



FootballFoundation

football's biggest supporter

FOOTBALL AND ITS COMMUNITIES

BASELINE ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDY FOOTBALL AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

For the Football Foundation

By

Dr. Gavin Mellor with Dr. Adam Brown

Manchester Institute for Popular Culture

Manchester Metropolitan University

&

Dr. Tony Blackshaw, Dr. Tim Crabbe & Chris Stone

School of Sport and Leisure Management

Sheffield Hallam University

April 2003

 *Sheffield
Hallam University*



manchester
institute
for
popular
culture



EMBED Word.Picture.8

Executive Summary

This is the first of four interim reports from the *Football and its Communities* research project, being conducted at Manchester Metropolitan University and Sheffield Hallam University between October 2002 and October 2005.

The project is a detailed investigation of football's relationship with, and impact upon, various types of 'communities'. The study is based upon detailed, longitudinal case studies of three English football clubs: Leeds United (LUFC), Manchester City (MCFC), and Sheffield United (SUFC).

The brief of this first report is:

'To identify the full range of existing community projects and policies at each case study club and the full range of non-club community initiatives in the area.'

The report contains three preliminary, contextual sections:

1. An historical note on the relationship between football clubs, community identity and civic pride. The historical role of football clubs as community institutions is commented upon here, as is the split between football clubs and local communities in England from the 1970s.
2. A brief analysis of the development of football and community initiatives in England since the 1970s. The aims and objectives of the Sports Council's Football and the Community schemes of the late 1970s are presented here, as is a descriptive note on the development of the Further Education and Vocational Training Society's Football in the Community programmes since the mid-1980s.
3. An audit of Government departments that currently employ sport in general, and football in particular, as a deliverer of key objectives. Departments that receive comment are:
 - Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
 - Department for Culture, Media and Sport
 - Department of Health
 - Department for Education and Skills
 - The Home Office

The main body of the report consists of two sections. The first explains the organisation and funding of community projects and initiatives at LUFC, MCFC and SUFC. Key community personnel are also identified within each club.

The second section presents a typological analysis of community initiatives and programmes that are currently run by the three case study clubs and by other providers in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. Categories of community work that are identified are:

- Football development (including coach education)
- Health through physical activity
- Health through health awareness/education
- Crime/anti-social behaviour reduction
- Drugs awareness/education
- Study support
- Talent identification
- Social skills, self-esteem, and life skills
- Football club promotion
- Anti-racism
- Anti-truancy for school children
- Community and family cohesion
- Key employment skills & adult learning
- City ‘boosterism’
- Girls’/women’s football development
- Disability football development
- Charity support
- Safe recreation
- Inclusion (race and ethnicity)
- Inclusion (economic groups)
- Club/neighbourhood relations

Examples of community programmes/initiatives are provided in the report for each of these categories, as is a brief analysis of the breadth and balance of community work at each case study clubs and in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield more broadly.

It is evident that our case study clubs’ community programmes are dominated by traditional football development and study support initiatives, although other work is carried out at each club.

It is also evident that Local Authorities and County Football Associations dominate non-club community football provision in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. These organisations offer a relatively traditional range of football development, except where they employ specific staff to engage with other agendas. Non-traditional football and community work is present in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield, and is largely undertaken by charity and voluntary organisations.

From our audit of club and non-club football-based community initiatives in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield, a number of themes have emerged that will form the basis for the continuing work of the project team.

The major issue to emerge is how our research relates to ‘smaller’ football clubs. Since this research project was initially conceived, a change in the viability and status of smaller English football clubs has occurred, with unprecedented numbers of Football

League clubs going into administration. This has resulted in the emergence of a policy agenda about the future viability of smaller football clubs, and whether public investment is justified in clubs as 'community' concerns. In this context, it is vital to assess the importance of smaller football clubs to their neighbourhood and other communities.

Contents

1.	Introduction	6
2.	The History of Football and Community: Representation and Civic Pride	8
3.	The History of English Football and Community Schemes	10
4.	The Social and Political Context of Current Football-led Community Interventions in England	13
5.	The Organisation of Community Projects and Initiatives at Leeds United FC, Manchester City FC and Sheffield United FC	21
6.	A Typological Analysis of Club and Non-Club Community Initiatives and Projects in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield	25
7.	Emerging Themes	40
Appendix 1	Community Programmes and Initiatives at Leeds United FC, Manchester City FC and Sheffield United FC	
Appendix 2	Non-club Community Football Programmes and Initiatives in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This is the first of four interim reports from the *Football and its Communities* research project, being conducted at Manchester Metropolitan University and Sheffield Hallam University between October 2002 and October 2005.¹ The project is a detailed investigation of football's relationship with, and impact upon, various types of 'communities'. The study is based upon detailed, longitudinal case studies of three of the country's major urban football clubs: Leeds United, Manchester City and Sheffield United.
- 1.2 The brief of this first report is:
'To identify the full range of existing community projects and policies at each case study club and the full range of non-club community initiatives in the area.'
- 1.3 Project reports that follow this one are focused on the following areas:
- i. **Second Interim Report** (to be delivered after 12 months): A 'map' of the different communities and constituencies at each of the chosen clubs and the relations between these different 'communities' and the clubs, as well as their relationships to each other
 - ii. **Third Interim Report** (to be delivered after 18 months): The full range of 'community' issues associated with a move of stadium and how clubs involved in moves are tackling community concerns
 - iii. **Forth Interim Report** (to be delivered after 24 months): Best practice in community development at club level and models of how these might be monitored
 - iv. **Final Report** (to be delivered after 36 months): A comprehensive set of recommendations for the Community and Education Panel covering policy changes, targeted areas for Panel investment, best practice models for club community work etc.
- 1.4 The purpose of this first report is to provide a baseline analysis of the ways in which the three case study clubs currently interact with community groups through their formal club initiatives. It is also to provide details on other non-club football and associated initiatives that are being delivered within the catchment areas of the case study clubs. This will help to identify the full range of formal football-related programmes that are currently being provided in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield, and all the individuals and organisations that are involved in their delivery.
- 1.5 To provide a useful context for understanding the types of football-related projects that are being delivered at or around the case study clubs, this report begins with three short contextual sections. The first explains the historical links between football clubs and communities, with specific reference to football clubs' representational properties and roles as providers of civic identities. The second

¹ For more information on the project and its aims see www.footballanditscommunities.org.uk.

section reprises the history of formal football and community schemes in England and their attempts to reconnect professional football clubs and local communities after the turbulent years of the 1970s. The third section appraises the current social and political context of football-led community interventions in England, with specific reference to the range of Government departments that are currently employing sport in general and football in particular as a deliverer of their objectives.

- 1.6 The fourth section of the report is a typological analysis of the range of community activities and programmes being conducted at the three case study clubs and in the case study cities.
- 1.7 The final section of the report details a range of themes and areas of potential investigation that have emerged from the early months of the research project. This section will inform forthcoming reports that will emanate from the project's continuing work.

2. The History of Football and Community: Representation and Civic Pride

- 2.1 It is well established that English professional football clubs have deep roots in their communities. Many of today's most successful clubs have their origins in community organisations such as churches, social clubs or work's teams. An example of this can be found amongst the case study clubs for this project. Manchester City FC started out as West Gorton St Mark's when it was established in 1880; a church team that later became Ardwick FC in 1887, before eventually being renamed Manchester City FC in 1894.
- 2.2 As English football clubs underwent professionalisation in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, strong links between football clubs and local communities continued to flourish. The vast majority of football clubs emerged from their formative years with names that they shared with towns, cities or areas of cities, and as such came to fulfil a representational role for large numbers of citizens from urban communities. As the number of spectators rose at English football matches in the first half of the twentieth century, large numbers of people embraced football clubs as representations of their home towns and cities.
- 2.3 The historical role of football clubs as representations of local communities has received a great deal of attention from social historians and sociologists of sport. The eminent labour and sports historian Tony Mason has written that football "often contributes to an individual's sense of identity with or belonging to a group or collectivity. It can be district, village, town, city or county. It can be class, colour or country".² Similarly, sports historian Richard Holt has written that football clubs are historically one of the principal agents through which social identities are created and reinforced.³ He claims that football clubs are sites of representation through which people (specifically men) are taught norms of behaviour, and that football teams and football 'heroes' have historically acted as exemplars of spirit and behaviour for the communities they represent. He suggests that football clubs enable communities to 'know themselves', and in doing so help signify what differentiates one town, city, region, county, or nation from another.
- 2.4 Whilst social history work on the historical relationship between professional football clubs and local communities has advanced understanding of the representational role of sports teams, more recent academic work on football and community has questioned the extent to which professional football clubs currently represent local communities. A number of writers have identified the increasingly problematic relationship between football clubs and their immediate neighbours (their 'real' local communities) since at least the 1960s, and have questioned whether football clubs today are little more than an occasional

² Mason, T., *Sport in Britain* (London: Faber & Faber, 1988), p.118

³ See, Holt, R., 'Heroes of the North: Sport and the Shaping of Regional Identity', Hill, J. & Williams, J. (eds.), *Sport and Identity in the North of England* (Keele: Keele University Press, 1996) and Holt, R., 'Football and Regional Identity in the North of England: The Legend of Jackie Milburn' in Gerhrmann, S., (ed.) *Football and Regional Identity in Europe* (New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers, 1997), pp. 49-66

nuisance to the people who live in their immediate locale. Indeed, some writers have claimed that a serious split occurred between English football clubs and local communities from the 1960s because of a combination of the following reasons:

- i. The relocation of many 'traditional' English urban communities during post-war 'slum' clearance programmes
- ii. Large-scale immigration into many English cities from the Indian subcontinent and the Caribbean during the 1950s and 1960s
- iii. Football clubs being increasingly regarded as 'nuisances' from the 1960s because of hooliganism and associated problems
- iv. The growth of 'out of town' supporters at successful football clubs who do not live in the immediate locale of clubs that they support

2.5 The view that football clubs did not 'automatically' represent their local communities from the 1960s is represented in Government reports from the time. In Sir Norman Chester's report on the football industry for the Department of Education and Science in 1968, it was reported that a "standardisation of national life" had occurred in England that had seen local identities, and institutions that are associated with the expression of local identity (such as football clubs), fall into decline.⁴ The report stated that this large-scale social change had occurred because of improvements in national communications, and concluded that it had resulted in significant declines in attendance at all but the most successful English football clubs.

2.6 By the 1970s, the problems identified above, coupled with the ever-rising profile of football hooliganism, had for many commentators fundamentally undermined the links between football clubs and local communities. In this context, various football and non-football bodies started to identify splits between football clubs and local communities as significant social problems, and began to propose schemes designed to re-establish a relationship that had once been taken for granted. These were to place the relationship between football clubs and local communities on a formal footing for the first time.

⁴ Department of Education and Science, *Report of the Committee on Football* (London: HMSO, 1968), p. 42

3. The History of English Football and Community Schemes

3.1 Football and Community Schemes – the 1970s

- 3.1.1 The most significant programme launched to address the split between football clubs and communities in the late 1970s came from the Sports Council and their ‘Football and the Community’ scheme. Backed by £1 million of Labour Government money, the Sports Council helped to launch 39 schemes across the country in 1978: 29 at professional football clubs and 10 at professional rugby league clubs.
- 3.1.2 The concerns that formed the background to the Sports Council’s Football and the Community schemes were threefold.⁵
- i. The lack of leisure facilities that existed in many urban areas.
 - ii. Issues associated with football hooliganism.
 - iii. Falling attendances at football matches.
- 3.1.3 A number of specific aims and objectives emerged for the Football and the Community programmes. For football clubs, five specific aims were written that were reflective of the benefits that the clubs hoped to accrue as a result of their participation in the schemes. These were:
- i. The acquisition of new facilities (in the vast majority of cases)
 - ii. Guidance, advice, facilities and finance to enable greater involvement with the local community
 - iii. The discovery of talented young players who, through transfer fees, could produce much-needed finance for some clubs
 - iv. Increased attendances through better and more frequent relations with the local community
 - v. Reductions in football-related hooliganism and violence by providing young fans with better leadership and examples through organised and controlled schemes.⁶
- 3.1.4 In 1981 Dr. Roger Ingham produced an evaluation of the Football and the Community schemes on behalf of the Sports Council. Ingham concluded that many successes had been achieved during the duration of the schemes and that with increased funding and commitment greater successes could be produced in the future.
- 3.1.5 Despite Ingham’s call for increased funding for the Football and the Community schemes, most disappeared after the Sports Council ceased to fund them whilst others slipped into disarray.⁷ By the mid 1980s the Sports Council were happy to

⁵ For information relating to the Football and the Community Schemes see Ingham, R., *Football and the Community Monitoring Project* (London: The Sports Council, 1979) & Ingham, R., *Football and the Community Monitoring Project(Phase II)* (London: The Sports Council, 1981).

⁶ Ingham, *Football and the Community Monitoring Project* , pp. 20-21.

⁷ Sports Council, *Football: The Club in the Community Workshop Report* (London: Sports Council, 1986), p. 81.

pass responsibility for the schemes over to other agencies who would be charged with reinvigorating football/community relations.

3.2 Football and Community Schemes – from the 1980s

- 3.2.1 In August 1985, Michael Burns of the Footballers' Further Education and Vocational Training Society (FFE&VTS), the educational branch of the Professional Footballers' Association (PFA), met with the Sports Council to discuss football and community schemes and possible new initiatives. In the wake of the Heysel disaster that saw 39 Juventus fans die in disturbances with Liverpool supporters before the 1985 European Cup Final in Brussels, FFE&VTS proposed a new scheme entitled 'Football in the Community' (FiTC) which they wished to launch with the financial help of the Manpower Services Commission. Approval for the scheme was granted in January 1986 when the FiTC pilot scheme was launched in the North West of England.
- 3.2.2 The original clubs involved in the FiTC scheme were Bolton Wanderers, Bury, Manchester City, Manchester United, Oldham Athletic and Preston North End. All clubs shared in the original aims of the scheme:
- i. To provide employment and training for unemployed people
 - ii. To promote closer links between professional football clubs and the community
 - iii. To involve minority and ethnic groups in social and recreational activities
 - iv. To attempt to prevent acts of hooliganism and vandalism
 - v. To maximise the use of facilities at football clubs.⁸
- 3.2.3 The main focus of the FiTC schemes was young people. In PFA documentation that traces the history of the schemes, the context into which they were launched is described by Labour Sports Minister Denis Howell's hope for the original schemes of the 1970s that "football clubs should give a lead to young people and encourage them to make more positive use of their time".⁹ Clearly, the FiTC schemes, much like their predecessors, were cast in the social and political context of providing recreation for the 'socially disadvantaged' and preventing young people from becoming involved in hooliganism or other 'anti-social' behaviour.
- 3.2.4 The original six FiTC schemes were largely regarded as a success by FFE&VTS, the PFA, and other bodies that were involved in their provision. By 1987 a further ten football clubs in the North West of England were invited to set up schemes, whilst in 1988, with the support of a new Regional Office in Barnsley, eleven Yorkshire and Humberside clubs established projects and four were set up in the North East.

⁸ The Footballers' Further Education and Vocational Training Society, *Football in the Community* (Manchester: PFA, 1999).

⁹ Ibid

- 3.2.5 At the same time as the FFE&VTS FiTC schemes were being established, a number of other, unconnected football and community programmes emerged in the London area. In the mid-1980s, three London football clubs set up community schemes at the behest of the Greater London Council (GLC) that were designed to bring those clubs closer to their local communities. The clubs involved; Arsenal, Fulham, and Millwall; received funding from the GLC to appoint Community Development Officers with a brief to open up clubs' facilities to local use and to find ways of using clubs for the benefit of the local area. After the abolition of the GLC in 1986, a number of partnerships emerged across London between Local Authorities, the Sports Council and football clubs that aimed to replicate the successes of the GLC schemes. Examples include the partnership between Brentford Football Club, Ealing and Hounslow Council and the Sports Council; and the partnership between Crystal Palace Football Club, Croydon Council and the Sports Council. In all cases, these partnerships enabled Community Development Officers to be employed at clubs to undertake project-based work with local people.
- 3.2.6 In the 1990s, the FFE&VTS FiTC programme continued to grow and also began to incorporate a number of the independent London schemes. In 1991, under a new management support framework that included the PFA, the Football League and the Football Association (FA), the FiTC schemes developed a new set of aims and objectives that were incorporated into a new Business Plan. With increased funding offered for the schemes by the Football Trust and new commercial sponsors such as Pizza Hut, Wagon Wheels and Adidas, these aims were refined again in 1996 when it was stated that the schemes should:
- i. Encourage more people (especially children) to play football
 - ii. Encourage more people (especially children) to watch football
 - iii. Promote closer links between football clubs and the community
 - iv. Encourage more people to support their local club
 - v. Maximise community facilities and their community usage at football clubs
 - vi. Provide temporary and/or gainful employment and training for unemployed people (where appropriate).¹⁰
- 3.2.7 These aims and objectives are instructive. As the perception of football as an inclusive and friendly game was re-established in the 1990s, clubs became able once again to sell themselves to their local communities, not as nuisances and harbourers of hooliganism, but rather as positive representations of local values and identities. Football clubs were redefined as role model organisations in this context, and as a consequence are now frequently viewed as powerful institutions that can positively influence the way that (especially) young people live their lives.

¹⁰ Ibid

4. The Social and Political Context of Current Football-led Community Interventions in England

- 4.1 Since the 1990s, the perceived role of football clubs in promoting sporting *and* social change for ‘good’ has grown exponentially. This has occurred for two principal reasons. Firstly, as shown in Section 3, football clubs have a history of being called upon to engage with social problems, most notably hooliganism and racism, which are associated with the national game. Secondly, the commercial success of a number of football clubs in the 1990s led commentators to question the extent to which football clubs were meeting their corporate and social responsibilities for supporters and neighbourhood communities. The Football Task Force’s *Investing in the Community* report that was submitted to the Minister for Sport in 1999 dealt directly with this issue when it noted: “football’s commercial development has brought great benefits but also created unease in some quarters about the direction the game is taking. It is argued by some that work in the community is being sidelined as commercial considerations take priority”.¹¹ These concerns led to a crystallisation of thinking about the good that football clubs could perform in their communities, and how they could help to address important issues of the day.
- iv.2 By identifying the potential that football clubs and other sports institutions have for promoting social change, the British Government is currently advocating the use sport in general, and football in particular, in a wider range of policy contexts than ever before. Sport has been identified as a key deliverer of social, economic and health objectives and can, therefore, currently be found in the portfolio of a number of Government departments.
- iv.3 The key British Government departments that currently identify sport as a key deliverer of their objectives are:
- i. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)
 - ii. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
 - iii. The Department of Health (DoH)
 - iv. The Department for Education and Skill (DfES)
 - v. The Home Office

4.4 The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

- 4.4.1 Two key subsections of the ODPM currently employ sport as a deliverer of social change in the context of urban redevelopment and regeneration. These are the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU).
- 4.4.2 The Prime Minister established the SEU in 1997 to tackle social exclusion in association with a number of Government departments. Since 2002, the SEU has

¹¹ Football Task Force, *Investing in the Community: A Report by the Football Task Force* (London: HMSO, 1999), p. 1

been located within the ODPM to bring it into closer contact with other departments that work on social justice and quality of life issues.

- 4.4.3 The SEU defines social exclusion as:
“what happens when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdowns”.¹²
- 4.4.4 In 1998 the SEU established a framework for tackling social exclusion in their paper *Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal*. The aims of the report were:
- i. Getting the people to work
 - ii. Getting the place to work
 - iii. Building a future for young people
 - iv. Increasing access to services
 - v. Making the Government work better¹³
- 4.4.5 To meet these aims, the SEU proposed that an intensive programme of policy development should be undertaken across a range of Government departments to identify how they could contribute to the eradication of social exclusion. To establish the role of sport in this exercise, it was proposed that a Policy Action Team (PAT) should be formed to investigate how sports and the arts could contribute to social inclusion initiatives. PAT 10, as the action team came to be known, were to report back to the DCMS to inform its policy objectives.
- 4.4.6 In 2000 the ODPM further outlined its vision for the use of sport in neighbourhood renewal in its white paper *Our Towns and Cities: The Future - Delivering an Urban Renaissance*. Specifically, the white paper set out four key reasons why sport and the arts can aid urban redevelopment and regeneration. It stated that sports and arts:
- i. are a source of civic pride and a positive way of celebrating racial and other forms of diversity
 - ii. can be an important factor in economic success
 - iii. promote and develop lifelong learning
 - iv. can help tackle community safety and promote social inclusion by enabling more people to participate in sports and cultural activities in the most deprived neighbourhoods.¹⁴
- 4.4.6 These assertions resulted in the white paper promising that the Government, in association with a wide range of partners, would ensure that an accessible and affordable sporting and cultural infrastructure would be in place in all urban

¹² Social Exclusion Unit website: <http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/>

¹³ Quoted from the Social Exclusion Unit website:
<http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/publications/reports/html/bbt/nr1.htm>

¹⁴ Social Exclusion Unit, *Our Towns and Cities: The Future - Delivering an Urban Renaissance* (London: HMSO, 2000) p. 126

communities. This, it was claimed, would enable the Government to utilise the ‘intrinsic’ benefits of sport and the arts, whilst also maximising the contribution that both can make to reducing crime and informing education initiatives.

- 4.4.7 The ODPM followed their urban white paper with the publication of the NRU’s *New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: A National Strategy Action Plan* (2001). Here the Government again highlighted the importance of sport to its regeneration strategy and explained how sports policy and sports funding arrangements would incorporate social inclusion considerations (see commitments 52-55).¹⁵

4.5 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport

- 4.5.1 The recent policy development work at the ODPM has had clear implications for the DCMS. As the lead Government department involved in sports policy and sports funding arrangements, the identification of sport as a key deliverer of social inclusion and urban regeneration has significantly altered the working agenda of the DCMS.
- 4.5.2 The change of focus at the DCMS began with the publication of the PAT 10 report that resulted from the early work of the SEU. The report aimed to investigate:
- i. best practice in using arts, sport and leisure to engage people in poor neighbourhoods, particularly those who may feel most excluded, such as disaffected young people and people from ethnic minorities
 - ii. how to maximise the impact on poor neighbourhoods of Government spending and policies on arts, sport and leisure.¹⁶
- 4.5.3 The report concluded that “arts and sport, cultural and recreational activity, can contribute to neighbourhood renewal and make a real difference to health, crime, employment and education in deprived communities”.¹⁷ This is, in the report’s opinion, because arts and sport:
- i. appeal to individuals’ interests and develop their potential and self-confidence
 - ii. relate to community identity and encourage collective effort
 - iii. help build positive links with the wider community
 - iv. are associated with rapidly growing industries.¹⁸
- 4.5.4 The specific proposals that the PAT 10 report made to maximise sport’s potential for addressing social exclusion and other socio-economic challenges are too numerous to detail here. The plethora of recommendations contained in the

¹⁵ Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, *New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: A National Strategy Action Plan* (London: HMSO, 2001) p. 38

¹⁶ Policy Action Team 10, *Report to the Social Exclusion Unit – Arts and Sports* (London: HMSO, 1999) p. 5

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 8

¹⁸ ibid, p. 8

document had potential implications for the work of a range of Government departments, but most crucially placed regeneration and social inclusion at the centre of the DCMS's agenda.

- 4.5.5 The importance of social inclusion to the work of the DCMS was underlined in the publication of the Government's *A Sporting Future for All* in March 2001. Here, the Government set out its vision for sport in the 21st century and explained again the role that sport should play in tackling social problems. Specifically, the document noted that all key funding bodies in sport had been told to ensure that social inclusion was a key part of their work, and that Best Value reviews within local government must be mindful of the wider value and benefits of sports provision in terms of the contribution that sport can make to health, social inclusion, regeneration, educational opportunities and crime prevention.¹⁹
- 4.5.6 In April 2002 the DCMS published *The Government's Plan for Sport*. This contained, amongst other things, a detailed action plan for the DCMS for their work on sport and social inclusion. According to the report, the DCMS would now have to:
- i. strengthen recognition of the value of sport across Government departments
 - ii. establish and build upon joint sport working groups within and across Government departments
 - iii. establish secondment arrangements with the Department of Health and the Home Office to develop policies around sport and physical activity promotion and sport and crime prevention respectively
 - iv. increase the recognition of sport as an important factor in regional policy, especially with Regional Development Agencies (RDAs)
 - v. increase research on the role of sport in tackling social problems.²⁰
- 4.5.7 The DCMS's call to recognise the utility of sport in regional policy has not gone unheeded. A number of RDAs are currently assessing the importance of sport in the regions. The North West Development Agency (NWDA), for instance, is in the process of assessing the strength of the North West 'sports cluster' as part of its economic strategy, as well as developing a separate strategic view of sport. Similar work is also under development in London and the Midlands. When this is complete, it is probable that sport will become viewed regionally, as well as nationally, as a key deliverer of a variety of policy objectives.

¹⁹ Department for Culture, Media and Sport, *A Sporting Future for All* (London: HMSO, 2001), p. 39

²⁰ Department for Culture, Media and Sport, *The Government's Plan for Sport* (London: HMSO, 2002), pp. 25-29

4.6 The Department for Education and Skills

- 4.6.1 The DfES has worked closely with the DCMS in recent years to establish a clear plan for sport and physical education in schools, further education colleges and Higher Education Institutions. It has also investigated ways in which sports can tackle problems within the education system and, specifically, help engage children who find traditional education techniques uninspiring or difficult.
- 4.6.2 In 1997 the DfES launched the *Playing for Success (Pfs)* initiative in partnership with the FA Premier League, the Nationwide League, professional football clubs and Local Education Authorities. Through this initiative, the DfES has established study support centres at football stadia and other sports clubs' grounds and venues. In the words of the DfES:
“*Playing for Success* centres use the environment and medium of football, rugby and other sports to help motivate pupils identified by their schools, as being in need of a boost to help them get back up to speed in literacy, numeracy and ICT”.²¹
- 4.6.3 In October 2002, the Football Foundation became a funding partner in the *PfS* initiative (along with the DfES and LEAs through the Standard Fund). By January 2003, 83 football and other sports clubs had signed up for *PfS* centres, and 65 were open.
- 4.6.4 The National Foundation for Educational Research has conducted three evaluations of education centres that have emerged from the *PfS* initiative. In all cases, significant increases in children's basic skills and self-esteem levels were reported.
- 4.6.5 Whilst the core business of football clubs' education centres remains the provision of additional support for under-performing Key Stage 2 and 3 pupils, some centres have expanded their activities to make full use of available resources. Some, for example, run revision and booster courses for local schools, family learning sessions, courses for parents and carers, Basic Skills Agency courses, adult education ICT courses, 'New Deal' training, gifted and talented courses, and summer schools. Some clubs' academy players also use centres.
- 4.6.6 The work of the DfES with football clubs as a medium for learning has not been restricted to establishing study support centres. They have also produced *Learning FC*: a set of study support materials that encourage Key Stage 2 and 3 pupils to learn more effectively through their interest in football. These materials, designed for use in schools, can support more traditional teaching and learning techniques.

²¹ DfES website: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/playingforsuccess/>

4.7 Department of Health

- 4.7.1 In 1999 the DoH published their white paper *Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation* which set out the Government's health priorities for the period up to 2010. The white paper set out a vision for "improving the health of everyone and the health of the worst off in particular".²²
- 4.7.2 The *Saving Lives* white paper aimed to redefine health policy in Britain by focusing on the prevention of disease and illness as well as on its treatment. It also placed 'health inequalities' at the centre of health policy for the first time, and drew attention to the influence that social, economic and environmental factors have on individuals' and communities' health.²³
- 4.7.3 The white paper's focus on the prevention of disease and illness led it to consider the role that sport and physical activity could play in reducing cases of coronary heart disease and stroke, and promoting good mental health.²⁴ The white paper proposed that the Government should engage in policies that would promote participation in sport and physical activity for all, regardless of class, ethnicity or other factors. Specifically, the DoH proposed that there should be:
- i. wide-ranging and affordable sports and leisure opportunities at local neighbourhood level
 - ii. *Exercise on Prescription* where family doctors refer patients for physical activity courses as a cost-effective alternative to prescribing long-term medication
 - iii. specific sports programmes to encourage activity among people with such conditions.²⁵
- 4.7.4 For the DoH, increasing the level of regular sport and physical activity engaged in by the population emerged as a key theme from the *Saving Lives* white paper. This is reflected in the work of Health Action Zones (HAZs) across the country, which were established to provide targeted health assistance for areas with the greatest health inequalities.

4.8 The Home Office

- 4.8.1 The Home Office's central interest in sport is focused around the Positive Futures (PF) initiative. PF was launched in March 2000 as a national programme and is now managed within the Home Office Drugs Strategy Directorate. The initiative is based around the provision of a variety of sporting activities (including football) and other opportunities that are targeted at vulnerable and 'at risk' young people between the ages of 10 and 19. Programmes are based in neighbourhoods that have been identified as being amongst the 20 per cent most deprived in the country.

²² Department of Health, *Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation* (London: HMSO, 1999), p. 2

²³ Ibid, p. 3

²⁴ Ibid, p. 3

²⁵ ibid, p. 26

4.8.2 PF has an advisory group that is made up of representatives from the DoH, the DCMS, DfES, Sport England, the Youth Justice Board and the Football Foundation. Programmes are currently being conducted in a number of locations across the country. A range of agencies including Local Authorities, charities, sport clubs, and crime reduction organisations currently contribute to the delivery of the projects.

4.9 The Strategy Unit: *Game Plan* Report, December 2002

4.9.1 The information above indicates the current level of Government thinking about the potential benefits of sport in Britain. This thinking was brought into sharp focus and re-evaluated by the joint publication of the DCMS's and the Strategy Unit's *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering the Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives* in December 2002. Commissioned by the Prime Minister, *Game Plan* was designed to rethink Government priorities for sport, whilst also ensuring that sport is well placed to make an important contribution to a range of Government policy objectives.²⁶

4.9.2 A possible change of emphasis in Government sports policy is signalled by the publication of *Game Plan*. Whilst the ability of sport to aid in the delivery of health objectives is underlined, the capacity of sport to contribute to education and social inclusion targets is viewed less favourably. The report notes that "some" evidence of sport improving educational attainment exists, but that "evidence of benefits in crime reduction and social inclusion is less clear".²⁷ The report goes on to state that "this is not to say [that] these benefits do not exist", but that:

"it is difficult to isolate and assess the impact of sport and physical activity in these areas. Experience suggests that where such benefits exist they can be best achieved by using sport and physical activity as part of a wider package of measures. By themselves, they do not necessarily produce the desired outcomes. There is a pressing need to improve our understanding of these linkages".²⁸

4.9.3 The conclusions provided by the *Game Plan* report suggest that assumptions about the utility of sport in delivering social regeneration objectives may have been overstated. New research on this matter is clearly overdue.

²⁶ Cabinet Office, *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives* (London: HMSO, 2002), p. 5

²⁷ *Ibid*, p. 15

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 15

4.10 The Football Association

4.10.1 Despite the concerns raised by the *Game Plan* report, the Football Association has accepted the possible contribution that football can make to tackle a range of social problems. In their *Football Development Strategy, 2001-2006*, the FA assesses the “broader social impact” that football can have, and analyses football’s “capacity for generating a ‘sense’ of community and empowerment amongst those groups who are typically seen as ‘excluded’ from mainstream society”.²⁹ The FA have also recently appointed a National Partnership Funding Manager to investigate how it can merge and remodel its work to fit the objectives of local regeneration partnerships across the country.

²⁹ Football Association, *The Football Development Strategy 2001-2006* (London: The Football Association, 2001) p. 36.

5. The Organisation of Community Projects and Initiatives at Leeds United FC, Manchester City FC and Sheffield United FC

5.1 Before detailing and explaining the community programmes in which Leeds United, Manchester City and Sheffield United are involved, it is worth providing a descriptive note on how community activities are organised at each club.

5.2 Leeds United FC

5.2.1 Leeds United Football Club (LUFC) was formed in 1904 as Leeds City, becoming Leeds United in 1919 and a professional, limited company in 1920. LUFC is the only professional football club in Leeds, and had a turnover last year of £81.5 million. The club is now a PLC; has an average attendance of nearly 40,000 at their Elland Road ground; and currently has 27,132 season ticket holders.

5.2.2 LUFC is involved in a comprehensive range of community activities that are organised under the banner of Community United comprising of Community Affairs, Developing Football in the Community Department (DFITC, part of the national FiTC scheme), and the Leeds United Learning Centre.

5.2.3 LUFC's DFITC department is located in a building on the Elland Road Stadium site. It is led by Mick Ferguson, an ex-professional player who has previously worked in community departments at Sunderland AFC and Newcastle United FC. Under him, the department employs a Project Officer, a Project Manager, eight full-time coaching staff and more than fifty part-time coaching staff. It also has a dedicated office manager and administration officer. The department is funded by sponsorship, the national Football in the Community Scheme, money generated from activities, and a donation from Leeds United PLC. The key sponsorship partners are Nike, Sportsmatch, Coca Cola, Playstation 2, and Barclaycard. The purpose of the department is to coordinate and deliver curriculum-based football coaching projects across Leeds and surrounding areas.

5.2.4 Opened in 1998, LUFC's Learning Centre is located within the Elland Road Stadium. Steve Smith, the Centre Manager, leads operations and is supported by a full-time Education Administrator and a full-time ICT Technician. A number of other people work in the Centre (currently 11), but they are on a mixture of fixed-term and part-time contracts. Funding for the Centre comes from a range of sources, most notably *Playing for Success* funding from the DFES, Single Regeneration Budget 4, Leeds City Council education study support, and Barclaycard Free Kicks. Leeds United PLC also makes a significant in-kind contribution and Club sponsors Arla and HSBC support the programme.

5.2.5 LUFC Community Affairs department is located within club offices at the Elland Road Stadium. It reports directly to the LUFC PLC board of directors on matters relating to Community Affairs, DFITC and the Learning Centre, and is afforded equal standing with other departments in the football club. Emma Stanford, Head

of Community Affairs, leads the department. Under her, the department employs a Community Projects Manager and two administration assistants. Leeds United PLC funds the department, although it also receives support from partner sponsors. The department leads and coordinates community activities at the club as well as various community initiatives including player appearances and the distribution of complimentary match tickets.

5.3 Manchester City FC

- 5.3.1 Manchester City Football Club (MCFC) was formed in 1880 as West Gorton St Marks. In 1887 the club changed its name to Ardwick FC, and in 1894 it changed it again to Manchester City FC, whilst also becoming a limited company. The club has played at its Maine Road ground since 1923 and are due to move to the new City of Manchester Stadium, owned by Manchester City Council, in 2003. The club had a turnover of £28m in 2001/2002, but hope that that figure will grow to near £60m when it moves to its new ground. MCFC have been League Champions once, in 1968. After a period of instability MCFC are re-establishing themselves as a Premier League team, have average attendances of 34,000, and have around 25,000 season ticket holders.
- 5.3.2 Manchester City's community projects and initiatives are organised by the City in the Community (CITC) department. The club's educational activities, located in the BlueZone Centre, are semi-autonomous and run by Lois Gyves (Study Centre Manager) who is employed by Manchester City Council LEA. Both CITC and the BlueZone are currently located on the Maine Road site in buildings separate from the main stadium. BlueZone have also delivered activities in The Grange in East Manchester during the 2002/2003 football season in advance of MCFC's relocation to the area in July 2003.
- 5.3.3 CITC was established to coordinate MCFC's community activities in September 2002. Emerging from the club's old FiTC scheme, it is an independent charitable organisation. All CITC staff are employed by the charity with the exception of Community Projects Manager Mike Walsh who is employed by MCFC PLC. Mike Walsh reports directly to the PLC Board of Directors about CITC's activities. The department's other staff include ex-professional goalkeeper Alex Williams, who is Director of Community Affairs, five scheme coordinators/coaches, and one personal administrator.
- 5.3.4 MCFC, the national FiTC scheme, and a range of sponsors including Coca Cola, First Advice, and Sony Playstation 2 provide funding for CITC. As the department operates as a charity, it can apply for public money to fund its operations.
- 5.3.5 MCFC's BlueZone Centre employs one full-time teacher, 2 part-time teachers and 14 learning mentors. The DfES and Manchester City Council part-fund the centre

to deliver the *Playing for Success* scheme. The centre also receives funding from a number of commercial sponsors and in-kind contributions from MCFC.

5.4 Sheffield United FC

- 5.4.1 Sheffield United Football Club (SUFC) was formed in 1889, although the first football match to be played at the club's Bramall Lane home took place in 1862. The club was a founder member of Football League Division Two in 1892 and has since played in all four divisions of the English professional league structure. SUFC became a PLC in 1997 and made a loss of £1.8m on turnover of £10m last year. The club won the League title in 1898 and has won the FA Cup four times, the last occasion in 1925. SUFC are currently fighting for promotion from Division One and have averaged League attendances of 17,000, although regularly attract larger gates for 'big games'.
- 5.4.2 SUFC is involved in a range of community initiatives that permeate many areas of the club. The club has a Football in the Community (FiTC) department and a Study Support Centre, but also has other community initiatives that do not operate under a single management structure. These include the Blades Enterprise Centre, the Sharrow Community Partnership and the community activities of the Sheffield United Academy.
- 5.4.3 SUFC's FiTC department is run by ex-Sheffield United and England player Tony Currie, who is supported by two assistants and four trainee coaches. It is funded by the national FiTC scheme, sponsorship, and in-kind contributions from SUFC. The key sponsorship partners are Railtrack, Adidas, LDV VanCentre and Sportsmatch. The department is housed in offices at Bramall Lane but uses facilities at Sheffield Works Department Sports Ground, Heeley Bank Road and at Wales High school, Kiveton Park for delivery of sessions. The purpose of the department is to coordinate and deliver football-based coaching sessions and other activities for children in the Sheffield area.
- 5.4.4 SUFC's Study Support Centre opened in 1999 and is located within the Main Stand at the Bramall Lane Stadium. It is managed by Mike Reid and employs 2 staff who split their time between the Study Support Centres at SUFC and Sheffield Wednesday Football Club. The DfES and Sheffield City Council Education department fund the Centre to deliver the *Playing for Success* programme and additional in-kind and financial support has come from Kelloggs, Connect-Up, McDonalds, UGC Cinemas, ASDA and IKEA. Volunteer mentor support is arranged through Sheffield Hallam University to help pupils in their learning.
- 5.4.5 SUFC is involved with three other major community facilities/initiatives. These are the Sharrow Community Partnership, the Blades Enterprise Centre and the new Sheffield United Academy facility.

- 5.4.6 The Sharrow Community Partnership emerged out of a liaison between Kevin McCabe, Chairman of the Sheffield United PLC Board, Sharrow Community Forum and others. The club's main link with the Partnership is now Steve Hicks, the Stadium Manager and Safety Officer, who attends meetings and sits on the steering group for the Sharrow Partnership Community Hall located in the new John Street Stand: a facility which emerged out of the group's work and is provided by SUFC for peppercorn rent. The Partnership has launched litter picking and graffiti removal initiatives as well as efforts to relieve traffic congestion.
- 5.4.7 Saeed Rehman, Economic Development Officer, runs the Blades Enterprise Centre which was opened in September 2001 with European regeneration Objective 1 funding. The Centre provides 22,000 sq ft of space sub divided into 64 separate office suites and meeting rooms. A significant proportion of these spaces are targeted at ethnic minority businesses, and occupancy rates currently exceed 90 percent with tenants from a variety of small and medium sized enterprises. SUFC is the first English professional football club to incorporate serviced office accommodation within its stadium.
- 5.4.8 John Warnock is in charge of operations at the SUFC Academy, which was opened in December 2002 with the help of a £838,294 grant from the Football Foundation (the total cost of the Academy was approximately £5 million). The facility incorporates five grass pitches, an outdoor floodlit synthetic surface, an indoor playing arena, a gymnasium, changing rooms, educational space, and support service areas. From March 2003 the facility has been made available for community use, which is facilitated by a series of specialist community-based partners such as NACRO, FURD, Sheffield City Council Leisure Services, Sheffield and Hallamshire County Football Association, and the Local Education Authority. Community football activities that have so far been organised at the Academy include work with disabled players, different ethnic groups, and girls and women. Relationships have also been established between the Academy and local residents' associations including Firshill Residents' Association, Shirecliffe Residents' Association, and Burngreave Residents' Association. Community usage of the facility is being monitored and evaluated by the Football Foundation as part of their grant agreement with SUFC. Community concerns extend beyond the use of facilities, as the Academy is also currently in consultation with the local council to get traffic calming measures installed after concerns arose from residents about extra traffic emanating from Academy activities. There are also plans to reopen a public footpath that leads along the edge of the grounds from the road to the woodland behind the Academy, and for the Academy to engage in an extensive programme of treeplanting on land not used specifically for sports purposes.

6. A Typological Analysis of Club and Non-Club Community Initiatives and Projects in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield

- 6.1 To gather an appreciation of the range of community activities being engaged in by Leeds United, Manchester City and Sheffield United, an audit of community projects and initiatives has been conducted at the case study clubs. The aim of this exercise has been simply to assess the breadth of the community work in which the three clubs are involved. We have not attempted to analyse the quality or appropriateness of club community initiatives, as this would have been improper at this early stage of the project.
- 6.2 In addition to auditing community projects and initiatives at the three case study clubs, we have also assessed the breadth of other football-related community interventions in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. The purpose of this exercise was to observe the ways in which Local Authorities, County Football Associations and other groups are engaging in the football for social ‘good’ agenda. We also wanted to evaluate the strength of partnership working in each city to see whether key providers are supporting each other in their work.
- 6.3 A full list of community projects and initiatives being conducted at LUFC, MCFC, SUFC, and across the case study cities is included in the appendices to this report.
- 6.4 Through auditing club and non-club football-led community initiatives in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield, it is observable that football is currently being employed in a number of different ways in each city. In an attempt to differentiate between the types of football-led interventions that exist in each city, a typology of football initiatives that we observed is presented below. The aim of this exercise is to identify the range of social and political contexts in which football is currently being employed. Therefore, football-specific interventions, designed to promote football for football’s sake, are all classified as football development. A number of case studies are also included below on club community interventions that we have visited since October 2002.

Table 1: Typologies of Club and Non-Club Football and Community Initiatives

Football development (including coach education)	Health through physical activity	Health through health awareness/education
Crime/anti-social behaviour reduction	Drugs awareness/education	Study support
Talent identification	Social skills, self-esteem and life skills.	Football club promotion
Anti-racism	Anti-truancy for school children	Community and family cohesion
Key employment skills & adult learning	City 'boosterism'	Girls'/women's football development
Disability football development	Charity support	Safe recreation
Inclusion (race and ethnicity)	Inclusion (economic groups)	Club/Neighbourhood relations

6.5 Examples of Football-Based Community Work

6.5.1 **FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT** work was found at all three case study clubs and within each city. Examples include:

- i. The 'Free Schools' programme at LUFC that provides coaching sessions for primary school children
- ii. Soccer Centres delivered across Manchester by MCFC to provide quality coaching for boys and girls
- iii. Holiday soccer schools at SUFC that provide coaching for boys and girls during school holidays
- iv. The 'High School Challenge' delivered by Leeds City Council to promote football to boys and girls as part of a multi-sport event
- v. The Commonwealth Games min-soccer festival delivered by Manchester County Football Association to promote football to boys and girl in Manchester as part of the 2002 Commonwealth Games
- vi. Mini-soccer courses delivered by West Riding County Football Association to promote skill development in boys and girls aged between 6-10

Case Study 1 – LUFC Free Schools Programme

On Thursday 30th January 2002 we visited Kippax Greenfield Primary School in Leeds to observe a Leeds United ‘Free Schools’ session being delivered. Under normal circumstances these activity-based sessions are held on playing fields or play grounds and focus on basic football skill acquisition. However, as Leeds had been subject to rather cold and inclement weather during the week of our visit, the children were given an alternative session that is designed for school halls and classrooms.

When we arrived at the school, the pupils had been split into two groups. The first group of about 15 children were practicing basic football skills with a LUFC coach in the school hall. The children were fully engaged in the session and enjoyed demonstrating their skills for the rest of the group when requested to do so by the coach. The coach had established a rapport with the children and constantly referred to them by ‘nicknames’. The children enjoyed this informality and responded to the coach’s requests with enthusiasm. The skills that were practiced included heading and close control of the ball. The children were physically active throughout the session.

The second group of children were involved in a classroom session supervised by two LUFC coaches. The session involved a football themed paper-based exercise on healthy eating and personal hygiene. The coaches engaged with the children throughout the session, helping them with questions that they found challenging. At the end of the session, the children were invited to shout out their answers in front of the group. They found this to be exciting and fun. The coaches maintained an entertaining style of delivery throughout the session.

6.5.2 **HEALTH THROUGH PHYSICAL ACTIVITY** work was present in a number of guises at the case study clubs and across the case study cities. Sometimes it was implicit in providers’ work because physical activity was viewed as a positive by-product of football training sessions. In other cases, however, it was viewed as being central to the aims and objectives of sessions/programmes. Examples of explicit health and physical activity work include:

- i. The ‘Free Schools’ programme delivered by LUFC that includes theoretical and practical sessions on the importance of physical activity
- ii. ‘Bluepals’ sessions delivered by MCFC that educate primary school children on the importance of being active

Case Study 2 – MCFC CITC Bluepals Session, Holy Trinity Primary School, Blackley

This is a football coaching session for Key Stage One pupils held at a North Manchester Church of England primary school. The school is attempting to create a strong, inclusive identity for itself. There is an ‘everyone welcome’ message as you go in and pictures of people from different parts of the world, with musical instruments, food dress etc. Other messages reads ‘Our school badge is the sun’ and ‘we like our uniform’ and notices around the sports hall read: ‘Be Gentle’; ‘Look After Property’; ‘Work Hard’.

The session involves about 30 mixed pupils in the main sports hall, led by one member of CITC staff with two teachers also in attendance. The first part involves warm up exercises and running/stopping to music. Other exercises involve stretches and running. At the end of this wheezing is clearly heard from some pupils. The teacher comments that for many it may be the first proper exercise that they have had for some time.

The pupils are a little unattentive at times, but for the teachers this is quieter than normal, perhaps suggesting greater attention/better behaviour with visiting teachers. As soon as footballs appear there is a cheer from many of them, emphasising what the core attraction is. The CITC coach then leads the pupils in a coaching session in which pupils are split into groups of about 5 and undertake a number of exercises - dribbling, passing etc. - and there is clearly a wide range of abilities. After about an hour the session finishes and pupils leave.

- 6.5.3 **HEALTH EDUCATION** work is being conducted by LUFC and MCFC as part of their schools and academy programmes. Examples include:
- i. The Free Schools programme at LUFC that includes classroom-based health education sessions for participating children
 - ii. Health education sessions that are delivered to academy girls and boys at LUFC
 - iii. LUFC’s support for the Leeds Healthy Schools Initiative that is part of the Government’s drive to improve health education in schools and to reduce health inequalities
 - iv. ‘Bluepals’ sessions that are delivered by MCFC to educate children on healthy eating, personal cleanliness and the benefits of regular exercise
- 6.5.4 **CRIME/ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR REDUCTION** programmes were located in all case study cities. This work is being delivered via club and non-club initiatives. Examples include:
- i. MCFC’s work with the Connexions Youth Service in Manchester. Coaching sessions have been provided for local youths who are at risk of offending
 - ii. The National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders’ (NACRO’s) work in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield with young people who are at risk of offending. Coaching sessions, support for club creation, and tournaments are provided in a range of locations across each city

- iii. The ‘Streetlife’ Soccer tournament run by Manchester Leisure and partners to provide recreation opportunities for young people in deprived wards who are at risk of offending
- iv. The Positive Futures (PF) initiative in the Shirecliffe area of Sheffield (see section 4 of this report for more information on PF). The initiative includes coaching session and drugs/health education for young people who are at risk of offending

6.5.5 **DRUGS AWARENESS/EDUCATION** programmes are provided by MCFC and a small selection of non-club institutions. They include:

- i. ‘Kick It’ drugs awareness sessions delivered by MCFC community staff to primary and junior school children in Manchester
- ii. Drugs awareness sessions delivered as part of the Positive Futures programme in Sheffield
- iii. Sports, arts and lifestyle programmes delivered by Outlook in Manchester to recovering abusers of drugs and alcohol

Case Study 3 – MCFC CITC Kick It Session, Benchill Primary School Key Stage 2

CITC run a number of Kick It sessions with local schools each week. These are primarily aimed at Key Stage Two pupils and are designed to raise awareness about drugs. We visited one such session at Benchill Primary School, in Wythenshawe, South Manchester. The Benchill estate is regarded as one of the most deprived in Western Europe and the smart, newly built school stands out in the sprawling 1930s estate.

The session begins at 9.15 with one member of the CITC staff, two teachers, and 20 mixed pupils. This is the second in a two-stage delivery of this initiative - at a previous session pupils had been given pictures and examples of drugs and been asked to identify them. The CITC coach leads a discussion of what are drugs (legal and not), when it might be appropriate to take them (e.g. Paracetamol) and what effects they have.

It is interesting to note how many pupils of a very young age are very knowledgeable, mostly due to first-hand family experience, even to the extent of knowing which are illegal and which are prescription-only. The teacher informs us later that the pupils knew many more words for drugs than the teachers, and she also points out one boy, in foster care, who she is particularly concerned about and who has been very vocal in the class.

Pupils are then asked to identify pictures of drug dealers, undermining some stereotypes, and given advice on what to do if they find drugs. They are then led outside for a short warm up, followed by a series of short 5-a-side games. Pupils are left with a task to produce a drugs awareness poster for a competition being run by CITC.

6.5.6 **STUDY SUPPORT** is provided for targeted school children by all three case study clubs in dedicated study support centres. Initiatives include:

- i. *Playing for Success (PFS)* sessions at LUFC, MCFC and SUFC (see section 4 for more information on *PfS*). Sessions are provided for children who are identified by their schools as requiring extra support in literacy, numeracy and IT

- ii. LUFC's Pupils Accessing Study Support (PASS) sessions. These are run solely for SRB4 schools and help to provide additional support for under-achieving pupils
- iii. MCFC's Saturday Morning sessions. These are run in the club's BlueZone study support centre for children who require support for homework assignments

Case Study 4 - Manchester City BlueZone Centre

This scheme is part of the Playing for Success initiative and is a partnership between Manchester City, the Local Education Authority and DfES. MCFC supply the venue, support and some staff, particularly players for award ceremonies, as an in-kind contribution. Manchester City was the 6th club to have such a scheme, which is located in a building adjacent to Maine Road. The club have recently also begun work at a second site, The Grange in East Manchester, and will have new permanent facilities within the new City of Manchester stadium. It is envisaged that a BlueZone facility will remain at the Maine Road site, although the precise nature and location of this is yet to be decided.

The scheme works with 22 schools in Manchester and offers 10 week programmes of activities for up to 120 school pupils a term. BlueZone also offers Saturday morning sessions for older school children including homework support, and other drop in sessions designed as boys and girls only. Stadium based learning, web based learning systems and mentoring (usually involving trainee teachers from Manchester Metropolitan University) are key features; and BlueZone also runs some adult education classes and drop-ins in conjunction with the adult education service.

When we visited, we saw examples of pupils work on the walls and spent time in the ICT centre whilst an adult education ICT skills drop-in was under way. There were 5 people using the terminals with ages ranging from the late teens to pensioners. A woman from the adult education service oversaw the session.

- 6.5.7 **TALENT IDENTIFICATION** is a by-product of much of the coaching and schools-based work that is conducted by the case study clubs. It is not focused around specific events and, therefore, it is not appropriate to provide named examples of talent identification events.
- 6.5.8 **SOCIAL SKILLS, SELF-ESTEEM and LIFE SKILLS** are promoted through a range of club and non-club initiatives. This is done through football coaching programmes and study support work. Examples include:
- i. *PfS* study support sessions at LUFC, MCFC, and SUFC. Sessions are designed to equip pupils with confidence and key life skills in addition to academic support
 - ii. LUFC's partnership with the Outward Bounds Trust. LUFC and partners organised an opportunity for children from 9 schools to attend an outward bounds centre to improve their self-confidence and life skills
 - iii. NACRO's work in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. Coaching sessions and associated programmes are designed to improve participants' self-esteem and feelings of self-worth
- 6.5.9 **FOOTBALL CLUB PROMOTION** is associated with many of the community activities that clubs undertake. Through their work with children, ethnic

minorities and other groups, clubs access and advertise themselves to sections of the population with which they might otherwise have little contact. Through support work with charities and other groups, clubs also promote themselves as good corporate citizens. The fact that this work is a by-product of other initiatives means that it is inappropriate to identify specific club initiatives as directed promotional activities.

6.5.10 **ANTI-RACISM** initiatives are being promoted at LUFC and SUFC. Both clubs are involved with specific anti-racism projects and general support for anti-racism schemes. In Sheffield, Football Unites, Racism Divides (FURD) is also doing a great deal of anti-racist work. Examples of anti-racist work include:

- i. A range of anti-racism initiatives at LUFC. These include specific match-day promotions, educational initiatives delivered through the Learning Centre, and a number of anti-racist consultation events with local groups in the wake of the Bowyer and Woodgate trial
- ii. SUFC's support for Football Unites Racism Divides. The club helps to publicise the work of FURD on match-days and helps to support the organisation's activities through in-kind contributions, as well as challenging racist behaviour through the match-day programme
- iii. FURD's activities in Sheffield. FURD work with a number of football clubs to promote an anti-racist message. They also conduct football-based anti-racist sessions in schools, colleges and youth clubs, run an anti-racist information centre, and manage anti-racist websites.

6.5.11 An **ANTI-TRUANCY** initiative for school children is run by LUFC through its study support centre. LUFC, with partner institutions, have attempted to re-engage parents and children with education in local SRB4 schools.

6.5.12 **COMMUNITY AND FAMILY COHESION** is promoted through club and non-club initiatives in two principal ways. First, the promotion of volunteer activities encourages people to engage in their community more fully. Second, specific sessions are provided at LUFC and MCFC that promote regular contact and shared interests for families. Examples include:

- i. LUFC's volunteer programme. The programme is linked to the Prince's Trust and aims to promote personal and community development amongst participants
- ii. Mentor programmes at LUFC, MCFC and SUFC. All three case study clubs run mentors schemes associated with their study support centres that, to a greater or lesser extent, encourage local people to 'put something back' into their community. This is particularly true of the LUFC scheme
- iii. NACRO volunteer schemes. In all case study cities, NACRO promote volunteering opportunities for local people to support football coaching schemes for 'at risk' young people
- iv. The Manchester Youth Volunteer Programme (MYVP). The MYVP encourages 14-25 year olds in Manchester to take part in media, sport

and other outreach projects to improve, amongst other things, community integration

- v. LUFC's Dads and Lads project. The project, in partnership with the YMCA, delivered football-related activities for fathers and sons with the aim of getting them to work together
- vi. MCFC's Family Learning sessions. MCFC deliver joint ICT training sessions for parents and children at the club's BlueZone centre. The sessions support parent/child bonding
- vii. FURDs involvement in the Millennium Volunteers Programme

6.5.13 **KEY EMPLOYMENT SKILLS AND ADULT LEARNING** are delivered by LUFC and MCFC at the clubs' learning centres. Examples include:

- i. Computer Literacy and Information Technology (CLAIT) courses delivered by LUFC. These course have been delivered to a range of groups at LUFC's Learning Centre by an adult trainer from the local College of Technology
- ii. Adult Education sessions at MCFC's BlueZone. The BlueZone offers a range of adult education course that cover IT, numeracy and literacy. Staff members from local adult education centres support the sessions

6.5.14 **CITY BOOSTERISM** is delivered through football in many ways. The very presence of a football club within a city can promote economic activity, tourism and other important by-products for that city. MCFC's move to the City of Manchester Stadium in Summer 2003 fits with a citywide attempt to re-brand the East of Manchester as 'Sportcity', and to boost the social and economic fortunes of the area. LUFC has formally engaged with the promotion of itself and the City of Leeds through the following initiatives:

- i. Holiday soccer courses for Irish children held in Leeds
- ii. The 'Search for a Star' TV programme. The show, launched initially in Thailand, was based on a docu-soap format and sought to find potential soccer stars from the host country who could win the chance to train with LUFC staff in Leeds

6.5.15 **GIRLS'/WOMEN'S FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT** is promoted by all three case study clubs and a range of non-club agencies in each case study city. Much of this work is done through non-gender specific programmes, but other initiatives are directed solely at females. Examples of this latter type of work include:

- i. LUFC's Girls' Centre of Excellence. This initiative runs once a week at LUFC's training ground. Sessions are run for promising female players in the under 12, under 14 and under 16 age categories
- ii. MCFC Girls' and Women's programme. MCFC run a range of girls' and women's teams from under 11s to the open age category. All teams train at the club's Platt Lane training facility
- iii. SUFC's Junior Blades Girls' Teams. SUFC run a series of junior girls teams through the Junior Blades

- iv. Active Sports Partnerships. Non-club responsibility for girls' and women's football development in the case study cities rests with local Sports Partnerships. These were established in conjunction with Sport England to coordinate sports development around a number of identified sports including girls'/women's football. The West Yorkshire Sports Partnership, GreaterSport, and the South Yorkshire Sports Partnership have responsibility in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield respectively to develop viable structures for female football

6.5.16 **DISABILITY FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT** is occurring at LUFC and MCFC and is being supported in Leeds by West Riding County Football Association (WRCFA) and Leeds City Council (LCC). Examples of this work include:

- i. LUFC's Ability Counts programme. LUFC work in partnership with LCC Leisure Services on the Ability Counts programme. It is based at South Leeds Leisure Centre and provides coaching and playing opportunities for disability footballers
- ii. MCFC's disability activities. MCFC's City in the Community (CITC) department have recently appointed a Disability Development Officer to coordinate all the club's work with disabled players and fans. CITC already coordinate playing and coaching opportunities for disability players
- iii. WRCFA's Disability Football Working Party. WRCFA established the Disability Football Working Party to coordinate and improve disability football development across the West Riding of Yorkshire

Case Study 5 - LUFC Ability Counts Session

On Friday 31st January 2003 we visited a disability football coaching session led by LUFC coaches at South Leeds Leisure Centre. The session is run every Friday for players who have various physical, mental and sensory impairments. The players who attend the sessions have different levels of mobility and, therefore, require different levels of support. This is a challenge for the LUFC coaches who are charged with designing training sessions that are suitable for everybody.

Approximately twenty disabled men between their late teens and mid-thirties attended the session that we observed. After some basic warming up exercises, the players practiced ball skills, running and shooting. Everybody was involved in the session at all times, regardless of ability. The LUFC coach who was in charge of the session knew many of the players' names and was clearly aware of their personal challenges. A Leeds City Council worker who has a long personal history of involvement with disability sport supported the session.

As we observed the session, we spoke to the City Council worker who explained the particular challenges currently facing organisers of disability football. He described the problems that the sport has with classifying players according to their disability, and by way of example classified some of the players in the session to help us understand the different levels of ability on show.

6.5.17 **CHARITY SUPPORT** work is evident at all case study clubs. Examples include:

- i. LUFC's support for the work of SMARTRISK, the Prince's Trust and a number of other charities through financial, personnel and other links
- ii. MCFC's Charity Liaison Worker who helps the club formally support 6 national and local charities
- iii. LUFC's, MCFC's and SUFC's involvement in the Football Aid initiative. Football Aid raises money for charity by allowing people to play at their favourite football grounds

6.5.18 **SAFE RECREATION** is provided as a positive by-product of the whole range of coaching session and holiday courses that are provided by club and non-club institutions in the case study cities. By providing supervised recreation, clubs and non-clubs create safe spaces for children to play.

6.5.19 **INCLUSION WORK WITH ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS** is being conducted by LUFC and MCFC, and is being supported by SUFC. It is also the basis of FURD's work in Sheffield. Examples include:

- i. LUFC have recently begun targeted work with ethnic minority groups. In February 2003 the club took a range of minority groups to a match versus Everton at Goodison Park
- ii. MCFC's work with ethnic minority groups. MCFC have conducted targeted work with a number of ethnic minority groups including Chinese, Bangladeshi, Afro-Caribbean and other groups. Work thus far has tended to focus on the provision of coaching sessions.
- iii. SUFC's support of the work of FURD. SUFC support FURD's attempts to open up SUFC and Bramall Lane to ethnically diverse populations
- iv. FURD work with ethnic minority groups. FURD conduct a vast range of activities that aim to provide football playing, coaching, and spectating opportunities for ethnic minority groups

Case Study 6 – MCFC Chinese Children's visit to Carrington Training Ground

Following a successful visit to the club by Chinese pensioners on Boxing Day, City in the Community decided to invite a group of 12 Chinese children to meet with the Chinese Manchester City first team player Sun Ji Hai on the 20th February 2003.

Amid the excitement of spotting and watching City's stars return to the dressing room after their morning's training, Sun made his way up to the hospitality suite where the children were waiting. Whilst only one of the children had declared their open support for the club, Sun was awarded a special revered status given his nationality. As he joined them in a training session led by one of City in the Community's coaches on an all weather artificial surface the kids were given a taste of 'celebrity' as other uninvited children seeking autographs from players looked on.

Afterwards the children were provided with sandwiches and a drink of lucozade and then a friendly game of football back on the pitch whilst Sun showered and changed. They were shown around the training facilities, the cafeteria, gym and treatment room but paid most attention to the car park where the first team players were returning to an array of smart cars and fashionable pick-ups. Afterwards Sun came back to answer the children's questions and discuss his experiences of football and life both in China and here at Manchester City. The kids hung on every word as he was joined by his jocular manager Kevin Keegan who then posed with the children for photographs and signed autographs. By the end of the afternoon several more children were now declaring their support for City.

Whilst the club and City in the Community have much to gain from their players' national affiliations, it is clear that they do not take the responsibilities that go with exploiting such opportunities lightly. The staff demonstrated a warmth and concern for those in their care and a familiarity with those they had met before, whilst showing a wider awareness of how their relations with ethnic minority groups might be interpreted by wider communities of fans and residents.

Case Study 7 – LUFC away trip to Everton 1 February 2003

Leeds had not been involved in any initiatives to take ‘community’ groups to away game during the current season. However, following Everton’s decision to take up its full allocation of 50 tickets for the game at Elland Road earlier in the season, Leeds decided to follow suit.

I met Leeds United’s representative at the stadium and we boarded the coach to make three pick-ups across the city before heading for Liverpool. The first two were at community centres in Chapeltown Road and Roundhay Road, situated in the heart of Harehills, which over the last century has welcomed the majority of the immigration to Leeds, from the Jews to the Irish and West Indians and more recently the Pakistanis and Bengalis. The third stop was at the Sikh Temple on Tong Road, Armley, to the west of the city centre. After Armley the coach was filled: black, brown, a minority of white people, kids, adults, community workers, parents, teenagers, sons and daughters, girls and boys. Detached neighbouring tribes maybe, but we were soon all exchanging glances, looking, examining and assessing each other, and before long it felt like we had become one. The atmosphere was convivial and the talk was of football and music, and the nearer to Liverpool we got, the likely outcome of the game.

When we arrived, Everton had put on a procession to mark the Chinese New Year and this added to the carnival atmosphere. Everybody seemed to have an extremely enjoyable day out. By the end of the afternoon most of the passengers on the coach home knew each other at least by sight and some by name.

6.5.20 INCLUSION WORK WITH ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED GROUPS is occurring through club and non-club interventions in two principal ways. First, programme organisers are providing free transport to make their activities more accessible. LUFC, MCFC, and SUFC all do this for their study centre activities. Second, programme organisers are providing free sessions to encourage the widest possible population base to take part in their activities. This is occurring at LUFC and MCFC and across a range of non-club providers.

Examples of this latter type of work include:

- i. LUFC’s free schools coaching programme
- ii. MCFC’s free schools coaching programme
- iii. NACRO’s free coaching sessions in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield
- iv. FURD’s free coaching sessions in Sheffield

6.5.21 CLUB/NEIGHBOURHOOD RELATIONS are affected by football clubs in a wide range of contexts. All three case study clubs undertake community work with groups that reside in the immediate locale of club stadiums, and MCFC has recently undertaken consultation work with community groups and people in East Manchester about its move to the area during Summer 2003. However, only SUFC have a formal relationship with their neighbourhood community through the Sharrow Partnership. This is a joint body set up between SUFC and a variety of community groups that aims to promote positive working relations between the football club and local people.

Case Study 8 - SUFC Community Hall

On Monday 2nd December 2002 a fairly informal ceremony with drinks, some live jazz/folk music and a multicultural buffet organised by Sharrow Community Forum was held to mark the opening of the Community Hall in the new John St Stand. The Hall is a dedicated space within the stand that is managed by the Forum specifically for community use.

The event was attended by a diverse collection of public sector and community workers, local volunteers, club directors and officers and local politicians. With speeches from the Mayor of Sheffield, Sheffield United PLC Chairman Kevin McCabe and vice Chair of the Community Forum Ann Wilson it marked the culmination of a partnership between the club and community representatives. This partnership has been formalised through the Sharrow Partnership which emerged out of a dialogue between the Forum and the club Chairman whilst plans were drawn up for the redevelopment of the John St side of the ground.

Whilst the speeches playfully acknowledged the tensions that have previously existed between the club and local residents, the occasion afforded an opportunity to recognise the mutual benefits which can be attained through an active partnership.

6.6 The Balance of Club and Non-Club Community Interventions

6.6.1 There is a clear breadth of football-based community work being provided by club and non-club organisations in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. It is difficult to classify exactly what the balance is between the different types of work because so few organisations (including some football clubs) keep details of how many people attend their events or how often their events are staged. However, some tentative comments can be made about the spread of football-related work currently being conducted at our three case study clubs, and in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield more generally.

6.7 Club Interventions

6.7.1 The case study clubs have a wide range of community activities occurring across their various departments. A significant number of these activities are focused on traditional football development, and a high number focus on study support and the promotion of social skills, self-esteem and life skills for children. It would appear that the traditional football development focus of the national FiTC programme, coupled with the successes of DfES/LEA funded study support centres within football clubs, has heavily influenced the scope of community work being undertaken by our case study football clubs.

6.7.2 A third prominent focus of football club-based community work being conducted at the three case study clubs is the promotion of health through physical activity. Football coaching sessions are sound forms of physical activity for children, and our case study football clubs have been keen to point out the contribution that

- their coaching sessions and skills courses make to participants' health, regardless of their interest in football.
- 6.7.3 Formal health education that is designed to educate children about how to adopt an holistic approach to living a healthy lifestyle was less prominent in our case study clubs' work. However, MCFC's Blue Pals sessions and LUFC's healthy living sessions indicate those clubs' willingness to engage with this kind of work.
- 6.7.4 Despite the dominance of football development and study support initiatives within our case study clubs' community work, all three clubs are involved, to a greater or lesser degree, with initiatives that address crime and anti-social behaviour, drugs awareness, anti-racism, or social inclusion. As these are relatively new areas of work for football clubs, they are yet to form a central and regular part of clubs' community provision. However, there is evidence that clubs are embracing the challenges that this 'difficult' work poses.
- 6.7.5 An example of where a case study club has embraced social inclusion objectives more centrally in their community provision is provided by LUFC's learning centre. Here, in addition to performing work associated with *Playing for Success*, LUFC have engaged with a range of initiatives that aim to help schools and children from local deprived wards. It is interesting that this work has happened most frequently when LUFC has been engaged in local partnerships, and when the club's work has been partly funded by external agencies (such as the Single Regeneration Budget).
- 6.7.6 Two of our case study clubs, LUFC and MCFC, provide programmes for disability football players and girls and women as part of their community work. This indicates an engagement on their part with the FA's wish to expand quality football provision for disability players and girls and women as part of their *Football Development Strategy, 2001-2006*.³⁰
- 6.7.7 Only one of our case study clubs, SUFC, has an established strategy for engaging with their local neighbourhood community (although MCFC has consulted with people in East Manchester about its imminent relocation to the area). All three clubs relate to their local communities through their everyday community provision, but only SUFC regularly and formally engages with local residents' groups and other local associations through the Sharrow Partnership. The work that SUFC and other groups have done to establish the Sharrow Partnership has been recognised as a model of best practice by the Federation of Stadium Communities.

6.8 Non-club Interventions

- 6.8.1 Three groups dominate non-club football-led community programmes in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield: Local Authorities, County Football Associations, and

³⁰ Football Association, *The Football Development Strategy*, p. 31&35

voluntary/charitable organisations. In all areas, Local Authority provision is dominated by traditional football development with children. In Leeds and Manchester, Community Sports Development Officers are employed by the Local Authority to promote sport in deprived wards. However, it is worth noting that in Manchester CSDOs are paid for through the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) and are on short-term contracts. This can cause problems in creating long-term football opportunities in areas with poor sporting infrastructures. This does not detract from the important inclusion work that Manchester's CSDOs are doing, however, including the 'Streetlife' football tournament that they are currently attempting to role out citywide. It should also be noted that Manchester's Local Authority has recently employed a Refugee Sports Development Officer for the first time.

- 6.8.2 In Manchester, the East Manchester Sports Action Zone (SAZ) supports the work of the Local Authority in providing/supporting inclusion-based football programmes in appropriate areas. The East Manchester SAZ is a short-term intervention that aims to improve long-term sporting opportunities for the people of East Manchester. Positive work is clearly emerging from the SAZ in East Manchester, not least in the partnership building and the level of coordination that currently accompanies programme proposals in the area.
- 6.8.3 The work of County Football Associations (CFAs) in our case study cities is again focused on traditional football development, and particularly football club development (in line with the FA's Charter Standard programme). However, all CFAs claim a commitment to inclusion, anti-racist and other 'new' work and state that they shall be extending their football provision when resources/opportunities arise. An example of Manchester CFA's involvement in social inclusion work is provided by their organisation of the New Deal for Communities Football Festival in February 2003.
- 6.8.4 Another primary function of CFA's in our three case study cities is to coordinate Local Football Partnerships (LFPs). The idea for LFPs emerged in the FA's *Football Development Strategy, 2001-2006*. They are charged with, amongst other things, coordinating countywide football strategies, and engaging with multi-agency local partnerships (such as Local Strategic Partnerships) to investigate how football can contribute to social, economic and physical regeneration. The LFPs in our case study cities are well established and are meeting on a regular basis, but do not yet appear to have fully engaged with the social inclusion agenda and/or regeneration agencies.
- 6.8.5 The other key providers of football initiatives in our case study cities are charity and/or voluntary organisations. The most significant of these providers is NACRO who provide football and anti-crime and football and anti-social disorder initiatives in all three of our cities. NACRO's work with young people who are at risk of offending is regarded with a great deal of respect in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield. In Manchester, NACRO's work in the east of the city is linked to the

aims and objectives of the local Sports Action Zone. NACRO's workers sit on all local sports workers meetings, and coordinate their activities to foster partnerships with the Local Authority, local County FA and other groups. Workers associated with the Positive Futures initiative are adopting a similar approach to this in Sheffield, and it is interesting to note that Positive Future will soon launch in selected areas of Manchester and Leeds.

- 6.8.6 The dependence of agencies such as NACRO on the voluntary sector means that they do much to promote community cohesion through their work. By encouraging people to become volunteers on football and social inclusion projects, NACRO and other bodies contribute, directly or indirectly, to the level of engagement that volunteers have with other local people in their communities. Manchester is particularly interesting in this regard. A number of sports volunteer programmes exist in the city, some of which were linked to the city's staging of the Commonwealth Games in 2002, and these provide an invaluable resource for people who run football projects with limited funding. Sports volunteer groups regularly sit on sports workers meeting in the city and are fully involved in discussions about potential future projects.
- 6.8.7 In addition to work provided by NACRO and Positive Futures, only a small number of other agencies contribute to non-traditional football initiatives in our case study cities. In Manchester, the Youth Charter for Sport and the Arts continues to develop its approach to tackling social inclusion, whilst Football Unites, Racism Divides leads an impressive range of anti-racist and social inclusion work in Sheffield. However, both of these organisations are charities, and the breadth and depth of their work depends entirely on their success when bidding for public or charitable funds.
- 6.8.8 It is notable that a large number of funding streams are available for football initiatives in our three case study cities. Local authorities, County FA's, charities and voluntary organisations can bid for money from a whole host of Governmental and non-Governmental organisations, particularly if they are undertaking work that fits with social, economic or physical regeneration. This offers opportunities for providers, but can also cause a great deal of confusion when agencies feel overwhelmed by the funding information that they receive. The relatively brief periods for which funding is made available for programmes can also prevent organisations from long-term planning.

7. Emerging Themes

7.1 A number of important themes have emerged from the early months of the *Football and its Communities* project. These will be investigated and will inform forthcoming reports from the project team.

7.2 Before listing our emerging themes, it is worth considering one issue that deserves special attention. This is the question of how our research relates to ‘smaller’ football clubs. Since this research project was initially conceived, a clear change in the viability and status of smaller English football clubs has occurred. The current football season (2002/2003) has seen an unprecedented number of Football League clubs go into administration. This has resulted in the emergence of a policy agenda about the future viability of smaller football clubs, and whether public investment is justified in clubs as ‘community’ concerns. In this context, it is vital to assess the importance of smaller football clubs to their neighbourhood and other communities. At present, our research concentrates on three relatively large football clubs. We wish to discuss the issue of whether our research brief needs expanding to include a smaller football club to enable it to tackle this emerging and important issue.

7.3 Our other emerging themes for future consideration are listed below:

Football Club Issues

- How are community activities within football clubs organised and funded?
- How are tensions between commercial/first-team concerns and the needs of community departments managed within football clubs?
- Do football clubs possess clear aims and objectives for their community work?
- To what extent do funding opportunities rather than the needs of communities drive football club community initiatives?
- What are football clubs’ communities? Are they defined geographically or in other terms?
- What responsibilities do football club’s have to ‘their communities’?
- Does a football club have a continuing responsibility to a geographical area when it leaves to relocate to a new stadium?
- Does a football club automatically obtain a responsibility for a new geographical area when it relocates to a new stadium?
- Are ‘small’ and ‘big’ football clubs equally responsible for their local communities?
- What formal strategies do football clubs have for engaging with their neighbourhood communities?
- What skills do football clubs’ community departments possess, and are they appropriate for all types of football and community interventions?
- What types of personal and professional development are being offered to community staff within football clubs to meet the demands of a changing work environment?

- How do football clubs related to and engage with Local Football Partnerships (LFPs), Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs), and Regional Development Agencies (RDAs)?
- What is the purpose of ‘one-off’ community interventions with specific groups (such as ethnic minorities)?
- To what extent are football clubs’ community interventions sustainable?
- How do football clubs employ club ‘branding’ around their community work?
- Do football club and community partnerships function as institutional partnerships or partnerships based on individuals?
- How do football clubs respond to requests for them to undertake social inclusion and other ‘difficult’ work?
- How are football clubs’ facility development strategies informed by community work and/or consultation?
- How are geographical areas (both within and outside of town/city boundaries) divided up between football clubs with regard to their community activities?
- Are football clubs enabled or hindered in their community work by the plethora of funding streams available to them?

Non-Club Issues

- How strong are Local Football Partnerships in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield? Are they successfully managing local football provision in each area?
- Are Local Authorities and County Football Associations adequately resourced and skilled to undertake football and social inclusion work?
- How do Local Authorities and County Football Associations respond to requests for them to undertake social inclusion and other ‘difficult’ work?
- Are Local Authorities, County Football Associations and Football Clubs replicating each other’s football development work?
- Are non-club deliverers of football projects enabled or hindered in their work by the plethora of funding streams available to them?