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Introduction

The main aim of the article is to present the adventures and mishaps (awkward field situations, methodological, ethical and 'technical' dilemmas) which a researcher may face using the ethnographic method. What is meant here are the adventures in the course of the qualitative exploration of the subworld that is hardly accessible and rarely 'visited' by social researchers – of football fans, particularly the 'committed' fans of the Dutch football team FC Twente Enschede. The indicated issues include various dilemmas of the 'before-' and 'out-of-field', problems in the very field, as well as multidimensional consequences of studying the subculture of football fans with a view to possibly enhancing the activities of researchers who would undertake similarly difficult ethnographical tasks in the future. We hope that the presented events, phenomena and states will contribute to deepening the reflections on the procedures used in qualitative research. The text may perhaps prove useful to researchers who lack similar experiences and are planning to set off into the 'unknown'.

Four issues are our main focus. The first one is access to the community of football fans. Our intention is to show what (often risky and unexpected) measures are required to gain the access. The issue of gaining access is connected with the attempt to build a bond with a group of fans, to gain their trust. The second issue are dangers (physical, emotional and legal ones) connected with 'being inside'. The third issue discussed in the article are consequences of such ethnography for the identity of a researcher which result from carrying out the research in the mode of 'complete immersion' and in the state of 'going with the flow' (of the consistent involvement in the process of being a fan). It has to be noted yet here that the term 'complete immersion' is not understood in the same sense as it is done by Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson (2000: 112), that is as full integration with the culture under study, at the same time concealing the role of the researcher. Our 'complete immersion' means 'being here and now' in the situations which the researched experienced, clearly emphasising the researching role. These were both situations when our roles of researchers had no special meaning for the researched (for example common singing of songs, cheering, applauding), and moments when we constituted 'one social body' with the researched. The fourth issue discussed in the article is the influence of the
first three issues (of gaining access, dangers of immersion and the identity of the immersed) on the inner accuracy and outer integrity (see Miles and Huberman 2000: 288-291) of the ethnographic description.

Studying subcultures and closed social sub-worlds has constituted a real challenge for sociologists almost since the very beginning of the discipline. What is meant here by referring to 'subculture' and 'subworld' are exclusive groups which are characterised by specific distinctness from the cultural mainstream, often by opposition to social order, other groups or norms, and they are sometimes situated somewhere on the margin or even in the 'underground' of social life. However, it is not our belief that fan subculture remains 'out of the society', although undoubtedly it fails to accept all changes that their field of activity is now undergoing. Football fans who our study focused on are characterised by an attitude of opposition which is manifested in the expression *Against Modern Football*. The industrial fans (cf. Antonowicz, Kossakowski, Szlendak 2011) whom we joined in the course of our study, do not like the transformations occurring in the contemporary sport. They protest against the more and more numerous restrictions which limit the range of acceptable behaviours in the stands, as well as against big corporations appropriating sport. It is worth adding that sports commercialisation has resulted in the emergence of a new type of football fan-consumer. Both groups – euphemistically saying – are not fond of each other. The industrial football fans often express their contempt for the 'new' fans, calling them 'picnics', for example. On the other hand, football fans-consumers regard the ultras as aggressive bandits who disturb the peaceful contemplation of sports show as a product of emotional industry like a Hollywood film or an outdoor concert of a music mega-star.

We accept that in the case of the industrial football fans (that is the 'old type' fans) it is worth using the label of 'living culture' which means not only the fact of being a specific quality dissimilar from others, but also the fact that there are cultural forms of activity which are integral with the existence of this community (see. Hugson, Inglis, Free 2005: 165-166). At the same time, the social world of football fans constitutes, as we see it, part of a natural life of all the late modern societies – the societies which are abundant in various lifestyles. Rober Prus described such a situation as 'subcultural mosaic which refers to the multiplicity of subcultures, worlds of life or group affiliations which determine people's involvement in societies or communities at every moment of time' (quoted after: Konecki 2010: 25). The approach which is also close to ours is the one by Robert Park who considered his contemporary Chicago as a mosaic of little worlds. Similarly, we believe that our subject of study is part of a larger whole, part of late modern society viewed as 'a subcultures federation', even if the representatives of the subculture under study match the
Park's expression *marginal men*, that is people who take – the uncomfortable – position 'in between' the two worlds (the worlds of students and football fans, employees and football fans, the unemployed and football fans, etc.). It is not our aim to determine what the 'quality status' of such people is. Park argued (see 1928) that the people 'in between' are often more civilised, have broader horizons. Looking at football fans from the angle of the mainstream media reports one would have to assume that in this case a *marginal man* is rather somebody backward in civilisation, a barbarian. In our analyses we distance ourselves from such a standpoint, and we use the Park's expression exclusively in the context of describing the people who are 'in between'.

**R1, R2, R3: On the Methodological Framework of the Research and Troubles with the Researchers' Statuses**

In order to explore the community of football fans, to get to know them and understand them, we have used the ethnographic technique of participant observation in 'complete immersion'. We have decided to enter the environment of the researched to experience the around-match rituals 'from the inside'. The participant observation study is understood here as 'a process of gaining knowledge as a result of exposing oneself or engaging in everyday or routine activities of the participants of a context under study' (Angrosino 2010: 11). As ethnography we consider here 'an empirical and theoretical approach which seeks detailed holistic description and analysis of cultures based on intensive participative fieldwork' (Hugson, Inglis, Free 2005: 159).

The research on the community of football fans was undertaken by three of us, with each of us approaching the research from a different position. The first one (who in the text is referred to as Researcher One – R1) has already known football fans for some time, he has long been a fan himself. Therefore, he was able to gain greater respect of the researched and he certainly was allowed to do more. He has come a longer way, gone through the necessary rituals, and his experience in being a fan has facilitated his reaching the subsequent 'levels of initiation'. The second of us (Researcher Two – R2) stared the exploration of football fans' subworld from the very beginning. At the start of his field work he had a low status, however, he was not 'doomed to fail' or to join the group 'in the dark'.

---

1 The research was carried out as part of the 'ZZZ' project funded by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (UUU). The project referred to the commercialisation of contemporary sports and changes occurring within being a football fan. Apart from participant observation study of football fan-ultras behaviours, we have also carried out interviews with people who are – in various ways – involved in contemporary football (stadium architects, stadium managers, football clubs managers and employees, etc.). The first findings and conceptual assumptions of the research are to be found here: YYY 2011 and 2012.
since he was introduced (and in a way 'instructed') by R1 whom the fans already knew and respected. The third of us (R3) remained distanced from the field explorations, assuming the necessary – theoretical, methodological and ethical – control over the level of R1 and R2 immersion.

Dissimilar 'positioning' and respect have resulted not only in a different status of each of the researchers among the football fans. The difference in access to the world of stadium stands caused that R1 and R2 experienced a bit different reality in the sense that they received the same facts in a slightly different way and they frequently attributed different meanings to them. This was a result of dissimilar positions within the social world of football fans, of previously gaining greater knowledge (nuances 'reading') and of the access to the 'secrets' unavailable to the ignoramus. We were of course aware of all these things while writing the ethnography.

In the literature, one may find extremely vivid ethnographies of the worlds of criminals, the homeless, marihuana smokers, religious communities or women in motorcycle groups (see the classic studies by the Chicago School, and for example Becker 2009). They are mentioned here only to point out that sociologists has very often ventured into the regions 'condemned' by the dominant social groups. Then, they broaden their baggage of sociological experiences, develop their sociological knowledge adding next tiers (or 'sub-tiers') of social reality. This happens even more so because – as was noticed by Howard S. Becker – this kind of participant observation study is meant not only to test the hypotheses, but also to discover them (1958: 653). Thus, as a result, and it is not always an intended consequence, this kind of research may deconstruct stereotypes and modify pictures created by the media. Frequently, the researchers finish such explorations different than they used to be before the study. The last statement may certainly appear trivial (as all is subject to change), however, what is meant here is a serious change. The situation here is that the researcher (often without any other choice, but not always) crosses the boundary and in the research process reaches a specific liminal state – the state 'in between' being the very researcher and the position of the so-called native. In other words, our intention is to show the backstage of this liminality – the techniques of carrying out field research among the most fanatical football fans, an integral part of which is complete unpredictability of situation, as well as the spontaneity of the researched people’s behaviours. It is obvious that we have not studied all football fans of FC Twente Enschede, but only part of them – the most fanatical fans – the Vak-P group. The ethnography of this group was a great challenge and a test for our research skills since the participant observation study took place in highly non-standard situations, and sometimes in the
extreme ones. What is more, when we started entering the environment of the researched and were gradually becoming members of this subculture, it was unavoidable that we started to experience some dilemmas connected with the transformation of the identity of a researcher trying to find his place in the very middle of a lively reacting crowd whose behaviours are full of spontaneity and dangerous extremes.

The participant observation study was one of the several techniques utilised by us; one of the pillars of a research complex that included, apart from observation, in-depths interviews with football fans and secondary analysis of documents, content analysis, among other things, of football fan press, informal publications of particular football fan groups (fanzines), fan websites and banners hung during matches. Michael Angrosino (see 2010: 102) describes an ethnographic research constructed in this way as 'good'. In our analysis, however, we omit the methodological considerations connected with carrying out interviews or content analysis since their performance was not significantly different from the standards set in the literature. Nevertheless, participant observation study carried out in the conditions of extreme emotions is basically unavailable for the average researcher, extremely difficult to be conducted in a reliable way, and most of all, it is accompanied by a series of physical, methodological and ethical dangers.

The choice of participant observation study was first of all determined by the specificity of the group under study which is of a community nature, highly hermetic and at the same time considerably distinct from the dominant culture as regards norms, values and behaviours; secondly, it was determined by the aim of the research which was learning and attempting to understand the irrational, nearly religious (according to our hypotheses) world of fans living in a stable and prosperous Dutch society. 'Sociologists usually use this method when they are specially interested in understanding a particular organization or substantive problem rather than demonstrating relations between abstractly defined variables' (Becker 1958: 652-653). That is the reason why beginning the research on football fans, and especially deciding to explore the group of the most fanatical Dutch football fans associated in Vak-P, we had basically no alternative if the research conducted by us was supposed to reach beyond the ordinary description of football fan reality seen from a safe distance. It appears impossible to get to know the community of orthodox football fans observing their behaviours from other sectors at the stadium. We would then have to resort only to 'sliding' on the surface and our understanding of community and stadium behaviours would be superficial. The aim of our study was yet to reach beyond the 'verandah' observation and the superficial description of behaviours available for the broader public, which accompany it, because, as was perfectly stated by Ruth Behar
‘the beauty and mystery of the ethnographer’s quest is to find the unexpected stories, the stories that challenge our theories’. The starting point of our considerations was the conviction that understanding fanatical fans of FC Twente Enschede is possible only thanks to interaction experience which requires approaching the community and common participation in football fans rites. Therefore, we have assumed the attitude that derived from the interaction approach which states that ‘it is necessary to enter into the actual situations where <the others> live, to enter into their worlds of life. To understand the experiences of others is possible only through constantly achieving inter-subjectivity or experiences similar to those of the researched. It may be achieved through participation in the researched people's worlds of life and repeated open conversations with them’ (Konecki 2010: 29). The participant observation study has thus become the only possible tool.

A football fans community researcher, Richard Giulianotti (1995: 2) argues that in such a case, using the participant observation study is connected with three issues which to an equal extent refer to sociologists and culture anthropologists. First of all, it is the researcher’s leaving his 'comfortable position on the verandah' in order to explore what emerges in the arcana of another community. Secondly, there is implicit curiosity pertaining especially to those communities or groups which significantly differ from the dominant social practices and norms within a context (they could be called *marginal communities*). Thirdly, we can observe here the empathic attitude towards the groups under study, which requires also a more relativised approach to the used scientific knowledge, as well as social constructs and norms in relation to such phenomena. In our case, empathy means recognising the 'truth' declared by the marginal community. Second to it is carefulness as regards the truths of other discourses (the media, journalistic, and to some extent also the scientific ones).

The 'relinquishing the verandah' has not only its metaphoric meaning; it also contains methodological implications that entail rejecting the accepted, dominant (very often popular) opinions, stereotypes and 'common truths' on the group under study. In our case, the research approach is well described by the attitude of *getting to know the culture from the perspective of the researched* (Hugson, Inglis, Free 2005: 167). This would mean relying rather on evidence, reports from the emic perspective, and only in the subsequent part (for example in the theoretical description being the final part of the research process) adding our etic perspective.

We have assumed that to get to know the football fans community, understand the world as perceived by them, we have to see fans through their own eyes, and not the eyes of
the police, security guards, journalists, or even office sociologists (or rather the verandah ones...). Our aim is to look at football fan world without the police or journalistic interpretation filters. Therefore, only the direct participant observation study could enable a fair judgement. 'In the research context this involves the fair and equal treatment of participants and all humans encountered within the ambit of study' (ibid.: 172). To defer expectations – which is obviously never fully effective – could contribute to a specific transformation of us as researchers. On the other hand, the wish to avoid looking at the researched through the eyes of the mentioned 'official' categories should not effect in perceiving the fans as victims of media attack, a socially stigmatised group, characterised by a specific 'imprint' of the excluded (see Goffman 2005). A similar challenge was faced by Teresa P. R. Caldeira (2002) when investigating overuse of force towards people of low social or economic status by the Brazilian police. It is a difficult task, however, from the very beginning we have been aware of the necessity to free ourselves from narration traps that dominate in the Polish public discourse, but also to free ourselves from the temptation of excessive empathy towards the researched group (from the so-called underdog sympathy, see Hugson, Inglis, Free 2005: 173).

Before beginning the first participant observation study during the match between FC Twente Enschede and Feyenoord Rotterdam, we decided not to structuralize our observations, following the guidelines by Howard S. Becker, who argued that 'The best evidence may be that gathered in the most unthinking fashion, when the observer has simply recorded the item although it has no place in the system of concepts and hypotheses he is working with at the time (...)' (1958: 659). Field research requires that the sociologist assumes the role in which he will explore the subject of their study. The same applied to our case. Covert observation was out of question since in the context of community where the most committed football fans recognise one another, the presence of strangers, whose sitting in the exclusive sector for the most fanatical fans could not be explained, would be unwelcome and dangerous. We would not be able to enter into the environment of the researched just like that. Like a stranger cannot enter our house as a member of the family or a friend, we had no chances to come to a place, greet everybody, and then get on the bus and set off for the away game together with the fans. Entering the community required preparations, and most of all openness, that is informing about our research idea and intentions. Without the support from the high in the hierarchy members of the Vak-P, it would be impossible to carry out ethnographic research for two main reasons. First of all, tickets for the sector of the most fanatical fans are not available for people from out of the Vak-P fan association. These seats are sold exclusively as season tickets which are
distributed by the club in cooperation with the fan organisation. Secondly, the fan community is constantly penetrated by the police, which results in extreme distrust towards strangers sitting in the fan sector. In our case, the fact that the tickets were not available meant that we were not able to buy them in an official way. The tickets for the above mentioned matches were 'fixed' for us. We informed the person who was our gatekeeper that we wanted to buy them well in advance. We collected the tickets a few hours before the match, obviously without enquiring whether anyone had given them up to us or not. In some cases, such as the Dutch Cup Final, we were asked if we wanted the tickets a few weeks before the game since it meant booking seats on a special coach. Even if we received tickets for the family sector, still our friends fans always found a way to 'smuggle' us to the Vak-P sector.

To describe our research role, there are obviously appropriate metaphors which were already coined by researchers. However, it is very difficult for us to become part of one of the most commonly used typology by Raymond Gold (1958). This results, first of all, from the different statuses of R1 and R2, and secondly, from the fact of our status changing with time. Definitely, we were not 'complete observers' for the reasons which have been mentioned earlier. In a sense, the role which was appropriate for us was the one of the 'observer as a member' which means that the researcher is a person who is known in the subculture under study, but they relate to it only and exclusively as researchers. Surely, this role was the closest to us as then the researcher builds closer relations with the researched, yet without giving up their cognitive neutrality. The research was always carried out by two researchers (but for one exception), one of whom was more an observer than a participant, and the other was more a participant (member of a football fandom) than an observer. This was caused by the fact that one of the researchers had spent almost a year in Enschede before he was symbolically admitted to the fandom. This quite a subtle difference was yet quite rightly recognised by the fans who were the closest to us within 'the crew' we were part of.

In our case, inapplicable was also the second 'extreme' role, that is the 'complete participant' which means integrating with the researched at different levels (of membership, emotions, etc.), frequently without revealing that one is a researcher. This role was out of question in our case even for the linguistic, cultural or nationality reasons. This does not mean, however, that we had no possibilities of experiencing 'complete immersion'. On the contrary, we experienced 'complete immersion' which was not necessarily connected with full integration. In other words, our 'complete immersion' referred only to some aspects of participating in the group. We are aware that it may sound
like nonsense – it is difficult to imagine that one is immersed only in some 'aspects' of the ocean. It is our belief that this 'aspect' immersion is characterised by the 'marginal native' position which Gary Armstrong (1993: 20) depicts as a midpoint between the 'stranger' and the 'friend'. Being 'a friend' in our case meant that both the researched and the researchers share their common interest in the game and events at the stadium – the atmosphere of the game, the score, the behaviour of the opposing team fans. The term 'stranger' means that the researcher pursues goals which do not refer – either in the collective, or the individual sense – to the members of the group. It is obvious that being a 'marginal native' entails specific dilemmas. For example, while being part of a community one has to subtly select the moments when it is possible to move from the role of the 'friend' into the role of the 'stranger', in which one may for example obtain additional information. Obviously, this is not possible at the time when the team scores a goal and all the researched go mad in excitement. However, the moment of travelling to the match together, the journey which gathers people in one place enables such a 'transition'. This was also the moment when some of the researched were themselves willing to talk, were curious about our conclusions, were willing to exchange opinions about changes taking place in the fan world. The role of the 'friend' was very helpful. We are interested in sports ourselves, in football, therefore the matter of common interests was a great starting point for conversations and broadening our knowledge. The Dutch football fans often asked us about the Polish fans. They assumed we had such knowledge and this has always generated comparisons, their comments, or our questions about their situation. Common interests strengthened our roles of the 'insiders'. As has turned out later, common supporting of the FC Twente Enschede club, which we practised as 'indifferent supporters' from the beginning, increased our common field of experience since in the course of 'research support' we started to 'move' from the role of the observer towards the role of the participant, which is described in detail later in this text.

Conducting the participant observation study among the fans of the FC Twente Enschede was not free of dilemmas, which we were prepared for as they could influence the evaluation of the studied phenomena, and we as researchers (and human beings) found ourselves in a situation which is often called double bind. On the one hand, we were limited by deeply internalised social norms, and on the other, by the necessity to internalise new patterns and norms characteristic of the subculture world of football fans. The necessity of cultural identification with the world, which at least for one of us (R2) had actually been known only from the external experience (media reports, books), caused that in the course of the research we had to take into account assuming of the status of specific
marginality. It is worth underlining that the different level of 'immersion' into the fan subculture caused that R1 and R2 sometimes formed extremely dissimilar interpretations of the same, commonly experienced phenomena. This shows how essential the role of the humanistic coefficient is in carrying out the participant observation study, even in sociologists proficient in skills and tools. Thanks to the fact that the people who surrounded us did not understand the Polish language, we had almost constantly the possibility of exchanging our observations which illustrated discrepancies of interpretations. Thus, in a sense, at almost every moment, we attempted to build a common definition of the situation.

The narration on our field adventures and mishaps has been built around four points, outlined in the introduction. These include as follows: 1) entering the researched group, 2) multidimensional dangers connected with the research situation, 3) the problem of the transformation of 'I' the researcher in the course of field exploration, and 4) the influence of the research experience on the 'objectivity' of description and analyses. All four problem fields are obvious to often overlap and interpenetrate.

Vak-P Opens Its Doors: Procedures of Entering the Football Fandom

The opening in the title has to be treated both literally and metaphorically; it is permission both to be physically present, and to cross a certain cultural and mental boundary. Entering the football fandom is key to the entire research process, and at the same time, the least 'stable' as at every moment the fandom members may ask the researchers to immediately leave or (in a more radical version) physically throw them out. There is always such a danger because the presence of researchers does not have to suit all fandom members, they do not have to let them in or even accept, especially due to the fact that football fans approach strangers with great distrust. Therefore, at the very beginning, we were faced with the challenge of finding 'the access code', that is gaining appropriate trust of the group members.

The fact that we personified strangeness in several dimensions intensified our doubts. Our ethnic and cultural strangeness was perceivable more than the fact than we were not members of the most fanatical fans of the Vak-P group. Mist of all, we are not Dutchmen and we do not speak Dutch. Our medium for communication was English. We are aware of the limitations in such a situation. This limited, most of all, our ability to get to know the language structures characteristic only of the researched subculture. Studying Dutch football fans we did not experience a culture shock like Bronislaw Malinowski or
other researchers who explored worlds that were totally unknown to them. In our case, to be able to refer to a culture shock at all, one has to mean the 'culture of supporting' as such, which is completely different from the academic culture we are connected with.2

In this context, it is worth mentioning the classic essay by Georga Simmla (2006: 204-212) about the very 'stranger'. The stranger who although was becoming a member of a community, never completely assimilated with it. At the very beginning, we were not able to have even such a status, though. We just wanted to become a 'stranger' who at the same time is a 'friend'. We were considering if the label which is pinned on such football fans – the folk devils label – would not be disadvantageous for us. The researched could assume that we represent the 'verandah' perspective which produces negative labels treating the 'stigmatised' group with overt contempt. Moreover, the hooligan 'brand' which is given to such groups, although we were aware of its social construction, could function like self-fulfilling prophecy. How to avoid perceiving football fans from the angle of such labels already during the first contacts? How to convince the Dutch fans that we are trying to investigate their world avoiding any prejudices? Can our explanations enable us to gain trust of the people who have lately become the target of very strong restrictions of state authorities and police actions?

On the other hand, we as researchers had to answer the question: what we are prepared for – in the personality and emotional sense – contacting with a group which is capable of radical behaviours, in which the collective soul dominates and one has to conform to collective behaviours on the borders of social norms. Michael Angrosino recommends that, before entering the field, the researcher make their 'personality inventory' (see 2010: 66-67). The inventory is a kind of internal dialogue in which the researcher himself/herself has to find answers to many questions. Are they able to persevere in specific situations which they are not accustomed to and which so far have not been the scene of socialisation mechanisms they were subject to? Are they able to 'go with the flow' of the research situation, which may result in questioning those I's under

---

2 It may be added that perhaps the academic culture is also a form of subculture in the sense offered here. Perhaps some scientists are also marginal men – persons located out of the main stream and committed to exploring entities which may fail to have much in common with the everyday life. Academics are yet considered freaks. Who knows, perhaps sometimes the subculture of academics (or a part of them) has more in common with other subcultures than it appears to us?

3 It may be pointed out that sometimes football fans accept some labels that are pinned on them by other circles. While analysing the content of the football fan monthly To my kibice [It's Us the Fans] one may find texts and photos of 'crews' which seem to identify with labels such as for example 'hooligans'. The issue here is a specific looking-glass self. Up to a certain degree, the fans become what others see them. It appears that the external stigma becomes a source of identity and a reservoir of terms serving auto-definition. This issue is very interesting and worth being considered separately, both in the context of the topic of the self, but also from the angle of the secondary deviance concept, in which after engaging in the 'first deviance' the person moves into the 'deviance of the second degree' internalising the label of the deviant and including it into the process of creating their own identity (see for example Lemert 1967).
consideration which they have used so far? Perhaps, it would be easier for us to answer these questions if we had socialisation experiences in the researched group. The issue here is not even being one of the members of the Vak-P group, but rather being a fan of Twente, a resident of the region or the city of Enschede, which would undoubtedly allow us to enter into the researched group more easily. Admittedly, one of us had built an effective network with several members of the Vak-P group who were ranked high in the informal hierarchy, but these were very personal relationships, which not necessarily facilitated the situation.

As a consequence, R1 began his attempts to enter the subculture much earlier than R2, while R3 stayed at the university away from the crowd. When we started our research, he had already overcome ‘the worst’. For this reason, at this point, our narration is separated in order to precisely show what the difference in our status was and what it resulted from. For clearer reasoning, it is the right thing to describe the adventures and mishaps of searching for the entrance to the football fans subculture of two researchers separately. The first one should be R1 whose experiences in this matter are richer, and most of all, have influenced the research future of R2. The role of R3, although the least exposed in this paper, was very important too. As the most experienced researcher remains in order to keep control and steer the process of field research. The role of R3 was critical also because he was observing how R1 and R2 were changing over the course of the research, how they have been influenced by their field work with Twente fans. Overall, his reflection largely inspired the paper and food for though.

R1 Enters

R1’s first attempts to reach the world of the football fans took almost three months at the end of 2007/beginning of 2008, during his scholarship stay in Enschede, and they failed to be successful. As an outsider, a fan buying single tickets for games, R1 had no other choice but sit at the stadium in the least attractive seats, from the perspective of the research aims, namely in the family sector, just next to the sector for the guest team fans. While this guaranteed a good view of the Vak-P sector, however, the sector was situated opposite the one he was in. Thus, apart from photographic documentation, there was no access to the group of the most fanatical fans.

The breakthrough was completely accidental. R1 happened to see trainings at the local boxing club which was located in the centre of the city. The fact that, before the scholarship stay, R1 was training boxing as an amateur, was much to his advantage. It
quickly turned out that among the trainees there were many fans of the local team, and they included also those most fanatical ones who were easy to identify. Their bodies were in large parts covered by many club tattoos. Thanks to training together regularly, R1’s relations with the football fans became better and better and more and more frequent, and most of all, more regular.

The fact that R1 travelled with the Twente fans to see away games (after obtaining a special card for away games fans) was also a breakthrough. Although the means of transport for those trips was organised by the club and there were also random fans whose participation was a form of a tourist trip in a nice atmosphere, still – especially at small stadiums like Venlo – there was an occasion to stand in a crowd with the most fanatical fans. Away games resulted in that, after the next training, the fans themselves offered to go by cars together, which was admittedly meant to be less safe, yet it guaranteed greater emotions. Since then, R1 went to away games together with the 'boxing crew' several times. The second breakthrough moment was a physical confrontation with football fans of another, larger club at a petrol station when in spite of being fewer, the group from Enschede (including R1) did not back away even an inch. This strengthened R1’s position in the group, as well as considerably increased the group’s trust in him. Since that time, the researcher’s status significantly changed. It may be said that he became a member of the group. It was evident especially during the final games of the play-off round when it was clear that the group members watched that nobody went away and that the group members kept close to one another. What is more, during the mentioned games with Ajax Amsterdam the researcher was allowed to travel wearing his home speedway team colours, which is generally not acceptable.

Concluding on R1 experiences, it was a long process of gradual entering the group, whose course was not possible to be planned in advance and then realised according to the plan. We began the research project having the 'access' to the FC Twente fans. However, it was not certain if after a year of his absence, the group which R1 was connected with would be willing to accept him in the role of a researcher and would be ready to help in organising the research, relying on the previous trust. The more so because the familiar and trusted R1 was joined by R2. We were curious what the fans' attitude to R2 would be. Would he gain trust since he was 'introduced' by the already tried R1?

**R2 Enters**

From the very beginning, we have agreed that the participant observation study cannot be
carried out by one researcher. The different levels of engagement of several researchers offered – it was at least our belief – chances to 'level' the comprehensive perspective. Thus, to maintain the inter-subjectivity of observation we agreed that the team of field researchers has to be made of at least two people. Against our concerns, the researchers obtained verbal consent to carry out the exploration and to be provided with assistance in logistics. Already during the first research trip together to the match against Feyenoord in April 2010, R2 got the 'green light' and was able to 'immerse' into the crowd gathered in the Vak-P sector. Therefore, did everything go without any problems, and the particular 'ignoramus', whom R2 was, received the entrance ticket without any reservations and on equal terms like R1? At first glance, it could appear so. However, it turned out that – for quite some time – the group statuses of R1 and R2 were significantly different. Most of the researched perceived R1 more as a participant (a fan, 'one of us'), and R2 as an observer exclusively. The difference in perceiving the researchers by the fans was evident in the situations of 'admittance'.

This was the case in Milan, where R2 was to meet with the fans in the main city square of Piazza del Duomo to collect the tickets for the Champions League match against Inter Milan. It is not a safe situation to wear one's club colours in the centre of a city if one is the away team's fan and so it demands keeping total discipline. Then, they have to move in bigger groups since if dispersed they become an easy target for the local fans' attacks. The Twente fans who were to meet R2 gave him the ticket, but they did not allow to wait together for the match in the centre of Milan. Without using words, they suggested that after handing in the tickets, everyone should go in their own direction. At that time, we did not know the reasons for that but we could verify our intuitive assumptions a few months later during the Dutch Cup final in Rotterdam. The Twente fans who we were with, decided to attempt a risky mission of getting out of the police cordon and getting to the city centre to drink some beer in the central football fans bar of this port city. The participants of this 'trip' quickly covered up all signs of being supporters of their club. In the city centre, our group divided into three smaller groups of several people in order not to attract attention of either the opposing team's fans, or the police.

We were there together, which changed the whole situation. R1 was then the person who legitimised the presence of R2 in that place and at that time, and he was responsible for the behaviour of the second researcher, who – using the language of fans – was not yet tried in action. That attempt finished with 'conquering' the bar. It was an act of courage (and in a sense, of recklessness) which at the same time, became the symbol of 'conquering' the city. The Twente fans (including us) turned out to be braver, more
audacious and cunning as it was them who took over the main football fans bar in Rotterdam. This undertaking was dangerous and risky because there was high probability of meeting the hated fans from Amsterdam or Rotterdam, as well as attracting the attention of the police who were patrolling the streets. Such risky escapades are a specific form of testing the new community members, their courage, solidarity and obedience. The fact that the crew members we travelled with did not reject our presence may have three possible explanations. The first one – in the course of research, R2 (the observer) gained so much trust that he was allowed to take a peek at the backstage of the football fandom. The backstage where it is clear that the fandom community search for an occasion to raise their adrenaline level. The second option – the presence of R1 (the participant) was a specific guarantee for R2's behaviour (the observer). And thirdly, which appears to us as the most probable scenario, there was an increase in trust gained by R2. The trust was additionally strengthened by R1's presence who in case of a dangerous situation assumes responsibility for his friend.

Both these situations – the trip to Milan and to Rotterdam – accurately illustrate the evolution of perceiving the researcher by the researched group. What the researcher will observe depends to a large extent on how much the community will 'let him into its secrets'. The researcher can never be certain if he had access to all aspects of life of the researched community. However, the more comprehensive knowledge of the researched group the researcher has, the better they are able to assess their the level of their initiation.

Before the research we were aware that looking for extreme sensations by the 'crews' is part of the fan world; however, it is difficult to describe such phenomena until one experiences them first-hand. In Rotterdam – fortunately – our 'trip around the city' turned out to be peaceful. It is easy to imagine that if the meeting with Ajax or Feyenoord did take place, we as researchers would face a serious ethical problem: how to behave in such a situation? If we had decided to remain only observers and not to participate in the confrontation, the community would probable have rejected us, we would have lost their trust. On the other hand, if we had begun to fight, becoming more participants than observers, we would have met with legal consequences. Such incidents in the city centre rarely end in the feud groups peacefully leaving the place. Moreover, taking part in a fight always entails the danger of injury of either one's own body or the opponents'. The third option assumes that one of the researchers would undertake fighting and the other would

4 Some time before, a Twente Enschede fan was killed in one of the bars in Rotterdam. It happened during an away match against Sparta Rotterdam. Since that time the relations between the fans of both clubs are extremely hostile and both parties do not hide that they look for confrontation.

5 Among us there were fans who took pride in that their every visit to Rotterdam ends in their being arrested. It may thus be rightly assumed that our 'trip' was rather an exception than a rule.
observe, and then it is uncertain how the researched group would react to them (it is yet difficult to imagine such a scenario). In any case, one has to remember that a researcher who takes part in participant observation, and so is willing to see what is not visible from the sociological verandah, has to take into account the transition from the role of the observer into the role of the participant. Such an opportunity emerges from exploring the 'social world' which requires a more and more intensive assimilation.

Exploding Firecrackers and Choking Smoke: the Risky Role of the Marginal Native

A football match is an exceptional event, especially if it is observed from the sector for the most fanatical fans who during the ninety minutes do not sit down in their seats even once, but constantly cheer up screaming, singing or rhythmically applauding. The very visit to the stadium where 40-50 thousand spectators express their emotions is itself sociologically intriguing. For the researchers of the fan world, the sport aspect of the event is not much significant, although the level of the Dutch or the European football is so high that it gives one aesthetic pleasure. We paid attention, most of all, to what was happening on the stands and around the stadium, but also to the around-match rituals that start one day before the match (drinking beer in the evening) and sometimes finish a day after the match, especially when the match requires travelling far. This is connected with additional dangers that a researcher is exposed to if he is not satisfied with the 'verandah' perspective and would like to see the world of football fans through their own eyes.

To maintain the order of narration, we will focus on distinguishing and analysing three types of dangers which, based on our experiences, constitute the most serious – physical and psychological – threats. Also, the consequences of investigating such a subculture for the structure of the researchers' personalities will be described.

The participant observation study in 'complete immersion' means constant danger. Most of all, there is risk of aggressive behaviour and confrontation with the fans of the opposing team, with the police, and in our case, also with the fans who would not like to accept our presence. Football fandom consists of small groups who are most often on very good terms with one another, but there happen to be exceptions to this rule. Fortunately, all these possibilities turned out to be only hypothetical, although we cannot deny that we felt the sense of uncertainty throughout the time of research. Especially if we consider possible situations of conflict when not knowing the language would be a huge problem for us. Apart from the danger of rows and fights, another type of danger we experienced first-
hand were pyrotechnic materials. Part of the fan rituals are smoke bomb and thunder bomb firecrackers. It was proved by research on football fans that the fans of strong identification with their club approve of using war analogies in sport. In this respect they differ from the fans of weaker identification (see End, Kretschmar, Campbell, Mueller, Dietz-Uhler 2003). We had the same impressions in Enschede. The industrial fans caused an intensive atmosphere full of music and shouts, while other fans simply walked from the stadium box offices towards the entrance to their sectors. Firecrackers explosions, smoke flares and loud, hard techno music made us feel as if we participated in tribe rituals before a forthcoming battle. Large amounts of alcohol consumed by fans, and it was not possible to refuse to drink, encouraged us even more, and the several hundredth crowd of fans grouped around the techno and beer tent was gradually falling into the trance of rhythmical dances, singing and battle-cries. Firecrackers exploded every few minutes without warning and in different places, becoming the impulse for bursting out in even louder shouts and singing. This was accompanied by smoke bombs. When suddenly one of them exploded just next to us, we were a bit dazed and for quite a few minutes we still felt discomfort in our ears and a temporary, partial hearing loss. Additionally, the air was filled with the smell of marihuana. This all formed a completely unique community atmosphere, the immersion in which is not neutral for the researchers' health and future doings. For example, R1's shoes were saturated with marihuana to such a degree that on his way back, at the airport in Munich, drug-sniffing dogs picked up the scent and the researcher had to undergo strip search.

The pyrotechnic materials are a separate issue at stadium. Officially, their use is forbidden but the fans always smuggle them into their sector. Before the match, the collect money for the materials which – as members of the community – we felt obliged to contribute to, although nobody put pressure on us. We felt the force of flares during a match against Feyenoord in Enschede, and especially against Ajax in the Dutch Cup final in Rotterdam. In both cases, the choking smoke not only completely limited visibility, but also made breathing difficult. At one moment, the situation became very unpleasant as the amount of smoke started to very effectively hinder normal breathing. It is worth adding that the 'pyro' (as they call the light and smoke attributes of supporting the team) is forbidden in most European countries (the authorities agreed to a compromise in Austria and Norway, in Germany the talks continue), although our experiences suggest that there is quite a lot of tolerance for pyrotechnics at Dutch stadiums. An inherent aspect of studying fans by means of the participant observation is the risk of health loss, similarly as it is inherent in the very nature of being a committed fan. Based on our research
impressions, we can indicate that people who engage in this type of activity look for extreme sensations, and this is synonymous with risking.

Apart from the physical dangers, there were also those connected with human psychology. Noise and exposition to very loud sounds intensified fatigue and irritation, people felt stressed. Stress is surely an effect of anxiety which grows at moments when it is difficult to predict what is going to happen. Such a situation is to some extent connected with the not fully comfortable position of the researcher who relies completely on the researched and who finds it hard to determine the limits which, on the one hand, would protect himself/herself (which is natural in any social situation), and on the other, would enable cognitive exploration. Those limits are never completely fixed, hence the metaphor of 'going with the flow' seems to be quite relevant. Investigating into such type of subcultures, like the industrial fans, the predictability of events fails to be high. Perhaps – although we know how much metaphorical it is – living among football fans as a researcher is stigmatised by uncertainty. It was further intensified by the possibility of almost every kind of behaviour towards the marginal insiders. Also, the uncertainty results from another aspect. Having studied football fans, we arrived at a conclusion that they form an extremely closely inter-connected community. These bonds frequently effect in irrational decisions, for example attempts to 'rescue' one of their friends who was arrested and put into a police car. This was an act of complete desperation that was doomed to failure, and additionally resulting in unavoidable punishment, however, apparently in the case of such bonds any rational calculations fail to have any importance.

Our observations allow us to conclude that a group of football fans is connected by means of the bonds of the Durkheim's mechanical solidarity, according to which the good of the community is a priority in relation to the individual interests of its particular members. Entering a community, even as a researcher, one has to be prepared that the possibility to stay aside as an uninvolved individual is limited. Fortunately, during our research explorations, we did not have to test our group bonds and, for most of the time, we could stay a bit 'aside', which did not require any proofs of fondness or commitment. On the other hand, it gave us the comfort of research-oriented 'immersing' only into those situations/aspects which we ourselves considered as worth the 'immersion'. Admittedly, we happened to experience some unique moments when the crowd expressed their emotions in a completely spontaneous way as over a dozen thousand people started to sing a song together. The songs resounded really impressively and their specific 'vibration' seemed to have indeed a ritual, almost religious character. Still, our loyalty could have been challenged at every moment and bearing this in mind made us feel emotional strain
and uncertainty, which are mentally exhausting feelings, throughout the entire time of carrying out the participant observation study. Naturally, the sense of some strangeness, or specific marginalisation, promotes maintaining objectivity of research, however, at the same time, it causes stress and tension which are hard to overcome.

Unfortunately, these are not the only problems of the emotional and psychological nature. The aspect of behaviours which are unacceptable or avoided in a non-research situation, is a huge challenge for a researcher. Under some circumstances, it is though difficult to remain as much orthodox, especially in the participant observation of a subculture whose values and norms differ from those internalised by the researcher. This, most of all, refers to using substances – alcohol and drugs. We were constantly offered both the 'hard' drugs (cocaine), and the 'soft' ones (marihuana), which is legal in the Netherlands. In such situations – following the inner gyroscope of ethics – one has to intuitively detect the acceptable behaviours. Unlike Ross Haenfler (2004:413) who stated that *I made known my commitment to avoid consuming alcohol, drugs and tobacco, and the group accepted me as one of their own* we did not enjoy this comfort. Although as researchers, we could not allow ourselves to fall into drug trances, and at the same time, it would be artificial if we only drank coffee and ate croissants. Moderation and rational attitude to substances enabled us to maintain clear-headedness in spite of circumstances. The context of travelling with football fans, however, contains a component of extreme experiences and even though our readiness to cross the boundaries of consciousness was low, it did not cause any form of ostracism.

As it has been mentioned, there is a danger of physical confrontation between groups of opposing clubs fans. It does not happen frequently, but it is not an extraordinary situation either. Rows at stands were often a reason for health impairments, or even caused death. During the project, we did not have any experiences of this kind, although several times we were close to situations when using force to solve a conflict seemed quite probable. These moments are extremely stressful for a researcher and they happen during almost every away match. The atmosphere of possible confrontation was noticeable in Milan, although heading for the stadium we were not accompanied by our 'acquaintances'. However, on the underground, we witnessed an animated dialogue between two groups of fans, of Twente and Inter. The dialogue was in English, and that is why we perfectly knew that the situation was becoming dangerous. All ended in a verbal clash, perhaps because these were not orthodox fans. Getting around an unfamiliar city with football fans wearing their club colours, one has to take into account danger, be prepared for attack, observe other fans, and identify threats. Acts of violence always happen and being aware of that
causes tension which seemed to grow in the 'gaps', that is dangerous passages, areas around the stadium or in city streets. Also, one has to bear in mind that manifestations of power could have occurred in clashes with the police who often apply the rule of collective responsibility when confronting football fans. Therefore, it may be stated that the issues discussed – anxiety, sense of strangeness and marginalisation, hostility, stress and uncertainty – all contribute to the 'disadaptation syndrome' (see Hammersley, Atkinson 2000: 121). Neutralising or intensifying these feelings depends on many factors, among others, the researcher's personal predispositions or the degree to which the researched change their attitude to the marginal native.

**Experience – Experiencing – Becoming Native**

At the beginning of the study, each of us started from a different level of 'immersion'. In the case of R2 who started from the role of the 'marginal insider', after his 'emergence', a change in his attitude to the subject, the phenomenon and people was noticeable. In the beginning, R2 demonstrated liking which can be called as 'neutral', that is one which is felt towards most people who are not close to us but who we share our lot with. It is obvious that this 'neutral liking' with time changed into the 'positive one'. The evolution did not pertain to particular persons (since it is an individual issue) but to the attitude towards the phenomenon of being a committed fan, or the entire football fans subculture. Immersing into the football fandom, entering into the group, enables one to perceive the researched through their eyes, that is not treating them from the perspective of the 'verandah' which is generally a pejorative one. Such an approach determines the relation between the researcher and the researched at the level of subjectivity of both parties. It is obviously not a new observation, although it is treated as an alternative one in sociology, which is proved, for example, by Anna Wyka (1993). Let us remind you: we have described the moments of 'religious' elation which in our opinion is the collectively experienced techno dance before the match, inarticulate shouts caused by the frightening bangs of firecrackers or the singing of over a dozen thousand people at the stadium. It is prescribed in the model of research by experiencing to let this collective elation carry one away, simply, to experience it. In such a case, it is a correct directive since it directs the researcher's mind towards the 'essence' of being a fan. This state can be compared to the state of excitement or *jouissance* described by Roland Barthes (see 1997). In the psychological sense, collective experiencing of one 'vibration' is a kind of community *flow*, that is the state of erasing the boundaries and opening the opportunities which are unavailable at moments of controlling
one's doings and cool distance. Then, it is the state of liminality, a kind of 'being in between' (see Turner 1975). It is this type of elation which was not noticeable when analysing the phenomenon of being a football fan 'from the verandah', which we practised forming the assumptions for our project. We expressed judgements on sport and its fans based on desk research, still separating the research subject from ourselves for the sake of objectivity. It was not until we experienced it that we could see the world of the researched in full picture.

The model of research by experiencing was applied several times, which enabled us to see the experienced situations again and again. It was essential especially for R2 for whom the study was his first 'immersion' into the world of football fans that is full of elation, extreme experiences and situations. From the works by Mihalyi Csikszentmihályi on the flow we know that experiencing such type of states broadens the identity of the individual. Also, thanks to Victor Turner, we know that liminality is not only the level of suspension and the state 'in between', but also a specific threshold (hence the term threshold people), crossing of which automatically defines a new status. How does the experience of 'being in between' influence researchers? In what direction does one head after crossing the 'threshold'? The answer may seem trivial: in a way, we have become natives. The perspective of industrial fans has become closer to us, which in the works on the methodology of field research is generally treated as a danger. For example, let us consider the following sentence: 'Not only may the task of analysis be abandoned in favour of the joys of participation, but also, even where it is retained, bias may arise from “overrapport”' (Hammersley, Atkinson 2000: 118).

**Conclusions: the Double Anchor Mechanism**

The participant observation in the football fan community enables us to experience the social phenomenon of being a fan, to immerse in it and to go beyond the superficial description from the 'verandah perspective' which is dominant in the literature. There are several essential methodological questions that emerge here. First of all, one has to ask: who is right? Are our conclusions more justified only because we were closer? We are inclined to give a positive answer, although, on the other hand, there is a reasonable doubt: can a more accurate description be produced by someone who underwent a community transformation? Can an accurate description be offered by someone who experienced 'elation'? And even if so, then how to present this 'elation' to people who have never experienced it? Who have never left their 'verandah' and treat football fans as an aggressive
crowd which shouts out its songs which are obscene and full of swear words? In other words, the essential issue of verifying the research findings has to be determined.

There are several possible procedures of verification to be applied.

The solution suggested by Wyka (1993) is assuming the 'perspective' instead of relying on the traditional division into subjectivity/objectivity. The perspective here would be 'the personal opinion formed from a certain distance', without any bias emerging from either subjectivity or the universality of objectivity. Wyka indicates the characteristics of such a 'distance' which would include the researcher's knowledge deriving from the research situation, the knowledge verified by the subjects of the research and the researcher's theoretical knowledge enriched by the experiences of the research subjects (see 1993: 61-62). The suggested solution is to be placed between subjectivity and objectivity, and in other words – directs the researcher towards knowledge that is verified inter-subjectively. What is crucial here are the self-control skills and interpersonal exchange of knowledge. We have used the latter only in a minimal degree. What we experienced while being part of the community was then discussed in private talks with fans and in in-depth interviews. We are obviously aware that this was not 'full' verification of findings by the researched subject who were the fans. Perhaps, the directive by Wyka would have been possible to implement if we had had an easier access to one another, however, in this case, distance was an effective barrier. Also, it is uncertain how the fans would have reacted to our conclusions written in English which would have had to be prepared for them in an easily understood way.

A much more accessible form of verification for us was the possibility to analyse our findings in our own group, as part of research team meetings, which aimed at achieving a greater inner accuracy – the authenticity or reliability of description, as both perceived by us, and by people reading the report from the study (see Miles i Huberman 2000). A very important element of our observation was the fact that it was carried out simultaneously by two researchers, one of whom was more integrated with the fandom, and the other had begun his research as a person completely unknown to the researched. This approach – seemingly very simple, but in our opinion, extremely important – guaranteed some type of inter-subjectivity, and as a result, a more authentic and reliable description, since the report from the research findings was written from two, and even three (the controlling role of R3) points of view. The dissimilar manner of defining situations by each of the researchers allowed their better understanding. It is easy to guess that each of us experienced the events of the exploration – due to the difference in the level of involvement – in a slightly different way, which we were able to compare and discuss as it
happened. Analyses and attempts to arrive at mutual understanding and common findings took us a lot of time on our way back home, as well as at home where we often contacted one another in order to draw conclusions and resolve doubts. Obviously, this does not have to guarantee ideal verification, but it surely helps presenting a report of a high level of authenticity/reliability.

If we were to point out the 'methodological value added' of the project we conducted, it would be the proposition of observation research in 'complete immersion' with controlling mechanisms of 'anchoring' which prevent the researcher's 'floating away' with the community under research. Ethnographic research carried out in 'integrating communities' in the atmosphere of emotional elation, and in extreme cases, even religious ecstasy, are subject to the danger of unreliability in collecting the data and their later interpretation. The mechanism of a double anchor used by us, allows R1 to conduct research in 'complete immersion' with no fear that the process of collecting the material and analysing it would be unreliable. The position and a lower level of involvement of R2 are the first anchoring mechanism in the process of collecting research material by R1 remaining in 'complete immersion'. Then, R3 is the second anchoring mechanism which guarantees reliable interpretation and the forthcoming analysis of the research material. The collective soul of the football fans together with (almost) tangible Durkheim's mechanical solidarity are methodologically and ethically dangerous like the current of a rapid mountain river which may not impress an external observer, however, it can be so powerful to carry away the researchers who are in water. This refers most of all to the one who conducts observation in complete immersion, though, the danger of being carried away by the current of the river applies also to the researcher who has just begun to explore the field. We believe that the double anchor mechanism allowed us to avoid traps connected with 'becoming a native'.

What remains is to determine the external accuracy of our research findings, that is the extent of adjusting our findings to the external context. This means posing the question: to what extent may the findings of our exploration be generalised for other contexts, for all groups of industrial football fans? Unfortunately, we will leave this question unanswered, even because it would require, among other things, employing the procedure of continuous moving between the emic and the etic perspectives, 'constantly checking the accuracy' (see Angrosino 2010: 130). In the case our research, such moving was impaired by the collective experiencing. While some of the situations we participated in allow such perspectives switching (for example trip to the stadium, waiting to be controlled at the gates, confronting our observations with the knowledge of experts – fans,
club managers – prepared during free-form interviews, etc.), still, the experience we exposed ourselves to does not help to realise this kind of ‘constant checking’. The moments of liminality during matches successfully hamper moving from the perspective of the participant to the perspective of the external evaluator, even post factum. Moreover, in order to make the passage between those worlds, that is between the phenomenology of common sense and the scientific rationality, one has to first exactly determine where the passage is, where the boundary is located. It was very difficult to separate the role of the observer-researcher from the participant-researcher, and as a consequence, the comparability of our experiences with the ones of others (authors of other explorations of the football fans world, or other fans world) was difficult to obtain.

Therefore, we have to admit that certain tasks turned out to be too difficult, perhaps even surpassing the possibilities of our skills and tools. At the same time, we hope that our attempt will become an open text to be used by all those who one day will decide to set off to explore the world of football fans, and when they succeed to do so – they will want to verify the accuracy of our findings themselves. Then, it will be interesting to read what they have written.
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