explain the underdeveloped state of this policy: a low level of identification with Europe on behalf of the leading actors, particular, nationally defined philosophies of sport, and a low level of collaboration among sport practitioners across Europe. This is accompanied, as he asserted, by the fact that the EU intervenes in this field only when there is an open clash with community law. Differences across European countries were also at the centre of *Ramon Llopis-Goig*'s (University of Valencia) paper which compared patterns of sport participation in the 28 EU member states. According to his statistical analysis of Eurobarometer data on sport participation levels (as well as GDP data, religious affiliations etc.), significant differences between countries and groupings of countries emerge. In terms of sporting activities in general, there is a 60 percentage-point difference between the country with the highest and the country with the lowest level of participation. More than that, physical activity is less common in most former Communist countries, and there are cleavages related to different religious affiliations with the population of “protestant countries” generally more active in sports than others. Afterwards, *Ninja Putzmann* and *Daniel Ziesche* (both at the German Sports University Cologne) concluded the conference with their contributions on specific developments in the sport sector within selected EU member states. *Putzmann* turned the attention of the audience towards recent changes in the Spanish sport system. She demonstrated that concepts taken from Easton's and Almond's system-theoretical approach can be fruitfully adapted and applied to elucidate the relevant shifts since the 1990s. The defining characteristics,

as she explained, of these changes are: growing decentralisation, less government intervention and more cooperation between public authorities and the private sector. Hence, it could be questioned whether the Spanish sport system is still aptly captured by the concept of a “bureaucratic and centralised configuration” assigning the primary (and sole) role to public authorities. *Ziesche*, in contrast, focused on football fan cultures in Germany and the UK, respectively. His paper tackled the emergence of new alignments and networks among fans in both national contexts which are increasingly frustrated with the ongoing commercialisation and securitisation of football. Interestingly, such protest has taken a wholly different shape in both countries, as he explained. While in the UK, fans tend to organise locally in order to increase their chances of participation in the decision-making of specific clubs, the German fan protests resemble a larger, quasi-political movement across the country with a dozen more general claims. Whether this amounts to a new type of “intra-football” social movements remains an open question, as *Ziesche* conceded, and so does the question of who of all those interested in football is being (not) represented by such fan movements (a question raised in the discussion afterwards).

Is it possible to distil common themes and main avenues of future research from a collection of two dozen papers/presentations at the annual conference of an association with a thematic emphasis that is broad enough to encompass football fans and sport systems, the EU legislative process and human rights issues, Twitter messages as well as doping and corruption? If anything, what the 2014 conference of the Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union has demonstrated is that the interest in the sport/politics-nexus is alive and kicking (and growing). Undoubtedly, topics such as the “integrity of sport”, the linkages between sport (mal)governance and crime as well as debates on the impact of hosting sport mega events will not disappear soon. The European Union will play an important and most probably growing role in the years to come while shaping the contours of global sports policy as well. And people, fans, spectators, consumers, amateur sportspeople and athletes alike, will likely press for having a bigger say as regards the frameworks to be established for the conduct of sports. Can sport also deliver anything for European integration? IT certainly can, precisely because it is an activity that is close to the lifeworlds of many. It may be that, fifty years from now we remember this time as one of turmoil and crisis in Europe, but also one in which integration progressed not least because sport was a key driver of socio-cultural growing together.

6. CONFERENCES AND EVENTS

Sport&EU 2015 Conference

Location: Angers, France

Date: 25-26 June 2014

Organisers: Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union in cooperation with the ESSCA School of Management

Call for papers: <http://www.sportandeu.com/2014/12/sporteu-conference-2015-call-for-papers/>

Sport Tourism Conference

Location: Coimbra, Portugal

Date: 10-12 December 2014

Organiser: Coimbra College of Education and the International Research Network In Sports Tourism

Website: <http://www.esec.pt/pagina/stc2014/index.php>

Culture of Fairness: Opportunities and Challenges

Location: Brussels, Belgium

Date: 10 December 2014

Organiser: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen

Contact: brussels@ifa.de

Sport, Politics and Social Policy Conference

Location: Durham, England, UK

Date: 7-8 January 2015

Organiser: Durham University

Website: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/conference.booking/details/?id=379>

The Black Student-Athlete Summit 2015

Location: Austin, TX, USA

Date: 7-9 January 2015

Organiser: University of Texas at Austin

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

13th Annual Macintosh Sociology of Sport Conference

Location: Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Date: 17 January 2015

Organiser: Queen's University

Contact: sarah.barnes@queensu.ca

The Worlds of Football III: Football Codes in the Asian Century

Location: Melbourne, Australia

Date: 20-22 January 2015

Organiser: Victoria University

Website: <http://www.vu.edu.au/news-events/events/the-worlds-of-football-iii-football-codes-in-the-asian-century>

27th ICCP World Play Conference

Location: Brussels, Belgium

Date: 1-3 February 2015

Organiser: International Council for Children's Play

Website: <http://www.iccp-play.org/>

2015 Global Sport Business Association Conference

Location: Nassau, Bahamas

Date: 6-9 February 2015

Organiser: Global Sport Business Association

Contact: GSBAssn@yahoo.com

1st Annual Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA) Conference

Location: Philadelphia, PA, USA

Date: 12-13 February 2015

Organiser: Commission on Sport Management Accreditation

Website: <http://www.cosmaweb.org/preliminary-schedule-and-events.html>

Violent Conflicts 2015: The violent decade?! Recent Domains of Violent Conflicts and Counteracting

Location: Bielefeld, Germany

Date: 27-28 February 2015

Organiser: Center for Interdisciplinary Research (ZiF), Bielefeld

Website: <https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/%28en%29/ikg/konferenz.html>

Sport & Leisure Symposium

Location: Crewe, England, UK

Date: 27-28 February 2015

Organiser: Manchester Metropolitan University

Website: <http://www.cheshire.mmu.ac.uk/sport-history/>

Eighth Summit on Communication and Sport

Location: Charlotte, NC, USA

Date: 6-8 March 2015

Organiser: International Association for Communication and Sport

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

BSSH South Workshop: 'Leisure and Organised Labour'

Location: Cambridge, England, UK

Date: 14 March 2015

Organiser: British Society for Sport History and Anglia Ruskin University

Contact: bsshsouth@gmail.com

12th International Scientific Conference of the Montenegrin Sports Academy

Location: Podgorica, Montenegro

Date: 2-5 April 2015

Organiser: Montenegrin Sports Academy

Website: <http://www.sportmont.ucg.ac.me/conference2015/>

Sports & Entertainment Analytics Conference

Location: Tampa, FL, USA

Date: 9-10 April 2015

Organiser: Ticketmaster

8th Annual Physical Cultural Studies Graduate Student Conference: “Bodies, Science, and Technology”

Location: College Park, MD, USA

Date: 17 April 2015

Organiser: University of Maryland

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

8th Annual College Sport Research Institute Conference

Location: Columbia, SC, USA

Date: 20-22 April 2015

Organiser: College Sport Research Institute

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

Sports Studies: The State of the Art

Location: Rockford, IL, USA

Date: 24 April 2015

Organiser: Rockford University

Contact: sklein@rockford.edu

History of Women's Health Conference

Location: Philadelphia, PA, USA

Date: 29 April 2015

Organiser: University of Pennsylvania Health System

Website: <http://www.uphs.upenn.edu/paharc/collections/events/>

Sport and Discrimination Conference

Location: London, England, UK

Date: 1 May 2015

Organiser: Centre for Research in Media and Cultural Studies, Univ. of Sunderland

Contact: info.sportdiscrimination@sunderland.ac.uk

15th Annual International Conference on Sports: Economic, Management, Marketing & Social Aspects

Location: Athens, Greece

Date: 11-14 May 2015

Organiser: Athens Institute for Education and Research

Website: <http://www.atiner.gr/sports.htm>

BSA Sport Study Group Day Conference: Sport and Social Protest

Location: London, England, United Kingdom **Date:** 15 May 2015
Organiser: British Sociological Association
Website: <http://www.britsoc.co.uk/study-groups/sport.aspx>

8th World Congress on Science and Football

Location: Copenhagen, Denmark **Date:** 20-23 May 2015
Organiser: Copenhagen University
Website: <http://wcsf2015.ku.dk/>

North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) Conference

Location: Ottawa, ON, Canada **Date:** 2-6 June 2015
Organiser: North American Society for Sport Management
Website: <http://www.nassm.com/InfoAbout/Conference/>

Sport and Society in Transnational Contexts

Location: Zurich, Switzerland **Date:** 5-6 June 2015
Organiser: ETH Zurich
Contact: souvik.naha@gmw.gess.ethz.ch

International Sociology of Sport Association World Congress

Location: Paris, France **Date:** 9-12 June 2015
Organiser: International Sociology of Sport Association
Website: <http://www.issa2015.org>

Philosophy at Play

Location: Gloucester, England, UK **Date:** 9-10 June 2015
Organiser: University of Gloucestershire
Website: <https://www.facebook.com/events/1484262871856953>

Sport, Unity, & Conflict: Annual Conference of the European Association for Sociology of Sport

Location: Dublin, Ireland **Date:** 10-13 June 2015
Organisers: European Association for Sociology of Sport
Website: <http://www.eass2015.ie/>

Girl Power in Play

Location: Ottawa, Canada

Date: 18-19 June 2015

Organisers: Women Deliver

Contact: jhoffman@womendeliver.org

20th Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science

Location: Malmö, Sweden

Date: 24-25 June 2015

Organisers: European College of Sport Science and Malmö University, Lund University, Copenhagen University and World Village of Women Sport

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

Sporting Traditions XX

Location: Darwin, NT, Australia

Date: 1-3 July 2015

Organiser: Australian Society for Sports History

Website: <http://www.sporthistory.org/Conference.html>

Sport and Diplomacy: Message, Mode and Metaphor?

Location: London, England, UK

Date: 3-4 July 2015

Organiser: Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy at SOAS, University of London

Contact: jsimon.rofe@soas.ac.uk

2015 AIESEP International Conference

Location: Madrid, Spain

Date: 8-11 July 2015

Organisers: Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d'Education Physique / International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education

Website: <http://www.aiesep2015.com>

Fandom and Religion conference

Location: Leicester, England, UK

Date: 28-30 July 2015

Organiser: University of Leicester

Website: <http://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/lifelong-learning/events/fandomconference/fandom>

Sport and Society Conference

Location: Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Date: 30-31 July 2015

Organiser: Sport and Society Knowledge Community

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

European Association for Sport Management Conference

Location: Dublin, Ireland

Date: 9-12 September 2015

Organiser: European Association for Sport Management

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

7th Asia Pacific Conference on Exercise and Sports Science

Location: Faridabad, India

Date: 14-16 October 2015

Organisers: Asian Council of Exercise and Sports Science

Website: <http://apcess2015.com/>

Play the Game 2015

Location: Aarhus, Denmark

Date: 26-29 October 2015

Organisers: Play the Game

Website: <http://playthegame.org/>

21st Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science

Location: Vienna, Austria

Date: 6-9 July 2016

Organisers: European College of Sport Science and University of Vienna

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

Inaugural Global Congress on Sports and Christianity (IGCSC), 24-28th August, 2016

Location: York, England, UK

Date: 24-28 August 2016

Organisers: York St John University

Website: <http://www.yorks.ac.uk/health--life-sciences/faculty-of-hls/faculty-events/igcsc.aspx>

22nd Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science

Location: Bochum, Germany

Date: 5-8 July 2017

Organisers: European College of Sport Science and University Alliance Metropolis

Ruhr: Ruhr University Bochum, Technical University Dortmund, University

Duisburg-Essen

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

7. JOURNALS

Call for Articles - International Sports Law Journal

The International Sports Law Journal (ISLJ), a peer-reviewed publication by Asser Press and Springer-Verlag, is accepting sports law related articles, papers, comments and book reviews for consideration for publishing both online and in hard-copy issues. Please review the Authors Guidelines and make your submission online at: <http://www.springer.com/?SGWID=0-102-2-1392646-preview>. Articles are accepted throughout the year. To be considered for the 2015 1-2 issue, articles should be submitted by 31 January 2015.

Sport in Society special issue: ‘The Ultras – The global development of a fan phenomenon’

Ultras are the most prominent form of football fandom in the 21st century. From their origins in Italy in the 1960s, this style of fandom has spread across Europe and then across the globe. This special edition seeks to bring together new research and theoretically informed papers to contribute to an understanding of the *ultras* phenomenon and establish a foundation for future scholarship on this form of fandom. This Special Issue invites papers that can contribute to new research agendas on *ultras* fandom.

Expression of Interest due: **1 December 2014**; Deadline for submission: **1 October 2015**. Further details can be found at <http://explore.tandfonline.com/cfp/pgas/sport-society-cfp>

Journal of Applied Sport Management Special Issue – The Political Arena: Power and Political Behavior in Sport Organizations

The goal of this special issue is to act as a catalyst by providing a platform for the examination of various aspects of power, politics, and social influence processes in sport organizations from a management research perspective, thus fostering advancement in these areas: awareness, investigation, and sport industry-specific managerial applications. Possible topics include (but are not limited to):

- Social dynamics of interpersonal and group processes in sport organizations

- Social influence and effectiveness competencies of sport coaches and administrative personnel
- Organizational power and the use of power through influence tactics in sport organizations
- Recruiting and personnel selection in college and professional sports
- Political skill and resource leveraging in college, professional, and international sports
- Experiences and perceptions of organizational political behavior in the sport industry
- Leadership styles and leader-member exchanges in the political sports arena
- Generational effects on politics perceptions and political behavior in the sport industry
- Power, performance, and career success in the sport industry
- The formation of human resources policies and systems in sport businesses
- Changes in technology on social network structure and power dynamics in sport
- Strategic collaboration among rivals in the global sport marketplace

Empirical and conceptual research that advances collective understanding about power and politics in collegiate and professional sport contexts are being sought. Critical review pieces will be considered. Review ideas should be sent to the guest editors for evaluation prior to being written and submitted to JASM. Research should incorporate either a derivative model or sport-focused model. Research aligned with the derivative model should be inspired by mainstream management scholarship and seek to affirm existing theory and research evidence in sport contexts or identify sport as a (potential) boundary condition. Research aligned with the sport-focused model should search for theory and research evidence that is grounded in the phenomena of sport and either promotes the creation of new theory or demonstrates the relevancies of existing theory and research evidence. Quantitative research is preferred; however, qualitative approaches are welcomed. Note: research papers are not limited to collegiate and professional sports in North America. International submissions will be given strong consideration if they can demonstrate practical value to students, instructors, and practitioners in North America and abroad.

Only manuscripts that strongly contribute to sport management practice, based on the practical, conceptual, philosophical, and empirical grounding of the piece will be considered for publication. Authors are required to submit both a scholarly manuscript (reviewed by academicians) and a corresponding management white paper (reviewed by practitioners). The style guidelines for both are posted at <http://js.sagamorepub.com/jasm/about/submissions>.

Questions about JASM or manuscript submission should be directed to the associate editor of JASM, Dr Matthew Walker, at matt.walker@hkn.tamu.edu. The submission deadline is **1 January 2015**.

International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing special issue: ‘Sport-for-Development and Peace Theory Building and Program Development’

Guest Editor: Jon Welty Peachey, (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, jwpeach@illinois.edu).

The aim of this special issue is to provide a platform for the examination of theory building as related to program development and implementation within the Sport for Development and Peace (SFDP) arena. This is a critical need within the field and will contribute to the ongoing discourse regarding the long-term viability and sustainability of SFDP programs, and to the undergirding theory and program design components which can serve as foundational frameworks. Conceptual, theoretical, and empirical work engaging with SFDP theory building and program development is welcome for this special issue. Topics include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The role of theory in SFDP
- Developing program theory in SFDP
- Theory testing in SFDP
- Value of context specific versus generalizable SFDP theory
- Effective program design and development in SFDP
- Program design and development issues and challenges
- SFDP program assessment
- Examining program components related to specified outcomes
- Translating theory into practice
- Efficacy of blending sport, education, and culture for SFDP (i.e., Oympism)

Submitted papers should not have been previously published nor be currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. (N.B. Conference papers may only be submitted if the paper has been completely re-written and if appropriate written permissions have been obtained from any copyright holders of the original paper). All papers are refereed through a peer review process. All papers must be submitted online.

Submission of manuscripts: **31 January 2015**. Notification to authors: **31 March 2015**. Final versions will be **due 31 May 2015**.

Sport Management Education Journal special issue: ‘Emerging Technology in Sport Management Education’

This special issue of SMEJ will explore emerging technologies within the sport management classroom. Research published in this issue will provide insight into the use of a variety of new learning tools to better prepare sport management students for an evolving industry. This special issue is open to all methodologies for research manuscripts, and “how-to” papers submitted under the new Pedagogical Innovations

section will also be considered (see submission guidelines for details). Possible topics include but are not limited to:

- Evaluation of the use of emerging technologies
- Integration of technology resources
- How to use technology within the sport management classroom
- Adapting emerging technologies to various learning styles
- Creative uses of technology in educational settings
- The use of social networking in sport management education
- Barriers to using technology in sport management education
- Impact of technology on sport management student learning
- Perceptions of technology in sport management education settings

Submissions to this special issue must adhere to the submission guidelines for SMEJ: <http://journals.humankinetics.com/submission-guidelines-for-smej>. Authors should submit their manuscript through Manuscript Central at http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/hk_smej. The cover page for the manuscript should clearly state that the submission is for the special issue on Emerging Technology in Sport Management Education.

Submission Deadline: **5 January 2015**. Guest Editors: Robin Hardin (University of Tennessee, robh@utk.edu) and Joshua R. Pate (James Madison University, patejr@jmu.edu).

Journal of Sport Management special issue on Sport Consumer Behavior

The list of topics that fit this special issue is broad. Questions of interest for this special issue could concentrate on the objects, influences and environments of sport consumption, and consider how sport organizations might better engage, communicate and connect strategically with their consumers. Such inquiries might explain how patterns of consumer behavior fluctuate, across seasons, events, game/event experiences, behavioural segments, or modes of consumption.

Manuscripts should be submitted no later than **1 April 2015** using Scholar One. Authors should indicate in their cover letter that the submission is to be considered for the Special Issue on Consumer Behavior. Separately and without the paper being attached, the co-editors request an email be sent to dfunk@temple.edu and to d.lock@griffith.edu.au with the subject 'JSM SI on Sport Consumer Behavior' to announce the title of the paper and the list of co-authors that have been submitted to Scholar One.

This special issue will be edited by guest editors, Professor Daniel Funk (dfunk@temple.edu), Professor Mark Pritchard, (pritcham@cwu.edu), Dr Daniel Lock (d.lock@griffith.edu.au), and Dr Adam Karg (adam.karg@deakin.edu.au).

Cardiff University seeks new journals for Academic Press

Cardiff University is establishing a new academic press. Cardiff University Press will be a major new initiative in the online open access publication of high quality peer reviewed academic journals. It will be 100% free and open access, with no fees and no paywalls.

If you are the editor of an established peer reviewed academic journal and are interested in discussing the possibility of applying to become an imprint of Cardiff University Press, please contact Paul Bowman by email: BowmanP@cardiff.ac.uk.

8. RESOURCES

Call for proposals to organise the Sport&EU 2016 conference

The Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union is searching for candidates to organise its **11th annual conference in summer 2016**. Given the success of past conferences and the good prospects of our upcoming conference in Angers, it is fair to say that Sport&EU's annual conference is becoming a regular stop in the academic circuit. It is also particularly attractive for practitioners. Thus, local organisers certainly benefit from organising the event. The conference has now grown to be a full two-day event and we expect our 2016 edition to maintain that format, if not to grow incrementally.

Sport&EU welcomes applications from its members across the continent. We would encourage members from countries that have not hosted the conference before to consider applying. We also encourage applications from Britain and southern Europe.

This year there is a two stage application process. Expressions of interest should be sent to B.Garcia-Garcia@lboro.ac.uk by **22 December 2014**. **Full applications** (http://www.sportandeu.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/SportEU_2016_conference_proposal_form.doc) will then be due to the same email address **no later than 28 February 2015**.

Advanced Olympic Research Grant Programme 2015/2016

The 2015/2016 edition of the Advanced Olympic Research Grant Programme is now open. This programme is aimed at encouraging university professors, lecturers and research fellows who have completed their doctorate, and who currently hold an academic/research appointment, to conduct projects in IOC priority fields of research. You will find on the [IOC website \(OSC web pages - Academic activities and network section\)](#) the rules and application form. The deadline for submitting applications is 9 February 2015.

New Film on Boxing and Poverty in India: “Light Fly, Fly High”

(By Susann R̥stigaard and Beathe Hofseth; Norway, 2013, 80', Color, Tamil, Subt.)

Thulasi, a young Indian woman in her twenties, is literally willing to box her way out of poverty and into a better life. A Dalit or “untouchable” born outside of caste, she rejected her place on society's lowest rung at an early age and was forced to leave her parents' home when only 14. Ten years later, despite her impressive record in the

ring, ranking 3rd in India's Light Fly category, Thulasi remains stuck at the bottom, deprived of opportunities she rightly deserves.

Despite an uphill battle against sexual harassment, poverty and the pressure to marry, Thulasi refuses to compromise herself and her goals and takes her destiny into her own hands. Filmed during three eventful years, LIGHT FLY, FLY HIGH is a beautifully shot, gripping and inspirational story of a courageous young woman who refuses to be anyone's victim and ends up a hero of her own making against all odds.

Awards: Oxfam Global Justice Award; Best Documentary, One World Media Awards; Amanda Award, Best Documentary.

Report on everyday mediated experiences of disability within the 2012 Paralympics published

This report – commissioned by the UK's Paralympic broadcaster, Channel 4 – considers everyday experiences of disability and disability sport within the context of the London 2012 Paralympics and televised coverage of the Games. The analysis is based on 140 in-depth interviews that took place in the UK over a period of eighteen months, during the lead up to, and immediately after, the Games: between January 2011 and September 2012. Embedded in the lifeworld of the participants, the researchers asked whether the 2012 Paralympics was successful in changing perceptions of disability.

Tracking changes in everyday experiences of disability and disability sport within the context of the 2012 London Paralympics, written by Caroline E. M. Hodges, Daniel Jackson, Richard Scullion, Shelley Thompson and Dr Mike Molesworth. Free to download at <http://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/cmc/sector-intelligence-reports/> or <http://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/cmc/files/2014/10/BU-2012-London-Paralympics.pdf>

ISCA Published 2014 Annual Report

The International Sport and Culture Association published its annual report for 2014. The report can be downloaded at http://www.isca-web.org/files/ISCA-AR-2014_WEB.pdf.

Sport&EU is on Twitter!

The Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union now has a Twitter presence. Follow it at [@Sportandeu!](https://twitter.com/Sportandeu)

9. THE READING CORNER

A Career With Meaning: Recreation, Parks, Sport Management, Hospitality, and Tourism, 2nd edition

Schwab, Keri A., Cheryl A. Stevens, Lawrence R. Allen, Emilyn A. Sheffield, James F. Murphy
Urbana, IL: Sagamore, 2014
369 pp., ISBN 978-1-57167-772-3

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

Boycoff, Jules
New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014
242 pp., ISBN 978-0-8135-6201-8

African Football, Identity Politics and Global Media Narratives: The Legacy of the FIFA 2010 World Cup

Chari, Tendai, and Nhamo A. Mhiripiri (Eds.)
Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014
ISBN 9781137392220

A spectacular leap: Black women athletes in twentieth-century America

Lansbury, Jennifer H.
Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2014
300 pp., ISBN 978-1-55728-658-1

Leadership in Recreation and Leisure Services

O'Connell, Timothy, Brent Cuthbertson and Terilyn Goins
Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2015
320 pp., ISBN 9780736095310

NFL Football: A History of America's New National Pastime

Crepeau, Richard C.
Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014.
272 pp., (Paperback).

Public Policy And Professional Sports

Wilson, John K. and Richard Pomfret
Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2014
192 pp., ISBN 978-1-78254-623-8 (hardback)

Social Sciences in Sport

Joseph Maguire
Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2014
384 pp., ISBN 978-0-7360-8958

Sport, Racism and Social Media

Farrington, Neil, Lee Hall, Daniel Kilvington, John Price, and Amir Saeed
London: Routledge, 2014
158 pp., ISBN 978-0415839860

Sport, race, activism, and social change: The impact of Dr. Harry Edwards' scholarship and service

Polite, Fritz G. and Billy Hawkins (Eds.)
San Diego, CA: Cognella, 2014
232 pp., ISBN: 978-1-63189-222-6

Sport and Social Exclusion in Global Society

Spaaij, Ramón, Jonathan Magee and Ruth Jeanes
Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2014
216 pp., ISBN 978-0-415-81491-1

The 1929 Bunion Derby: Johnny Salo and the Great Footrace Across America

Kastner, Charles B.
Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press 2014
304 pp., ISBN 978-0-8156-1036-6

Sport, Public Broadcasting and Cultural Citizenship: Signal Lost?

Scherer, Jay & David Rowe
Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2014
321 pp., ISBN 978-0-415-88603-1

The Bloomsbury Companion to the Philosophy of Sport

Torres, Cesar R.
London: Bloomsbury, 2014
470 pp., ISBN 978-1-4081-8257-4

The NFL: Critical and Cultural Perspectives

Oates, Thomas, and Zack Furness (Eds.)
Chicago, IL: Temple University Press
268 pp., ISBN 978-1-4399-0957-7

The (Peculiar) Economics of NCAA Basketball

McFall, Todd A.

London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014

180 pp., ISBN 9781137384553

More book announcements at: <https://networks.h-net.org/node/2622/discussions/46488/book-announcements-october-2014>