THE SUBCULTURE OF RUGBY PLAYERS

THE SUBCULTURE OF RUGBY PLAYERS:

A FORM OF RESISTANCE AND INCORPORATION

By

KEVIN MARK YOUNG, B.Sc.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

June 1983

MASTER OF ARTS (1983)
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Subculture of Rugby Players: A Form of Resistance and Incorporation

AUTHOR: Kevin Mark Young, B.Sc.(Hons.) (University of Leicester)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Richard Brymer

Dr. Peter Donnelly
Dr. Graham Knight

NUMBER OF PAGES: VII, 182

ABSTRACT

The genesis of rugby football is to be found in the unique all-male environment of the nineteenth century British public schools. The game was initially introduced by masters as an agent of social control - to restrain the usually unruly behaviour of boys. Outside the confines of the public schools (and particularly at university), Old Boys formed Rugby Clubs in which clusters of cultural characteristics based principally around amateurism and specific non-game features came to be developed into a subculture of rugby players, and although certain changes have taken place, this subculture is still intact today in the United Kingdom.

Rugby, in its embryonic form, was introduced in North America in the mid-nineteenth century by garrison soldiers and British immigrants. For a short while it enjoyed some popularity but the War years took their toll and the sport dwindled. However, it sprang up with renewed vigour in the late 1950's and early 1960's replete with all the cultural features that had come to characterize the British game, but these features had taken on different meanings.

In order to examine the subculture and public image of rugby players, the redevelopment of rugby as an increasingly popular sport in North America and this apparent transformation of meaning of various cultural elements, data were collected during one season of participant-observation with a Canadian university rugby team and

supplemented with extensive informal observations of and interviews with players and members of the subculture in the United Kingdom and North America.

It is hypothesized here that on a continent preoccupied with professional sport and a win-at-all-cost philosophy in sport, the amateur game of Rugby Union exists as a type of 'resistance' to the dominant sporting forms in North America (particularly football), and for Britons as a resistance to assimilation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the time spent on the preparation of this thesis I have received assistance from a great number of people. For their guidance I wish to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Richard Brymer and Dr. Graham Knight, but I am particularly grateful to Dr. Peter Donnelly without whose enthusiasm and faithful advice this study would not have been completed.

Great thanks are also due to the members of Rugby Clubs and Boards in the United Kingdom and North America who gave more generously of their time than I could have expected.

Finally, I am especially indebted to Jill Pember for her invaluable encouragement and for diligently and meticulously typing the final draft, and to my parents, Margery and Herbert Young, for their constant love and support from afar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"At times in London it is acutely embarrassing to be a Rugby player, or as fashionable young ladies refer to him in Oxford, a 'rugger-bugger', the message being very clear. He is the 'hearty', the hotel-smasher, the food-thrower, the beer-swiller, the lady mauler, and above all the singer of <u>those</u> songs..."[1]

"In a society that glorifies professional sport, rugby is a worthy anachronism in which fortune and fame are replaced with fun, friendship and a mug of beer."[2]

1. C. Laidlaw, (1973: 153)

2. Alex Ward, The Agony and Ecstasy of Rugby. In <u>New York Times</u>, Jan. 20, 1980 (Section 6: 26)

INTRODUCTION

The study is comprised of five major sections. The first examines theoretical advances in the concept of subculture in sociology and in the sociology of sport in North America and the United Kingdom. It traces the concept from its origins in the Chicago School of the 1920's and 1930's through to very recent theoretical breakthroughs in the United Kingdom and indicates that, unlike the situation in North America, work on subcultures and cultural studies more generally is currently a thriving area of sociological concern in the United Kingdom.

The second section introduces the procedure and methodology of the study. Fundamentally, the research consisted of a season of participant-observation conducted with a Canadian university rugby team and this was supplemented with informal observations of and interviews with rugby players in both the United Kingdom and North America (primarily Canada). Methodological problems in field-work (entering the field; objectivity and subjectivity in field-work; managing field-work data; disengaging from the field) are examined.

Thirdly, the origins and development of Rugby Football in the United Kingdom and North America are discussed in some detail. This chapter traces Rugby Union in the United Kingdom from its conception in the early nineteenth century public schools through to the present day, specifically demonstrating how game and non-game features that

grew up around rugby have changed over approximately the last two decades. Although it was introduced before the turn of the century in North America also, rugby faded in popularity in the first half of the twentieth century but since the late 1950's has enjoyed renewed popularity on these shores.

Penultimately, there follows an in-depth examination of the subculture of rugby players with an emphasis on subcultural values, behaviours, attitudes, symbols and rituals. Deviance requires an audience since behaviour is unlikely to be labelled as such unless it attracts public attention. Thus the responses of non-members was also considered to be a significant source of data, in addition to rugby players' perceptions of their own behaviour and public image.

Finally, these four sections have been integrated and their substance interpreted in a concluding statement on the status of rugby football in North America. A major objective of this chapter is to explore and interpret the reasons for the game's resurgence since the late 1950's and early 1960's. It is hypothesized that the rugby subculture in North America exists as a type of 'resistance' or opposition to the dominant sporting forms (particularly that of football). The term resistance is employed here in much the same way as British sociologists (eg. Clark et al, 1976; Willis, 1978a; Brake, 1980) have recently analyzed many youth subcultural formations, ie. as an alternative to mainstream forms, rather than an extreme rejection of or attempt to overthrow them.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

As with any other study, various factors combine to present for the current analysis certain limitations. The data presented here has been derived from two continents (North America and Europe) but predominantly from rugby fraternities in the southern Ontario region of Canada. Thus the study has not been a global one. Rugby fraternities in other countries (New Zealand, Australia, France, South Africa) require further scholarly attention in sociology particularly since there are indications that rugby players in at least one of these contexts - France - do not 'fit' the current model as presented below. Hence, perhaps the major limitation of the study concerns the type of global assumptions one might make on the basis of such a relatively modest project.

As sociologists, we are cognizant of the caution that must be exercised when, using recently collected data, we presuppose that certain 'universals' exist. However, since extrapolations derived from the data in this study have been supported and reinforced by informal observations of the behaviour of members of the rugby fraternities of the United Kingdom, America and Canada by this researcher, and by other informative examinations provided by writers in the United Kingdom (Sheard and Dunning, 1981), the American South-West (Orloff, 1974), and the Canadian West (Thomson, 1976), any assumptions arrived at on the basis of a relatively small study in the Canadian East appear to be made more viable, (the values and behaviours of members of rugby

subcultures in North America and the United Kingdom are similar in structure and expression).

Finally, a possible limitation exists here in the fact that, as a sometime rugby player, the present researcher may have unconsciously encouraged responses from subjects or indicated biases in situations when neutrality and objectivity were more centrally called for. For the researcher adopting the observer as participant role (Gold, 1958), and particularly the researcher with prior experience in the subjects' environment, we must note the sheer inevitability of occasional subjectivity (Willis, 1980). Provided the researcher is aware of the dangers therein and prepares accordingly, there is no reason why successful field-work cannot be practised.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study was to provide a detailed examination of the subculture of rugby players, specifically concentrating on four major areas:

1. The cultural and social organization and structure of the rugby fraternity.
2. The societal reaction to or public image of rugby players.
3. Rugby players' perceptions of their own behaviour and the manner in which (if any) their public image affects them.

4. The reasons for the re-expansion in popularity of the rugby game in North America beginning effectively in the 1960's, and the cultural transformation in meaning of non-game features traditionally associated with the British game that apparently occurred concomitantly.

The significance of the study lies in its contribution to the sociology of sport and sociology more generally. Until very recently, work on sport subcultures has indicated only basic descriptive and largely ahistorical interactionist analyses without providing any meaningful attempt to theorize studies. In contrast, this study represents an attempt to ground the research in recent theoretical advances in youth subcultures and cultural studies in Britain particularly concerning the combination of critical theory with phenomenology and the concept of 'resistance', to see if we can extend new analytical approaches used principally to explain deviant or delinquent youth subcultural formations into the study of sport and sport subcultures. Hence, this is an attempt to develop descriptive data theoretically, or to combine a basically interactionist examination of a group's experiences within an analysis of the larger social structural formations in which these experiences occur.

The study is of significance in sociology because it demonstrates the importance of sport for testing sociological theories. Subculture theory (definitions of the concept, analyses of subcultural boundaries and levels of exclusivity, and the concept's application) and labelling theory (the subculture of rugby players can only be allocated a deviant public image if it has an adjudicating audience) have been combined

in a general symbolic interactionist ethnography of the rugby subculture.

In addition, the methodological significance of the study lies in showing that participant-observation (an interchange of procedures with particular emphasis on the observer as participant role) can be used as fruitfully in the study of sport subcultures as in the study of other more extensively researched groups (delinquent youth subcultures, counter-cultural groups or studies of ghetto life, for example).

Finally, specifically by underlining the ways in which certain cultural formations which traditionally came to characterize the Rugby Union game in the United Kingdom have recently been adopted in North America, but with an entirely different array of meanings attached to them, the study functions to provide a deeper understanding of 'cultural resonance' and 'cultural transformation' in sociology and the sociology of sport.

CHAPTER ONE

THE CONCEPT OF SUBCULTURE: AN HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Introduction

The available literature dealing with the concept of 'subculture' is extensive but, at the same time, extremely varied. Moreover, there would appear to exist something of a conceptual dichotomy over the use of the term in North America and more recent explanations offered by British writers.

The concept is traceable as far back as 1945 in America (McLung Lee). Although it has been used in sociology for many years in the United Kingdom also, sociologists did not begin to write about subcultures or youth culture on a widespread scale until after the publication of Downes' 'The Delinquent Solution' in 1966 and even Cohens' 'Folk Devils and Moral Panics' in 1972. To some extent, the recent vanguard of British subculture literature seems to have followed Michael Clarke's seminal 1974 paper 'On the Concept of Subculture', where the author neatly summarized the apparent lack of concern over the concept:

> ...very little attention has been given to whether 'subculture' is a useful concept or whether it should be abandoned or broken down into a number of clearer components. (428)

In the last decade the United Kingdom has witnessed a great increase in the development of subculture theory and, in contrast to the situation in the U.S.A., this area of attention seems to be currently in vogue. More importantly, British writers have visibly taken on a theoretical departure from their American counterparts, combining a structural analysis with the (long used in America) interactionist perspective to account for subculture groupings and locate them in a wider class analysis, thus arriving at new explanatory levels.

This chapter will attempt to trace the origins of the concept of subculture analyzing facets of the term itself, including: subculture definitions, subculture boundaries, exclusivity in subcultures, theoretical applications of subculture in America and the United Kingdom and finally a brief look at the employment of the term in the sociology of sport.

Culture and Society

Before we can establish any definition of subculture we must initially refer to the parent concept of culture.[1] A brief discussion of culture is relevant here since a preliminary problem with subculture theory is whether it is a 'thing-like facticity' (Pearson, 1976: 2) or simply a reified abstraction devised by sociologists.

Although there are numerous definitions of culture available today, probably one of the most widely used is over a hundred years old.

In 1871, Edward B. Tylor defined culture as:

> ...that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. (1)

In as much as it sets down what man actually uses these various elements for, however, the definition offered by Clarke et al (1976: 10) is perhaps a more adequate one in sociology:

> Culture refers to that level at which social groups develop distinct patterns of life and give expressive form to their social and material life-experiences. Culture is the way, the forms, in which groups handle the 'raw' material of their social and material existence.

Perhaps the most important factor to note when studying culture is the relation of the concept to social reproduction. Willis (1978a: 172) reminds us that cultural forms are perpetually in flux:

> Culture is not (a) static, or composed of a set of invariant categories which can be read off at the same level in any kind of society. The essence of the cultural forms in our capitalist society is their contribution towards the creative, uncertain and tense social reproduction of distinctive kinds of relationships. Cultural reproduction in particular always carries with it the possibility of producing... alternative outcomes.

There has been a marked attempt since the work of the Chicago School of Ecology to differentiate between notions of 'culture' and 'society', or between cultural and social systems (Gordon, 1964; Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967). Pearson (1975), for example, argues that each level is "analytically distinct". Gordon (1947), however, had earlier ignored attempts to accomodate such a differentiation. He saw

American society as a composite of groups which have preserved their own cultural identity. Similarly, Arnold (1970) argues that while the cultural elements comprising a subculture may differ somewhat from those of the dominant culture, they cannot differ entirely from that culture. More recently, Willis (1978a: 174) has written that 'culture' and 'society' "are part of a necessary circle in which neither term is thinkable alone".

The attempt to differentiate between the two concepts has nevertheless given use to various types of definition of subculture in sociology.

The Chicago School of Ecology

In the 1920's and 1930's, the general focus in sociology shifted from journalistic accounts of social movements to empirically oriented analyses of social and cultural sources of deviant behaviour. Sociologists began to show interest in youth as an urban social problem, particularly those living in the ghettos and slums. At about this time, a group of sociologists at the University of Chicago, led by Robert Ezra Park, undertook research on the features of urban styles of life, developing a basically anthropological approach into a critique of prevailing social conditions. Fundamentally, their belief was that social interaction was structured by the ecology of the material world.

The ethnographic studies of the relations between neighbourhoods and youth lifestyles undertaken by the Chicagoans characteristically indicated a relative disregard for underlying sociological theories, and were based primarily on the interview and participant-observation techniques as research methods. The 1920's and 1930's saw Park and his colleagues amass considerable research data on what came to be called 'the social ecology of the city'. This included:

> ...research into the distribution of areas of work and residence, places of public interaction and private retreat, the extent of illness and health and urban concentrations of conformity and deviance. (Taylor et al, 1973: 110)

For the Chicagoans, 'natural' boundaries were considered to be those of urban neighbourhoods and ethnic group residence, particularly since Chicago was at this time experiencing rapid waves of migration.

Park et al adopted a model based on plant life and applied it to the city. As in plant life where different species exist in the same habitat, human beings were seen to be living in a state of 'symbiosis'. Brake (1980: 30) writes:

> The social scientist's task was to seek out the well-ordered, mutually advantageous equilibrium known in plant life as the biotic balance, which was postulated to be present in urban life.

The implications of such a model for the sociological study of deviant behaviour had already been set out by R. K. Merton (1938: 672):

> Our primary aim is to discover how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconformist rather than conformist conduct.

Thus, beginning from a model of a healthy symbiotic society, a logical extension of their model led the Chicagoans to argue that some environments:

> ...by virtue of their parasitical existence on the over-weening social organism and their isolation from its integrative culture - are pathologically disorganized. (Taylor et al, 1973: 113)

Consequently, through, for example, the unexpectedly high migration of an ethnic group or groups to a new neighbourhood, it was now seen as possible that the social organization of the neighbourhood could be thrown out of equilibrium, and new social movements could evolve.

It is clear, then, that Park and his colleagues recognized the existence of differentiated social structures, conflicting sets of norms and values, even within the context of one neighbourhood. The proposition arising from this is that delinquency in these neighbourhood areas is a normative form of behaviour supported by mixed sets of values helping to develop differential learning environments, hence providing space for apprenticeships into both deviant and 'respectable' careers.

Examples of the descriptive studies emerging from the Chicago School are Nels Anderson's 'The Hobo', (1923), Harvey Zorbaugh's 'The Gold Coast and The Slum', (1929) and Paul Cressey's 'The Taxi-Dance Hall', (1932).[2] The impetus such studies had lay primarily in opening doors for new analyses of the cultural implications for the city of immigration, particularly in that the latter gave rise to socially problematic urban areas or 'transitional zones'. These and other studies were based predominantly on examinations of single ethnic groups (G. D. Suttles, 1974: 27).

It was the criminologist Edwin Sutherland (1937) who from these studies derived the concept of 'behaviour systems' to account for the types of groups formed in zones of transition. Sutherland's notion of

behaviour systems, placed within a larger theory of differential association, proposed that while man is bound by certain constraints which determine social action, he has at the same time the power to exert a free will. So, says Sutherland, although the structural precipitants may be readily available for the individual, in the final analysis it can only be his choice to become, for example, a drug-addict or a criminal.

At a time when significant developments were being made in explanations of behaviour systems (Hollingshead, 1939),[3] M. M. Gordon (1947) introduced the first definition of 'subculture'. It was a simple definition, suggesting that American society was comprised of a variety of smaller groups preserving their own cultural integrity. Unfortunately, rather than assisting in improving explanations of crime and deviant behaviour, through its simplistic emphasis on population segments and a lack of practical applicability, Gordon's definition arguably hindered ongoing breakthroughs in the field. With the publication of 'Delinquent Boys' in 1955, however, A. K. Cohen made efforts to develop studies of careers and occupations made by Sutherland (1937; 1939) and Hollingshead (1939) into a theory of delinquent subcultures. It was a more thorough explanation than Gordon's, particularly in its efforts to state the conditions under which subcultures emerge or fail to emerge, and the content of subcultural solutions. 'Delinquent Boys' will be dealt with in greater detail below.

To some extent, then, we can see that the study of what we now call subcultures has its origins in the work of the Chicago School.

Since the early stages the concept has taken on considerable developments and "has become a central analytical tool in social psychology", (Shibutani, 1955: 562-9).

Defining Subculture

It is rather unusual for sociology to produce a term that is readily understood by both its practitioners and laymen. While the concept of subculture is probably no real exception, its immense popularity in recent years has arguably elevated it to one of the most frequently used sociological concepts by laymen.[4] Unfortunately, such a trend has not been accompanied by any common understanding of the term, or by a precise and widely accepted working definition of subculture.

Although 'subculture' was first used by McLung Lee in 1945, it was not until 1947 that Gordon presented its first definition. He defined the concept in terms of its population aspects:

> ...a subdivision of a national culture, composed of a combination of factorable social situations such as class status, ethnic background, regional or rural or urban residence, and religious affiliation, but forming in their combination a functioning unity which has an integrated impact on the participating individual. (40)

Donnelly (1980) has noted that since (and including) Gordon's original definition, subsequent definitions have fallen within three distinct categories, indicating:

1. An emphasis on the population segments of subcultures, such as class or ethnic groups.

2. An emphasis on the deviant or delinquent aspects of subcultural behaviour.

3. 'Neutral' definitions, such as global definitions of the term, including glossary and dictionary definitions.

Gordon's definition is perhaps the foremost example of the first group. Others are very similar. Broom and Selznick (1973: 76), for example, have emphasized the inter-connectedness between subcultures and the local community, suggesting that the typical subculture is:

> ...based on residential, ethnic or social class conditions. These subcultures tend to be coextensive with the local community and thus provide a setting for the entire round of life.

It is, however, with reference to deviance or delinquency that the concept is most frequently applied, and examples in this regard are legion. Studies in this category consider the social organization of deviance and question whether subcultures provide the source of deviant behaviour. Presenting subcultures essentially as a form of 'detachment', Peter Berger (1975: 132) contends that entering the subcultural environment necessarily involves adapting or reconstructing already acquired knowledge, beliefs and values in the 'cognitive separateness' of smaller (and more deviant) groups:

> The person who retires from the social stage into religious, intellectual or artistic domains of his own making still, of course, carries into this self-imposed exile the language, identity and store of knowledge that he initially achieved at the hands of society... If one finds others to join one in such an enterprise, one can in a very real sense create a counter-society whose relations with the other, the 'legitimate' society, can be

> reduced to a diplomatic minimum... such counter-societies, constructed on the basis of deviant and detached definitions, exist in the form of sects, cults, "inner-circles" or other groups that sociologists call subcultures.

The third category includes only a very general array of definitions, all with limited degrees of usefulness in sociological study. For example, at one extreme we have the various glossary definitions of subculture such as that offered by Hagedorn (1980: 121). For him, subculture is comprised of:

> ...more or less distinctive patterns, names, symbols, values and ideologies shared by categories or subgroups of a larger population.

From this rather crude definition one can move to longer, more accurate, but still quite general definitions within the same category. Bullock and Stallybrass (1979: 609), for instance, propose that subcultures are comprised of:

> ...a body of attitudes, values, beliefs and natural habits, shared by the members of a particular group or stratum within a society, which has significant determining effects upon them as individuals, and is distinguishable from the commonly accepted culture held to be characteristic of the society as a whole.

With its general purpose and effect being somewhat unspecific, it seems reasonable to argue that such a category provides little more than a starting point of analysis.

With the existence of various definitional categories, it comes as no surprise that sociologists have been impeded by definitional problems and, although the concept has existed for decades in the discipline, there is still no common understanding of the term. Clearly, in order to proceed, a need exists for one.

Subcultural Boundaries

One important conceptual and theoretical issue dealt with in the literature is the 'boundary' problem, ie. where do subcultures begin and end? There is a tendency on the part of some writers to treat subcultures as explicitly separate entities, as Arnold (1970: 84) puts it, "as though each was surrounded by a twelve foot high barbed wire fence".[5] Subcultural boundaries are frequently diffuse, however, and occasionally overlap, subcultures themselves almost all exhibiting elements of a national culture.[6]

According to Arnold, the total culture can be seen as an amalgamation of all the cultural elements subcultures have in common. Similarly, Gordon (1947) writes that a subculture is 'a subdivision of national culture'. There are conceptual problems with both hypotheses, however. If Arnold's contention were true, it would mean that we would be able to adequately identify not only all the elements that constitute a 'total' national culture, but also the factors that distinguish subcultures. Such a proposition is that it is, in fact, possible for subcultures to extend beyond the limits of one particular nation. Some subcultures are internationally widespread, such as the hippy and disco subcultures, rock climbing and other sport subcultures (the extension of which is often achieved via commercial appropriation, eg. rock music, film representations etc.). Indeed, so strong are the influences of these international subculture groupings that they are unrestrained by any barriers of language.

Although no adequate explanation has been offered for treating subculture as an isolated concept in sociology to date, some writers (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960), have argued for the explicit distinctiveness between subcultures. If individuals actually live out large parts of their lives in subcultural settings, it seems at least plausible that the idea of multiple involvement exists, with members participating in two or more subcultures simultaneously, serially or both. This would indeed appear to be the normative condition. As Cohen (in Arnold, 1970: 101) puts it:

> One fascinating aspect of the social process is the continual alignment of groups, the migration of individuals from one group to another.

The most practical theoretical suggestion thus seems to be that subcultures at the very least overlap and, as Arnold argues, have 'fuzzy' boundaries.

Michael Clarke (1974: 434) has to some extent clarified the boundary problem by arguing that temporally a "hardening or a softening of specificity can take place" with subculture boundaries. He provides a list of four 'specific processes' that can be affected:

1. A process of absorption or assimilation, where subcultural identity diminishes until it entirely disappears, eg. Irish immigrants in the United Kingdom.

2. A process whereby subcultural identity is arrested at a certain stage due to changes in outside resistance to it, eg. the lessening of hostility and stigma towards nudism in various countries.

3. A process whereby subcultural identity is amplified, eg. hippies and addicts subject to stigmatizing processes amplified by media reportage forming a subsequent more closely-knit consciousness, (using the Mods and Rockers subcultures Stan Cohen, 1972, later underlined how this process can occur).

4. Subcultures operating in complete isolation from society, eg. Gay Liberation, Black Power and National Front movements.

Clarke's perceptive contribution to subculture theory illustrates that subculture is a dynamic concept prone to change, growth or dimunition, depending on specific social responses to it.

Subcultural Exclusivity

As subcultures have certain boundaries, they also indicate varying degrees of exclusivity to members and non-members. Arnold (1970) and Mungham and Pearson (1976) have noted that exclusivity refers firstly to the difficulty in attaining membership, and second to the degree of commitment demanded of members, enforced by the hegemonic order of the group. For example, Bennet Berger (1971: 175) writes:

> An upper-class, aristocratic subculture can be maintained in a hostile democratic environment to the extent that it goes on in places (territories) others can't afford to enter and to the extent that it is enclosed by a system of exclusive institutions... The important thing to remember is that a subculture is made viable to the extent that territorial and institutional factors (the conditions are variables) provide sustenance and support to its norms, insulate the members of the group from outside pressures and hence discourage, forestall, or minimize defection, ie. mobility.

Donnelly (1980) would explain Berger's example by arguing that a universal relation exists between the presence of a complex belief system in a subculture and its proximity to outsiders.

A very apparent factor emerging from a review of the literature

is that the term subculture should not be applied loosely to just any collectivity of individuals. All too often it seems that writers have manufactured their own understandings of the term to suit their own purposes. An adequate definition of 'subculture' (and one that is employed in this thesis) should emphasize that the concept is an identifiable small structure within the larger dominant culture, composed of individuals sharing similar values, behaviours, attitudes, symbols and rituals, which set them apart from the larger culture, dominating their style of life and stabilizing over time.[7] The extent of isolation indicates the degree of integrity or exclusivity of members, but the subculture will probably not be so exclusive that it does not overlap in some way with other subcultural groupings.

American Theorizations of Subculture

Many of the Chicago School's arguments concerning the genesis of deviant behaviour can be explained using the predominantly Durkheimian theory of 'anomie', ie. the theorists of 'social disorganization' laid emphasis on the essential 'normlessness' existing in delinquent areas. It was R. K. Merton (1938) who initially attempted to devise a structural explanation for anomie, incorporating the concept into his interpretation of delinquency and deviance. Such an interpretation can be seen as an explanation of the 'undue' emphasis on goals in the American value system, ie. it stems from notions of structural strain created by

differential access to opportunity structures[8] (Merton, 1938: 678). For Merton, the establishment of a deviant subculture is an 'adaption' by individuals who are aware of society's success goals but who cannot internalize them.

Merton's influence on the subculture theorists that followed him was considerable. Anomie was increasingly expressed in terms of the existence of cultural goals without the corresponding structural means of achievement. This approach was employed, although in a slightly different way, in A. K. Cohen's 'Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang', (1955) - essentially an interactionist and critical response to earlier psychogenic approaches to crime, such as Merton's. Cohen argued that Merton's theory was acceptable for utilitarian crime, but that it was not a plausible explanation for non-utilitarian crime, such as vandalism. His own proposal was that delinquent subcultures arise through conflict between working-class and middle-class culture. Working-class children at school, for example, experience 'status frustration' as they are judged by criteria such as ambition, cultivation of manners, asceticism or 'deferred gratification' and respect for property, ie. predominantly middle-class values. A subsequent 'reaction-formation' takes place and delinquents unite collectively in groups, precipitating the formation of subcultures. As Cohen (1955: 59) puts it, new subcultures emerge when individuals tentatively seek out others through a series of 'exploratory gestures':

> The crucial condition for the emergence of new cultural forms is the existence, in effective interaction with one another, of a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment.

Since many of the characteristics fostered in such a reaction-formation are anti-establishment (legitimation of aggression and a general deliberate disengagement from positive attitudes) the culture of the delinquent gang is referred to as a non-utilitarian culture. We have said that it was because of Merton's failure to account for 'non-utilitarian, malicious and negativistic' behaviour in working-class delinquent subcultures that Cohen criticized him. Cohen posits the example of the apparent willingness of delinquents to steal, indicating an appreciation of money, but then waste what they have stolen, as a typical adolescent status problem. Aware of the prestige associated with middle-class status goals, but excluded from these by limited opportunity structures, working-class youth are presented with a paradoxical situation. Hence Cohen (1955: 28) arrives at the following conclusion:

> The delinquent subculture is not only a set of roles, a design for living which is different from or indifferent to or even in conflict with the norms of the 'respectable' adult society. It would appear at least plausible that it is defined by its 'negative polarity' to these norms. That is, the delinquent subculture takes its norms from the larger culture but turns them upside down. The delinquent's conduct is right by the standards of his subculture, precisely because it is wrong by the norms of the larger culture.

'Delinquent Boys' did not go without criticism, however. One immediate problem arising from a reading of the text is the author's failure to satisfactorily account for any adult working-class culture. Further, Cohen's theory is problematic in that it takes for granted the essential 'middle-classness' of the middle-class, ie. it ignored

waves of middle-class deviance and overlooked the way in which the persistence of subcultures also defies the parameters of the dominant culture, as well as the other way around. Cohen actually acknowledges the existence of subterranean values in the dominant culture, but omits a discussion of this in his central analysis. W. B. Miller (1958) also contested Cohen's theorization by arguing that delinquent subcultures were more an extension of working-class 'focal concerns' that contradict dominant values, than a reaction to loss of status. Such 'focal concerns' are identified as trouble, smartness, toughness, fate, excitement and autonomy. According to Miller, delinquent subcultures arise through adolescent boys being socialized into accepting an unlawful set of standards inherent in what he calls 'lower-class culture':

> In the case of 'gang' delinquency, the cultural system which exerts the most direct influence on behaviour is that of the lower-class community itself - a long-established, distinctively patterned tradition with an intensity of its own - rather than a so-called 'delinquent subculture' which has arisen through conflict with middle-class culture and is oriented to the deliberate violation of middle-class norms. (In D. H. Kelly, 1979: 75)

Thus, for Miller, lower-class culture and delinquency are coexistent.

In the same year as Miller's original publication, Cohen combined with Short in a reply to his critics. Crucially, they did so by proposing a three-fold working-class delinquent subcultural type:

1. the conflict-oriented subculture, propagating violence.
2. the drug-addict subculture, focusing on the accessibility of drugs.
3. the semi-professional thief subculture, paving a road towards organized crime.

Cohen and Short remained vehement, however, that the parent working-class subculture functioned to provide the strongest influence on working-class delinquents, in fact referring to the latter as the 'garden-variety' of delinquent subculture, (Cohen and Short, 1958: 22).

Like Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) laid emphasis on collective solutions to unfavourable social environments.[9] Their typology also revealed pluralistic elements intrinsic to the theory of differential social organization, rather than the Mertonian structural-functionalist model of social disorganization. Two main arguments are posited by Cloward and Ohlin. First, they point to the pre-existence of 'subculture' in the organized slum or ghetto. They argue that a specific structure of illegal opportunities to success not only exist in the slum or ghetto, but also that criminal cultural themes are transmitted through such a structure. 'Subculture', then, already exists. It is not seen as the result of consensus but as the provider, through differential association and interaction, of a particular type of life-style. Second, Cloward and Ohlin argue that because of limited legal and illegal opportunity structures for adolescents, subcultures can develop without any extensive degree of consensus, eg. a small gang placing value on the use of violence in a larger delinquent environment. Again, largely through the effects of differential association, individuals are seen as solving problems they face collectively. Thus, apart from refuting the extreme separation hinted at by Miller, Cloward and Ohlin's argument is similar to Cohen's and Miller's in suggesting that delinquents are bound to certain subcultural roles of conduct or precepts.

The analysis of Cloward and Ohlin can be criticized in presupposing that only one explanation exists for the development of subcultures - limited opportunities to success. As Taylor et al (1973: 134) note, this omits a whole area of discussion:

> ...the diversity of subcultures in modern industrial societies is scarcely grasped by Cloward and Ohlin. They inherit the consensus legacy of Merton - there is one all-embracing cultural goal, monetary success, the only difference being that there are two types of institutional means available for its achievement; legitimate and illegitimate opportunity structures.

Such an omission has, I think, only successfully been overcome in recent British work, particularly Hall and Jefferson's 'Resistance Through Rituals' (1976).

Around the same time as the publication of Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) paper, a new American influence began to appear in the 'naturalistic' observations of David Matza.[10] Matza argued that subculture theory before him had distorted how deviants themselves (would) rationalize their behaviour. In an article with Gresham Sykes (1957), Matza explicitly refuted the proposition that delinquents invert dominant values. Rather, delinquents adopt a number of 'techniques of neutralization' - specific linguistic constructs designed to neutralize the moral binds or oppressive controls incurred by such values.

Five major 'techniques' exist: denial of injury ("I didn't really hurt him"); denial of victim ("He was only some queer"); denial of responsibility ("I didn't mean it"); appeals to higher loyalties

("You've got to help your friends") and condemning the condemners ("Everyone picks on us"). For Matza, the delinquent subculture represents the suspension of a moral commitment to conventional norms. Particularly in times of boredom and frustration, adolescents are prone to "drift" in and out of delinquency:

> Drift stands midway between freedom and control. Its basis is an area in the social structure in which control has been loosened, coupled with the abortiveness of adolescent endeavour to organize an autonomous subculture, and thus an important source of control, around illegal action. The delinquent transiently exists in a limbo between convention and crime, responding in turn to the demands of each, flirting now with one, now with the other, but postponing commitment, evading decision. (1964: 49)

Delinquents are situated ambivalently between not being able to choose what they do and feeling compelled to deeds. Thus we can see in Matza an argument against some of the earlier deterministic explanations of subculture. His writings have subsequently been called 'humanistic'.

In a later paper by Matza and Sykes (1961), the authors argue that delinquent values, such as contempt of work or 'toughness', are more indicative of 'subterranean'[11] leisure values expressed occasionally by us all, rather than inherently deviant values. Typical environments for the acting out of such values are games, gambling and orgies. According to Matza and Sykes, there is nothing intrinsically unique in the behaviour of delinquents - they simply accentuate these subterranean values on a more regular basis than members of other class groupings. Although the delinquents themselves may be unaware of it, various ideologies of the dominant culture are often seen in their behaviour.

It is at this juncture that Matza's work directly contrasts A. K. Cohen's. While the latter argues that delinquents abandon the demands of the dominant culture, the former (with Sykes, 1961) is concerned to indicate that there is a constant conflict between the demands of the delinquent subculture and the larger culture. For Matza, it is an attempt, albeit diffident, on the part of delinquents to neutralize such conflicts that legitimizes a subcultural solution, not a completely oppositional rejection of dominant values.

It is Fine and Kleinman (1979) who finally bring together American conceptualizations of subculture in an interactionist analysis. Although their argument is essentially that subcultures stem from groups of individuals interacting together, Fine and Kleinman assure us that delinquent interaction alone does not guarantee the formation of a subculture:

> Although culture is meaningful only when it is activated in interaction, cultural elements may constitute a subculture through the diffusion of information among groups. While a small group can be studied as a closed system, it is erroneous to conceive of group members as interacting exclusively with one another. (1979: 8)

The explanation is that although individuals share like problems they may be so separated by physical space that there exists little chance of 'mutual exploration'.

Fine and Kleinman (1979: 10) consequently argue for what has been called 'multiple group membership', where subculture members are seen as participating in several groups simultaneously. They would here, I think, agree with Arnold to the extent that subculture boundaries

tend to be 'fuzzy', and that 'weak ties' are created when the interacting network is not 'totally bounded or finite'.

The conclusion arrived at by Fine and Kleinman (1979: 1) neatly summarizes much of the American theory to date:

> For the subculture construct to be of maximal usefulness it must be linked to the process of interaction. Subculture is reconceptualized in terms of cultural spread occurring through an interlocking group network characterized by multiple group membership, weak ties, structural roles, conducive to information spread between groups, and media diffusion. Identification with the referrent group seems to motivate the potential member to adopt the artifacts, behaviour, norms and values characteristic of the subculture.

More important, perhaps, than bringing together the American material, in suggesting that the notions of interaction and structure must be combined to account adequately for the development of subcultures, Fine and Kleinman hint at subsequent British theorizations.

In summary, then, the predominant focus of early subculture studies in the U.S.A. centered around an analysis of youth culture as a social problem, and of various conflicts and strains brought on by a specific generation gap rather than factors intrinsic to class. In 'Essays in Sociological Theory' (1954: 220), for instance, Parsons underlines his argument that youth culture is an isolated cultural system experienced only by the young:

> It is at the point of emergence into adolescence that there first begins to develop a set of patterns and behaviour phenomena which involve a highly complex combination of age grading and sex role elements. These may be referred to together as the phenomena of the 'youth culture'. Certain of its

> elements are present in pre-adolescence and others in the adult culture. But the peculiar combination in connection with this particular age limit is unique and highly distinctive for American society.

Similarly, Matza (1961: 104) accounted for various deviant youth traditions by assuring us that:

> Within the life-cycle, the apex of rebelliousness is reached during the period of youth, before and after which rates of rebelliousness seem considerably lower.

Such a socio-demographic view fits in well with the dominant methodological themes (positivism and empiricism) of American sociology. What is absent at this stage is any 'relational' concept of subculture.

It was not until Cohen's 'Delinquent Boys', (1955) that a notion of class was introduced to explanations of subcultures in any major way. However, in Cohen's proposal that the delinquent subculture is a solution by socially aspirant sections of the working-class to 'normative strain' and 'status frustration' created by inaccessible middle-class opportunity structures, we can still see classic Durkheimian anomie theory, ie. deviance as an absence of norms. Since Cohen, other American writers (Miller, 1958; Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) have avoided relying on a 'generation gap' explanation and have made (arguably unsuccessful) attempts to place delinquent youth subcultures in a wider class analysis, working still within a basic symbolic-interactionist framework. As the title indicates - 'Rethinking Subculture: An Interactionist Analysis' - Fine and Kleinman's (1979) paper is also very much rooted within this tradition. The strength of the paper lies,

however, in making the breakthrough of combining an interactionist and structural explanation of subculture, an approach that has recently been acknowledged as an appropriate methodology by British writers.

British Theorizations of Subculture

It follows that since Britain's history, unlike that of the U.S.A., is characterized more by class consciousness than by colonial immigration, its studies of youth subcultures should have also favoured a different orientation. In contrast to American studies of ethnic minorities and other groupings, there has been a concern in the British work with studies of peer groups within local neighbourhoods. Thus there are difficulties in applying American theorizations to Britain. Indeed, in 'The Delinquent Solution' (1966), David Downes underlined the inappropriateness of such an application, arguing that different cultural and historical traditions demand different conceptualizations.

Recent British writers have chosen to ignore any simple notion of an overall youth culture created by generation gap criteria. Brake (1974: 179), for example, notes that:

> Since the end of the Second World War Britain has produced several adolescent subcultures. This has led to the popular but erroneous belief that they are somehow part and parcel of the same 'youth culture'. To argue this is to oversimplify the part that class origins and education play in these various subcultures, whilst at the same time failing to see as problematic a complex set of cultural themes.

A satisfactory explanation calls also for an historical analysis, a feature conspicuously absent from the majority of the American literature. Mungham and Pearson (1976: 9) dwell on the need for an understanding of the historicity of the phenomena arguing that:

> ...the de-mystification of the youth question must be attacked at its roots.

Michael Clarke (1974) has favoured the same orientation. Thus we find that recent British studies have attempted to locate youth subcultures both in a class and an historical analysis. Moreover, class has been seen as a type of metaphor for social change (Clarke et al, 1976). To some extent developing the work of American sociologists (A. K. Cohen in particular), class has been used by British writers, although within a more Marxist mould, as a dynamic in a historical framework to clarify the concept of subculture. It is, in fact, the relations between classes and their reactions to change which is frequently thought to be a determining factor, ie. subcultures are seen as a specific kind of response to class developments.

Extensive work on subcultures in Britain has come to the fore only since the mid-1960's. Most of the early studies were social ecological interrogations of working-class neighbourhoods, employing relatively unsophisticated symbolic interactionist approaches. For the most part, they centered around the implications for delinquency of conflicts between working-class and middle-class values and, as such, American theories of social disorganization were 'borrowed' to assist in explanations.

One of the earliest studies was conducted in an area which had a long tradition of poor schooling, unemployment and general economic disadvantage. Mays' 1954 study of a slum neighbourhood within the Liverpool Dock district proposed that delinquency was typical of the various ways of life in rough working-class areas, but that it did not extend into adulthood. Delinquency in the Liverpool slum was seen particularly in a casual attitude towards monetary matters, a central value of fatalism (seen to carry over to adulthood), and a defiance to authority frequently exhibited in shows of risk-taking. It was precisely the social conditions of the neighbourhood that projected adolescents towards delinquency. The latter represented:

> ...not so much a symptom of maladjustment as adjustment to a subculture which was in conflict with the culture of the city as a whole. (1954: 147)

Thus, for Mays, delinquency was an indication of a larger environmental problem.

The late 1950's in Britain were, of course, characterized by assumptions about the apparently increasing affluence and embourgeoisement of the working-classes. Abrams' 1959 study of The Teenage Consumer, (cited in Brake, 1980), for example, stressed that working-class youth, seen as a 'classless' group, were the largest group of consumers in the economy. They were stereotyped as being affluent but bored. Arguments arose about a specific synthetic culture being created for adolescents by media forces concerned only with profit-making.[12]

Downes' 'The Delinquent Solution' (1966) was one such study emphasizing that a synthetic culture had been created for, not by,

adolescents. The author also perceptively indicated, however, that market forces could not create such a ready-made 'youth market' unless it satisfied (at least partially) the desires of the consuming sector. He argued that an important subcultural value for delinquents was cynicism towards school, achievement and the police. Delinquents were seen by Downes as disillusioned with the essentially middle-class goals of success which dominated the school and work spheres. He writes:

> This disenchantment provoked an over-emphasis on purely 'leisure' goals sedulously fostered by commercial 'teenage' cultures - rather on other non-work areas. (257)

To avoid the tedium of school, adolescents begin to explore the more exciting prospects of leisure activities, but here too they are disenchanted - they lack the means to achieve attractive aspects of leisure. Thus the adolescent sees himself as trapped, no longer satisfied with his class position but unable to reach middle-class goals. Downes argues that the subsequent 'solution' on the part of the delinquent, ie. the formation of a delinquent subculture, involves a rejection of both working-class and middle-class culture. A study by Willmott in the same year of adolescent boys in East London proposed a similar view of delinquency. Thus a common theme in Downes' and Willmott's work is that for working-class youth, the educational and occupational structure is laden with structural contradictions. Youth are taught the positive aspects of aspiration and ambition without being presented with the correlative means of achievement.

It was in response to earlier subculture studies, particularly those that had relied upon simple techniques of symbolic interaction

in both the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom, that the National Deviancy Conference was established in 1968. It introduced a radical Marxist critique to trace the careers of deviants and focused predominantly on two methods of investigation. First, the Conference proposed that deviant behaviour should be studied both ethnomethodologically and from a transactionalist position (examining the socio-cultural background of deviants and the social processes they are engaged in). Second, these initial orientations should take place within an overall structural framework, underlining the political implications of types of deviance. In one of the most radical but nonetheless seminal texts of the 1970's, Taylor et al (1973) established the second stance as the 'New Criminology'.

The first comprehensive dealing with youth within the trans-actionalist mould was presented in Stan Cohen's 1972 study of Mods and Rockers. Its central thrust was that deviance exists as a transaction between the judged and various adjudicating bodies, ie. delinquency was not seen as growing naturally out of a 'deviant' or 'outside' world, but was a social label ascribed to youth. A key precipitant in encouraging youth in deviant careers was a specific social reaction to or labelling of deviant categories by the powerful.[13] Cohen argued that such a reaction involved youths seeing themselves as unfairly labelled as deviant and in response severing ties with the dominant value system, thus extending the deviance. More specifically, the case of the Mods and Rockers of the mid-1960's was viewed as a type of deviant behaviour initially brought on by various structural strains, but amplified through a series of exaggerative processes principally on

the part of the press but aided occasionally by policy-makers and enforcers of the law. Cohen (1972: 109) quotes one magistrate, for example, who referred to the Mods and Rockers as:

> ...mentally unstable, long-haired, petty little sawdust caesars who seem to find courage, like rats, by hunting in packs.

Moreover, argued Cohen, provocative reports of vandalism and violence by the press, encouraging local over-reaction, had fuelled a 'moral-panic' over the 'folk-devil' and 'affluent-yob' image of the Mods and Rockers.

Since Cohen, the transactionalist perspective has been developed at a mass communication unit at the University of Leicester, led principally by the work of Murdock[14], but more particularly at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham. Both sources have placed special import on analyses of the relations between 'lived' cultural forms and the establishment of subcultural 'style' and meanings, developed in ethnographic discussions of youth subcultures. Writers at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies have illustrated that working-class subcultures arise mainly through streams of class socialization developed in the working-class neighbourhood. Clarke et al (1976: 29) write:

> ...the young inherit a cultural orientation from their parents towards a 'problematic' common to the class as a whole, which is likely to weight, shape and signify the meanings they then attach to different areas of their social life.

In a study of working-class culture and youth culture in East London, Phil Cohen (1972) has argued that specific class structural

changes have taken place to diffuse the once close-knit working-class community. Post-war rehousing plans, and the introduction of immigrant labour, diversifying local economies and altering local working-class relations to the occupational structure, have amongst other factors combined to fragment traditional working-class formal institutions, such as the extended kinship group, and replace it with a more privatized and nuclear style of life. Thus, says Cohen, "the working-class family was not only isolated from outside but undermined from within", (1972: 17).

Cohen goes on to describe the implications for subculture development of these material, social and economic changes taking place in the parent culture:

> ...the latent function of subculture is this - to express and resolve, albeit "magically", the contradictions which appear in the parent culture. The succession of subcultures which this parent culture generated can thus all be considered at an ideological level, between traditional working-class puritanism, and the new ideology of consumption; at an economic level between a part of the socially mobile elite, or a part of the new lumpen. (1972: 23)

Thus, for Cohen, an analysis of class and historical relations is central to an explanation of subculture growth.

The work of Clarke et al (1976: 35) has developed along similar lines to Cohen:

> The relation between class and subculture has been placed in a more dynamic historical framework. The relations between classes, the experience and response to change within different class fractions, is now seen as the determining level.

In one of the most sophisticated theorizations of youth subcultures to date, Clarke et al have used Antonio Gramsci's original notion of

'hegemony' to locate youth in a dialectical relationship between the dominant (or hegemonic) culture and the subordinate working-class parent culture. As employed by Gramsci, hegemony refers to the imposition of moral, political and cultural authority structures on the majority by a ruling order. Of particular significance for working-class youth subcultural formations is that, in so doing, a dominant class can legitimize generalizations or standards of what is normative and deviant in behaviour. The key aspect for Clarke et al is that class hegemony is never permanent, ie. it is always located along a 'moving equilibrium'. Since the working-classes are never completely engulfed in the dominant culture, they can occasionally 'win space'[15] for themselves. Thus, by way of constant 'negotiation, resistance and struggle', particularly on the part of youth, a subcultural response can emerge. However, as class hegemony is never infinitely complete, nor can the subcultural response be. It manifests itself merely at the level of a temporary 'time-out', as opposed to a final solution to problems lurking in unequal employment and educational opportunities:

> So, when post-war sub-cultures address the problematics of their class experience, they often do so in ways which reproduce the gaps and discrepancies between real negotiations and symbolically displaced 'resolutions'. They 'solve', but in an imaginary way, problems which at the concrete material level remain unresolved. (Clarke et al, 1976: 47-8)

We have seen that Phil Cohen (1972: 23) had earlier hinted at such an imaginary or ideological subcultural solution, ie. forms of magical displacement using the Mod subculture as an example:

> ...the original mod style could be interpreted as an attempt to realize, but in an imaginary relation, the conditions of existence of the socially mobile white collar worker. While their argot and ritual forms stressed many of the traditional values of their parent culture, their dress and music reflected the hedonistic image of the affluent consumer.

Cohen had indeed set the scene for much subsequent work, particularly seen in the Hall and Jefferson (1976) reader.

Combined with class explanations, writers at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies have argued that the working-class in Britain in the late 1950's through to the present day have become 'generationally conscious'[16], and of course this smacks of previous American suggestions of an overall youth culture. However, unlike the American writers, sociologists at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies have argued that such a youth culture is necessarily linked to the processes in which (five major) post-war changes have been interpreted by youth. Clarke et al (1976: 17-20) list these as: increasing affluence in the youth market and youth oriented leisure industries; the arrival of mass communications, mass art and mass culture; certain disruptive social effects of the war, eg. juvenile delinquency; changes in the educational structure, eg. secondary education for all; and the introduction of distinctive 'styles', associated with dress and popular music. All these factors are seen to have contributed to a realistic consciousness and unity among youth. Class has nevertheless remained fundamental to explanations of youth subculture, necessarily so since some subcultures (the Skinheads, for example) showed both generational and class consciousness.

It is, in fact, the relation between class and generation that produces a stylistic backdrop to youth subcultures. Although many of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies' writings discuss the connotations of subcultural 'style', work by Clarke, (1976), Willis, (1978a) and Hebdige, (1979) has been most illuminating. These authors have arrived at a new level of analysis by combining a concern with critical theory, focusing on notions of social structure and social conflict, with a phenomenological approach towards symbolic and cultural relations.

Clarke (1976) has employed the concept of 'bricolage', originally used by Levi-Strauss, to describe how everyday objects can appropriate new meanings in a subcultural setting. Frequently this occurs by devising a new object with particular significance for the cause of the subculture (frisbee throwing for naturalists), but more generally it is seen simply in the recontextualization of an old object with a new meaning. Cohen shows us that the Skinheads wore Doc Marten industrial boots, raised trousers (revealing the boots) and braces to project an air of aggression. It achieved for the Skinheads the label of boot or 'bovver' (bother) boys.

Paul Willis (1978a: 189) has argued that we can only make sense of cultural experience if we locate the inter-relations between the cultural group and the wider society. He notes that the most important feature of cultural forms are their 'constitutive relationships', ie.:

> ...the way the social group is connected to other objects, artifacts, institutions and systematic practices of others which surround it.

According to Willis, there are three different levels in the interpretation of cultural relations. The 'indexical' level refers to how particular cultural items are used by a social group in a quantitative way. Once these items have been indexed or established, they take on a significant meaning and reflect the structure of the group. This is the 'homological' arena. Over time, the indexical and homological features in a cultural relationship can be modified or changed. Thus, new items may be indexed or appropriated to the group, or older ones may have new meanings attributed to them. Willis calls this dynamic, which serves principally to historicize the phenomena, the 'integral' level of analysis. In "Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids get Working-Class Jobs", Willis (1978a: 29) later documents how the expression of certain homologies by lower working-class boys reflects an attitude of opposition to the discipline and authority of the school. Much of the text is in fact an explanation of the techniques working-class boys adopt to 'win space' from the school structure. This involves particular cultural skills centered around 'having a laff'.

Dick Hebdige (1979: 2) uses Jean Genet's interpretation of 'style as a form of refusal' to describe how the members of subcultures can elevate everyday objects into an art form. He writes:

> ...like Genet also, we are intrigued by the most mundane objects - a safety pin, a pointed shoe, a motor cycle - which... take on a symbolic dimension, becoming a form of stigmata, tokens of self-imposed exile.

As Willis (1978a) argues for the existence of a constitutive relation which renders objects with particular significance, Hebdige argues that

a dialectic is created between the object and the reaction to it to give the object its unique meaning. The latter adopts Willis' notion of style as a form of homology to show how the symbolic fit between values and group experience serves to reinforce the group's 'focal concerns'. Like the subcultures of which they are a part, style is, for these writers, a particular brand of resistance to dominant cultural forms.

In summary, although both argue predominantly from an interactionist perspective, British subculture theorists differ from their American counterparts in that they locate youth in a rather different framework of class relations.[17] As exemplified by Brake (1980), one of the primary emphases in Britain is on subcultures as an attempt on the part of the working-class youth to counter collectively experienced problems, but it is the explanation of the origins of these problems that makes British explanations unique, and arguably more adequate than American theorizations to date.[18] Clarke et al (1976: 53) summarize the main stream of thought in the recent British work thus:

> It is at the intersection between the located parent culture and the mediating institutions of the dominant culture that youth subcultures arise.

For P. Cohen (1972), Clarke et al (1976), Willis (1978a and b), and other British writers, explanations for the emergence of youth subcultures are found in the complex contradictions between the total set of meanings of the subordinate working-class parent culture and the hegemonic culture.

The Concept of Subculture in the Sociology of Sport

Sport is of great significance in contemporary society. In a concentrated manner it mirrors and sometimes contradicts elements in the larger culture (Boyle, 1963). Moreover, it provides an ideal sphere for the employment of direct observational techniques and a form in which general sociological theory can be tested.

Many sports-related studies in sociology to date have indicated descriptive but rather atheoretical orientations. Also, Loy and Segrave (1974: 300) have noted that "there is a paucity of solid research studies in sports situations based on the method of participant-observation", and such a paucity reveals itself most succintly in studies of the behaviour of members of sports subcultures. Sheard and Dunning (1981: 157) address this problem directly:

> Sport is an area of social life which is rich in opportunities for sociological research. So far, however, little work of a genuinely sociological character has been carried out into the problems which it raises. This... is particularly the case as far as the subcultures which arise in connection with sport are concerned.

It would seem that sport sociologists have shown a trend towards auto-biographical and biographical accounts, and a penchant for studying groups to which they are already connected, if not 'bona fide' members. Polsky's 1969 study of poolrooms is a classic example of the latter category and in some ways a combination of them both:

> Billiard playing is my chief recreation. I have frequented poolrooms for over twenty years, and at one poolroom game, three-cushion billiards, am considered a far better than average player. (35)

Donnelly's 1980 study began with more theoretical intentions, but the writer's persuasion towards a study of the subculture of rock climbers owes much to his prior participation and talent in that area, and, although it is concerned with a recreational rather than a sporting form, Becker's 1963 study of jazz musicians owes much to the fact that the author had for years been a jazz pianist. Thus various environmental precipitants can be seen to exist.[19]

The general tendency for studies of sports-related subcultures (like much of the early work carried out with youth subcultures in sociology) to provide only basic descriptive analyses without concerning themselves with any larger notion of social structure is, as we have seen above, indicative of a trend in symbolic interactionism more generally. Coser (1977: 574), for example, writes:

> In symbolic interactionism the structural level of analysis is all but abandoned, and the scene is almost completely occupied by interacting individuals who modify their respective conducts regardless of position in the social structure, socio-cultural climates of values and norms, or institutional settings.

Recently, however, several sport sociologists (Thomson, 1976; Donnelly, 1980; Vanreusel and Rensen, 1981) have used 'subculture' as an analytical tool in an interactionist sense with a combined overall perspective of social structure to argue that certain sports-related fraternities can be analyzed as forms of deviant or non-conformist behaviour. A predominant theme running through the work of these writers is that the behaviour, and particularly the apparently deviant non-playing behaviour of members, deliberately contravenes the values of the dominant culture.

Importantly, efforts have been made to explain such behaviour in terms of certain historical and structural precipitants: what is it in the wider social structure that makes sports participants behave the way they do, and how are they responded to by members of the larger society?

The sociology of sport is in need of more extensive and detailed studies of sports fraternities. Voight (1974: 137) is cognizant of such a requirement:

> The task of identifying and analyzing sports subcommittees, including the job of teasing out values and goals... is a pioneer task for the serious study of sport.

Particularly, studies are needed of the non-playing behaviour of participants since it is in this sphere that the cultural characteristics of certain groups manifest themselves most clearly. As Thomson (1976: 17) has noted, sport sociology has provided "little research specifically concerned with the deviant behaviour of athletes in a non-sport situation". Only through closer and more qualitative observations of sports-related groups might we arrive at deeper empathic levels, particularly regarding the genesis of these fraternities and the meanings they hold for both their members and 'outsiders'.

Footnotes

1. 'Culture' has interestingly been described by Raymond Williams (1976: 78-82) as "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English Language".

2. All three publications are University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

3. Hollingshead, A., 'Behaviour Systems as a Field of Research'. In American Sociological Review, IV, No. 6, December, 1939.

4. Donnelly (1980) in fact asserts that as we were once 'class conscious', so we are now 'subculture conscious'. Michael Clarke (1974: 428) would probably agree. He argues that it is difficult to think critically about subculture since it has become a feature of everyday language, but goes on to say:

   > ...I suspect that were it to be introduced today as a new concept in sociology it would be rejected as worthless.

   It is the 'spongy' aspects of the term in particular, the extreme vagueness over the structural and cultural elements of subculture, that worry Clarke.

5. Most studies have, in fact, only examined one subcultural grouping. Miller's 1958 study is an exception. Here the author considers the inter-connectedness and overlaps between lower class and delinquent subcultures.

6. Since they comprise a subculture which exhibits very few elements of the national or conventional culture, Arnold (1970) suggests that gypsies may be one exception to the rule.

7. The stabilizing element in these characteristics is crucial in allowing the observer to differentiate between a subculture and a 'fad' or a 'craze'. An explanation of the development and stabilization of subcultures is offered by Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1969), and Donnelly (1980). Both underline that stability is a key determinant in subcultural development. Donnelly argues that scope and potential are the primary attributes in this direction, ie. whereas the hula-hoop and the 'twist' did not produce long-lasting subcultures, the skateboard and disco phenomenon did. The difference is that skateboarding and disco dancing exhibit identifiable associated 'styles of life' in addition to demanding various elements of skill and talent.

8. Further, it characterizes American society as wedded to an over-riding goal of material success.

9. That is, deviant or illegitimate means are mostly represented as a collective solution by Cloward and Ohlin. The exception is the 'retreatist pattern' of delinquency, which includes "a variety of expressive, sensual, or consummatory experiences, alone or in a group". (In D. H. Kelly, 1979: 131)

10. The perspective of naturalism originated in the Chicago School of the 1920's and 1930's. It involved the demand for remaining true to the phenomena under study. This approach was echoed recently in Marsh, Rosser and Harre's 'The Rules of Disorder' (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978) where the 'ethogenic' method employed by them was primarily an attempt by middle-class investigators to empathize with the deviant behaviour of working-class boys. The importance of being able to analyze social behaviour from the deviant's point of view is again brought out by John Irwin in his study of California surfers. He writes:

> ...systematic deviant behaviour carried on by groups has no meaning outside its subcultural context... Any attempt to point to causes of this form of deviant behaviour must begin with an understanding of the behaviour in its setting of values, beliefs, and symbolic systems of the perpetrators of the particular behaviour. (In Arnold, 1970: 109)

11. Three 'subterranean' traditions are seen by Matza and Sykes (1961: 102) as creating special interest for youth, ("they manifest a spirit of rebelliousness"):

    a) Delinquency - a basic rejection of methodism and routine, seen especially within the school system.
    b) Radicalism - a focus by radical youth on economic and political exploitation.
    c) Bohemianism - an attack on Puritanism and mechanized bureaucratic society. Youth are here committed to romanticism, monasticism and 'expressive authenticity'.

    All three anti-bourgeois responses can be seen as threats to social stability, and it is here that the relationship between the predominantly Durkheimian concept of 'anomie' and subculture studies arises. The source of anomie is located in the structural conflict arising between the collective moral authority - the 'collective conscience' - and the individual needs of youth.

12. The growth of a synthetic culture can be seen in the various ways materials and commodities, principally concerned with dress and language fashions and the popular music industry, were made more readily accessible to a new 'youth market'. For example, the Teddy Boy subculture was furnished with massive store orders of bootlace ties, drape jackets and crêpe-soled shoes, all assisting in their Edwardian image. Punk rockers were later pleased to witness the extensive promotion of outrageous and vividly coloured clothing and associated objects (eg. safety-pins and zippers) emphasizing bondage and sexual fetishism. More recently, the Rastafarian subculture, with its stress on the secret code of the 'Rasta' argot, has been encouraged by the increasing sale of clothes (eg. shirts, hats and badges) bearing the national colours of Jamaica and Ethiopia. Currently, for Britons of West Indian descent, and particularly those living in the slum areas of large cities (eg. East London, Bristol), such products are helping these individuals on a journey 'back to their roots'. In addition, to some extent these post-war subcultures can be seen as part of a 'democratization' of fashion - quickly changing clothing styles now accessible to the working-class as well as the middle-class.

13. Cohen's argument was in fact based on Lemert's (1969: 48) distinction between primary and secondary deviance:

> Primary deviance is assumed to arise in a wide variety of social, cultural and psychological contexts, and at best has only marginal implications for the psychic structure of the individual; it does not lead to symbolic reorganization at the level of self-regarding attitudes and social roles. Secondary deviation is deviant behaviour, or social roles based upon it, which becomes a means of defence, attack or adaption to the overt and covert problems created by societal reaction to primary deviation.

Cohen's 'folk-devils' were seen to engage in secondary deviance, their behaviour for the most part representing a reaction to various social processes through which they were labelled as deviant. He refers to such processes as a 'signification spiral', identifying six accumulative stages in a 'moral panic': the identification of a specific issue; the identification of a subversive minority; the labelling of the issue; the creation of a belief that the menace will escalate, resulting in spurious analogous references to other social groups; and a final call for more serious controls. As underlined in Hall et al's 1978 study 'Policing the Crisis - Mugging, the State and Law and Order' (London: MacMillan) the effects of a signification spiral were

particularly evident in police moves to control the London ghettos after links had been made between black youths and mugging crimes in the early 1970's.

14. See, for example, Murdock, G., 'Mass Communication and The Construction of Meaning'. In N. Armistead (Ed.), 'Reconstructing Social Psychology', Penguin, 1974.

15. For Willis (1978a: 2) also, working-class youth are seen to acknowledge their cultural subordination. They:

> ...know what surrounds them sufficiently to seize and creatively exploit aspects of it to express their own zest and identity - so partially changing their conditions of existence.

Thus, Willis argues that the dialectic of cultural life for working-class youth is specifically related to a desire to 'win-space' from the hegemonic culture.

16. Willis (1978a: 3) in fact talks of the emergence of a new 'consciousness industry' for youth.

17. As Mungham and Pearson (1976: 16) have noted, American theorizations seem to have suffered from "a systematic myopia on the question of class".

18. One feature of the literature on youth subcultures in both Britain and America is that it would appear almost exclusively to identify these subcultures with males. Referring to the 'invisible girl', Brake (1980) explains this partly in terms of womens' relatively weak relation to the process of production and also to the larger preoccupation on the part of girls and women with traditional images of romance and marriage. Frith's explanation is, I think, a rather stereotyped, if not condescending one:

> Girl culture becomes a culture of the bedroom, the place where girls meet, listen to music and teach each other make-up skills, practise their dancing, compare sexual notes, criticize each others clothes and gossip. (In Brake, 1980: 143)

Current work at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies is actually developing the same approach used initially by Willis in his 1978(a) study of the transition from school to work with working-class boys but with girls, focusing on differential gender cultures in the occupational arena.

19. Roberts (1976: 246), however, argues that despite prior engagement in the field affording the investigator a certain amount of

empathy with his 'not-so-new' subjects, he or she remains an 'inside-outsider' only since "The appreciative nature of his approach has made him the natural scientific ally of the outsider".

CHAPTER TWO

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The fundamental approach here was to test the hypothesis that marginal sport subcultures, particularly the Rugby Football subculture in North America, can exist as types of resistance to dominant sport cultural forms. 'Resistance' here is employed in much the same way as British writers (Clarke et al, 1976; Willis, 1978a; and Brake, 1980) have used the term to analyze recent youth subcultural formations, ie. as types of counter-culture rather than purely extremist or political movements. The study represents an attempt to ground the research in such recent theoretical advances in the area of youth subcultures, to see if it is possible to 'extend' new analytical approaches used to explain delinquent and deviant youth subcultures to the study of sport and sport subcultures.

For the purpose of the study, three major types of investigation were conducted:

1. An examination of the history and present status of the Rugby Union game in the United Kingdom.
2. An examination of the history of the game in North America.
3. A participant-observation study of the rugby subculture in Canada, focusing on an Ontario university team. (An Inventory of Research Sources and an Interview Guide are included in a Methodological Appendix).

Since the predominant research technique employed in the study was participant-observation, the present chapter will initially provide a brief review of the methodology of participant-observation, and subsequently discuss in greater detail the three investigative procedures used by the author.

Methodology in Participant-Observation

The use of participant-observation as a tool in social science derives largely from the impact of the Chicago School of the early twentieth century. Imaginative studies by Anderson (1923), Thrasher (1927) and Shaw (1930), amongst others, were based not so much on the role of participant-observation per se, as on the writer's personal knowledge of the way of life of the subjects under study. William F. Whyte was among the first researchers to lay emphasis on participant-observation as one of the basic strategies in sociological study, and since then other scholars have followed in this now well-established tradition (Becker, 1958; Goffman, 1961, 1963a; Polsky, 1969). Becker and Geer (1957: 28), for example, note that:

> The most complete form of sociological datum is the form in which the participant-observer gathers it... such a datum gives us more information about the event under study than data collected by any other sociological method.

There indeed appears to be much support for participant-observation in general sociological investigation.

In 1955, the Schwartzes defined participant-observation as:

> ...a process in which the observer's presence in a social situation is maintained for the purpose of scientific investigation. The observer is in a face-to-face relationship with the observed and, by participating with them in their natural setting, he gathers data. Thus the observer is part of the context being observed, and he both modifies and is influenced by this context. (344)

Hence the sociologist enters the field to learn the everyday experiences of his subjects, withdrawing occasionally to quantify his observations and draw suppositions from them.

It has been argued that participant-observation is not a single method but a very flexible tool incorporating an array of methods, including not only direct observation and interaction but also other techniques such as informal interviewing and documentary analysis (Junker, 1960; McCall and Simmons, 1969). In the present study, full advantage was taken of the various techniques related to participant-observation. Documentary analysis in particular was crucial to the study since important historical data could only be derived from various Rugby Club records, newsletters, magazines and other archival documentation.

Gold (1958: 220) has classified what he considered to be the four central roles in participant-observation. The 'complete participant' is enveloped in the 'total situation' of the group under study, keeping completely hidden his or her real identity and intentions. When the research role is less concealed, the investigator acts in the role of 'participant as observer'. Gold writes that this role involves an understanding between the investigator and his or her subjects:

> ...both field-worker and informant are aware that there is a field relationship. This mutual awareness tends to minimize role-pretending.

Third, the 'observer as participant' involves the investigator more or less totally revealing research intentions at the outset and even being sponsored by his or her subjects. Gold notes how such an approach is often used if a very few visits or observations are made by the field worker. Finally, the 'complete observer' works closely with his or her subjects but declines from interacting with them. As Denzin (1970: 193) has put it, such an approach is most common when "observations are recorded mechanically or conducted through one-way mirrors in the laboratory". It would thus appear that participant-observation is an 'umbrella' term for a wide variety of research methods. Confusion over the range of observational techniques available has in fact recently led several writers to formally attempt to 'ground' its theoretical orientation as a research method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Denzin, 1970).

Some Methodological Problems in Field Work

a. Entering the Field

One of the major sources of disencouragement for field-workers can exist from the very beginning - the problem of 'getting-in'[1]. Wax (1971) argues that two factors prevail from the outset. First, the success of field-work entry depends greatly on the congeniality of the

subjects themselves, ie. their efforts to accept being 'watched' and to cooperate. As Wax argues, this is always a 'joint-process'. Prus (1980: 134) asserts that the participant-observer's task here can be made easier if he is willing to be flexible vis-a-vis the subjects' likes and dislikes:

> Just as researchers frequently have to overcome the 'subject-mystique', it is also important that they help those whom they study overcome the 'researcher-mystique'. Fitting in is a two way process. Thus, persons more willing to view activities from a variety of perspectives are more likely to help the respondents adjust to them.

Wax's second point is that if entry is attempted in an over-confident or arrogant manner, or the field-worker simply tries too hard to force a point of acceptance, he or she will inevitably run into difficulties: "the field-worker who tries to push his way in is asking for disaster" (46). Shaffir et al (1980: 188) have noted the same potential source of conflict:

> Insensitivity to subject's routines, observing and scheduling interviews in ways that violate the local code of etiquette, airs of superiority, obnoxious personal mannerisms, and other characteristics contribute to underrapport and hence ineffective field-research.

A successful field-rapport would seem to be best achieved by the researcher who enters the field politely, open-mindedly and, above all, in an unthreatening manner. Respondents who feel jeopardized by observers' presence will be unlikely either to act entirely naturally or volunteer information freely. Further, effective relations will be enhanced if the group perceives that the observer's interest in and

appreciation of them is genuine. In a study of preadolescent little league baseball players, Fine and Glassner (1979) have shown the necessity of the investigator carefully structuring his role to encourage an atmosphere of trust. Again, trust in field-relations is a joint-process. Blalock (1970: 41) has written that it is important for the investigator to gain confidence in his or her subjects in order to accept their behaviour as authentic. It is essential, he argues, to behave in such a way that "they will provide him with honest answers to his questions and not hide important activities from his view". Thus, in a sense, the 'entry' aspect of field-research can be seen to replicate relations in everyday life. Clearly, the field-worker will best be able to manage his or her field-relations following a successful entry and the establishment of a field-rapport.

Following a declaration of academic intentions on meeting the team members for the first time, the first two weeks of interaction proved to be something of a strained period for the current researcher inasmuch as many of the team members seemed unwilling to accept that a sincere interest in playing rugby could be coupled with other reasons for participating. It was felt, however, that this initial 'feeling-out' stage (by both parties) was inevitable and thus it was not disheartening.

After approximately four training sessions, some of the ruggers ventured to joke about the researcher's dual role of participant-observer and player. One team member spent some time joking that a spy had been sent by the Athletic Director to maintain a vigil over the ruggers' behaviour.

On talking to players individually for the first time, it was immediately apparent that they were keen for the investigator to show signs of understanding behaviour that might later present itself. As West (In Shaffir et al, 1980: 35) writes:

> In gaining entry nothing seems as important as a genuine appreciative interest in the subjects. When people know that someone likes them, they probably feel similarly and certainly are more willing to trust.

It should be anticipated that any group being studied for the first time would display the same desire. Wax's two arguments introduced above were also apparent from the outset. First, the success or otherwise of the research role was dependent upon the players themselves, ie. as to whether they would be accepting and cooperate. We have seen that cooperation in a field-rapport is essentially a joint-process. Second, through previous experience in the rugby subculture, the investigator was aware that if entry was attempted in an arrogant or over-confident manner, difficulties with being accepted would be more pronounced. The 'loudmouth' or 'cocky' newcomer is never a favourite at a Rugby Club.

Roughly two weeks elapsed before the researcher perceived that most barriers between him and his subjects had been relaxed. Considering that that period included fairly intense interactions (two hour weeknight training sessions, evening 'get-togethers', weekend games, post-game beer-ups etc.) it passed rather more slowly than the reader might at first imagine. On the whole, however, and greatly assisted by prior experience with members of the subculture providing valuable insights into their likes, dislikes, preferences and needs, the process of

'getting-in' posed no serious problems for the investigator beyond the inevitable initial anxiety over wanting respondents to understand and accept problems incumbent of the observer as participant role in field-work.

b. Flexibility and Renegotiation: Managing Field-Work Data

An important task of the field-worker is to constantly develop or 'renegotiate' ground so that, first, he or she can decide how subjects like best to be approached. Second, renegotiation will help determine which variables are more centrally characteristic of the investigator's respondents than others and demand further interrogation. For example, an initial perception on his or her part may be contradicted and rejected at a later, and more knowledgeable, stage. This will necessitate a change in focus and purpose of observations. As Schatzman (1973: 64) has noted, shifting ground in the various phases of field-work can only ever be a matter of subjective judgement. The success of renegotiating an observational stance will depend primarily on how systematically the field-worker goes about the research at hand, ie. how he or she organizes and collates data. Only through carefully checking and rechecking notes can researchers compare observed moments and shift their focus accordingly. This type of flexibility is a crucial element in field-work.

c. Disengaging from the Field

Although closure arguably presents the field-worker with fewer problems than, say, 'getting-in' or maintaining relations (this is reflected in the relatively sparse debates over the issue in the methodological literature), it must nevertheless be approached with

some caution. The immediate question is: how do we know when to leave the field?[2] Is it when we have exhausted all the data we can collect and, equally important, how do we know when we have attained such a level of theoretical or empirical saturation?

Snow (1980) lists three categories of extraneous precipitants to disengagement. 'Institutional' pressures may come from employers or sponsors responsible for funding the research; 'interpersonal' pressures may result from a conflict between the resercher's role of field-worker and role of, say, spouse; and third, 'intrapersonal' strains, mental or physical exhaustion for example, can influence the investigator to terminate his or her research. Elements of all three are probably prevalent in most studies. It seems, however, that the field-worker must design certain margins for time spent in the field. As Freilich (1975: 25) writes:

> ...without a formal model, which would set the boundaries of data collection, the typical field study has no logical end.

Other problems manifest themselves in a hesitancy on the part of the investigator to disengage. This will vary, probably depending on the intensity of field-relations, from a reluctance to sacrifice "hard won ties and relations" (Wax, 1971), and the emotional torment or "sorrow of parting" (Evans-Pritchard, 1964), to the field-worker simply feeling "ensnarled in a web of multiple loyalties" (Snow, 1980).

Disengagement is as much a part of the overall research experience as 'getting-in' but as yet comparatively little is known about the process. Before we can arrive at adequate categorizations of sequential

field-work procedures, it is important that disengagement be 'demystified' (Shaffir et al, 1980). Above all, it is imperative that field-workers do not jeopardize the reputation of their colleagues and the discipline more generally by exiting irresponsibly.

The type of partial disengagement effected in the present study occurs rather infrequently in field-work. Participation on the part of the researcher in the rugby subculture prior to field-work meant that involvement was not entirely terminated on concluding the research. Instead of severing ties with the group under study, the researcher's participation in the subculture has been an ongoing, though less intense, process.

Identification and Objectivity in the Methodology of Participant-Observation: Some Recent Developments

The problem exists from the start that the participant-observer infrequently enters the field without any hunches or preconceived ideas of what he or she will unearth. Wax (1971: 15) stresses the importance of anticipating what one will find and preparing from this accordingly in the correct scientific manner. Whenever he or she is a total participant, however -

> ...the field-worker who is completely involved emotionally in a social situation and who only after it is over becomes an investigator again and writes down what has happened -[3]

there exists a heightened danger of 'going native'.

As regards maintaining objectivity, the observer who has prior, and more particularly, intimate knowledge of his or her subjects is in a precarious position. Clark (1967: XV) has provided a useful analysis of this predicament. He describes his investigation into ghetto life as the:

> ...summation of my personal and lifelong experiences and observation as a prisoner within the ghetto long before I was aware that I was really a prisoner.

Subjective involvement with the group meant for Clark that he "could never be fully detached as a scholar or participant" (XV). He goes on to document, however, how intimate knowledge of his or her subjects can work in the researcher's favour, particularly in that prior insight of the group's behaviour renders the field-worker at an initial advantage of being able to penetrate and make sense of data.

Although others have disagreed (Gans, 1968), Evans-Pritchard (1964: 79) supports Clark's view on identifying with respondents "since to understand a peoples' thought one has to be able to think in their symbols". The field-worker with prior knowledge of his or her respondents' world undoubtedly treads a fine line between involvement and over-involvement. It seems that striking a compromise between the two might best facilitate satisfactory working relations between field-workers and their subjects.

Until very recently, then, most participant-observation studies have reflected the mainstream positivistic tradition in sociology, ie. searches, based on methods borrowed originally from the natural sciences, for objective truth and certainty, seen particularly in the naturalistic

perspectives of American writers (eg. Becker, 1963; Farris, 1967; Park and Mackenzie (Eds.), 1967). Increasingly, however, sociologists are recognizing the crucial role the human element plays in the field-work. As Georges and Jones (1980: 33) put it:

> ...there is now a tendency among field-workers to recognize and reveal, rather than deny and conceal, the part that personal interests, preferences and experiences play in the formulation of field-work plans.

Some of these 'obstructions' have been considered above.

Recently, writers at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Butters, 1976; Roberts, 1976; Willis, 1980) have called into question the positivist search for objectivity and quantification. For example, Brian Roberts (1976: 245) argues that positivistic quantification techniques can fail to grasp the real experiential meaning of the native group. His preference, representative of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies as a whole, is for pure ethnographic detail:

> The assimilation of participant-observation to 'ethnography' changes the focus from objectivity and quantification to 'empathic understanding' (understanding from the inside, taking the perspective of the native) and to qualitative work... participant-observation has rarely been pursued in a rigorously ethnographic and qualitative way.

Such a central stress on 'experiencing' would render participant-observation a phenomenological sociological methodology. It has been put into practise by writers at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in association with a theoretical orientation looking at groups in the social network not simply in interactional terms, but in a

combination of interactional and structural terms (P. Cohen, 1972; Clarke et al, 1976).

One of the most recent and significant essays on participant-observation as a method has been provided by Paul Willis (1980) in a critique of mainstream positivism, in which suggestions are made for a more developed and 'liberal' usage of the methodology. Essentially, Willis' argument is that naturalistic American (and British) writers have deluded themselves about their alleged scientific and objective 'pursuit of truth' in field-work, ie. that at least partial subjectivity on the part of the researcher is an inevitability due to a commitment to his or her own 'self-reflexivity'. Willis' essay seeks to identify "the really central principles of the qualitative method" (1980: 88) for a more acceptable method of investigative sociological inquiry.

According to Willis, although the field-worker should ideally set out with a basic rejection of theoretical plans and an intention of allowing native concepts to emerge, if ever, by themselves, we should however recognize the impossibility of approaching field-work completely atheoretically. He refers to this as the 'manifest posture'. Theory must be temporarily put aside since it "can only, ultimately, demonstrate its own assumptions" (89) but it cannot be completely disregarded. The participant-observer who enters the field with prior theoretical aspirations endangers 'disturbing' it, and the avoidance of this should be a central objective. Willis argues, however, that even the application of his or her proposed qualitative as opposed to quantitative techniques necessarily involves a positivistic preservation of the native group as

'object' to some extent. The participant-observer cannot be completely neutral or objective since in the final analysis his or her own perceptions of the respondents are necessarily mediated through his or her own interpretations of the world. Moreover, back at the work desk, the researcher is obliged to make theoretical sense of data and to undo 'inconsistencies, contradictions and misunderstandings'. This is the dilemma of the participant-observer. He or she must strive to capture the essential qualitative experience of the subject's world, but must perforce employ subjective quantitative external structures to do so. In a sense, he or she is entangled in a positivist trap. Thus we remain at the point where the participant-observer is:

> ...still in need of a method which respects evidence, seeks corroboration and minimizes distortion, but which is without rationalist natural-science-like pretence. (1980: 91)

The final problem emerging for the participant-observer exists in the relation between subjective and cultural systems which, Willis assures us, the participant-observer cannot afford to ignore. In the social relationship he or she shares with subjects, the investigator must play a self-reflexive role at all times.

The importance of recent discussions of identification and objectivity in field-work, particularly seen in Willis' work, lies in demonstrating to sociologists some unrealistic goals lurking in the positivist tradition. Emphases on true scientific objectivity are being undermined by a demand for the participant-observer to remain open and direct in field-work, an approach which is now seen as fundamental in recreating "something of the richness, of the original" (Willis, 1980: 89).

Willis (1980:94) agrees with earlier writers (Gold, 1958; Gans, 1968) that there are various techniques in data gathering, but underlines that these arise purely through observers' theoretical interest and a latent positivistic orientation. He argues that the investigator should avoid "the hegemonizing tendency of technique" which emerges particularly at points of uncertainty, suspending creativity and the element of surprise. Willis' spectrum of research methods includes: participation; observation; participant as observer; observer as participant; 'just being around'; group discussion; recorded group discussion; unfocused interview; recorded unfocused interview. Hegemonizing techniques should be avoided because equally valuable data can be collected, says Willis, by a less prestigious technique such as what he refers to as 'just being around', as by the technique that has traditionally been viewed as the most productive in field-work - participant as observer. The specific research context ought to determine the relevant technique, but through the dextrous employment of a cross-checking combination of methods, the participant-observer will be afforded a more adequate level of qualitative results.

Procedure in the Study

It was mentioned above that three types of investigative procedure were conducted in this study. First, since a full understanding of a rugby subculture requires an insight into the history

of the game itself, the origins and development of rugby were examined from its genesis in the mid-nineteenth century British public schools to the late 1960's, concentrating specifically on the systematic game and non-game aspects which traditionally came to characterize the sport. Various changes that have been occurring in the British game over approximately the last twenty years were considered to be of significance for the study and have also been noted. The range of sources relied on in this area included historians of rugby and historians of education and, particularly to gain insight into recent developments in the British game, biographies and autobiographies of (mostly current and ex-international) players themselves.

Second, the introduction of rugby at the end of the nineteenth century in North America was examined, from its relative lack of popularity at the beginning of the twentieth century through to its recent reintroduction as an increasingly popular sport. Again, the work of (particularly sports) historians was heavily relied upon. Extensive correspondence also took place with other sources including national and provincial or regional Rugby Union Boards, university teams and coaches, documented records of clubs, annual reports, minutes of meetings, magazines and newsletters, and informal interviews with ex-players, ex-officials etc. Questions for the various informed sources centered around why rugby had been reintroduced in North America in the 1960's at a time when the dominant sporting forms (especially football) began to receive widespread criticism (seen particularly in the development of the 'play movement', new games, critical studies of sports and biographical

critiques of football) and why, at a time when rugby was losing its traditional cultural forms in one setting (Britain), it reappeared in another with a full complement of cultural characteristics borrowed from the British rugby 'world'.

Finally, ethnographic data has been used as a methodological base in a comparative analysis of the subcultural forms associated with rugby in the United Kingdom and North America. Encouraged principally by Ned Polsky's 1969 assurance that an adequate understanding of deviant life-styles can best be achieved by employing participant-observation as a methodology in field research, and by recent breakthroughs in cultural studies at the University of Birmingham vis-a-vis the use of a range of methodological techniques (Butters, 1976; Roberts, 1976; Willis, 1980), data were collected during one season of intense participant-observation with an Ontario university rugby team, and supplemented with extensive informal observations of and interviews with rugby players in England, Canada and the U.S.A. Specifically, the research concentrated on pre- and post-game behaviour of players and the meanings attached to that behaviour, including subcultural values, behaviours, attitudes, symbols and rituals.

Since deviant behaviour is unlikely to be so labelled unless it attracts public attention, deviance also requires an audience. Thomson (1976), Donnelly (1980) and Vanreusel and Rensen (1981) have suggested that members of some sports subcultures actually create their own image of social outlaws. Thomson (1976) has in fact described the remarkable tolerance of the public to the behaviour of rugby players, specifically

suggesting that certain acts are permitted to them that would not be permitted to others. Thus the responses of new and non-members of the rugby subculture were considered to be an important source of data. Amongst the various interviewed sources reacting to the situation were past and present Athletic Directors, rugby and other coaches, bus drivers, police and campus patrolmen, a gaoler, bar and restaurant owners, as well as 'other' members of or visitors to Rugby Clubs - spectators, players' girlfriends and wives, club officials etc. These interviews were supplemented with the author's own experience of the rugby fraternity in Britain, Canada and the U.S.A.

Three basic participant-observation techniques were employed in the research:

a. Field Diary

During all road trips and away games a diary was maintained of observations and events, including informal interviews and overheard conversations. Throughout training sessions, pre- and post-game locker room interaction and social events, a record of general observations was also kept, together with first impressions of incidents as they occurred. These were at later stages compared to more thorough understandings of the normative code of behaviour of subculture members as they developed.

b. Informal Interviews and Discussion

Discussions with team members were recorded whenever possible. At first this began by note-taking after the event in order to lighten any feelings of discomfort the interviewees might have but, as relations developed, this later came to include both note-taking in the interviewees

presence and recording interviews on tape. Interviews were also held, though less frequently, in informally assembled discussion groups, usually with two to four members present. The most informal technique adopted has been referred to as 'just being around' by Paul Willis (1980: 94). Particularly during locker room and beer-up interaction (when players proved least willing to be interviewed), listening to conversations and generally 'taking in' the situation occupied much research time.

c. Use of Particular Members of the Subculture as Informants

One strategy of investigative field-research may be employed, either when the observer is absent or when circumstances are unfavourable, to good effect. This is the use of 'key informants' (Fine, 1980). Sometimes, the contribution of informants is so illuminative that it becomes integral to the entire field-work project. 'Doc' in 'Street Corner Society' (Whyte, 1943) is probably the most famous example in the sociological literature. Over the course of the rugby season, relations between the present investigator and some of the players developed extremely well. The latter were, at times, willing to volunteer information that the investigator had missed or overlooked, and advantage was taken of this.

Footnotes

1. W. F. Whyte's now famous Appendix to 'Street Corner Society' (1943) illustrates the central importance of striking good initial field-relations.

2. See Turowetz (1974) and Shaffir et al (1980) for an appraisal of this problem.

3. H. Gans cited in H. S. Becker et al, 1968: 302.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF RUGBY FOOTBALL IN THE UNITED KINGDOM AND NORTH AMERICA

United Kingdom

Although its very earliest history remains unclear, we can trace the origins of Rugby Football to forms of Medieval folk-games played in England before the fourteenth century, such as types of handball and hurling (Dunning and Sheard, 1979). During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, inflated animal bladders began to be used by peasant communities as instruments of amusement in regional variations of games involving large numbers of people kicking these 'balls' in open spaces, using trees and other natural objects for boundaries and goals. From various sources (Dunning and Sheard, 1979; Atyeo, 1979) we are fairly certain that these games were played under disorderly and often violent conditions and according to unwritten rules.

In the late eighteenth century, elaborated versions of such games were incorporated into the public schools and, at first, they were played with as much unsophisticated vigour as townsfolk had earlier played in the fields. Dunning and Sheard (1979: 96) inform us that although civilizing aspects were later to be introduced such games began as 'mock-fights', and Atyeo (1979: 196) similarly notes that:

> There were few rules and players showed no hesitation in trampling or maiming their opponents. For long periods the ball simply disappeared, trapped under the massive heaving scrum.

Adding to the disorganization of such events, it was not uncommon for spectators to join in the mayhem.

Walvin (1975: 31) argues that since public school life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was often coarse and brutal, football was an extremely well-suited game:

> Often enough the only virtues which the life at public schools with any certainty inculcated seem to have been those of the dark ages - courage, ability to bear pain and loyalty to immediate companions. Social and recreational behaviour reflected the general style of life in the schools and the games played consequently mirrored the hierarchical and violent nature of school society in general.

Increasingly, however, and helped by public school masters of the period (Arnold of Rugby; Almond of the Scottish public school Loretto Academy; Cotton of Marlborough; Thring of Uppingham and Vaughan of Harrow) football began to be administered as a means of keeping the usually boisterous behaviour of boys in check and was hence moulded into more organized forms in the public schools. A sense of this change at Rugby school is captured by Bamford (1960: 186) who notes that masters there:

> ...organized games to give the boys a legitimate outlet for energy within sight of the law. This was well put by another old Rugbeian, A. G. Butler:
>
> '...much of their old mischief arose from having nothing else to do... they prefer to run, leap, climb, catch, kill and carry off something.'
>
> The energies of boys were drained on the playing fields, and their passion for hero-worshipping and

> gang-construction caged within the concept of the House. Significantly, when the new discipline was introduced into other schools there went with it rugby football.

Thus rugby began to reflect public schools' characteristic forms of social organization.

Since the structure of football was made to reflect the orthodox hierarchy of public school relations, seen especially in the 'prefect-fag' system - "the peculiar system of authority relations which grew up in such schools" (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 2) - it follows that during games all but the most talented fags[1] were made to play in the least interesting and usually most dangerous positions (defensive positions such as goalkeeper), authority being vested in the hands of senior (and usually biggest) boys. Captains, as prefects themselves, were responsible for calling decisions, but in the event of a disagreement final word went to the senior masters. Since the purpose of football was to promote self-control[2], however, interruptions were kept to a minimum. Through football, rather than placing any emphasis on an achievement orientation, masters like Arnold at Rugby encouraged themes of companionship, sportsmanship and selfless leadership. Arnold inculcated the belief that:

> It was better (for pupils) to play for the good of their companions rather than merely for the sake of themselves. Thus... he had also sown the seeds of the team spirit at Rugby during those turbulent years. (Wymer, 1953: 174-5)

As a crucial part of their moral education, boys were expected to learn how both to be controlled and to control, to obey and command through

the athletic sphere. As Mangan (1981: 135) notes:

> ...manliness... embraced antithetical values - success, aggression and ruthlessness, yet victory within the rules, courtesy in triumph, compassion for the defeated.

More instrumentally, as we have seen the athletic sphere was exploited to steer boys away from their usual inclinations towards drinking, idleness and, since many of the schools were located in rural surroundings, poaching, hunting and fishing. Poaching in fact seems to have provoked a good deal of public attention at the time. Ford (1977: 179), for example, informs us that:

> Cotton, the headmaster of Marlborough, saw the game as a way of preventing his boys from spending much of their time poaching, about which many of the local landowners had bitterly complained.[3]

By the mid-nineteenth century, the new pedagogical ideal of 'Muscular Christianity'[4], strongly advocated at Rugby in Arnoldian didacticism, underlined that the virtues of manliness, self-control and good living were all to be developed in the sports setting. Mason (1980: 12) writes that sport was central to Arnold's aim of producing "an enlightened ruling class imbued with Christian principles and values". Similarly, Mackenzie (1905: 247) notes that at Loretto Academy in Scotland, Almond's moral ideals were so bound up with his physical ideals "that it was impossible to separate them". From its very beginnings, football was organized as a medium through which physical exhibitions of courage could be combined with Christian ideals to stimulate the development of the 'complete man'. For Almond:

> More germane to his health notions was his value for courage, for mere bulldog tenacity and headlong

> gallantry, in the first place, but much more for that rarer quality, blended of the intellectual and the physical, which we call presence of mind... Temperance, courage, and espirt de corps, then, were the trinity virtues which all his hygienic arrangements were intended to promote, and together they formed the 'Sparto - Christian' ideal.[5] (Mackenzie, 1905: 247)

As we can see from the Report of the Public Schools Commission (1864), the efforts of Arnold, Almond and others were at the time rewarded with considerable praise:

> It is not easy... to estimate the degree to which the English people are indebted to these schools for qualities on which they pique themselves most - for the capacity to govern others and control themselves, their aptitude for combining freedom with order, their public spirit, their vigour and manliness of character, their strong but not slavish respect for public opinion, their love of healthy sports and exercise. (Simon, 1974: 312)

The Report concluded that the public schools were fundamental in moulding the moral and religious character of the British gentleman.

From the mid-1840's on, it was with the help of public school graduates moving to different areas of the country to work or to extend their education at university that the dissemination of public school football came about and knowledge of the game spread into society at large. Irvine (1979: 22), for example, notes that:

> In 1839 at Cambridge University a group of undergraduates, among them Albert Pell (Rugby and Trinity) and Edgar Montague (Shrewsbury and Caius) formed a club - the very first rugby club.

Hence, at Oxford and (more particularly) Cambridge the role of ex-public school men was crucial as they sought to establish football as a sporting activity, arranging fixtures between new town based teams and old schools.

The organization of such fixtures, however, and especially differential acceptance of rules on the part of Old Boys and other players led to immediate difficulties. Although, as Harris (1975: 107) notes, an informal meeting was held between team representatives at Cambridge in 1848 setting up a code of laws called the 'Cambridge Rules', the various school origins of the players nevertheless served to present unsurmountable problems.

By the mid-nineteenth century, most schools had adopted its own idiosyncratic playing technique, often determined by topographical factors such as actual playing space available. Walvin (1975: 32), for example, writes that while the emphasis was on dribbling in the enclosed cloisters at Charterhouse, at Eton, where playing space was more abundant, the ball could be kicked for larger distances. All schools began by permitting handling the ball, but usually insisted that once caught the player must kick it. The practice of holding and 'running-in' with the ball, distinctive features of rugby today, seems to have begun at Rugby school between 1820-30, providing for the game a significant sense of direction.[6]

A result of differential playing codes was an expanding divergence between school and other teams wanting to run holding the ball and those preferring simply to dribble with their feet. Despite numerous attempts to bring the two forms of play together in a general codification of rules, this division was finally accentuated by the setting up of the Football Association in 1863, a move which apparently ignored the decisions of the Cambridge Conference of 1848. The Association banned

traditional public school forms of football including the kicking of one's opponent in the shins (hacking), charging the goalkeeper and the more recent running-in technique, preferring instead to focus almost entirely on dribbling. It was, in fact, the older, better established and more aristocratic schools such as Eton and Charterhouse that began to view 'hacking' and other features of the football game as uncivilized. In contrast, controversy resulting from the foundation of the Football Association centered on Rugby's and other newer and less aristocratic schools' insistence that it was unmanly to do away with these well-established forms. The controversy provoked a break that was never to be resolved and from it the individual games of soccer and rugby as we know them today can be seen to derive.

Following the formation of the Football Association and largely enhanced by the missionary assistance of former pupils, the two forms of football began to attract a spectator following. The public school connection ensured that for approximately the first decade of the Association's existence players and spectators were drawn almost exclusively from middle- and upper-classes. As Dunning and Sheard (1979) argue, however, football was soon to undergo a process of 'democratization', ie. an increasing involvement by participants of a lower social status. Wherever ex-public school men settled in numbers, in university towns or deprived urban communities, they attempted to organize local teams. Increasingly, the now well-established public school ideology of Muscular Christianity and Athleticism was seen as a key to help the poor rise from their physically and socially deprived position. Easy

to learn, requiring no expense, and playable under almost any circumstances, rugby was readily accessible to the working-classes. It provided for them a break from the monotony of factory work and an avenue through which identifications with friends and community could be enhanced. This meant, of course, that the upper-class monopoly of rugby had been challenged and that working-class values began to infiltrate the game.

It was from about 1870 onwards that people from the Northern and Midlands working-class towns, especially in Lancashire and Yorkshire, came to play rugby on a widespread scale. As they did so, the values the industrial classes expressed in the game came to take on a professional flavour.[7] Cup competitions and leagues were introduced, encouraging what Dunning and Sheard (1979: 145) have referred to as "the growing 'monetization' of the game", manifested largely in the shape of such phenomena as admission fees and player payments. It was such modes of 'shamateurism', as these developments were called, enforced by entrepreneurs aspiring to change rugby into a profit-oriented business, that finally led to a splintering of Northern clubs wanting to form their own 'Rugby League'. The more bourgeois proponents of the amateur ethic abhorred the thought of playing rugby for its own sake. Their lives were characterized by a stark dichotomy between the work sphere and the leisure sphere and, as far as they were concerned, "to play for money was to make it work" (Dunning, 1971: 149). Such was the hostility of middle- and upper-class groups towards the threat posed by the incipient professionalization of the sport that officials from the Northern and

Midland Football Associations declared it illegal. Nevertheless, the 1880's saw a marked "erosion of amateur attitudes, values and structures" (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 9) in the North. There, expanding industrialization, coupled with spreading dominance of bourgeois groups unfettered by the values of the public schools and the accompanying amateur ethic enhanced the effects of shamateurism. The break that was hence created between the amateur Union and the professional League games still exists as concretely today.[8]

The 'deep-structures' of the amateur-professional controversy are well brought out by Dunning and Sheard (1979). Their developmental and configurational approach draws on the historical evidence that the 1880's and 1890's in particular were decades of mounting class tension, and leads them to argue that the changing patterns of class relations in that period and accompanying anxieties were crucial determinants in the controversy. They show how, for example, the growing power of the proletariat, both on and off the football field, was received as threatening by the aristocracy and gentry. At work, his latent power was being transformed into 'real' power in the formation of trades unions and the development of the Labour Party and, on the field of play, clubs which had decided to maintain the essentially bourgeois amateur ethic in districts where professionalism was establishing itself are likely to have suffered greatly against more professionally-run sides. Thus, class factors played a central role in the split between the different rugby games and the outcome of this 'class-war' was the development of a 'segregated sports participation' (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 197) in which amateurs and professionals were kept well apart.

Dunning and Sheard (1979) have illuminated two other crucial processes integral to the structural changes going on inside the rugby game at this time. First, the clientele of the newer (but socially ascending) public schools such as Rugby, Marlborough and Cheltenham were experiencing 'embourgeoisement', ie. largely through the influences of industrialization, the clientele of these schools were gradually reducing the power of the predominantly aristocratic older public schools. That is, the former were now able to express 'manly' standards themselves in a leisure-excitement context. At the same time, argue Dunning and Sheard, aristocratic-based public schools such as Eton, Charterhouse and Harrow were undergoing a 'civilizing' process, ie. increasingly, regulations demanding stricter control on violence in games were emerging in the older public schools. Thus we find that it was the newer and less aristocratic public schools, aspiring to perpetuate the 'manly' and essentially amateur aspects of football, that developed the Rugby Union game as we know it. The older public schools "advocated 'manliness' of a more restrained and civilized kind" (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 101).

We can see, then, that even from its formative years, the major emphasis in rugby football has been on the game aspects of courage, manliness and sportsmanship. Although hacking would ironically become taboo in both rugby and soccer shortly after the formation of the Rugby Football Union in 1871, the rough physical aspects of body-tackling and running-in were tightly held on to. Protecting themselves from the 'civilizing' aspects of football, players began, especially at Rugby school, to isolate themselves and sever ties with advocates of

professional football, and to develop and even accentuate the original game and non-game aspects of the sport as they saw them. It seems that Rugby men saw Rugby League as a threat to the cultural integrity of the entire football tradition. It fostered neither the ideals of true manliness or amateurism and sportsmanship. Thus:

> The close-knit character of the school community served to insulate Rugby boys from the pressure of those who sought to force them to 'civilize' their football. It formed a protective shell which enabled them to resist outside pressure and hence to retain, at least for longer than was possible elsewhere, the traditional structure of the game. (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 120)

Undoubtedly, a strong emotional attachment prevailed over standards of masculinity and an amateur ethos acquired by rugby players in the specific context of certain English public schools, a tradition that has been preserved over the years in the Rugby Union game.

Clearly, the central thrust of early rugby proponents was a concern with intense exhibitions of masculinity. Mackenzie (1905: 73) quotes H. H. Almond who in 1892 expressed a belief that:

> ...the great end of the game (is) to produce a race of robust men, with active habits, brisk circulations, manly sympathies and exhuberant spirits.

More recently, describing the development of rugby in the mid-nineteenth century public schools and universities, Sheard and Dunning (1981: 159) have conceptualized the Rugby Club as a type of 'male-preserve' which in their view "came to function as a social setting for the expression, often in an extreme form, of the then current norms of masculinity". Not surprisingly, therefore, traditional behavioural forms associated with

the non-game behaviour of players have also long indicated very masculine orientations.

We know that football was used by Dr. Arnold and other head-masters as a means of keeping the extra-curricular behaviour of boys in check, and it seems that at least during school careers time spent playing football did in fact offer an alternative to activities such as idleness, rowdy behaviour and excessive drinking. It is hypothesized, however, that once away from the authority-laden public school environment, players re-established their heavy drinking and other unruly habits under the cloak of the university Rugby Club which "functioned in part as a perpetuation of the all-male community of the boarding school" (Sheard and Dunning, 1981: 161) and where restraints against such forms of behaviour were limited. We think such an hypothesis is viable partly because the same situation prevails today, but also because we have evidence that college life in the mid-nineteenth century lent itself readily to an array of social vices. Simon (1974: 294), for example, refers to the Report of the Oxford University Commission (1852) noting that:

> Since there was little encouragement to work, students tended to be idle and college life was apt to degenerate into lounging and indolence, gambling and vice; 'the three great temptations of the place' the report quoted from Mark Pattison's evidence, were 'fornication, wine and... betting'.

Also, we have early evidence that even before the turn of the century, rugby tours acquired a reputation for encouraging a series of vices centered around excessive drinking and unsociable, unruly behaviour on

the part of players. The following, for instance, is a letter written by Almond complaining of the customs that were apparently establishing around the rugby game in the late nineteenth century, and acted out particularly on tour:

> I have been talking to several people about the University football tours, and everyone agrees that they are a bad thing. They knock the men up, discredit the 'varsity, which, of course, cannot play up to form, depreciate the value of a blue, put temptations in mens' way to drink and eat too much at those vile dinners, waste time in vacations... and help to raise a hue and cry against football from the relatives of the men who get hurt, fagged out, or spend too much money. (Mackenzie, 1905: 297)

Certain values and vices exhibited by late nineteenth century players were expanded and developed into a series of subcultural qualities that came to characterize Rugby Football and are still in evidence in the structure of the game today. This structure includes certain values, behaviours, attitudes, symbols and rituals that developed after graduation from public school at club level, including university teams, Old Boys teams and newly established town and city teams. Amongst these cultural forms are various reiterations and parodies, reactions and responses of and to the controls of British public schools, including: game aspects of amateurism and sportsmanship; courage and manliness; non-game aspects of male-bonding; communal bath; repressed homosexuality; group singing (possibly parodying the chapel hymn singing of public schools)[9]; rowdiness; excessive drinking (drinking was not permitted in the public schools); the vilification of women (for those raised in the all-male bonding of the public schools, women were an unnerving if not

unknown quantity). As Sheard and Dunning (1981: 157) have indicated, the persistent acting out of these subcultural values has earned rugby players 'a specific reputation' both within and outside of sporting circles.

Such an acting out of these subcultural values perhaps reached a peak in the 1940's and 1950's in the United Kingdom in what Michael Green (1967) has called 'The Art of Coarse Rugby'. Recognizable both on and off the field, coarse rugby involved the 'raw' aspects of the game with the emphasis being very much on levity. As David Irvine (1979: 49) has written, it focused on a world where:

> For six days a week... pitches were used for grazing; as was clearly evidenced on the seventh. As for washing, a galvanised bucket, cold water and a bar of 'Fairy' was the ultimate luxury. Tactics were primitive rather than basic and, with luck, as many as twelve or thirteen players would turn up for an important match.

Irvine correctly demonstrates that many readers mistakenly took Green's book for fiction. Evidence unearthed by the present investigator suggests that the primitive conditions hinted at by Green were indeed the norm before the 1960's. One ex-player, for example, underlined that changing facilities during the 1950's were remarkable for their crudity:

> At our club we used to get changed in the back of a pub and the bath there was a stable in which the lower door had been taken off, bricked up, and the whole place had been filled with cold water. And I'm sure they hardly ever changed the water. It was common for us to get changed in the back of pubs.

Of course, coarse rugby was also accompanied by a good deal of 'oval-shaped humour'. Another ex-player, for example, recalled a now famous incident at his club:

> I'll always remember lending J___ a pair of shorts. This will have been around the late 1950's. He looked at them and said 'they look pretty small don't they?' 'Well', I said, 'that's the style these days', to which he responded 'My God, where the hell do I put my cigarettes and matches! '

Finally, various game tactics also became synonymous with coarse rugby. The following is a quotation from the same ex-player:

> One of the ways the game has changed is in the shape of the ball itself. In the fifties and sixties the game was played with a purely leather ball, whereas now the ball is covered with a waterproof coating. Of course, on wet days the ball of old would get very wet and heavy and be difficult to pass and just about impossible to kick. So when we played against a very skilful side, we'd employ the tactic of having one of those very old, very round, very heavy balls in reserve. We'd kick the ball into the bushes or the stream and bring on the 'new' one which always served to slow down the opposition. I even remember it helped us to win a game against O___ once!

Generally, then, coarse rugby involved an array of game and non-game features which shared lines of commonality with the original public school game of rugby.

The strength and integrity of the subculture that developed around Rugby Union (including coarse tactics) appears to have remained intact as part of a middle- and upper-middle class preserve in the United Kingdom until the 1960's. Since then, great changes have begun to take place and both on- and off-field behaviour of players is seen to have undergone serious modification. On the field, players are indicating a much more competitive and professional attitude towards the game. In conjunction, greater emphasis is being placed on advanced

technical and scientific methods of coaching and training. Off the field, this new concern with fitness and winning is being illustrated in an increasing orientation towards restraint and control vis-a-vis the forms of subcultural behaviour that have come to characterize rugby. That is, the British Rugby Union game is currently undergoing professionalizing processes or, as Atyeo (1979: 289) puts it, "Rugby Union has now become an amateur game played to professional standards".

An indication of this more serious approach is evidenced in the waning of the obscene song in British Rugby Clubs. Increasingly, the singing of these songs is being restricted to special events only - particularly Easter tours. As one ex-player in his fifties informed the researcher:

> Obscene songs have mostly been forgotten now. I used to have a huge catalogue of them but no-one asks for it anymore. Every now and then you'll hear the lads singing but I think it happens mostly after a good game or on tour. Actually, I would also say that the songs have been killed off since women have been coming to clubs in larger numbers and I think we've lost out there.

Principally, this example of restraint as regards singing would seem to indicate an (ongoing) erosion of male-dominance in the British Rugby Club.

With an increasing emphasis on the importance of winning arises an accompanying pressure on players to perform well. For example, Bob Hiller, a former England captain, offered the following explanation for his premature retirement from the International game: "Basically, we play rugby for fun. It was never meant to carry the pressure it now does" (Dunning and Sheard, 1979: 258).

It is feasibly such a win-at-all-costs attitude that is bringing to the game an expanding predominance of violent and malicious play. Rugby is in many ways a ready-made vehicle for aggression[10], but traditionally players have acted out their self-control according to unwritten but nonetheless legitimate laws. If players have behaved outside the confines of such 'laws' they have done so consciously and deliberately. Many observers perceive that today these 'silent laws' are being contravened on a regular basis. Dunning and Sheard (1979: 274), for example, quote an article in a recent British newspaper which focused centrally on this issue:

> Recently punching and kicking have become increasingly prevalent in rugby and soccer... Rugby was once a gentleman's game, providing ample opportunity for violent contact within the rules. But gentlemen didn't take advantage of the rules to kick and punch. This is not so any longer.
>
> It is quite clear... that Common Law assaults are prevalent in the modern game. In a T.V. interview some time ago a famous Lions forward let it be known that the motto on tour was 'get your intimidation in first'.

Assuredly, there are those who minimize the role that violence plays in today's rugby. Dunning and Sheard themselves, for example, argue that reports like the latter are exaggerated versions of the real situation. However, rather more conclusive evidence can be found in Atyeo (1979: 290) who describes the recent findings of a Yorkshire physician, Dr. Ian Adams:

> In his experience rugby's injury rate has increased by something like 25 percent within a decade. Besides the traditional afflictions of shoulder and knee damage, there has been a marked increase in the number of injuries caused by 'violence around the head'... the result of both fiercer physical contact and a rise in extra-curricular

> violence. 'Injuries have become so widespread', said Dr. Adams, 'that the Rugby Football Union (R.F.U.) has now introduced special medical courses for trainers'.

Significantly, Dr. Adams had no qualms as to the explanation of such a new trend: "Players now play to win... and Rugby Union is now a very different game to what it was because of it". Not surprisingly, one eventuality of the alleged increasingly violent mode of play is that the Rugby Football Union has ordered referees and officials to clamp down on offending players in case the present predicament is further exacerbated.

Correlated to the increasing competitive image of modern play stands the recent widespread and ongoing adoption of scientific and technical methods of coaching and training and, unlike the previous issue, there would appear to be no argument over this. Gareth Edwards (1979: 49), an ex-Welsh International, has recently commented:

> Only now, in the 1970's, when team preparation is so sophisticated, I see what a Steptoe outfit Welsh International rugby used to be.

In another autobiography, Chris Laidlaw (1973: 11), an ex-New Zealand International, also traces the introduction of scientific methods of training back to the 1960's, and notes that the change was at first not welcomed equally throughout the rugby world:

> The decision to go all out on coaching in Britain taken in 1968-9, although at last bearing fruit, was highly unpopular in some quarters.

Laidlaw, in fact, goes one step further than Edwards in suggesting that the new found emphasis on coaching techniques has precipitated the removal of the amateur ethos from modern rugby:

> Amateurism, like Avery Brundage, has retired from the fray. At British public schools the walls of

> gymnasiums are bespattered with diagrams of passing and kicking techniques. First XV members during winter term are lucky to get one day off from training. The pressure on British youth simply to take part has gone. Replacing it is the scientific devotion to winning.

The controversy over the imminent professionalization of the Rugby Union game has recently come to a head in Britain with discoveries that a well-known sports company has been providing equipment for and paying International players. Such overt levels of sponsorship do of course impose on rugby professional qualities. As one knowledgeable ex-referee recently assured the present investigator, however, the relevant authorities are adamant that such modes of 'shamateurism' will be repelled:

> This has been going on for a long time. Secret payments or rewards have been given since I remember, but I've spoken to the secretary of English Rugby Union and he's determined to stamp this out. Lets face it, International players and officials are entertained and receive expenses - beer bought, hotel fees, wined and dined etc. - but these have long been accepted as legitimate advantages.

The immediate question is, of course, are subsidies of this type enhancing a professional orientation towards the game?

While it may be true that there is widespread concern over professional influences penetrating the game in the shape of new approaches to training, winning and sponsors, some commentators argue that there is no sign, as Irvine (1979: 15) puts it: "that this has impaired the real fellowship which is the game's valued foundation". He goes on to substantiate the point:

> The competitive element may be stronger, horizons may have broadened and organization may have risen to new levels but thousands still give of their time and effort without reward just as their forefathers did. Rugby has developed and thrived in the hands of such men for over 150 years because humour, grief, happiness, fellowship and the desire to win - all component parts of the human character - have been so effectively encompassed on the rugby field.

Further, if we also consider the modern objectives of Rugby Union as set out by the English Rugby Football Union in its Centenary year (1971), we can see that the powers that be inside the perimeters of the rugby world are concerned with encouraging much the same ideals as mid-nineteenth century public school masters:

> The object of any match is to win, not at any price, but fairly, scoring the maximum number of points as conditions allow. The object of becoming involved in the game as a player, referee, coach, administrator or spectator is wider: it is simply enjoyment and friendship. The amity and goodwill, which are bigger than the result of any particular match, endure long after the game has been forgotten. (Irvine, 1979: 21)

Nevertheless, recent changes in the rugby game - the alleged increase in violence on the field of play, the continuing influx of scientific methods of coaching, the fact that young schoolboys of nine and ten are being yelled at by parents from the sidelines to "give all they've got" in 'Mini-Rugby', and the recent furore over the boot-money scandal - have all served to cause rejuvenated anxiety over rugby's status as an amateur sport. Although the widespread belief would appear to be that an ultimate change in the status of the game may, as yet, be several steps away, recent and ongoing concern over the issue continues to express itself no less vehemently in rugby circles.

Finally, it is interesting to note that in comparison with older members of the subculture (ex-players, referees, officials, administrators etc.) modern-day International players like Edwards and Laidlaw[11] seem more consenting to the view that "The laws relating to amateurism desperately require revision" (Duckham, 1980: 209). For example, the Treasurer of the English Rugby Football Union, W. C. Ramsay, is considered to have a 'progressive-conservative' attitude towards these apparent changes in the modern game, but his amateur instincts still shine through very clearly:

> The game must be protected at all times, for it is our game, the game of rugby men everywhere, and while we must progress within the times and compete with other forms of sport, we must also ensure that nothing is done to make it less enjoyable to play or merely a social entertainment. Rugby football is for rugby players and this is the basis for administration at top level. It can be helped financially in many ways, but professionalism must never be allowed to rear its ugly head... We have a fine game to care for, and we owe it a duty. We must never let it down. (In J. B. G. Thomas, 1970: 93)

Contrast this view with that of the recently retired International Gareth Edwards (1979: 93):

> Beware! Professional rugby football could come, and will be of a higher standard than anything we part-timers can produce. The mood is ripe among players, as it was for Kerry Packer with the cricketers, for a privateer to step in. Towards the end of an international career, players less fortunate than me, who have no satisfactory job, would be easily persuaded to tour the world for the right reward for their families.

Increasingly, modern players are forwarding the view that they are deserving of more extensive rewards for their toil. To some extent,

in a life conditioned by advanced forms of technology, and in a world where Rugby Union, as an amateur sport, is one of the few remaining sports whose top participants do not enjoy high monetary rewards, we might note the inevitability of such attitudinal changes. Indeed, they may be representative of current changes in the political economy of sport as a whole. Time alone will be the determinant.

North America

As townsfolk and peasants played games that can be considered as precursors to the Rugby Football game in the United Kingdom before the nineteenth century, so Indians also developed their own variations of ball games before that time in North America. Atyeo (1979: 203-4) records that like their early British counterparts, Indian games took the form of violent mob-ball rather than a civilized game format, and here again they were played by large numbers of participants and within very loosely defined boundaries. In the seventeenth century, however, early British immigrants introduced their own version of (still fairly brutal) mob-ball played with inflated animal bladders. Thus, although variations of ball games had been played by Indians and early colonists for many years before the late nineteenth century, it was not until that period that later immigrants, replete with the sporting influences of English public schools that North American football began to take on a more systematic appearance. In fact, North American rugby owes its

cultural heritage specifically to these nineteenth century settlers who brought with them across the Atlantic the still embryonic game-aspects of British rugby.

In the early nineteenth century, forms of football were introduced into the American colleges and in particular Yale, Harvard and Princeton by settlers. These institutions:

> ...were, like the public schools of England, extremely spartan establishments. Conditions were harsh and the discipline even harsher... It is not surprising then that American students also quickly developed a taste for rugged recreation. (Atyeo, 1979: 204)

Thus, another type of Muscular Christianity was developed in the context of North American colleges, and games were played according to such a prevailing ideology.

A rough game known as 'ballown' was first played at Princeton in 1820. Initially, the ball was advanced by players punching it with fists, but kicking soon took over as the major technique. During the first Monday of a fall term at Yale at around the same time, sophomore students organized a similar game against freshmen. They dressed up as Indians in war paint in a symbolic and bloody annihilation of the freshmen. By 1840, the game that subsequently came to be known as 'Bloody Monday' had become a familiar feature of American college recreation. It was so disorderly in fact that in 1860 the relevant authorities at Yale and Harvard banned 'Bloody Monday' altogether. By this time, however, its roots had been firmly laid and the ban was largely ineffectual. Only nine years later, on November ninth 1869, the first intercollegiate match was to take place between Rutgers and

Princeton.[12] Two games were played, each college winning one, but the rapidly developing rivalries evoked so much game violence that headmasters of the two colleges consulted and decided to cancel a third and deciding encounter in the interests of safety.

Like its corresponding forerunner in Britain, the early years of North American football were characterized by a series of rule disagreements and changes. At the time of the first 'Bloody Monday' and Rutgers vs. Princeton matches, the game played was more akin to elementary soccer than rugby. Rejecting the 'unmanly' dribbling game in the 1870's, and in favour of a rougher, more physical game, Harvard was the first college to divert its interests to traditional Rugby Union codes. However, such a switch was not accepted by other United States' universities and Harvard found it necessary to travel north to Canada in search of new and sympathetic opponents, McGill in particular.

The first match between McGill and Harvard was also the first to be played between a Canadian and an American team. It was played in Cambridge, Massachusetts on May 14th 1874 (Sturrock, 1976: 42). Harvard found that its technique of mostly kicking but occasionally running with the ball (known as the 'Boston game') complemented McGill's preference for British rugby rules, despite its never having played with an egg-shaped ball. We would probably be justified in asserting that the match was the first actual game of rugby played in the United States. In fact, since the game was played under the rugby-like rules of the Canadians, it seems that Frayne and Gzowski's (1965: 10) argument that "it was Canada that introduced the game to the United States in the

first place" would appear to hold true. Meanwhile, the other American colleges, led principally by the innovations of Walter Camp[13] at Yale, began to elaborate football rules into a specific and new code. The emerging game emphasized mechanized game forms such as 'mass plays' (highly organized group plays) and 'mass tactics' (such as rudimentary versions of the 'wedge' play as we know it), and replaced the rugby scrummage with a straight-lined scrimmage. It also reduced the number of players from the standard fifteen to eleven. Probably the rule that distinguished it most clearly from rugby was the henceforth legality of the forward pass. Finally, it accomodated a good deal more physical strength and violence than had previously been in evidence.[14] Thus:

> By 1887, the American game had already acquired considerably more sting than rugby: whereas in rugby the object was merely to stop the ball carrier, under American rules tackles were required to slam him to the ground; in rugby, only the ball carrier could be tackled, but on the American gridiron anyone was fair game. (Atyeo, 1979: 206)

Hence we note the genesis of American gridiron football.

Relying strongly on the early documentations of football by Camp and Deland (1896), Riesman and Denney (1969: 309) argue that the change in codes from the English football (soccer) to the new American game underlined much more than a simple conflict over rules:

> ...it became clear that American players, having tested the 'running' game, were willing to give up the soccer form. It became equally clear that they either did not want to, or could not, play Rugby according to the British rules. 'The American players found in this code (English Rugby Rules) many uncertain and knotty points which caused much trouble in their game, especially as they had no traditions, or older and more experienced players, to whom they could turn for the necessary explanations', says Camp.

For Riesman and Denney, the split between the different codes owes much to a specific cultural diffusion surrounding various rule ambiguities on the part of American college students. On the one hand, proponents of the English rugby game wanted to sustain the traditional play forms developed in the contexts of English public schools, while on the other, settlers unimpressed by ambiguous British rules aspired to develop a game to fit their new surroundings. As Riesman and Denney (1969: 310) put it:

> An effort was undertaken, at once systematic and gradual, to fill in by formal procedures the vacuum of etiquette and, in general, to adapt the game to its new cultural home.

Howard Nixon (1976: 14) has written that this 'effort' was principally concerned with attempts to rationalize and commercialize football and links this to a larger concern of American society in the twentieth century:

> The rationalization of the game could be viewed as a partial outcome of the capitalistic emphasis on productive efficiency in American society.

For Nixon, such productive efficiency was particularly evident in the rapid standardization of formal rules and regulations visible in football. In contrast with the essentially amateur ethos and lack of emphasis on an achievement-orientation fostered in British public school rugby, the American game became distinctly geared towards intense ends-directed as opposed to means-directed goals, ie. a pride in winning rather than a pride in performance, and this distinction is no less obvious today in North American football and rugby.

Clearly, then, the inception of rugby and the incentive for its maintenance and growth on the North American continent owes much to waves

of British immigration in the nineteenth century, but also to the attempts of garrison soldiers to integrate it into the sporting scenes of both the U.S.A. and Canada in the same period. The very earliest origins of the game in Canada and exact dates of events remain unclear, but Sturrock (1971: 16) has documented that:

> ...the credit for introducing Rugby football to Canada probably belongs to the British settlers who arrived from 1823 onwards, to the members of the regiments based in several main centres of the country, or to the members of the Royal Navy who were stationed at the Halifax and Esquimalt naval bases.

The author goes on to trace the first game of rugby in Canada to the year 1876[15] which took place on Vancouver Island between a Royal Navy team and one combined of civilians and land-forces. A local Vancouver newspaper report of a game on Easter Monday in the Spring of 1887 between New Westminster and Vancouver, similarly acknowledges rugby's origins:

> The game was played principally by men from Great Britain, who knew no other game of Rugby than that which they had previous to their coming to Canada.[16]

For early enthusiasts, rugby had much to offer in an otherwise demanding physical environment. Sturrock (1971: 335) notes that players "experienced a zest for life and a satisfaction of leisure well spent, in addition to the formulation of a host of lasting friendships". In a country as geographically vast as Canada, a crucial contributory factor to the early development of the game was late nineteenth century innovations in transportation which, of course, meant that more fixtures could be arranged. Still, however, the relative lack of means of transport

and its expense in the early years of the twentieth century meant that for Ontario and other Eastern teams, tours to the East, the Maritimes, the Eastern U.S.A. and even to Britain were more plausible than travelling to the Canadian West.

Apparently, by the end of the nineteenth century, rugby was being played in every province but Newfoundland (Sturrock, 1971: III). We know from Sturrock's study that before World War I, the game prospered in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island while it was popular for a short time only in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. In the latter provinces, sportsmen had taken more to the developing rules of Canadian football which, similar to the American game, was becoming increasingly concerned with mass plays and a singly professional attitude. In addition, the expansion of rugby throughout much of Canada was inhibited for meteorological reasons which rendered the game playable for short seasons only. As Sturrock (1971: IV) puts it:

> Due, in part, to this factor, touring sides from other countries accepted matches in British Columbia more often than in other provinces prior to 1939.

Thus, it is no surprise that over the years British Columbia (in particular) and the Maritimes have provided the major strongholds of rugby in Canada.

Just as rugby was beginning to flourish in Canada in the early twentieth century - the Rugby Union of Canada was formed in 1929 (Goodwin and Rhys, 1981) - the onset of World War II functioned to temporarily stunt its expansion. In the inter-war years, it was played principally by servicemen but on a minor scale. It was probably the

disablement and loss of innumerable influential rugby men overseas that precipitated a period of relative inactivity in the post-war years. Dennis Fletcher (cited in Sturrock, 1971: 308) has accounted for this hiatus in rugby's post-war development in the Toronto area in this way:

> The reason was painfully obvious. The depression and World War II completely stopped immigration from the British Isles. Rugger players can't play the game forever, and when the supply of new blood from overseas failed, the game just petered out. It needn't have. There were, are, and always will be, thousands of men in Canada qualified by age and physique to play this grandest of games. But alas, the former rulers of the rugger roost locally did not have the foresight, common sense, energy or patience to lay a Canadian foundation - to root the game among the Canadian youth.

Until 1949, in fact, only the University of Toronto club existed in the city and its environs until the Wanderers club was formed in that year.

On the whole, the interruptions of the wars proved costly and attempts to recover the previously developing state of affairs was slow in the post-war period. The heavy tolls of the wars meant not only that few players were on hand, but also that the structure of rugby authorities had dissipated. The situation was not enhanced by the fact that even until the mid-1950's the predominant sports encouraged in most secondary schools did not include rugby. Rather, sports such as basketball, football, soccer and track and field were developed. Hence Sturrock (1971: 336) perceptively arrives at the following conclusion:

> This probably accounted for the fact that the average age of the provincial representative player was higher than their counterparts in other Rugby-playing countries.

The post-war lull in Canadian rugby lasted until approximately the late 1950's and early 1960's, but since then a rejuvenated interest in the game seems to have occurred. This has been partly due to the restored impetus of rugby officials and authorities but also because in the mid-1950's, rugby was introduced as a school and college sport. In 1956 in Ontario, for example, where rugby was previously unknown in the schools, a Scotsman called J. Brown encouraged its development, and in 1959 the Ontario Federation of Schools Athletic Association introduced the game as a school sport on a widespread scale (Sturrock, 1971: 319). In addition, government moneys were made available at this time to various bodies responsible for the game's development in Canada:

> During the 1960's the game grew considerably at club level across the country and at youth level in most of the provinces, but particularly in British Columbia and Ontario. An increase in government grants, not only federally but also at a provincial level, saw a tremendous increase in the number of programmes being run for players, coaches and referees and also in the quality of these programmes. (Goodwin and Rhys, 1981: 52)

Finally, the re-escalation in popularity was clearly linked to subsequent upgradings in the standard of play of the national team, probably as a consequence of numerous tours in this period, specifically to Australia, Japan and Britain. Sturrock (1971: 338) argues that:

> The significant growth, especially since 1960, may have been indicative of a shift in the sporting preference of Canadian youth. The expansion and calibre of Rugby football in Canada reached the point where it received respect throughout the world. The defeats of the Australian, Japanese and British international sides, as well as the victories over the Oxford-Cambridge and the New Zealand Universities teams, and Yawata Iron and Steel, all

> in British Columbia, warranted widespread attention. Undoubtedly, an important factor in determining the direction and success of the game in Canada, especially since the late 1950's, was the cooperation and coordination among the Rugby officials.

(The current investigator's own interpretation of the re-popularization of rugby in Canada and the U.S.A. beginning in the late 1950's is dealt with in greater detail below and indeed constitutes the main line of argument of this thesis).

In 1965, a national governing body which had previously existed for the decade immediately prior to World War II was reformed as the Canadian Rugby Union (Goodwin and Rhys, 1981: 52). It functioned to organize matches on local, provincial, national and International levels, as well as mediating between the individual rugby boards. The latter have themselves only quite recently been formed - Nova Scotia Rugby Football Union in 1953, and Ontario Rugby Union in 1952, for example. At the time of writing, Canadian rugby continues to disseminate rapidly.

The patterns of development of Rugby Football in the U.S.A. are extremely similar. We have seen that recognizable forms of the British Rugby Union game were beginning to take shape in the American colonies of the late 1870's at the same time as a new cultural sporting form, derived directly from the parent game, was simultaneously expanding in the same environment.

In its infancy, the years immediately following the turn of the century were some of rugby's most prosperous in the U.S.A. Particularly around 1905-1906, the divergent football game came to receive widespread condemnation for the awesome levels of violence it was inculcating.

Menke (1944) informs us that it was around this time, indeed directly correlated to the criticism of football, that more and more colleges began to shift their focus to rugby. For example, Sturrock (1971: 40) demonstrates this change-over in Southern California:

> In the Fall of 1905, disapproval of American Football by the presidents of Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley resulted in Rugby Football being introduced there as a major intercollegiate sport.

Although the shift was rather shortlasted, rugby had been given sufficient time to take firm root on both Pacific and Atlantic coasts and continued in some quarters as a minor sport. Dick Moneymaker (1978)[17], for example, informs us that rugby was well-received on the West Coast between 1906 and up to the first World War. He writes:

> ...only rugby was played at West Coast universities. Equally important, it was also played in the majority of California High Schools. The California Rugby Union sent combined sides on tour to New Zealand, Australia, and likewise hosted tours during these early years.

After World War I, however, the American game again took precedence on the Pacific Coast and was reintroduced into university sporting calendars, but despite its dwindling popularity against the gridiron game, rugby remained intact in certain strongholds, such as at the San Franciscan club, the Olympians (Moneymaker, 1978).

An interrogation of America's sporting annals (eg. Encyclopedia Americana, 1965) reveals that its most acclaimed moments in rugby occurred at the 1920 and 1924 Olympic Games. Following an unexpectedly successful tour of British Columbia in 1919, and sponsored by a small

group of wealthy rugby enthusiasts, a representative team of American collegians sailed to Europe to compete in the 1920 Games. Although the British were not represented in the competition, to everyone's surprise the Americans reached the Final and in it beat the French 8-0 thus acquiring the considerable prestige of winning an Olympic gold medal. Back in America, news of the win understandably kindled renewed interest in the game. Four years later, the U.S.A. sent an equally well-qualified squad to the 1924 Games which repeated its earlier performance.

The 1920's and 1930's were, in fact, key times for the expansion of U.S.A. rugby. On the East Coast, ten clubs had been founded in the New York region alone by the early 1930's (Lee, 1978: 15) and a few examples are New York (1929), Harvard and Yale (1930), and Princeton (1931). This prompted the inauguration of a parent governing body - the Eastern Rugby Union - in 1934. The troubled years of World War II, however, again saw rugby's expansion temporarily stunted. As Lee (1978: 15) writes:

> Rugby ceased in the Spring of 1943 when a heavy concentration of foreign players returned to military service in their home countries and many American players joined the U.S. armed forces.

Rugby maintained a relatively low profile on the American sporting scene until the 1950's and 1960's. During this period clubs and unions began to reform. The Eastern Rugby Union, for example, was reactivated in 1954 with seven clubs under its aegis (Lee, 1978: 15). Within that union, tours began to play an increasing role on club itineraries, particularly to the Caribbean Islands, and such a trend has carried over to the present day, especially in college Spring breaks. Also, another

present trend - tours by Eastern clubs to the West - seem to have begun during this period. The American colleges in particular functioned as the promoters of rugby during the 1950's. The secondary schools, too, began to encourage the game more widely. For instance, on the East coast:

> Schoolboy rugby among the New England preparatory schools developed in the late 1950's continuing into the mid-1960's before dying out. It was not to be revived until the early 1970's and then in the large metropolitan centres of New York, Philadelphia and Washington... At this time a great number of club sides were organized as graduating college players were determined to continue to play. (Lee, 1978: 15)

Finally, Lee also asserts that the advent of the Fall season was established in the 1950's at around the same time that a rapid expansion in rugby occurred in the southern States.

Since the late 1950's, the game has continued to gather momentum in the U.S.A., and this is well illustrated by figues recently calculated by Goodwin and Rhys (1981: 162):

> There were around 3,000 players in 180 clubs 20 years ago. Today there are 1,000 clubs and 45,000 players.

Four major territorial Union Boards now exist (Eastern Rugby Union, 1934; Midwest Rugby Football Union, 1964[18]; Rugby Football Union Pacific Coast, 1965; Rugby Union of the U.S. (Western) 1975).[19] In the mid-1970's, it became apparent that a national governing body was needed to administer policies and to represent the U.S.A. in International affairs. The result was the inauguration of the U.S.A. Rugby Football Union in Chicago, June 1975. Its inception was the culmination of all the ambition both administrators and players of rugby had held for the game for nearly

a century in America and since 1975, rugby in the U.S.A. has been administered on an essentially International level.[20]

Thus we can see that the ultimate origins of Rugby Football on the North American continent owe much to early British settlers and soldiers residing in garrison towns in the mid-nineteenth century. After a period of flourishing activity between 1870 and the early years of the twentieth century, the actual game of rugby, as played primarily in the United Kingdom, France, New Zealand and South Africa fluctuated in popularity but largely dwindled in North America. It remained dormant as a minor sport until its reappearance in the late 1950's, particularly on university campuses and in a number of newly founded clubs, and this is very much an ongoing process.

Footnotes

1. It may be necessary to indicate that the term 'fag' in the United Kingdom does not hold the same connotations as it does in North America. Rather, it refers to a pupil who does service for seniors in the school setting. Dunning and Sheard (1979: 54) make the pertinent point that acceptance of this system may be different today than it was in years gone by:

> By present day standards fagging may seem to have been a brutalizing institution. However, from the standpoint of upper-class parents in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, at least of those who sent their sons to public schools, it was a crucial means of training boys in 'manliness' and 'independence'.

2. Clearly, self-control of this type was dependent largely upon the social homogeneity of the school boys and players.

3. For a good discussion of the individual hobbies and interests of pupils at different English public schools in the nineteenth century see J. A. Mangan, 1981.

4. This is not to say that the movement towards athleticism and 'Muscular Christianity' encouraged by masters like Arnold and Almond was accepted without opposition. R. J. Mackenzie (1905: 95), for example, shows that at Loretto Academy, clashes between the proponents of athleticism and Evangelicalism prevailed for some time. Of athletics and games of football in particular he writes:

> Many doctors denounced the more violent forms of them as perilous to life and limb... Ministers of religion, for the most part, discouraged them as conducing to frivolity and the formation of a brutal type of character. Evangelicalism was still the dominant cult in Scotland - an Evangelicalism which had not concluded its alliance with the Muscular Christian's creed.

   Ironically, of course, the formation of a 'brutal type of character' was one eventuality that Arnold, Almond and others sought to eliminate through Muscular Christianity.

5. Almond's own gospel of all-round good health - Lorettonianism - was

comprised of five basic measurements presented here in order of importance: 1. Character 2. Physique 3. Intelligence 4. Manners 5. Information. (J. A. Mangan, 1981: 55)

6. A popular belief proposes that during an 1823 Bigside game at Rugby School a student named William Webb Ellis picked up the ball and ran with it, thus paving the way for the distinctive feature of the Rugby Football game. However, the validity of such an explanation remains unsubstantiated. By all accounts, such a 'fine disregard' for, or a violation of, the then accepted rules would have been as likely to incite as much anger as surprise on the part of the players, despite the fact that, at sixteen years, Ellis was a prefect. In a letter to the Old Rugbeian Society, Thomas Hughes, author of the famous 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' demonstrates this:

> In my first year, 1834, running with the ball was not absolutely forbidden but a jury of Rugby boys of that day would almost certainly have found a verdict of 'justifiable homicide' if a boy had been killed running-in. (In Irvine, 1979: 22)

Whatever, the incident has withstood scepticism over the years and is indeed recorded on a commemorative stone at Rugby School which reads as follows:

THIS STONE
COMMEMORATES THE EXPLOIT OF
WILLIAM WEBB ELLIS
WHO WITH A FINE DISREGARD FOR THE RULES OF
FOOTBALL, AS PLAYED IN HIS TIME,
FIRST TOOK THE BALL IN HIS ARMS AND RAN WITH IT,
THUS ORIGINATING THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF
THE RUGBY GAME
A.D. 1823.

7. It is understandable that working-class teams, accustomed to deprived social conditions, should seek victory in the sports sphere. There is no doubt that rugby provided the working-class with a means of excitement and identification in an otherwise grim industrial existence. Both the physical and mental demands laid upon Victorian workers by their employers were particularly hard. In a life controlled and dominated by the bourgeoisie, leisure time offered the worker a break in which he was his own boss, and slowly the fate of the local team came to provide the focus of leisure. Unlike toil in the factory or down in the pit, here success was indeed possible. Hence it was this increasing desire for victory by Northern and Midlands clubs and their growing enthusiasm for competition that led to a demand for rugby (League) as a professional sport.

8. Today, the Rugby League conducts professional competition in Australia, France and New Zealand as well as the United Kingdom.

9. Along with vigorous sporting activities, Arnold also introduced chapel hymn singing as a method of social control at Rugby school. An example of a parodied hymn tune is the rugby song 'Hark My Soul it is the Lord' which, as Michael Green (in a Preface to 'Why Was he Born so Beautiful and other Rugby Songs'. London: Sphere Books Ltd., 1969: 12) has indicated, "would scarsely be accepted by ecclesiastical authorities".

10. As Dunning and Sheard (1979: 272) put it:

> In the sense that its formal rules legitimize a relatively high degree of physical contact, rugby football is undoubtedly one of the roughest contemporary sports.

11. See also D. Duckham (1980: 208-11).

12. Apparently, the game was the culmination of conflicts between the two schools over a Revolutionary War canon (Atyeo, 1979: 205). When Princeton connived to cement the canon inside its grounds, a great furore ensued and the two colleges decided to settle the matter on the football field.

13. For a discussion of the development of American football, particularly at Yale, see W. Camp and L. F. Deland, "Football". Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1896.

14. So rough was the new game that it apparently came to be characterized by a particular 'boxer-slugger' image.

15. It would seem that although ambiguities still existed over differential playing codes, rugby was a fairly popular sport world-wide by the mid-1870's. Irvine (1979: 23), for instance, writes that by then:

> ...rugby had spread acorss the globe - carried to countries like Australia and New Zealand by immigrants, businessmen and farmers; to South Africa by soldiers stationed in the Cape Town garrison; and to France by students. If the rules were still far from universal the game, as such, was established internationally. The foundations of the world-wide game we have today had been successfully laid.

16. Cited in D. Sturrock, 'It all began...', Canadian Rugby Union Newsletter, 12, August, 1976.

17. D. Moneymaker, 'History of Pacific Coast R.F.U.', Rugby. March, 1978.

18. The original MidWestern name was replaced with the shortened Midwest title in 1968.

19. A more detailed scan of rugby popularity in America has recently been set down in personal correspondence (April 9, 1983) to the present investigator by Edmund Lee, Historian and Archivist for the U.S.A. Rugby Football Union and the Eastern Rugby Union:

> There are about 1,000 clubs in U.S.A. divided I estimate about equally between college and non-college clubs and I estimate of the 1,000 about 150 are women's clubs supported by about 4,500 women players.

The inclusion of a note on women's rugby is relevant since, although it is still in its adolescent years, it is a rapidly expanding sport in North America, a sport which apparently stems back to Colorado, 1974. The women's game is one area where the United States leads world rugby - women have their own committee on the U.S.A. R.F.U. and hold annual national championships. Personal correspondence from the same source also records that there are approximately 50,000 players coast to coast, including women players, and approximately 200 teams are fielded each week during the Fall season.

20. As with Canadian rugby, the spiralling popularity of the game in America has meant that a concomitant rise in standard of play has also occurred and, not surprisingly, this is a factor that other rugby playing countries are well aware of. Terry O'Connor (cited in Goodwin and Rhys, 1981: 162), for example, writes of American rugby:

> ...the birth of the U.S.A. national union could well prove the most significant factor during the last part of this century. The reigning rugby giants wait with trepidation as America harnesses her physical talents for the rugby field.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SUBCULTURE OF RUGBY PLAYERS

Presented here are the results of one season of participant-observation with an Ontario university rugby team, supplemented with informal observations of and interviews with British, American and (other) Canadian players. Frequent communications (verbal and observational) with players particularly during pre- and post-locker room interaction, but also at post-game beer-ups, parties and other social events revealed a constellation of characteristics which together constitute a rugby subculture. Following a brief introduction to the members of the subculture, these behavioural forms are categorized below as values, behaviours, attitudes, symbols and rituals. It should be emphasized that there is a certain amount of flexibility between the boundaries of these groupings. For example, features dealt with as subcultural values might also be considered attitudinal or behavioural characteristics. However, other qualities do not overlap so readily and in the pursuit of systematization and clarity it was thus considered best to categorize them in the aforementioned fashion.

In addition, some of the subcultural qualities are not restricted only to the rugby fraternity. The heavy consumption of beer and harrowing 'Rookie Night' experiences, for example, have long been associated with athletes. The distinguishing factor is that no other sports-related grouping demonstrates the same commitment to this particular interrelated cluster of characteristics around which a specific way of life has been framed.

Finally, the public image of rugby players will be examined along with an analysis of ruggers' own perceptions of their behaviour.

Introduction to the Members of the Subculture

All of the ruggers in the study were university students and, judging from the socio-economic status of their parents' occupations, came predominantly from middle- and upper middle-class milieux. Ages ranged from eighteen to twenty-five. There was considerable involvement among the ruggers in intramural activities within the university. The majority had been strongly encouraged to try out for university teams by parents who themselves were found to have sports-oriented histories.

Informal interviews revealed that many of the players need to unravel their ancestry no more than two generations to locate a British descendant. Although, as we have seen, rugby is incipient in North American high schools, many of the ruggers attributed their interest in the sport to the influence of a British relative. As one player with a Welsh father put it:

> All through high school I wanted to play football but my father, being Welsh, preferred me to stick to rugby. So I started - reluctantly - in grade ten, and I've been playing ever since.

Another major precipitant for involvement in the subculture centres around aspects of the game itself. For many players, rugby provided the first real opportunity to try a contact sport:

> I played basketball and intramural ball here in my first year. I decided I wanted to play a tackle sport with more closeness and contact so I tried out for the football team but didn't make it. So then I tried out for the rugby team and it grabbed me right away.

In all cases the toughness and aggression demanded of players proved to be a powerful influential factor:

> I used to play football. One time I bragged to my Dad that I was playing the roughest sport in the world. He's English and always played rugby at school, so he bet me ten bucks I wouldn't be tough enough to make the rugby team at M___. So I went out to practise, made the team, and in my first game had half my ear ripped away. I won the ten bucks but I had as many stitches to show for it.

The same player went on to assert that his favourite aspect of the game was 'the body contact'. Motives in this regard varied depending on individual interpretation of the game (some ruggers emphasized the importance of physical fitness over strength and courage) and position played, but the roughness indigenous to rugby and parental influence represented two primary sources of encouragement. These factors should not necessarily be considered separately since some ruggers quoted both explanations in interviews.

A third and final explanation in the rugby subculture concerns its non-game features. Responding to a small questionnaire all but one (of twenty-five) of the ruggers said that they had been attracted by social or cultural characteristics of the sport. Two classifications were noted here: those who had prior knowledge of the subculture on entry and those who witnessed its norms for the first time once actually involved. The following quotation from one player typifies the first group:

> I had heard from a friend of some things that had happened after the games but had never really bothered to find out for myself. Then this guy told me a story about the players at his club playing a trick on a stripper that made her run off-stage. Apparently, one guy made out that he was really interested in her while his friend knelt down behind her and bit her ass so bad that it bled. Now I've started hanging around with those guys I've never seen so much butt-biting in all my life!

On the other hand, some novices enter the subculture unaware that what they will find 'on the inside' often constitutes something of a surprise:

> It was my first year and people had warned me that Rookie Night was a bit of an ordeal, but I'd just shrugged it off. Well, we (the rookies) were forced to chug three full beers right at the start. After that things slowed down for a while and I thought it wasn't going to be so bad. Then they (veterans) lined us up and brought out the goldfish. Live goldfish! We had to bite each fish in half with out teeth, chew them and pass them mouth to mouth amongst each other. I couldn't believe it. And it got worse!

Despite such unexpected and daunting encounters, however, rugby's non-game or social characteristics, such as those witnessed at rookie ceremonies and 'beer-ups', proved foremost in providing initiates with a sense of curiosity about what the rugby subculture entailed and thus in persuading them to join or remain members of that fraternity.

Values

The quintessential facet of North American sport is its overriding emphasis on the value of competition and winning. Playing in a league,

the ruggers in this study also placed high value on winning but, unlike more professionally oriented college sports (eg. football, hockey, basketball), more kudos seemed to exist in enjoying the game itself and in playing 'good rugger' than in a 'win-at-all-cost' philosophy.

Probably a carry-over from rugby's very earliest days in the British public schools, a prevalent theme of amateuristic sportsmanship, loyalty and 'esprit de corps' frequently emerged through conversation with players. The general approach was epitomized in the following statement made by one player:

> Sure we want to win and as the play-offs get closer we want to win badly. But whether we win or lose it's important to us all that we enjoy the game and that both teams get together afterwards and party.

In a 1974 study of the San Diego State rugby team, one of Orloff's respondents captured the same sense of sporting generosity and togetherness:

> Rugby is the only sport I know of in the world where you can go out drinking with your opponents before the game, try to kill them during the game and then have a party afterwards. If you play any team anywhere, then the host team provides a party for the opposing team. This is a tradition. We always provide two kegs of beer for our opponents after every single game, and we would expect them to do the same. (45)

Again, Thomson (1976: 115) quotes one player who, having played both, interestingly compared the different values emanating from football and rugby:

> I think the attitude in football is almost opposite to rugby. Football's all competition - when the game's over, that's it. In rugby you stick together and have a good time. I get upset when we lose, but there's not that much pressure to win.

Another study[1] which compared motivations towards rugby and football by players revealed that a differential perception of sportsmanship prevailed in the two sports. Football players, for instance believed in:

> Kicking is unacceptable but a fist is acceptable... Making the most within the rules... Avenge within the rules... Don't try to hit people unless it's retaliation...

In contrast, the rugby players in the study expressed rather different emphases:

> There is only one referee, so you have to be kind of honest, (You could probably get away with a lot more than we do)... Helping each other up - whether they are on your team or the other team... Sometimes the other team will tap you on the shoulder and say 'good play'...

Thus, whereas football players seemed to focus on taking advantage within the rules, ruggers emphasized cooperation and honesty more strongly.

As we can see from a recent piece of propaganda issued by the British Columbia Rugby Union, at the present time the administrators of North American rugby are clearly concerned to promote the game as one rich in the ethos of sportsmanship and team spirit:[2]

> Some of the earliest clubs to play Rugby in Vancouver were the Vancouver Rowing Club, Ex-Britannia, Meralomas, North Shore and U.B.C. who along with many other teams are providing athletes the facilities to enjoy the sense of loyalty, friendship and fitness only the Rugby team spirit can provide.

Noticeable here is a distinct attempt to elevate rugby above other North American sports because of its emphasis on player fraternization and team spirit.

In this study, the value for comradeship was ultimately demonstrated in the fact that in recent years one particular apartment on campus has provided the 'headquarters' for hard-core and peripheral members of the rugby subculture. During the season these ruggers join the rest of the squad for daily two hour training sessions. Members then disperse to eat but the normative code was to reassemble at the rugby headquarters before heading routinely over to a bar on campus later in the evening. Even outside the confines of the college season these members stayed in close contact, if not with each other, with members of other (usually home town) teams.

McElroy (1971)[3] has argued that particularly the college rugby fraternity exists as a 'seasonal subculture' into which players are re-socialized at the beginning of each new season. However, for players committed to a Fall college season and a Summer season of rugby, "this re-socialization is lessened by anticipatory socialization" (2). For these players, subcultural values, behaviours and attitudes pervade the entire life-style, both inside and outside of the college context and provide an ongoing source of identity. Thus we can refer to these players as the hard-core members of the subculture.

Significantly, the players in this study rejected and even took offense at suggestions that the rugby subculture was seasonally oriented:

> No way is the set up a seasonal thing. Beyond the limits of the season we stick together and other players go off to other clubs. Last year I went to New Orleans with about 20 other ruggers and we arranged that ourselves. Even in summer we house together. In fact, the rugby team is the basis for a lot of people's social groups both in school and out of it.

Contact with other Ontario university and British teams has functioned to verify this observation. Players encourage and boast of the sense of community spirit intrinsic to rugby. Some mentioned that joining a club was "the easiest way to get to know people" and becoming part of a close-knit group. One rugger, for example, stated this belief with a good deal of austerity:

> Out in Calgary this summer, I just joined a team and I had friends all of a sudden.

Clearly, then, there is a vital aura of community associated with the rugby life-style which, for the majority of players, is enjoyed on a more encompassing than seasonal level.

Toughness and ferocity are other factors valued highly by rugby players, and the emphasis on being able to take and give out 'punishment' is evident at all times. As one player put it:

> You're expected to give as good as you get so you have to be pretty tough. If you get hurt, you get up and get on with it, unless it's really serious. There's one player on the team - everytime he's tackled he starts moaning. At first we were all concerned but now nobody takes any notice. He just wants attention.

Moreover, as McElroy (1971: 5) found in his small study of a Californian university team, part of the players' belief system was that there was a certain "naturalness in injury". As with the sportsmanship issue, the stress on being able to 'take it like a man' is probably a twentieth century extension of nineteenth century British public school ideology. More importantly, a strong correlation exists between physical courage and subcultural respect and acceptance. The timid player who shies away

from 'getting stuck in' will be hard-pressed to find acceptance at a Rugby Club.

Behaviours

As Sheard and Dunning (1981: 163) and Thomson (1976) have noted, perhaps the strongest behavioural norm within the rugby subculture is that associated with excessive beer drinking. The former cite an article from a late nineteenth century Scottish newspaper which warned the reader that Rugby Football was:

> ...the fascination of the devil and twin sister of the drinking system and that without the latter it would have a job to succeed.

Today, the important role of beer-drinking is visible from the most junior level to International level. In one of the most outspoken statements on the topic to date, Chris Laidlaw (1973: 8), an ex-International All-Black, has argued that:

> Beer and Rugby are more or less synonymous. No Rugby tour, function, meeting or even committee could operate without it. After every match it flows for merry hours until angry wives are confronted in the early hours by their heroes, who are invariably accompanied by a sporting band of hearties, singing the sorts of songs that have neighbours hastening to close windows and spinsters composing outraged letters to editors.

The present study confirmed that weeknight team drinking was regular but that extremely heavy beer drinking was emphasized at all post-game beer-ups where players' attendance was mandatory. A new recruit

explained that the central focus on beer-drinking confused him at first:

> I didn't expect anything like it. We'd train real hard for two hours a day and then go down to the ___ and get hammered, and beer-ups... well, they're twice as bad! I was surprised because I thought the coach would be angry if we didn't try to keep in shape. In actual fact, he condones it as much as the rest of us. If we were on the football or hockey team, we'd have all been benched by now.

Frequent beer drinking sessions functioned primarily to enhance and enforce group cohesiveness and players were cognizant of this purpose and effect. In fact, players with less pronounced likings for heavy beer consumption often felt peripheral to the central core of the sub-culture and sometimes ostracized from the group as a whole:

> I like drinking but persistent inebriation doesn't turn me on. I've been with the team some time now and I know the guys don't think I'm such a great partyer, but I also know they wouldn't do or say anything about it. Still, I don't really feel like I'm part of the group because of it.

However, the concern to be accepted indicated by this player was unwarranted. A more recognized player later confided in the researcher that:

> B___ is pretty boring when it comes to partying, but he's still regarded as one of 'us'. It's the guys that don't show up at all that are unwelcome.

Acceptance in the subculture, then, hinged on visible demonstrations that individuals wanted to take part in activities. Ostracism was not correlated to less extreme demonstrations in this regard as much as no demonstrations at all.

Tendencies towards forms of physical and verbal abuse (particularly of women and homosexuals), petty vandalism and theft (particularly drunken

vandalism and the theft of trophies and plaques) and other types of 'rowdy' behaviour have long been associated with rugby players. A favourite and frequently executed characteristic is female 'butt-biting'. Self explanatory, butt-biting is often the result of a bet and is a deliberate attempt to intimidate women and to invoke a response. An example was provided early in the season when one rugger brought along his 'new' girlfriend to a party. She was obviously a retiring type and visibly embarassed at some of the language and stories being bandied around. The end of the evening came for her when one of the ruggers knelt down behind her (another drew her attention by talking to her) and bit into her rear. She screamed and ran from the room, understandably distressed. Her boyfriend laughed but followed her. She later explained that she was uncertain of what her reaction "was supposed to be" and felt too embarassed to stay, but added:

> Now I've got to know the guys I accept the way they are. T___ (her boyfriend) explained that the guy meant no harm. I know all the guys want to do is to have fun and actually they're fun to be with, at least once you get to know them. But it can be pretty embarrassing at first.

All the women in the study tended to rationalize rugger behaviour in these terms.

Many other forms of rowdiness were witnessed in the study. These included: frequent food fights in restaurants, particularly returning from away games; player stripteases in public bars and on buses; souvenir hunting escapades (one subject was arrested and gaoled for attempting to steal an enormous mirror from behind a crowded bar in Louisiana). For example, returning from one road trip the team stopped

at a popular restaurant for refreshments. Excited after a well-earned victory, the players soon became unruly when one small prank escalated into a major food fight amongst themselves and other unrelated customers. The team was subsequently requested to leave the premises. Outside the restaurant, empty beer bottles (smuggled on to the bus) were thrown onto the car parking area from bus windows and the bus drew away to a crescendo of breaking glass.

Other examples of the rowdy behaviour of rugby players was presented to the researcher by an Ontario university Athletic Director who commented that the frequent unruly behaviour of players on his university team, particularly on away trips, had been the cause of a great deal of anxiety on the part of bus drivers. He recalled how he:

> ...on one trip had a driver who was very much on edge and approached the trip with a good deal of trepidation. We finally settled him down and he revealed to us how he'd been the driver of a bus several years previously on a rugby trip that had turned out to be quite an adventure. The team did $1,700 worth of damage to that particular bus. He told me that at different times when he applied the breaks there was so much urine in the floor of the bus that it slushed forward in a wave and engulfed his heel. Windows were broken and seats were torn from their moorings. He was so incensed at that and at the lack of control exhibited by the team that he took the bus straight to the house of the President of the university to show him the damage first hand. Nothing was done... it was hushed up, people tended not to face the problem and hoped it would go away.

This source went on to document a conversation with a secretary at the same university who had told him the following story:

> 'When I go by the rugby field on the way home there's often a tie-up at the corner and cars are forced to line-up for a while. Often the entire team comes

> over and drop their shorts.' She said she'd never been passed the field without that transpiring.

In the present study, nakedness and 'mooning', especially from bus windows and for the benefit of female observers, was a very frequently enacted form of rowdiness.

To be sure, forms of vandalism are often manifested by members of the subculture and this can also be seen at International level. A recent report of an International game between France and England in Paris, for example, recorded that:

> Celebrations at the post-match banquet in Paris last Saturday began with the customary throwing of bread rolls and went on to include the drinking of after-shave lotion presented to guests by the French Rugby Federation, the dousing of a French official with sauce, and the upsetting of a fruit table.[4]

Post-game banquets and parties following International rugby games have acquired something of a reputation for such demeanour (Edwards, 1979: 54; Duckham, 1980: 86; Laidlaw, 1973: 153).[5] Following a successful recent International match the English scrum-half Steve Smith is rumoured to have made the now infamous promise that "the aftershave will flow tonight!" Much of the ruggers' rowdy behaviour can be attributed to their propensity and willingness to consume inordinate volumes of beer, particularly in a post-match setting, and this is, of course, instrumental to the kinds of activities that follow.

Attitudes

Since one of the traditional roles of rugby has been its function

as a 'male-preserve' (Sheard and Dunning, 1981), women's status in the subculture is an essentially unglamorous one. Like the situation in Britain, women's presence is now accepted in most North American clubs and is indeed seen as necessary in contributing, directly or indirectly, to their financial support. Fewer players would probably participate at organized parties and other events without girlfriends or the presence of women more generally. However, the current study verified that there are also occasions where the presence of women is unwelcome and even prohibited, and one such milieu is the journey to away games.

On one road trip to K___, for example, a player was signalled to the back of the bus and told that his wife was driving behind. The player's exclamation on verifying this was proof enough that she was unwelcome. Soon after this, the bus driver stopped and the team alighted for refreshments. Here, L___'s wife apparently requested to join the group and retrieve her car on the return trip. Although L___ refused flatly, his wife's presence nevertheless precipitated some scathing criticism from the other players for "bringing his wife along".

Some ruggers were noticeably less rowdy when their girlfriends, wives or other women were present at events. The general attitude seemed to be captured in the statement made by one player who was seldom accompanied by his girlfriend at events:

> You can't help but feel intimidated with women around. Some of the things we do or say are pretty gross and I wouldn't like my girlfriend to witness it. I'm sure she'd be disgusted and would feel intimidated.

Quite clearly the absence of women provided for some ruggers a license to behave in ways only possible within the male-preserve confines of certain

contexts including road trips and rookie ceremonies. At other times women are welcome and encouraged to participate, but since ruggers' behaviour normatively includes butt-biting, stripteases, obscenity in song and a chauvinistic attitude towards sex, many women simply prefer to stay away. Furthermore, one might be hard-pressed to comprehend what some women find so enticing about an environment in which they are frequently the target of verbal degredation (especially in song, but also in that they are referred to inside the subculture as 'rugger-huggers'), and physical humiliation (butt-biting). As we have seen, the explanation for this exists in rationalizing rugby behaviour ('they're fun to be with'). Some women do of course prefer to stay away, particularly from post-game events:

> I don't mind meeting J___ later on, but I'd rather him be with the guys because I know the sort of things they do and talk about I wouldn't be interested in anyway. Actually some instances have resulted in the two of us fighting. J___ always tells me that Saturday is his day with the team. I accept that now and I know other girls who feel the same way.

Thus, in order to accept rugger behaviour, women are in effect presented with a choice of rationalizing or rejecting it. Sometimes, they even attempt to cajole their men away. As the following extract from a Rugby Newsletter indicates, such attempts are regarded with some cynicism by the majority of players:

> E___ is her name. The new woman in M___'s life. She's threatening to change him from that fun-loving, partying, single guy to a real domesticated gentleman. He can't make the game against B___ due to school commitments but a source close to him has revealed that she may even be taking him away from his beloved Rugby.

Further, if such attempts prove successful, in the eyes of team-mates the player in question will disengage from the subculture with no more than considerable ignominy.

Symbols

Several idiomatic forms have come to take on a symbolic meaning in the rugby subculture. Specifically, this is evidenced in the wearing of T-shirts and other garments bearing crude slogans: 'It Takes Leather Balls to Play Rugby'; 'Rugby Players Eat their Dead'; 'Elegant Violence'. The double meaning of the first example has now humorously been countered by North American women's teams whose players can be found wearing clothes emblazoned with the slogan 'No Balls at All!' The function of these symbolic gestures is fundamentally to emphasize the public image ruggers aim to project. Hence it is no coincidence that some club names have immediate connotations (eg. the New Zealand All-Blacks; the Barbarians).

Other symbols are visible in the frequent wearing of jerseys, dress sweaters and jackets etc. bearing various team insignia. In this study, most players possessed T-shirts and jackets of this type and these were worn, particularly to away games, with some degree of pride. Although the researcher did not hear of or witness such an incident throughout the duration of the study, players made it clear that non-members found wearing these symbols of identification would be confronted with some degree of severity on the matter.

Certain game terminology and jargon also serves to symbolize the sport. Phrases like 'ruck', 'maul', 'scrum' and 'knock-on', all peculiar to rugby, are commonly employed by players in an analogous manner to explain everyday experiences.

Rituals

In order to be socialized into the subculture, initiates are expected to take part in certain ritualistic rookie ceremonies held annually at the beginning of each season. Perhaps the most institutionalized initiate event has been called the 'Zulu Warrior', a ritualistic strip made by the rookie usually following his first game away from home or at a separate Rookie Night event. Rookies are coerced by veterans into drinking excessive amounts of beer before being made (often forcibly) to strip individually in front of a cheering audience of established players who form a circle around the initiate and chant:

> Come on you Zulu Warrior, come on you Zulu Chief,
> Take them down you Zulu Warrior, take them down
> you Zulu Chief.

Often, the ritual takes place in mixed company and in front of total strangers. Thus, for the faint-hearted, the performance of a 'Zulu' is an experience awaited with some trepidation. For instance, one player recalled:

> Someone had told me I was going to have to strip so
> I got so drunk that I didn't know what was happening.
> Actually, I didn't really have a choice about that.

> But even then it's quite a nervy experience to have to strip in front of strangers and others you've only just met. All I can remember is that they were screaming and throwing their drinks on me. Without the beer I drank, I could never have done it.

To further the humiliation of the event, during and on completion of the strip, particularly the rookies' genitals are defiled with beer and sometimes embrocation.

Typically, Rookie Night is characterized by excessive beer drinking and is a time when the ability of players to behave like 'true ruggers' is literally put to the test. This is done by involving rookies in a series of bizarre and embarrassing 'games'. One of the most popular of these involves marshmallows coated in heat liniment. The 'atomic bombs', as they are called, are placed in between the buttocks of naked rookies who race each other over a short distance. If the atomic bomb drops from its precarious position, the rookie is penalized by being forced to eat it. Needless to say, inebriation does not assist the skilful execution of such a task. Other penalties imposed upon offending initiates in this study ranged from the rapid consumption of more beer through a 'bong' (a tube with a funnel on top through which beer is poured and which enhances almost instant drunkenness) to the shaving-off of eyebrows. At one point, an inebriated rookie was presented with these choices. Unable to consume any more alcohol, he succumbed to the latter and without any apparent concern for the skin of the player in question, a veteran quickly took off his eyebrows with a razor. It took the initiate most of the college Fall season to grow it back.

No real opposition to these events was registered by the researcher. In any case, initiates are aware from their very first introduction to the subculture that the predominant ideology is very much 'take it or leave it'. As one established player commented:

> If they can't take the things we do, then they're not really considered appropriate for the team and we don't want them. Anyway, we've all got to go through initiation.

As we can see from the subsequent tongue-in-cheek account of it in the Rugby Newsletter, Rookie Night is a ritual source of hilarity on the rugby calendar:

> Rookie Night was an extreme success, Many thanks to B___ and all the people who helped it go. What can you say about those Rookies? They were simply fantastic! The evening began with all Rookies clearly marked with headbands and a few quiet beers. The man who decided to play the red hot marshmallows on the top of a beer bottle for better penetration will be elected to the M___ Rugby Hall of Fame. For many of the lads it marked the first time in their lives that their arseholes were really on fire! (Any takers for Gay Sex?) But poor M___ actually got his red hot marshmallow on his genitals and his eyes told the story all night. Following a few boat races which the forwards won only through cheating, it was on to the highlight of the night: THE FEAST! R___ and P___ started things off with an incredibly disgusting show by passing a chewed goldfish dissolved in beer between each others' mouths in fine artificial respiration fashion. All Rookies devoured their portions with relish, with K___ actually displaying the remnants to the delighted crowd on the tip of his tongue... B___ contributed to the fun by making a goldfish disappear up his nose before eating it. Many were not satisfied with only one swimmer and managed to eat several in true glutton fashion. The ensuing Zulu and Elephant Walk through B___ residence was well organized, well attended and well received by all the tenants... Our Rookies of this year are to be commended, for they put on a splendid show with great desire and intensity, making this year's Rugby Club a very close-knit one.

Rookies are aware from their introduction to the group that certain forms of behaviour are demanded of them and their subsequent behaviour often shows something of a cyclical orientation. Conscious of conforming to a set of subcultural expectations, rookies and more established players make deliberate efforts to demonstrate modes of 'typical' rugger behaviour to other members of the group. On Rookie Night, for example, the usual procedure is that once initiates are seen to be suffering from the effects of the beer they have been made to consume, they are cajoled into performing a 'Zulu'. This season, one novice, much the worse for wear but without any apparent persuasion, took it upon himself to strip even as players were still arriving. The event was predictably greeted with suitable applause but also a fair degree of surprise. Asked to explain his premature performance, the rookie informed the researcher that:

> I knew I was going to have to strip but I didn't know when or how. I was feeling pretty hammered and I wanted to show the rest of the team that I could party as well as anyone, so away I went. I guess I was a little over-eager in retrospect!

There seems to be, then, something of a self-fulfilling prophecy about rugger behaviour.

One of the most ritual traditions in rugby is a technical language which has no real meaning outside the sport. On the whole, this is manifested in the unique way ruggers both put lyrics to recognized traditional hymns and songs and write their own songs. These ribald songs are sung ritually at social events but particularly at post-game beer-ups. Almost without exception, they are based on bizarre sexual

themes revealing a scatological emphasis on the vilification of women and homosexuals and absurd sexual techniques which, as Thomson (1976: 129) writes, is reminiscent of the more coarse themes of Chaucerian literature.

In addition to songs that have long been associated with the game (eg. 'Alouette', 'Eskimo Nell', 'The Engineer's Song' and 'We're all Queers Together'), each team has its own songs and sometimes organizes song-writing competitions to elect team favourites. The obscure and sexual themes present in the example below typify rugby songs. Aptly entitled 'Disease Monger', the following was penned by two ruggers in the study:

My mother was a leper, my father had V.D.,
All my cousins were paraplegics, so what d'ya expect from me?

(CHORUS) Cuz I'm a Disease Monger, coming down on you,
Cuz I'm a Disease Monger, there ain't nothin' I won't screw.

My urine comes out purple, my eyes are too blind to see,
My gums are shot from scurvy, so what d'ya expect from me?

To piss is now a hardship, it hurts me when I pee,
I see those little bugs down there, they try to swallow me.

I like to visit old folks' homes, their bowels they can't control,
Bedpans always to the brim, I love to lick the bowl.

I like it if they've got no legs or if they're only nine,
And if they happen to be dead, well that suits me fine.

I like to perform abortions with just the tip of my tongue,
With one mighty swipe of that weapon, that's the end of the young.

I love to go out hunting to try and catch some meat,
Those female moose are really loose, I love their clits to eat.

Throughout the course of the season, Disease Monger became a great favourite with the players, and on every road trip they would provide a rendition, with the composers singing the verses and other team members joining in the chorus.

If anything is unique about the rugby subculture it is the manner in which at post-game parties and beer-ups the host and visiting team each form a circle and rival each other in spontaneous song. The home team generally begins this patterned sequence by chanting:

> We call on ___ to give us a song
> So sing, you bastards, sing

whereafter each team alternately provides renditions of songs. The more bizarre the song, the more the emphasis on excessive and baroque bodily functions, the greater seems to be the associated prestige. Naturally, each team has its leaders whose function it is to prompt others. All team members are expected to join in.

For initiates unfamiliar with this ritual, singing can also be a daunting experience. Penalties are imposed on those who are unfortunate enough to make mistakes with the lyrics. Whenever this occurs, the guilty player is greeted with the chorus:

> Why was he born so beautiful,
> Why was he born at all?
> He's no f___ use to anyone,
> He's no f___ use at all.

The chorus will be chanted repeatedly until the player has picked up the closest beer at hand and drank it, verifying the termination of the task by holding the empty bottle or glass above his head. Further choral attention is paid to slow or hesitant ruggers:

> Why are we waiting?
> He must be masturbating,
> Oh, why are we waiting,
> Why, why, why?

A consequence of the penalty system is, of course, that erring individuals, coerced into drinking great volumes of beer, make escalating

mistakes. Utter inebriation is frequently the end result and is the reason why players unsure of lyrics often take some time to conquer them and hence attempt to maintain a low profile at the appropriate moments.

Singing usually occurs on the way to, but more usually returning from, away games. One player will start with a verse or song and then nominate another to perform until the whole team has contributed. Again, the more timid ruggers tend to quieten in these situations but rarely evade nomination. Hesitancy here is also greeted with the 'Why Was he Born so Beautiful?' chorus being sung to the offending party.

In his article Rugby Folk, Tony McCarthy (1970: 550)[6] has argued that through the spreading influence of sexual permissiveness, women are increasingly coming to enjoy bath- and bar-room ballads so common in rugby circles. He writes perceptively of its adverse effects for the game:

> Sexual permissiveness may well mean that the fantastic images of song may no longer be a necessary substitute. Women now like and enjoy the songs in many bars. The songs' meaning is lost in the same way that country dance destroyed the fertility symbol of Morris.

Interviews recently conducted by the researcher with British players and club members in fact illustrated that the singing of rugby songs is not only losing its meaning but is a fading tradition that ought to be linked to other changes (documented above) occurring in the British game since the 1960's. Despite the continuing expansion of women's clubs,

there is, however, no sound base to the argument that rugger songs are fading in the North American context. If the vocal contributions of visiting teams and ruggers in the study on all road trips and at all post-game parties and events is any indication, there are no signs of this ritual disappearing.

Finally, there is something of an unwritten law in the rugby subculture vis-a-vis rowdy behaviour that can be regarded as a ritualistic behavioural norm. In the study, many incidents occurred at and on the way home from away games and on tours that players, with an apparent common understanding, only referred back to among themselves and other members of the subculture. Laidlaw (1973: 2) has referred to this ritual as 'Rugby Law':

> The last and perhaps the most persuasive reason for my writing a book about Rugby at all is simply because under Rugby Law it isn't permitted. On all fronts players are sworn to silence. After an International tour they are 'bound' to remain mute for years.

In this way, incidents generally involving various types of rowdiness are ritually internalized in the subculture and recalled later only at appropriate moments and amongst members.

The Public Image of Rugby Players

We have already said that in order to be so-labelled deviance requires an audience and it is clear from what we have seen that the

rugby subculture has one - the public at large. Thus a discussion of public response to the members of the subculture as well as ruggers' perceptions of their own behaviour is relevant here.

Since the game's developing years in the British public schools, the public image of rugby players has taken on certain changes. Particularly in the nineteenth century when players were drawn exclusively from the middle- and upper-classes, their behaviour was regarded more as an "elite leisure activity" than as a deviant form. Afterall, as Sheard and Dunning (1981: 158) suggest:

> It is unlikely that members of the upper- and middle-classes would have branded their own sons as delinquents.

With the democratization of rugby in the twentieth century, however, a concomitant transformation in public image has been effected. Today the activities of rugby players have come to be regarded as a very specific form of deviant behaviour.

Despite this, and after all we have evidenced, it is ironic that one of the strongest attitudes or beliefs on the part of ruggers is that they are a victimized group. One player epitomized this view in the following manner:

> If anything happens around campus - any vandalism, theft or violence - people blame us first. Only last week I was talking to a guy who'd been beaten pretty badly in a fight outside M____ Hall. He'd seen the Dean and told him it was a rugger, so the Dean called us in but nobody knew anything about it. We later found out it was someone from off campus, but we were still blamed for it. The Dean, now he really hates us.

Although the study provided little evidence to support this complaint, on occasion some credence did seem to exist in claims that at least

strained relations prevailed between university administrators and the rugby team. Probably the most overt indication of this was provided when the university sporting body refused to allow the team to compete under the university name in an annual tournament in Louisiana. Instead, the team perforce temporarily adopted the name of the city. However, since the explanation for the ban lay in the fact that during the previous year's tournament three members of the team had been arrested and gaoled for various offences, the prohibition seemed justified.

Despite notions of victimization, the present study and other informal observations has revealed that rugby players lead something of a charmed existence. Arguing along similar lines, Thomson (1976) has described the remarkable tolerance of the public to the behaviour of players, in particular proposing that certain acts are permitted to them that would not be permitted to others. Over the course of the season, numerous incidents were witnessed by the investigator where laws were violated by participating ruggers. Others have been provided above but one final example should suffice to illustrate this. On the way home from one game, the bus driver stopped at a restaurant and the players waited while he went inside. He returned to find almost the whole team urinating on the side of his bus but beyond mumbling something disparaging about rugby players his general response was to 'turn a blind eye'. He was later asked why he had not taken the event more seriously, and replied simply: "when you've been in the job as long as I have you come to expect it of rugby players. Besides, I've seen worse". Apparently, the incident was taken no further.

Other bus drivers were less lenient. The players always looked out for one in particular who had erected a placard above the entrance to the bus for their benefit which read: 'No Offensive or Abusive Language to be heard on the Bus - TODAY!' In fact, this driver more than once pulled over to the roadside where he summoned the coach and demanded that players observe the regulation. Incidents of rugger rowdiness has led to other anticipatory action being taken by individuals and authorities towards upcoming rugby events. Recently a Toronto newspaper[7] noted that following 'rambunctious' behaviour on the outward flight of an Ontario team's trip to the Bahamas, the players were each asked to post a hundred dollar 'good conduct bond' to the airline "if they wanted to get on the flight home".

In addition, some typical Rookie Night events display a markedly illicit character. The final event at this year's ceremony was the performance of an 'Elephant Walk' by rookies on campus and through residence apartments. For the uninitiated, an Elephant Walk is a chain of naked people (approximately ten on this occasion) marching with one hand on the shoulder of the man in front, one holding the penis of the man behind. The tune '<u>The Baby Elephant</u>' is usually whistled by participants. Largely through the attention of students yelling out of campus residence windows, campus patrol was soon on the scene. Too inebriated to run away, some of the rookies confronted the officers who, instead of imposing legal sanctions, advised them to quickly return home. One officer informed the investigator that:

> Each year at this time the Rugby team contrives the most mischief and we usually have an Elephant Walk to contend with. As long as we arrive on the scene before any serious complaints are lodged, we usually just send them back inside. But I know of others that work here that would throw the book at them.

Despite their frequent violations of the law, the ruggers appeared to maintain good relations with campus police.

As far as their own interpretation of their life-style was concerned, it became apparent that the ruggers considered normative behaviour that is deemed non-conformist or deviant in the culture of the university and mainstream culture as a whole. Initiation ceremony events, the singing of obscene songs, refusals vis-a-vis sociability and politeness, regular forms of vandalism and petty theft, etc. all led to the ruggers being stigmatized as 'outsiders' by non-members both on and off campus.

On campus, other students uninvolved in the subculture sometimes tended to rationalize rugby behaviour with assertions like 'they're fun to be with' and 'they're no worse than the other teams', but student animosity towards the team was also evident on occasion. The ambivalence of the public image of ruggers on campus was best illustrated at a cheese and wine pub the team organized in order to raise funds for the upcoming trip to Louisiana. Many of the students arriving at the party did not know who it was being held by and this was often the first question. The answer was greeted with mixed response. On the one hand, two females closed their purses as they were about to pay to enter, informed the doormen that they should "try not to break all the windows"

and then departed. On the other hand, a group of four girls were about to make a decision not to pay (the entrance fee was higher than normal) when one asked who was holding the party. The answer precipitated a rapid change in decision and one girl uttered, "well, it should be interesting anyway!" Regardless of whether it was accepted or rejected, the important point is that both groups were evidently responding to a specific image the ruggers had acquired on campus; first, for being stereotypical 'bad guys' and second, for being stereotypical 'good partyers'. The rationale of the last group entering the pub serves to provide support for Thomson's (1976: 171) argument that:

> ...many of the public obtained some sort of vicarious enjoyment in observing the uninhibited behaviour within the group, provided that they were reasonably secure in a non-participant role.

The public labelling of ruggers was equally in evidence outside the university context and sometimes this was seen to function in their favour. For example, following the arrest of one player at the Louisiana tourney, one police officer made it apparent that unusually slack sanctions would be levied against him:

> There'll be a minimum fine and maybe a few days in jail but that's not the way it should be. The same happened last year with three of you Canadians. If there wasn't so much local interest in the tournament here in H___ the guy would be in the hole for a month.

The town gaoler later echoed the police officer's sentiments:

> Yes, A___ was right, We've got better things to do than send men out at night to arrest drunken rugby players. This is one of the busiest weeks for us. I blame the sponsors myself.

Clearly, the two law enforcers had formed their own very rigid impression of rugby players, but under the circumstances felt obliged if not pressured to relent. Although nothing was said, one received the impression that much tougher sanctions would have been imposed had the team not been returning to a home far away only a few days later.

On other occasions, the reputation that preceded the ruggers served to act against them. This was well illustrated in the views of one bus driver who commented:

> As far as I'm concerned, these and other rugby players are a disgrace to the university and the city. We've seen so much vandalism over the years you wouldn't believe it. That's why I usually refuse to drive the bus. The only reason I'm here today is that B___ called in sick.

The same driver assured the investigator that most of his colleagues shared "similar views".

A certain ambivalence was also found in the ways that players perceived their own behaviour. For example, when asked if deliberate efforts were made to maintain a rugby image, the players seemed ready to boast of their rowdiness:

> It's all deliberate. As a group our action is attention demanding. We often do things so someone the next day says, 'Hey, you guys are f___ wild'. Yes, that gives us a kick.

Such an affirmation of 'wildness' on the part of players was recently recorded by Alex Ward:[8]

> Most Americans think of rugby as a chaotic version of football played by educated roughnecks intent on beating each others' brains out, then drinking themselves under the table afterward. It's an image the

> players themselves aren't exactly quick to dispel. On the contrary, many of them pursue it actively, even aggressively.

In this way, ruggers are seen to derive pleasure and satisfaction in the ambiguous image of athlete and 'rugger-bugger'.

Players were also aware, however, that their public label at times worked against them. The same player who asserted that rugby behaviour was "all deliberate" indicated this view in an afterthought:

> ...then again, I think if you're trying to pick up a girl at a party or in a bar, then the first thing you tell her isn't that you're on the team!

In another study[9] which attempted to measure quantitatively their own perceptions of rugby behaviour, it was found that players considered the most negative aspect of the sport to be "its bad reputation".

On the whole, an underlying attitude existed that the forms of behaviour that had come to be associated with rugby were to be consciously flaunted for the benefit of impressing other members and attracting the attention of (if not shocking) non-members, ie. ruggers' image of 'social outlaws' was self-created. A strong correlation existed between showings of public disapproval and more overt demonstrations of rowdiness. Thus, public displays of unruly behaviour on the part of members of the rugby subculture can be viewed as particular modes of defiance.

Donnelly (1980: 47) has argued that:

> ...the formation of a defiant attitude... resisting or ignoring sanctions and continuing to practise the behaviour or to display the attribute

can be seen as a specific response on the part of members of a group

to a label publicly imposed upon them. Similarly, Vanreusel and Rensen (1981: 4) have proposed that it is the social stigma associated with (specifically) high-risk sports that provides for participants a sense of group membership and role identification. They write that:

> ...social stigma can be described as a discrediting typification that rests upon the members of an identifiable group or that contributes to the process that the stigmatized persons are seen as a group by outsiders and consequently perceive themselves as a group.

Data from this study and other informal observations of rugby players is supportive. It appears to be the very awareness of non-conformism on the part of members of the various subcultures, an acknowledgement that their values demonstrate an extreme disregard for the mainstream values in society, that functions to instil the all-important sense of identity and belonging. Sheard and Dunning (1981: 164) would agree:

> The very fact... that this type of (non-conformist)[10] activity runs counter to the dominant values and that this is recognized by the participants themselves, probably serves even further to reinforce the close-knit character of the group.

Goffman (1963b: 143) has argued that when participants of a group actively seek to reinforce or stimulate their own deviant image, the term 'disaffiliate' should be applied. Disaffiliation is:

> ...presented by individuals who are seen as declining voluntarily and openly to accept the social place accorded them, and who act irregularly and somewhat rebelliously with our basic institutions.

As depicted by Vanreusel and Rensen (1981) and Donnelly (1980), the normative life-style patterns and values of high-risk sports participants such as sky-divers, scuba-divers, cavers, climbers and others are seen

to share common ground with those of the members of the subculture of rugby players inasmuch as they demonstrate the unique deviant and defiant attitude that Goffman refers to as disaffiliation.

Summary

We have witnessed, then, a group of characteristics around which the rugby subculture is formed, a subculture complete with its own boundaries and exclusivity.

Rugby players deliberately contravene or resist society's mainstream norms, but we must finally re-underline the precise manner in which this contravention or resistance is manifested. Examining the historical development of the regulation of the body and its physical functions, Elias (1978) has shown how man and woman have become more civilized since the Middle-Ages. He writes:

> The standard of what society demands and prohibits changes; in conjunction with this, the threshold of socially instilled displeasure and fear moves; and the question of sociogenic fears thus emerges as one of the central problems of the civilizing process. (1978: XIII)

Elias shows, for example, how spitting and the release of wind have become less acceptable since the Middle-Ages. What is normative in any society at any one time is representative of the larger structures of hegemonic power and social control. When we consider that values in the West in the 1980's do not normatively include: ritualistic obscenity

in song (and certainly not, in this age of equality, the objectification of women and homosexuals in song); regular displays of drunkenness, petty theft and vandalism; the physical humiliation of women (butt-biting); norm-breaking on the body and those aspects of its physical organization that are now socially regulated (the display of nakedness, the fascination with anality and sexuality, the overt debasement of the romantic notion of sexuality etc.) we are presented with an explanation as to why the norms of the rugby subculture are considered deviant by non-members. Further, since society's norms are essentially middle-class in origin, we arrive at the conclusion that the rugby subculture is a form of resistance to middle-class norms on the part of (mostly) middle-class males, and even a rearguard and nostalgic attempt to defend (or indeed to re-affiliate with) the traditional 'maleness' of all-male groups.

One factor that emerged with clarity in the study was that the ruggers frequently felt pressured to behave in ways that would be labelled rowdy or deviant by non-members. An example is the initiate who voluntarily stripped on Rookie Night. Another player informed the researcher that:

> Sometimes I just don't feel like partying or singing or drinking my brains out at all but I feel I should. It's like, I don't want to be seen as not being one of the guys.

Thus, a crucial feature of the subculture of rugby players is the highly circumscribed nature of members' behaviour. Clearly defined boundaries exist as regards its appropriate performance, ie. largely in group

situations associated temporally with the actual playing of the game itself (Rookie Night, beer-ups, road trips). In this respect, what at first appears to be spontaneous deviance is, on closer inspection, highly routinized and internally policed and, in actual fact, almost bureaucratic in its code of obligatoriness, ie. the breaking of normative practices by rugby players is deviant in substance yet highly conformist in its structural form.

Finally, since attempts are made by outsiders or non-members (including enforcers of law) to rationalize it, rugby behaviour appears ultimately tolerable within the boundaries of the dominant order in ways that other forms of resistance and opposition are not (eg. criminalized forms such as drug-abuse). The most appropriate categorization for this type of behaviour would thus appear to be Etzioni-Halevy's (1975: 357-8) notion of 'semi-deviance' which the author defines in the following manner:

> Semi-deviant behaviour may be the kind of behaviour that falls into the jurisdiction of more than one normative domain. Thus when a certain behaviour is regarded in society as having favourable effects on that society, certain norms are likely to arise which label that behaviour as legitimate. Conversely, when a certain behaviour is conceived in society as having adverse effects on that society, certain norms are likely to label that behaviour as illegitimate or deviant. It may happen, however, that behaviour which by the above criterion should be considered as deviant, is legitimized by its connection with <u>other</u> attitudes and behaviour which are regarded as having salutory effects on society, and which consequently fall into a different, legitimate normative domain. When this happens, it is likely that the behaviour will not be deviant, but semi-deviant.

The concept of semi-deviance as depicted by Etzioni-Halevy seems most relevant here because, as we have seen, rugby behaviour is both "flatly condemned" by certain groups at the same time as being "normatively fully condoned by others" (Etzioni-Halevy, 1975: 356).

Footnotes

1. M. Valiquette and S. Hennenfent, Intercollegiate Rugby and Football: Reflections in Motivational Involvement. Unpublished term paper, McMaster University, 1983.

2. On its Certificate of Incorporation, the Eastern Rugby Union of America, Incorporated, underlined some of the primary objectives of North American rugby in the following manner:

   3a. To further and develop amateur sports and, in particular, Rugby Football.

   b. To provide social and physical activities by encouraging and developing the sport of Rugby Union Football therein by amateurs.

   c. To cultivate social entertainment and promote friendship and sociability among its members.

   The source of this data is personal correspondence to the researcher from Edmund W. Lee, Historian and Archivist of the Eastern Rugby Union of America.

3. McElroy, D. K., Socialization and the Seasonal Subculture. Paper presented at the 3rd International Symposium on the Sociology of Sport, Waterloo, Ontario (1971).

4. Manchester Guardian Weekly, (Feb. 28, 1982: 24).

5. All three are autobiographies of ex-International players.

6. T. McCarthy, 'Rugby Folk'. In New Society, 392, 1970: 550.

7. Toronto Sun, (11.4.1983).

8. New York Times, (Jan., 20, 1980. Section 6: 26).

9. M. Valiquette and S. Hennenfent, Intercollegiate Rugby and Football: Reflections in Motivational Involvement. Unpublished term paper, McMaster University, 1983.

10. My brackets.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTEGRATION AND INTERPRETATION

The problem posed here, then, is essentially one concerning explanations for a 'cultural transformation' that has apparently taken place in sport. Specifically, at the same time as rugby began to lose its traditional appearance in the United Kingdom and adopt the qualities of rationalized and commercialized North American sport, it reappeared in the North American setting replete with all the cultural forms that had been institutionalized in the British game for nearly a century. Moreover these cultural forms were now expressed in an even more exaggerated format, and had taken on completely different meanings.

A number of points can be made. First, while excessive drinking is a core characteristic of the rugby subculture, other North American sports underline (and demand observation of) the importance of scientific training techniques and not abusing the body through drink. Second, at a time when women's equality is reaching new heights in both the United Kingdom and North America, the North American rugby subculture exists as a bastion of male chauvinism, ie. as a type of 'male-preserve' (Sheard and Dunning, 1981).[1] Third, sportsmanship exhibited in North American rugby is seen as a revival of the play element which has all but disappeared from North American sport and is indeed slowly disappearing from other rationalizing sports in the United Kingdom. Finally, the values and meanings of the traditional manliness aspects of British

rugby are seen as being transferred into more of an expression of 'macho' in North American rugby - it has the body contact and the roughness without the technologized and militaristic overtones of football.[2]

If we examine this transformation historically, we find that the incipient expansion of rugby in North America - beginning effectively in the 1960's - occurred at a time of enormous social change. Three factors in particular are considered significant here. First, North America and the United Kingdom were being brought much closer together by advances in media and satellite technology and cheap jet travel, and the two different cultures were having a reciprocal impact, particularly evident in fashion and popular music. Second, (although this was not a uniquely post-war phenomenon) widespread emigration was taking place from the United Kingdom to North America, and the 'brain drain' from British to North American universities and colleges was being effected.[3] Finally, the 1960's was a decade in which counter-cultural[4] movements were precipitating the widespread questioning and reinterpretation of established social values in both spheres, but particularly in North America, (values regarding: sexual permissiveness, sex roles and sexual equality; youth movements including naturalist and environmentalist attempts to 'get back to the land' (the hippies, drug and drop-out movements); political movements including the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the singing of anti-war or 'protest' songs).

In sport, the movement began to express itself in counter-cultural challenges to dominant North American sporting themes, most

evident in critical studies of football, autobiographical and biographical critiques of football and the development of the 'play movement'. Essentially, the play movement which occurred in North America at this time involved a demand for more means-directed rather than ends-directed goals in the athletic sphere, for more sportsmanship and simply for more 'fun' in sport. Predicting a "rebirth of play-like amateurism", Howard Nixon (1976: 67-70) has referred to such a reaction on the part of sports participants and spectators as a "democratic movement in sport" which:

> ...can be viewed as a reaction to the all-consuming passion for winning at all cost and to the dehumanization of athletes and athletic performances. Both of these presumed patterns in sport are seen as consequences of the authoritarianism of coaches and others in formal positions of authority.

Similarly, Harry Edwards (1973: 336-341) has identified a 'humanitarian counter-creed' in sport, the members of which share the ideology of being concerned for the well-being of their fellow competitors. This is not to suggest that commercial sport in North America is or ever was in jeopardy of disappearing. Rather, the point is that during the 1960's and 1970's whole areas of sporting life began to be viewed differently, not only by the spectating public but also by (the then) current and ex-sports participants themselves. This is amply demonstrated by the extensive exposes of sport and sports heroes and close examinations of the social and political conflicts and discontents in sport penned in the late 1960's and early 1970's, (eg. Edwards, 1969; Schechter, 1969; Sample, 1970; Meggyesy, 1971; Scott, 1971; Hoch, 1972; Meschery, 1972; Shaw, 1972; Wolf, 1972; Dickey, 1974).

As if to underline these social changes, of the three predominantly British sports, two were reintroduced on to the North American continent at this time. Despite early popularity with British immigrants in the late nineteenth century, cricket did not attract the North American population in any major way. The mechanics of the game were probably far too unfamiliar and it was played only by a handful of Britons and East and West Indians, (this indicates that sporting forms will not achieve meaning and be transmittable from one culture to another unless common elements resonate). Although its initial television coverage also failed, the second sport - soccer - more akin to North American sport in its already rationalized and professionalized form, eventually developed with vigour and it was not long before the North American Soccer League had been founded.[5] The final sport to be reintroduced - rugby - shared the most technical and organizational affinities with North American sport and with football in particular. Unlike football, however, it exhibited essentially amateur ethics and an emphasis on play-like sportsmanship, and this is what had immediate appeals for counter-cultural enthusiasts and others seeking a sporting alternative. Significantly, this could be seen in the lack of attempt to rationalize rugby and in the maintenance of cultural forms outside the game. Rugby began to be played by both North Americans and ex-patriot Britons on a widespread scale and, unlike football, it remains resolutely a play-sport.

It is proposed here that in the North American attraction to rugby there exists a resistance to the dominant sporting form of football,

ready-made in the cultural characteristics associated with the game. The term 'resistance' is used here in much the same way as Phil Cohen (1972), Clarke et al (1976) and Willis (1978a) have used it with reference to post-war British youth subcultures, ie. the type of resistance manifested in the rugby subculture exists not as an extreme political rejection of or an attempt to overthrow dominant cultural forms and values but rather as a (possibly temporary and episodic) recreational alternative to them. Referring back to Chapter One, we find that Cohen (1972) and Clarke et al (1976) have argued that recent youth subcultures in the United Kingdom:

> ...'solve', but in an imaginary way, problems which at the concrete material level remain unresolved. (Clarke et al, 1976: 47-48)

Specifically employing the example of lower working-class youth subcultures, Willis (1978a: 2) proposes that it is precisely because the members of these subcultures acknowledge their cultural subordination that they can respond collectively and 'win space' from the hegemonic culture. They:

> ...know what surrounds them sufficiently to seize and creatively exploit aspects of it to express their own zest and identity - so partially changing their conditions of existence.

Similarly, the North American rugby subculture is one that is comprised of members who, by way of 'negotiation, resistance and struggle' (Willis, 1978a), have consciously sought an alternative to the mainstream sporting forms, but one that <u>does not completely resolve</u> the conflicts and problems inherent in over-professionalized and over-commercialized North American sport. The opposition or resistance

expressed in the rugby subculture may be temporary and episodic because rugby players may in fact enjoy other more professional sporting forms. Many, for example, have prior football experience but are now excluded from the latter because of age norms.[6]

As a form of resistance, lines of comparison can be drawn between the rugby subculture and other counter-cultural movements inside and outside of sport. For example, in a discussion of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament supporters in the United Kingdom, Frank Parkin (1968) has argued that these supporters have been categorized as 'deviant' simply because they feel alienated from some of society's core values. He talks of:

> ...individuals' non-acceptance or rejection of certain values which may be regarded as central to the social order, and their commitment to alternative values which, simply as a matter of definition, can be classified as deviant. (21)

Importantly, however, Parkin goes on to assert that such a preference for alternative values does not necessitate that these individuals should lack integration into society as a whole. On the contrary, he writes that:

> ...estrangement from dominant values is quite compatible with the individual's firm integration into society as measured by the usual criteria of social and personal involvement. (30)

Thus, rather than expressing purely deviant values, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament supporters are seen by Parkin as putting into practise resistant or oppositional - counter-cultural - values.

In addition, an attempt has recently been made to formally categorize three oppositional or resistant forms through sport

(Donnelly, 1983).[7] 'Political' resistance is visible where sport is exploited to make a political statement about factors or events unrelated to sport, eg. 'Black Power' demonstrations at the 1968 Summer Olympics in Mexico; the 'Munich Massacre' at the 1972 Summer Olympics. 'Colonial' resistance exists where attempts are made by a subordinate culture through sport to oppose elements in the hegemonic order, eg. Geertz's (1971)[8] illustration of the oppositional cockfight in Balinese culture which resists assimilation against the colonial Dutch and the Indonesian government:

> The cockfight has lately become a symbol of the primitive villager's resistance to externally imposed authority while retaining its previous function as a source of analogy to masculine traits and the affairs of men.

A further example of colonial resistance is the formation of the Gaelic Athletic Association in Ireland in 1884, demonstrating a revival of Irish culture in the face of oppressive British rule. For Britons playing rugby in the colonial environment, the game similarly became a source of resisting assimilation, a theme also evident in Pooley's (1981) study of soccer in Milwaukee and LaFlamme's (1977) study of West Indian cricketers in Buffalo, New York. Donnelly's third type of resistance through sport - 'cultural' resistance - shares similarities with colonial resistance but more centrally encompasses attempts to introduce new activities into a culture to oppose standardized mainstream forms, eg. counter-cultural activities or expressive movements of the 1960's and 1970's - surfing, frisbee and hot-dog skiing, which all opposed the rationalization and bureaucratization of other more dominant sporting

forms; the attempt of the 'subcultural rump' of soccer hooligans in the United Kingdom to regain control of a game overtaken by the influences of post-war embourgeoisement.[9] North American rugby players are included here as resisting, like early surfers, frisbee throwers and hot-dog skiers, rationalized and technologized North American sporting forms.

Finally, Donnelly (1983: 6) goes on to illustrate that these forms of resistance may over time "lose their oppositional content as they become incorporated by the dominant culture". He shows, for example, that as the presence of sponsorships, competitions and media coverage (ie. elements of bureaucratization and rationalization) has expanded, surfing, hot-dog skiing and even frisbee throwing have lost much of their oppositional elements.

Hence the argument here is that, like these other forms of 'colonial' and 'cultural' resistance through sport, the rugby subculture in North America is viewed as a type of oppositional or counter-cultural movement rather than an extremist or political attempt to overthrow forms prevalent in the dominant order. We should further consider the precise mode of this resistance in more detail.

For newly-arrived Britons in North America, football in particular is a technically alien sport. Militaristically rigid game-patterns including continual substitution, regular stoppages (time-outs, penalties etc.) and an intense division of labour vis-a-vis positional specialization and officiation are all unfamiliar to them. Hence, resistance for this group is in many ways an exaggeration of what Britons already

know. As with other aspects of culture such as accent and customs, the cultural forms associated with rugby were elaborated and exaggerated.

For North American players, rugby is seen as a specific resistance to the game of football. Rugby goes against all of the dominant sporting themes identifiable in football. In addition to the differences outlined above, rugby players (unlike football players) are largely responsible for the successful maintenance of games. Specifically: only one referee and two touch judges officiate in rugby, clearly necessitating a degree of 'honesty' on the part of players if games are to be played successfully; in rugby, time is kept on the referee's stop-watch not via an electric or computerized clock system and other specially appointed time keepers; no time-outs are allowed in rugby; substitutes are allowed in rugby only if injured players are deemed unfit to continue by an appointed physician; no padding is used in rugby; in rugby each player is eligible at all times to run with, pass or kick the ball; rugby players on hitting the ground must immediately release the ball which is then back in play, ie. play is continual; in rugby all tackles must be made with arms and blocking is not allowed. Thus we can see that rugby is a much more play-like concern in the sense of not being over-regimented, over-officiated and over-competitive.

In an article entitled '<u>The Agony and Ecstasy of Rugby</u>'[10], Alex Ward quotes Dr. Robert L. Laurence, coach of the University of Massachusetts Rugby Club, who emphasizes that North American rugby began to blossom on the college campuses of the 1960's as a unique alternative to organized sporting forms:

> 'I think there was a general rebellion against organized sport', he says. 'Rugby isn't a 'varsity sport in most colleges, it's a club sport, and it appealed to a lot of students because it was something they could play without making a tremendous commitment'.
>
> In a society that glorifies professional sport, rugby qualifies as a worthy anachronism, a bastion of the true amateur. No one is in it for the money; not even the referees get paid. When clubs travel, members kick in for expenses, and often stay at the homes of opposing players.

Similarly, Goodwin and Rhys (1981: 162) have acknowledged the oppositional element visible in the rugby game in America, and locate its recent development in the 1960's also. They write that what we:

> ...could not have possibly expected 20-odd years ago was the reactionary wave against commercialized, professionalized sport that swept over the United States in the sixties and seventies. By accident or design rugby's amateur code suddenly became popular and was organized as never before.

Thus, for these writers, the important point is that not only does rugby exist as an alternative to highly organized and commercialized North American sport, but as a much less serious, more amateur and more play-like alternative.

We have already seen in the previous section that British parental or family influences were responsible for persuading many young players in the study towards rugby. However, other sources of encouragement and selection existed and amongst these were aspects of the game itself and the expanding scale on which rugby is played in North American schools and on college campuses.[11] Of course, today's young players were not responsible for initially promoting the game. It was rugby administrators and zealots during the 1960's who were instrumental

in marketing the game, and explanations for the growth of rugby from that time from these people were considered to be a vital source of data.

Extensive informal interviewing in the Southern Ontario region with members of rugby's organizational and administrative structure - people who had witnessed first hand the reintroduction and expansion of the game beginning in the 1960's - has served to substantiate claims that rugby provides a type of resistance to North America's dominant sporting forms. With the major focus of interviews being on why rugby had developed so rapidly since the 1960's, answers heavily underlined that two basic processes had been in operation: first, in the 1960's football - not for the first time but in a more extensive manner than ever before - was suffering the brunt of serious criticism aimed particularly at its escalating levels of violence and its general over-professionalism; second, at a time when it was most needed, rugby was on hand, promoted specifically by ex-patriot Britons, to reintroduce the sporting elements of 'play' and team-spirit which were seen to exist only feebly (if at all) in football.

One club president indicated a belief that with large segments of the sports-following public becoming increasingly disillusioned with football's apparent over-concern with commercialism, the shift to a different more play-like sport was something of an inevitability:

> Sooner or later rugby was going to take off again here. I think it's ideally suited to the courage and brute force demands of football but it seems to offer more. For about the last twenty years,

> football has been too professional, you know, too concerned with big money, big trades, big perks etc. It's just too greedy. Only last week Hershel Walker was plucked from his amateur tree and put into the big league. The guy is an incredible athlete but they're going to turn him into a profit-making machine. We might even lose a future Olympic champion through it. Rugby is much more of a sport than football and everyone inside the game knows that this aspect can be seen most after the match is over. What goes on after the game is just as important in my book as the eighty minutes on the field, and I think more and more football players are beginning to see this.

A similar explanation was offered by a member of another Ontario club's executive committee. After agreeing that the recent growth of rugby stems back "probably to the mid-'60's", he went on to focus on features that were visible in rugby but were conspicuously absent in football:

> Basically, I feel that football at the time was becoming less attractive to young men. Its emphasis on blood and guts could be seen in rugby but without the intensity carrying on after the game. Rugby offered things football couldn't. First, the players were more involved - they could play a full 60 or 80 minutes which is impossible in football. That's because there's none of these militaristic offense/defense moves or substitutions. Second, rugby was as tough as football but you didn't have to be 6'3" and 240 pounds to compete. Also rugby had a social side which football didn't. Players expected to stay together after games and share a few drinks with opponents. You don't see that in football. Altogether, rugby was played in a much more fun-loving atmosphere and coaches encouraged this. I would say that although players didn't necessarily reject it outright - afterall they'd all played football at one time or another and they probably all still watch it - the move to rugby was a move which provided much more participation and more all-round enjoyment than football and it happened in the 1960's because the time was right.

The same respondent went on to argue that although rugby could never overtake football in terms of popularity:

> ...more and more footballers are trying out, and I know from my own experience at the B___ club that they're often pleasantly surprised. Few of them go back to football once they've come to us and I would say this has as much to do with the game's social side as anything else.

It became increasingly more evident as the study unfolded that at the time of reintroduction key administrative positions in terms of promoting rugby were held at most clubs by ex-patriot Britons. As one (Canadian by birth) Ontario club secretary put it:

> Rugby has been played here - on and off - for nearly a century now and of course second and third generation Canadians are playing and organizing the game, but without the British influence I doubt whether the recent upsurge would have happened at all.

It is likely that the ongoing emigration of Britons to North America will continue to influence and encourage the currently spiralling popularity of Rugby Football.

Thus the thesis presented here is a transformation of meaning of cultural elements of rugby, from both the expression and parody of public school life in the United Kingdom to an expression of resistance (within conformity) to the dominant sporting forms in North America, and for Britons a resistance (within conformity) to assimilation.

Finally, it should be re-emphasized that despite pre-war interest, rugby in both Canada and the U.S.A. is in actuality still in its adolescent years. The Canadian Rugby Football Union was not re-established after the War until 1965, and the U.S.A. Rugby Football Union

was not inaugurated until 1975. However, the dominant sporting values of North America may eventually prove too oppressive for the continuing development of an essentially non-rationalized and non-commercialized amateur sport, and although the moment for such a metamorphosis has not yet arrived, North American rugby may ultimately be engulfed under its own wave of professionalizing processes.

Footnotes

1. Currently, women's teams in North America occupy an expanding, though still only a relatively small enclave in rugby's administrative structure.

2. For critiques of the rigid and militaristic overtones of North American sport, see Scott, J. (1971) and Hoch, P. (1972).

3. A report in the September, 1974 edition of the American government publication 'Science, Technology and American Diplomacy' entitled 'Brain Drain: A Study of the Persistent Issue of International Scientifical Mobility' records that the 'brain drain' refers to the migration of skilled manpower mostly to developing countries but also to North America. It notes that the phrase was:

> ...coined in a 1962 report by the British Royal Society which inquired into the emigration of engineers, scientists and technicians from Britain to North America. (11)

Figures cited in the report demonstrate that by 1961, approximately 140 men and women with Ph.D's were departing from the United Kingdom per annum, 60 entering the U.S.A., 20 going to Canada, 35 to other Commonwealth countries and 25 to all other countries. Thus, the British brain drain was clearly aimed in large part at North America.

4. The first definition of counter-culture was presented in J. M. Yinger's 'Counter-Culture and Sub-Culture', (1960: 629). A counter-culture exists:

> ...whenever the normative system of a group contains, as a primary element, a theme of conflict with the values of the total society, where personality values are directly involved in the development and maintenance of the group's values and whenever its norms can only be understood by reference to the relationship of the group to a surrounding dominant culture.

Rozak's (1969: 5) later definition of counter-culture focused similarly on negative responses or lived alternatives to the 'total society'. For him, counter-culture could be defined in terms of "the expression of the grand cultural imperative".

5. Significantly, it seems that following its initial failure, the developing popularity of North American soccer was correlated to certain transformations in the game's structure which functioned to 'North Americanize' its image. This was particularly evident in rule changes that made it impossible to tie games or to generally play them defensively (points earned for a victory were increased, for example), and in attempts to deliver the game as a 'clean', family sport, not one enveloped in the hooligan connotations of British soccer. In addition, world soccer heroes (Franz Beckenbauer, George Best, Pele, Johan Cruyff) were brought to North America to sell and promote the game on television and at specially arranged soccer clinics in grade-schools, (see New York Times, Aug., 29, 1977: 1; New York Times (Illus.), July 11, 1978. II, 15: 4). The former article, penned by Lowell Miller, argues that the New York Cosmos signing of the Brazilian Pele was singly responsible for the increasing popularity of the North American Soccer League.

6. If part of the attraction of the rugby game lies in its organizational proximity to football for those excluded from the latter's highly professionalized and formalized nature, part of its growing popularity may also exist in what appears to be the expanding popularity (particularly in North America) of physical activity more generally (especially jogging and aerobic and jazz 'dancercise').

7. Donnelly, P. A., 'Resistance Through Sports: Sport and Cultural Hegemony'. Paper to be Presented at the forthcoming International Community for the Sociology of Sport, (8th International Symposium), Paris, France. (July, 1983).

8. Geertz, C. (Ed.), Myth, Symbol and Culture. New York: Norton, 1971, (cover).

9. Taylor, I. R., 'Soccer Consciousness and Soccer Hooliganism'. In S. Cohen (Ed.), Images of Deviance. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

10. New York Times, Jan. 20, 1980. (Section 6: 33).

11. One other factor that may account for the resurgence of rugby in North America is that (like soccer) the game is simply very inexpensive to play (very little equipment is necessary), and easier to organize on an informal and spontaneous basis (fewer players and officials are required).

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

A. INVENTORY OF RESEARCH SOURCES

Primary Sources

One season of participant-observation with an Ontario university rugby team, including:

1. Observations of pre- and post-game locker room interaction, behaviour at parties, beer-ups and other social events (eg. Rookie Night).
2. Observations of behaviour on road trips in Canada and U.S.A. maintained in a 'daily log'.
3. Informal interviews with: team members (particularly 'key informants') and coaches; peripheral members of the subculture and 'outside' observers including: spectators, women (wives and girlfriends), bus drivers, campus security officers, a gaoler, a manager of a campus bar, restaurant workers, ex- and current university sports administrators.

One season of participant-observation with an Ontario city Rugby Football Club employing similar methodological techniques.

Informal and taped interviews with members of Rugby Clubs in the United Kingdom including: players, ex-players, officials, ex-officials, administrators, coaches, spectators.

Correspondence with informed sources in U.S.A. and Canada including: historians and archivists, publicity and administrative committees, coaches and other Rugby Club and Union officials.

Minutes of meetings, newsletters, development coordinator's reports.

Secondary Sources

Historians of education and historians of sport, newspapers, magazines and periodicals.

Autobiographies of ex-International players, (Laidlaw, 1973; Edwards, 1979; Duckham, 1980; Burton, 1982).

Doctoral Dissertation, (Thomson, 1976).

B. INTERVIEW GUIDE

With older members and ex-members of the rugby subculture in the United Kingdom

1. How long have you been a member of the rugby fraternity?
2. Why did you choose rugby?
3. In your playing days, what was the class composition of players?
4. Would you say there were any particular game or non-game features that characterized the rugby fraternity in your playing days?
5. Were they enacted only infrequently, often or ritually under particular conditions?
6. Did you fraternize with opponents and did the outcome of games dictate the extent of this?
7. How welcome were women at Rugby Clubs at this time?
8. Have any of these issues changed noticeably over the years?

With older members and ex-members of the rugby subculture in North America

1. How long have you been a member of the rugby fraternity?
2. Why did you choose rugby?
3. When would you say the recent resurgence of rugby's popularity occurred in North America?

4. What was structurally conducive about rugby that attracted the North American population at this time?
5. Did rugby indicate any qualities that were absent in other North American sports?
6. Is the attraction to rugby different for ex-patriot Britons than for North Americans by birth?
7. Is the professionalization of rugby in North America inevitable?

With current players and younger members of the rugby subculture in the United Kingdom and North America

1. How long have you been playing rugby?
2. Why did you choose this sport? (For North American players in particular) Does rugby have qualities other North American sports do not?
3. How do you see the class composition of rugby?
4. Was the rugby fraternity what you had expected?
5. What do you see as the most typical rugger values and behaviours? Are these enacted only sometimes, often or ritually under particular conditions?
6. Do you feel that you have certain expectations to live up to in this regard? Are there times when it is difficult to live up to these expectations?
7. How welcome are women in Rugby Clubs? Does this differ with the circumstance or the event?

8. Do you behave differently at post-match events with women present?
9. How do you combine scholastic and athletic interests? Does one take precedence over the other?
10. Do you feel any sense of 'community' on the team? Does this stop when the season ends?
11. Do you play rugby outside of the college context?
12. Do you fraternize with opponents, and does the outcome of games dictate the extent of this?
13. How do you think the public receives rugby? Do you and the other players feel accepted by the public, regarded as neutral or even unfavourably?
14. You are at a beer-up in an unfamiliar bar. The team gives a rendition of 'Disease Monger' and some unsympathetic strangers make it clear that they are unimpressed. How would you and your colleagues react - for example, would this response inhibit or encourage further 'rowdiness'?

<u>With non-members in the United Kingdom and North America</u>

1. Do you have a particular image of rugby players? How was this caused?
2. Do you think ruggers behave differently to any other collectivity of (male) athletes?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSON, N., The Hobo. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

ARNOLD, D. O. (Ed.), The Sociology of Subcultures. Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1970.

ATYEO, D., Blood and Guts: Violence in Sports. New York: Paddington Press, 1979.

BAMFORD, T. W., Thomas Arnold. London: The Cresset Press, 1960.

BECKER, H. S., Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant-Observation. In American Journal of Sociology, 1958: 652-660.

BECKER, H. S., Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press, 1963.

BECKER, H. S. and B. GEER, Participant-Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison. In Human Organization, 16, 1957: 28-32.

BECKER, H. S., et al, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

BERGER, B. M., Looking For America. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

BERGER, P. L. and P. BERGER, Sociology: A Biographical Approach. London: Basic Books Inc., 1975.

BLALOCK, H. M., An Introduction to Social Research. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

BOYLE, R. H., Sport: Mirror of American Life. Boston: Little Brown, 1963.

BRAKE, M., The Skinheads: An English Working-Class Subculture. In Youth and Society, 6, 1974-75.

BRAKE, M., The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures: Sex and Drugs and Rock 'n' Roll. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

BROOM, L. and P. SELZNICK, Sociology: A Text with Adapted Readings. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

BULLOCK, A. and O. STALLYBRASS, (Eds.), The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought. London: Fontana Books, 1979.

BURTON, M., Never Stay Down. London: MacDonald and Co., 1982.

BUTTERS, S., The Logic of Enquiry of Participant-Observation: A Critical Review. In S. Hall and T. Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London: Hutchinson, 1976: 253-274.

CAMP, W. and L. F. DELAND, Football. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1896.

CLARK, K. B., Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

CLARKE, J., The Skinheads and the Magical Recovery of Community. In S. Hall and T. Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London: Hutchinson, 1976: 99-103.

CLARKE, J., S. HALL, T. JEFFERSON and B. ROBERTS, Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical Overview. In S. Hall and T. Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London: Hutchinson, 1976: 9-75.

CLARKE, M., On the Concept of Subculture. In British Journal of Sociology, Vol. XXV, 1974: 428-441.

CLOWARD, R. and L. E. OHLIN, Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. Chicago: Free Press, 1960.

COHEN, A. K., Delinquent Boys: The Subculture of the Gang. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1955.

COHEN, A. K., A General Theory of Subcultures. In D. O. Arnold (Ed.), The Sociology of Subcultures. Berkeley: The Glendessary Press, 1970: 96-108.

COHEN, A. K. and J. SHORT, Research of Delinquent Subcultures. In Journal of Social Issues, XIV, 3, 1958.

COHEN, P., Subcultural Conflict and Working Class Community. In Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 2, University of Birmingham, 1972.

COHEN, S., Folk Devils and Moral Panics. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972.

COSER, L. A., Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

CRESSEY, P., The Taxi-Dance Hall. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

DAVIS, F., Comment on 'Initial Interaction of Newcomers in Alcoholics Anonymous'. In Social Problems, 8, 1960-61: 364-365.

DENZIN, N. K., The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

DICKEY, G., The Jock Empire: Its Rise and Deserved Fall. Pennsylvania: Chilton, 1974.

DONNELLY, P. A., The Subculture and Public Image of Climbers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1980.

DOWNES, D., The Delinquent Solution. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

DUCKHAM, D., Dai For England. London: Pelham Books, 1980.

DUNNING, E. G. (Ed.), The Sociology of Sport: A Selection of Readings. London: Cass, 1971.

DUNNING, E. G. and K. G. SHEARD, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football. New York: New York University Press, 1979.

EDWARDS, G., Gareth. London: Arrow Books, 1979.

EDWARDS, H., The Revolt of the Black Athlete. New York: Free Press, 1969.

EDWARDS, H., Sociology of Sport. Homewood, Ill.: Dorset, 1973.

ELIAS, N., The Civilizing Process: A History of Manners. New York: Urizen Books, 1978.

ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA INTERNATIONAL EDITION. New York: Americana Corporation, 1965.

ETZIONI-HALEVY, E., Some Patterns of Semi-Deviance on the Israeli Social Scene. In Social Problems, 22, 1975: 356-367.

EVANS-PRITCHARD, E. E., Social Anthropology and Other Essays. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964: 77-79.

FARRIS, R. E., Chicago Sociology: 1920-1932. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

FINE, G. A., Cracking Diamonds: Observer Role in Little League Baseball Settings and the Acquisition of Social Competence. In W. B. Shaffir, R. A. Stebbins and A. Turowetz (Eds.), Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980: 117-132.

FINE, G. A. and B. GLASSNER, Participant-Observation with Children: Promise and Problems. In Urban Life, 8, 1979: 153-174.

FINE, G. A. and S. KLEINMAN, Rethinking Subculture: An Interactionist Analysis. In American Journal of Sociology, 85, 1979-80: 1-20.

FORD, J., This Sporting Land. London: New English Library, 1977.

FRAYNE, T., and P. GZOWSKI, Great Canadian Sports Stories: A Century of Competition. Toronto: Canadian Centennial Publishing Co., Ltd., 1965.

FRIELICH, M. (Ed.), Marginal Natives at Work: Anthropologists in the Field. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, 1977.

GANS, H., The Participant-Observer as a Human Being: Observations on the Personal Aspects of Fieldwork. In H. S. Becker et al (Eds.), Institutions and the Person. Chicago: Aldine, 1968: 300-317.

GEORGES, R. A. and M. O. JONES, People Studying People: The Human Element in Field-Work. California: University of California Press, 1980.

GLASER, B. and A. STRAUSS, The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

GOFFMAN, E., Encounters. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.

GOFFMAN, E., Behaviour in Public Places. New York: Free Press, 1963a.

GOFFMAN, E., Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963b.

GOLD, R. L., Roles in Sociological Field Observations. In Journal of Social Forces, 36, 1958: 217-223.

GOODWIN, T. and C. RHYS, The Guinness Book of Rugby Facts and Feats. Middlesex, England: Guinness Superlatives Ltd., 1981.

GORDON, M. M., The Concept of Subculture and its Application. In Journal of Social Forces, Oct; 1947.

GORDON, M. M., The Subsociety and the Subculture. In Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

GREEN, M., The Art of Coarse Rugby. London: Arrow Books, 1967.

HAGEDORN, R. (Ed.), Sociology. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

HALL, S. and T. JEFFERSON (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London: Hutchinson, 1976.

HALL, S., D. HOBSON, A. LOWE and P. WILLIS (Eds.), Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies 1972-9. Birmingham: Hutchinson, 1980.

HARRIS, H. A., Sport in Britain: Its Origins and Development. London: Stanley Paul, 1975.

HEBDIGE, D., Subculture: The Meaning of Style. London: Methuen and Co., 1979.

HOCH, P., Rip Off the Big Game. New York: Doubleday, 1972.

IRVINE, D., The Joy of Rugby. London: Emblem, 1979.

IRWIN, J. K., Surfers: A Study of the Growth of a Deviant Subculture. M. A. Thesis Presented to the University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

IRWIN, J. K., Notes on the Present Status of the Concept of Subculture. In D. O. Arnold (Ed.), The Sociology of Subcultures. Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1970.

JUNKER, B. H., Field-Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

KELLY, D. H. (Ed.), Deviant Behaviour: Readings in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.

LAFLAMME, A. G., The Role of Sport in the Development of Ethnicity: A Case Study. In Sport Sociology Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 1, Spring 1977: 47-52.

LAIDLAW, C., Mud in Your Eye: A Worm's Eye View of the Changing World of Rugby. London: Pelham Books, 1973.

LEE, A. M., Levels of Culture as Levels of Social Generalization. In American Sociological Review. August, 1945.

LEE, E. W., History of the Eastern Rugby Union. In Rugby, Jan., 1978: 15.

LEMERT, E., Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

LOY, J. W. and J. O. SEGRAVE, Research Methodology in the Sociology of Sport. In J. H. Wilmore (Ed.), Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews, Vol. 2, New York: Academic Press, 1974.

McCALL, G. J. and J. L. SIMMONS (Eds.), Issues in Participant-Observation. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

McCLELLAND, D. C., The Achieving Society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1961.

McELROY, D. K., Socialization and the Seasonal Subculture. Paper Presented at the Third International Symposium of the Sociology of Sport, Waterloo, Ontario, 1971.

MACKENZIE, R. J., Almond of Loretto. London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1905.

MANGAN, J. A., Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public Schools: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

MASON, T., Association Football and English Society, 1863-1915. Brighton, England: Harvester Press, 1980.

MATZA, D., Subterranean Traditions of Youth. In American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 338, 1961: 102-118.

MATZA, D., Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

MATZA, D. and G. SYKES, Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Vales. In American Sociological Review, 26, 1961.

MAYS, J. B., Juvenile Delinquency. Jonathan Cape, 1954.

MEGGYESY, D., Out of Their League. Berkeley, California: Ramparts Press, 1971.

MENKE, F. G., Rugby Football. In his Encyclopedia of Sports. New York: A. S. Barnes Co., 1944.

MERTON, R. K., Social Structure and Anomie. In American Sociological Review, 3, 1938: 672-682.

MESCHERY, T., 'There is a disease in sports now'. In Sports Illustrated, October 2: 1982.

MILLER, W. B., Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency. In Journal of Social Issues, 14, 1958: 5-19. (Reprinted in D. H. Kelly (Ed.), Deviant Behaviour: Readings in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979).

MONEYMAKER, D., History of Pacific Coast R.F.U. In Rugby, March, 1978.

MUNGHAM, G. and G. PEARSON, Working-Class Youth Cultures. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

NIXON, H., Sport and Social Organization. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Ltd., 1976.

ORLOFF, K., 'Playgirl' Presents the San Diego State Rugby Team. In Playgirl, 11, 1, 1974: 44-46.

PARK, R. E., E. BURGESS and R. D. McKENZIE, The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

PARK, R. E. and R. D. McKENZIE (Eds.), The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

PARKIN, F., Middle-Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. New York: F. A. Praeger Inc., 1968.

PARSONS, T., Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States. In his Essays in Sociological Theory. Chicago: Free Press, 1954: 89-103.

PEARSON, G., The Deviant Imagination: Psychiatry, Social Work and Social Change. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1975.

PEARSON, K., Surfing Subcultures of Australia and New Zealand. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 1979.

POLSKY, N., Hustlers, Beats and Others. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

POOLEY, J. C., Ethnic Soccer Clubs in Milwaukee: A Study in Assimilation. In M. Hart and S. Birrell (Eds.), Sport in the Sociocultural Process. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1981. (Third Edition).

PRUS, R., Sociologist as Hustler: The Dynamics of Acquiring Information. In W. B. Shaffir, R. A. Stebbins and A. Turowetz (Eds.), Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981: 132-145.

RIESMAN, D. and R. DENNEY, Football in America: A Study in Culture Diffusion. In J. W. Loy Jnr. and G. S. Kenyon (Eds.), Sport, Culture and Society: A Reader on the Sociology of Sport. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1969.

RIESS, A. J., The Study of Deviant Behaviour: Where the Action Is. In M. Lefton, J. K. Skipper Jnr., and C. H. McCaghy (Eds.), Approaches to Deviance: Theories, Concepts and Research Findings. New York: Century Crofts, 1968.

ROBERTS, B., Naturalistic Research into Subcultures and Deviance: An Account of a Sociological Tendency. In S. Hall and T. Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London: Hutchinson, 1976: 243-253.

ROZAK, T., The Making of the Counter-Culture. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

SAMPLE, J., Confessions of a Dirty Ball Player. New York: Dell Books, 1972.

SCHATZMAN, L., Field Research: Strategies For a Natural Sociology. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

SCHECHTER, L., The Jocks. New York: Warner, 1969.

SCHWARTZ, M. S. and C. G. SCHWARTZ, Problems in Participant-Observation. In American Journal of Sociology, 60, 1955: 343-353.

SCOTT, J., The Athletic Revolution. New York: Free Press, 1971.

SHAFFIR, W. B., R. A. STEBBINS and A. TUROWETZ (Eds.), Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

SHAW, C. R., The Jack-Roller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

SHAW, G., Meat on the Hoof: The Hidden World of Texas Football. New York: Dell Books, 1972.

SHEARD, K. G. and E. G. DUNNING, The Rugby Football Club as a Type of Male-Preserve: Some Sociological Notes. In J. W. Loy et al (Eds.), Sport, Culture and Society: A Reader on the Sociology of Sport. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1981. (Second Edition).

SHIBUTANI, T., Reference Groups as Perspectives. In American Journal of Sociology, 60, 1954-1955: 562-569.

SIMON, B., The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780-1870. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.

SNOW, D. A., The Disengagement Process: A Neglected Problem in Participant-Observation Research. In Qualitative Sociology, Vol. 3, 1980: 100-122.

STURROCK, D. N., A History of Rugby Football in Canada. Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Alberta, Fall, 1971.

SUTHERLAND, E. H., Principles of Criminology. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1939. (Third Edition).

SUTHERLAND, E. H., White Collar Crime. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1949.

SUTHERLAND, E. H. and C. CORNWELL, The Professional Thief. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

SUTTLES, G. D., The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

SYKES, G. and D. MATZA, Techniques of Neutralization. In American Sociological Review, 22, Dec., 1957: 664-670.

TAYLOR, I., P. WALTON and J. YOUNG, The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

THOMAS, J. B. G., Rugby: Men, Matches and Moments. London: Pelham Books, 1970.

THOMSON, R., Sport and Deviance: A Subcultural Analysis. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1976.

THRASHER, F. M., The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

TUROWETZ, A., An Ethnography of Professional Wrestling: Elements of a Staged Contest. Unpublished M. A. Thesis, McGill University, 1974.

TYLOR, E. B., Primitive Culture. London: John Murray, 1871.

VANREUSEL, B. and R. RENSEN, The Role of Social Stigma in the Formation and Maintenance of High Risk Sport Subcultures. Paper Presented at the Second Annual Conference of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Fort Worth, Texas, Nov., 1981.

VOIGHT, D. Q., America's Leisure Revolution. Reading, Penn., Albright College, 1974.

WALVIN, J., The People's Game: A Social History of British Football. London: Allen Lane, 1975.

WALVIN, J., Leisure and Society, 1830-1950. New York: Longman, 1978.

WAX, R., Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

WEST, W. G., Access to Adolescent Deviants and Deviance. In W. B. Shaffir, R. A. Stebbins and A. Turowetz (Eds.), Fieldwork Experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

WHYTE, W. F., Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

WILLIAMS, R., Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. London: Fontana, 1976.

WILLIS, P., Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working-Class Jobs. London: Saxon House, 1978a.

WILLIS, P., Profane Culture. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978b.

WILLIS, P., A Note on Method. In S. Hall et al (Eds.), Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies 1972-9. Birmingham: Hutchinson, 1980: 88-96.

WILLMOTT, P., Adolescent Boys in East London. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

WOLF, D., Foul! New York: Warner, 1972.

WOLFGANG, M. E. and F. FERRACUTI, The Subculture of Violence. London: Tavistock, 1967.

WYMER, N., Dr. Arnold of Rugby. London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1953.

YINGER, J. M., Counter-Culture and the Sub-Culture. In American Sociological Review, 25, Oct., 1960.

ZORBAUGH, H., The Gold Coast and the Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.