Abstract: This article examines South African professional cricketers’ motivations for coming to the UK to ply their trade. Our data covers fifteen years of migratory cricketers leaving South Africa for the northern hemisphere. Through numerous interviews, these migrants explain their reasons for leaving South Africa. The South Africans list numerous motivations for engaging in migration, which includes career opportunities, financial incentives, developing professional networks, and family safety, among others. Our focus in this article is on the perceived problems with the governance of South African cricket, and the economic differences and sporting conditions between South Africa and the United Kingdom.
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Introduction

There is an increasing acceptance that sport has become global, meaning that it is pervasive in all “civilized” or “modern” parts of the world. Part of this globalization of sport is the broadly accepted idea that athletes can and do travel around the world in pursuit of athletic excellence. This paper examines one such specific case of transnational sport migration within a particular global sport from a historical and sociological ethos: that of cricket. As an iconic sport embodying values of civilization, cricket certainly is evolving. The pace of that evolution is rapid and the landscape of the international cricket is changing more rapidly than many other sports. The emergence of Twenty/Twenty or T20 cricket, a short form of cricket in which a match only lasts 3-4 hours instead of the 3-4 days of the historically dominant
form, is increasingly popular around the world. Frowned on by many cricketing “purists” as the bastard child of cricket, T20 cannot be ignored. Its rise is changing the way cricket is played, produced, consumed, viewed, marketed, developed. The emergence of the Indian Premier League (IPL), with its moneyed, privately-owned city-based franchises, and the riches they offer international cricketers, is altering the cricketing landscape to the point that it is becoming a genuine threat to the integrity of the heavy schedule of international cricket. Other leagues have started – the Big Bash League in Australia, the Caribbean Premier League, and the Ram Slam in South Africa. These new international opportunities are producing a new category of cricketer – the itinerant professional who chases the short-term financial rewards of these leagues in contrast to the “committed” nationally-based cricketer who represents his country in international competitions.

Cricket, like most global sports, is widely held to be a particular cultural practice that brings disparate people together through a shared set of practices, that include a presumed shared set of values. This sense of sport as a connective force is evident by the seemingly rational and logical assumption that the “best” athletes “naturally” will travel to compete against their counterparts. This presumed meritocracy in relation to professional migration is rife with contradictions, obstacles, and consternation (Carter, 2007, 2011a). Those who work in sport are highly skilled labor migrants yet the very practices and processes of transnational sport migration are only vaguely acknowledged in migration scholarship. It is not clear where and how transnational sport migration fits in the unavoidably value laden contentious debates about migration overall. Whether for or against, the positions taken about migration implicitly assume direction and intentionality, that migrants should be incorporated into the societies into which they move, that migration is a one-way
process, and that the host society remains relatively unchanged if incorporation is successful (DeWind and Kasinitz, 1997). These resurrected assimilationist models presume that it is only the migrant who changes while the “host” remains unaltered (Brubaker, 2003; Freeman, 2008). Similarly, a transnational sport migrant is expected to adapt entirely to the employer’s expectations with little to no expectation on the part of the employer to change to meet the athlete’s worldview.

Such expectations do not fully constitute or represent migrants’ experiences or points of view precisely because transnational migrants’ own personal histories of movement and emplacement do not necessarily correlate with nationalist discourses. Although the concept of the transnational “calls attention to the cultural and political projects of nation-states as they vie for hegemony in relation with other nation-states, with their citizens and ‘aliens’” (Kearney, 2004: 218), “transnational” suggests a way to avoid the either-or categorization inherent in nation-state assimilationist discourses. The existence of transnational migrants therefore suggests the emergence of alternative constitutive forms of cultural consciousness.

Our focus in this article is on the transnational cricket migration between two nations once subsumed within, and whose historical trajectories diverged out of the dissolution of, the British Empire: the English of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Afrikaner nation in what is now the Republic of South Africa. This article examines the relationship between sport and migration in a broad context before focusing on transnational cricket migration. We then move to an in-depth consideration of the historical contexts of South African cricket to better inform our study of the transnational migration of South African cricketers to England in the twenty-first century. Given the long historical activity of cricket migration between these two localities, it is imperative to avoid any presumption that the historical
reasons for migration continue unabated at present. Consequently, we focus on the motivations for South African migration at present. While there are several interrelated motivations for South African cricketers to come to the UK, we focus on two that are specific to cricket migrants – the structure of cricket in South Africa and what English clubs are perceived to provide versus the actual provision that overseas migrants receive.

TAGLIEREI TUTTO IL PARAGRAFO SUCCESSIVO (EVIDENZIATO IN GIALLO), E’ PIUTTOSTO GENERICO E L’ARTICOLO E’ TROPPO LUNGO

**Sport and Migration**

Transnational migration has begun to draw lucrative and provocative attention within the study of sport (Chiba 2001; Lanfranchi and Taylor, 2001; Regalado 2000). The emphasis within the majority of sport migration studies have concentrated upon on economic factors within the processes of transnational migration within sport (Magee and Sugden, 2002; Maguire, 1999; Maguire and Falcous, 2005) particularly under the influence of Joseph Maguire (Maguire and Stead, 1996; Stead and Maguire, 1998). While that is also part of the emphasis of our work here, the work that has come before us concentrates on classifying migrants, either separately or in combination, based on migrants’ routes and ethnic and national identity, which is something that we do not do. While extremely important, the concentration on these dual factors along with much of the other literature in the globalization of sport considers the experiences of sport migration as unproblematically positive in terms of experience and outcome for the transnational migrant in question.

Sport-related migration, like all migration, is shaped by a wide array of social, economic, political, and historical factors. One’s citizenship, race, gender, family,
religion, and sport all help to determine whether one ever becomes an international sport migrant. Growing attention has been paid to how these various factors affect international sport migration. The principal critique of the classificatory schema used to analyse global sport migration has focused on the politics of citizenship, on questions about the regulatory schema controlling labor migration and on migrants’ experiences with those regulatory regimes (Carter, 2011a: 74-97, 2011b, 2013).

Gender, of course, shapes migratory experiences of women and men in decidedly different ways, especially when it comes to professionals in sport (Agergaard, 2008; Agergaard and Botelho, 2011; Agergaard and Tiesler, 2014; Botelho and Agergaard, 2011; Carter, 2014). The role of race is widely acknowledged within sport-related scholarship but how it shapes international sport migration has only attracted some indirect attention, most particularly in the contexts of African football players traveling to Europe (Cornelissen and Solberg, 2007; Poli, 2006) and how North American baseball clubs label Latin American baseball players (Brock and Bayne, 1998; Klein, 1995). Other social factors have not really been explored although some analysis of migrants’ families has been done (Carter, 2007, 2011a: 127-151; Ortiz, 2006; Roderick, 2012).

The intermittent mobilization of sport-related labor is a recurrent feature in the larger struggle to subordinate labor to the requirements of global capital in the universalizing form of global sport. These mobilizations are not new, nor are they unchanging. Generally speaking, the unbounded, effectively global, mobility of capital demands that the parallel movement of labor be much more regulated, when not inhibited altogether. Whether mobilized or captive, the mobility of sport-related labor tends to be more or less stringently encircled than other forms of labor even as all labor is disciplined by the tactics of sovereign power.
That sovereign power as far as cricket is concerned has been England and the Marleybone Cricket Club (MCC) for most of the sport’s history. From its seat in South London, the MCC begat the cricket’s global governing body, the International Cricket Council (ICC). The MCC basically controlled the ICC, and therefore ruled over global cricket until the twenty-first century when the ICC moved to India. Because of cricket’s imperial history, England was often seen as the “finishing school” (Stead and Maguire, 1998) for colonials wishing to punctuate and confirm their “civilized status.” English cricket had a greater need for overseas migrants after 1960 due to a perceived need to bring success and glamour to the sport. Cricketers from the former imperial territories in lower leagues travelled to England to play in the lower English leagues in order to develop their talents (Maguire and Stead, 1996). Beginning in the 1970s, these former members of Empire were seen as interlopers threatening the quintessential element of Britishness (Lee, 1997; McLellan, 1994) to the point that non-White English cricketers play by allegedly different ethos (Burdsey, 2010; Carter, 2003; McDonald and Ugra, 1999). The former imperial British citizens now supposedly played the game under different value systems (Burton, 1991; Werbner, 1996; Williams, 2003) even as cricket itself shook its imperial fetters and became truly global (Appadurai, 1995; Gupta, 2004; Nandy, 2001; Rumford, 2007).

**South African Cricket**
Historically, it is generally accepted that the diffusion and control of sport in general has been dominated by European and North American societies. It is in that context that the traditions and rules of cricket spread around the world because of the expansion of the British Empire (Stoddard and Sandiford, 1998). Cricket’s diffusion was inextricably bound up in the expansion and governance of the British Empire.
The links between England and South African cricket were established in the 1880s, and the first English tour to South Africa in 1888/89 provided ripe symbolism of the “civilizing” mission of colonialism. Cricket provided a range of political purposes in nineteenth-century Southern Africa (Murray and Vahed, 2009). Cricket clubs served as organizational bases for the nascent Pioneer Column that led the overt colonization and creation of Rhodesia. Cricketers also played active roles in the colonization of Zimbabwe. In South Africa, cricket was a metaphor for the shift in “native policy” emphasizing individual advancement and opportunity regardless of skin color. Cricket served to “reconcile” the two “races” – Afrikaner and English – at the expense of Africans after the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), which eventually led to the deep institutionalization of segregation and racism and eventually formalized apartheid.

Cricket’s role as an embodied practice of apartheid politics is well documented and in the latter half of the twentieth century South African sport was badly affected by the international embargo prohibiting South Africa’s participation in international competitions, including the Olympics. Cricket too was hit hard especially with the 1968 D’Olivera affair that illustrated the arbitrariness and bigotry of South African and English cricket authorities (Oborne, 2004). Basil D’Oliveira was a non-White South African cricketer who eventually played in England due to the apartheid regime yet still faced racism in English cricket. Other South African cricketers did follow in the 1970s and 1980s.

Cricket-related migration continued after the collapse of the apartheid regime in 1994. The dismantling of the state system of apartheid and the release of Nelson Mandela along with his ascension to the presidency of the country all augured uncertain times (Harvey, 2001). Mandela’s subsequent retirement from politics, the rise of Mbeki to the presidency and the death of Mandela all fuel questions about the
policies implemented during the immediate successes of the ANC in the 1990s and early 2000s. Economic stagnation, petrified social mobility, and limited political revolution in post-apartheid South Africa, particularly among many of South Africa’s poorer classes, as well as the continuing remnants of both colonial and apartheid regimes, all serve to remind current South Africans of the violent, repressive conflicts of the past. Those socioeconomic and political conditions inform the struggles South Africans currently experience, causing many of the younger generation to question what the point of all that struggle was and why have they not seen greater benefits and successes.

Those massive political transformations and the ongoing political questions have had far reaching social and economic reverberations throughout South African society, including South African sport. Sport in South Africa prior to Mandela’s release was openly divided along racial lines (Grundlingh, Odendaal, and Spies, 1995; Jarvie, 1985; Odendaal, 1977). Rugby and cricket were perceived as institutional and practiced legacies of White privilege and had, prior to international censure in 1970, represented the nation-state on the international stage. Football, in contrast, was seen as primarily a Black sport (Korr and Close, 2008). It lacked any real state support, had never had any substantive international success, and did not “truly represent” South Africa in the eyes of the country’s Afrikaner political leaders. All three sports played a significant role in making the new sociopolitical order visible (Booth, 1998; Bose, 1994), but rugby in particular made a spectacular contribution to the visibility of a new South African sporting regime. Mandela’s adoption of the national rugby team prior to the 1995 World Cup held in South Africa was widely regarded to be a pivotal moment in making the new South Africa visible to all.
Yet the brilliant glare of South Africa’s world championship in this global sport hid the ongoing tensions within all of South African sport. At that particular time, Black players had no hope of representing South Africa despite the collapse of the apartheid system. A quota system was introduced that required professional teams to field at least one Black African player and amateur clubs two Black Africans (Ghosh, 2013). Sport was supposed to provide a leading example of the “transformative integration of South Africa that was supposed to maintain social order and promote the new Rainbow Nation nation-state (Gemmell, 2004: 51-76). This leadership role, however, was enforced from the top, outside of South Africa’s national governing bodies, instead of endemic change from within those bodies.

Consequently, South African sport’s post-apartheid transformations were not smooth or uncontested. Although international pressure diminished significantly with Mandela’s presidency, domestic pressure from Black players, administrators and the Mandela-led national government all forced White officials to acknowledge the need for and begin to implement change in sport. The national governing bodies of South African sport, especially the men at the top of these institutions, had to adjust rapidly to these dynamic and frightening changes occurring all around them. Businesses, tertiary institutions, the civil service and media were all being forced to include non-White Africans in meaningful decision-making positions. Sport too had to change but that did not mean that the change would be warmly accepted or even initiated within its institutional walls.

White administrators initially supported affirmative action by creating opportunities for individual Blacks, thus leaving the existing structures of privilege intact. Since 1998 White leadership has become untenable. Indeed, sport was one of the final institutional remnants of White privilege. Changes gradually evolved
throughout the 1990s and into the 2000s from acceptance of all-White teams, to calls for inclusion of some ‘players of colour’, to demands for selection quotas, and, finally, demands for African control. Yet these changes on the pitch were not evident in the stands or across the country. Over eighty percent of spectators at cricket matches are White. Few Black South Africans attend matches. Only eighteen percent of Black African adults support cricket and while fifty-five percent of Indian South African adults support cricket, the majority support teams from the subcontinent (Vahed, 2001: 333). These patterns mirror the face of post-apartheid South African society. These changes in cricket are still seen as part of the process of transforming South African society and in no way are they even, at present, complete or uncontested. If anything, they are woefully incomplete as Temba Bavuma was only the sixth non-White cricketer to play for the Proteas, the South African national team, at the end of 2014, a full twenty-five years after initiating programmatic changes to South African cricket (The Guardian, 2014). Cricket failed to create an imagined South African nation in the same manner as rugby union initially did.

South African sport’s capacity to lead social change was squandered in the ensuing years. Much of this loss has a great deal to do with the reticence of Afrikaner bureaucrats heavily involved in the national governing bodies of South African sport. That inaction within the broader national contexts of the Rand’s precipitous devaluation and stagnant domestic economy, increasing socioeconomic demographic changes brought about by the upward mobility of a small minority of Black South Africans, and the frustrated aspirations of many poverty-stricken Black South Africans led to fear, uncertainty and White middle class South Africans feeling particularly threatened. These factors manifested in South African sport during the tumultuous changes being brought to bear institutionally in order to make the national
governing bodies and their representative sides more accurately reflect the country’s population. In other words, struggles ensued over the implementation of quota systems, the investment in areas of South Africa previously ignored by national governing bodies, i.e., the townships, and the overall direction and control within each sport’s governing body. Quite simply, “the complexity of the [governing body’s] transformation issues left players confused and unsure of their role and purpose in the broader context of South African cricket” (Vahed, 2001: 330).

During 2000 and 2001, several White cricketers who qualified for British passports migrated to England. Not all South African cricketers had the advantage of a British ancestry (i.e., English, Irish, Scottish, or Welsh nationality), however. These others, especially those who were not prominent members of any national squad, were professionals in the provincial cricket clubs and had to negotiate contracts, make use of personal transnational connections, and obtain visas in order to secure their own mobility. Their marginal status with South Africa’s cricketing hierarchy also meant that they would have to seek out more marginal localities to find employment.

The data for this article comes from Carter’s long-term research into transnational sport migration that has been on-going since the late 1990s and Eaves’ case study conducted in 2014 on South African cricket migrants in England. Carter also studied South African migrants who work in cricket, rugby union and field hockey, focusing on their experiences around the world. In total, he has compiled a database of over 200 migrants with whom he has conducted ethnographic fieldwork and extended oral life history interviews throughout the past fifteen years. Fieldwork involved
participatory observation in training sessions, sports clubs, social settings, competitions, and whilst travelling between those various locations, and has taken him to nine different countries in the Americas and Europe.

Interviews for Carter’s on-going research have been conducted face-to-face in family homes, at sports facilities, in social settings, and on aircraft and trains. Additional face-to-face interviews have done in recent years via Skype to expand the reach and scope of his work to include migrants working in the global sports industries that do not attract public attention but work behind the scenes. All of these interviews are open-ended discussions in which Carter asks the interviewee to discuss how they began to play the sport, how their career path as athlete or coach developed, and the routes they took to arrive at the place where they were at the time of the interview. Follow-up questions were determined based on what the interviewees described in their initial comments and further details were elicited as necessary to provide an in-depth understanding of the career trajectories and international movements of these high-skilled migrants.

While Carter’s work has taken a broad scope, the opportunity to work with Eaves on his project provides a solid case study that covers fifteen years of South African cricket migration into the United Kingdom. Eaves’ case study focuses specifically on the motivations of South African cricket migrants plying their trade in England. His work fits within Carter’s larger study and the data that Carter compiled a decade earlier was combined with the semi-structured interviews Eaves conducted. Eaves also conducted face-to-face interviews either in person or using Skype as some cricketers were in South Africa at the time of their availability during his study. Waiting for them to return to England was not feasible given the constraints, both fiscally and temporally, on his own work.
The participants in Eaves’ case study comprised 12 South African cricketers who had spent at least three months in England playing cricket for an English club by the time of their interview. The majority of the participants were recruited through the use of personal and professional networks, which had been built up and developed through Eaves playing cricket in and around Devon and Sussex, as well as a brief stint in Durban, South Africa, prior to the undertaking of his study. The twelve respondents were identified through snowball sampling thereby tracing migrants’ own professional networks whilst finding interview subjects for his study. This technique is one that Carter also pursued with great success over the years, with the exception that he has not played cricket with South Africans, although he also played cricket with other migrants in his study. Nonetheless, Carter’s own research totalled 37 South Africans, of whom 11 were cricket migrants. This gives us a total of 23 interview subjects who were interviewed over a span of thirteen years beginning in 2001 with Carter’s fieldwork, and culminating with Eaves’ research in 2014.

All interviews were transcribed at the time of the study in question. Eaves and Carter then worked together examining the coding procedures the other followed for those transcripts looking for commonalities that would then demonstrate that some consistent motivations and experiences were being experienced by these men during their careers despite the changing contexts of international cricket, as well as English and South African domestic cricket. We made the decision to focus exclusively on the motivations for pursuing transnational migration within their cricketing careers. Within this broader code of “motivation”, numerous reasons were found: economic, familial, political, and social. Our focus here is on the economic motivations, though the other motivations are extremely difficult to separate from each other. Our analysis makes it abundantly clear that the motivations and experiences of transnational sport
migrants are complex and require fine and careful consideration of the information provided to ensure that their actual experiences are understood as these men intended. Thus, after transcription, Carter and Eaves double checked with their respective interviewees that the transcripts were accurate and that the interviewees did not wish to change any of their narrative either through elaboration or deletion. When this was done, and it was an exceedingly rare occurrence, the researcher asked for an explanation as to why the interviewee wished to change the statement to allow for greater understanding by the researcher at that time. At no point, however, was any request to alter interview data refused, although a note was made for clarity for any later analysis that such modifications did occur and the reasons behind said changes.

Motivations for Migration: Perceptions versus Actual Conditions

Two emergent themes dominate the motivation of South African cricketers to migrate to the United Kingdom over the past fifteen years. The first of these is the rather infamous quota system in force in South African cricket. The second of these is the opportunity to earn more money in the UK than is possible in South Africa. These two motivating factors are interrelated as the sense of restricted opportunities in one’s home country informs the desire to migrate. These are not the only factors, as other socioeconomic factors like the fear of violence and crime amongst the White middle and upper classes (Carter 2011a: 136-140), also affect cricketers’ weighing the risks and benefits of engaging in transnational sport migration. The perceived deteriorating situation in South Africa politically and economically informs social fears that also fuel the movement of these men.

One of the recurring themes was how government interference in South African cricket has limited the chances of these particular professional cricketers due
the imposition of quota systems at both the grassroots levels where cricketers develop their skills as youths and in the professional clubs where a “more skilled” cricketer might be forced to give way because of the racial quota system instituted in post-apartheid South African cricket. As one interviewee stated at the outset of his interview, “Obviously, in South Africa, I wasn’t getting the opportunities due to the quota system so I thought I would pursue elsewhere, which worked out better for me.”

The actuality of such assertions is not our concern in this article because whether or not they experienced these barriers themselves, or knew others who did so, their belief that the quota system detrimentally affects their own development makes it a social fact. That they discuss such ideas as if they had happened, irrespective of their actual experience, means that the perceived possibility of such discrimination is a form of motivation. From their perspective, one *had* to migrate overseas to have a career because of how they understood the potential and actual practices within the current structure of South African cricket.

The politics of South African cricket are such that although sport after apartheid may seem to have become more equal within South Africa, the current situation appears to limit opportunities that White players, who are thought of as “privileged,” to make it within professional cricket. Several interviewees over the years discussed how this system affected their own careers and how its spread to the grassroots level led to greater motivation to leave South Africa:

Basically what entails is they have to have a certain number of … well, they call it “underprivileged” players, but everybody knows its non-White players. It got to a point where it started off at international and provincial level but the government wasn’t seeing a quick enough change, so they were adamant to start implementing it at club cricket as well. As soon as that happened I decided that it was time to move on.
That “privilege” at the elite level is much more complicated than it appears. Privilege in cricket is more often class-based privilege than racially-based privilege wherever it is played. Class and race intersect, of course, and race certainly plays a significant role in cricket around the world (James, 1993; Williams, 2001). In South Africa race cannot be ignored and its racial history directly affects the sport. Despite the significance of race, the class of cricketers, including those Black cricketers who have made it to the professional level cannot be explained solely by an athlete’s skin colour since the vast majority of black cricketers who have made it to the professional level did not attend township schools at all (Roberts, 1992). Just over thirty-five percent of national team players since 1991 attended the same ten private high schools (Hart, 2016). This does not negate the endemic racial exclusion and utter lack of sport-related opportunities amongst South Africa’s poor but the notion of privilege is something that is not as straightforward as it might first appear. Nonetheless, at the grassroots and provincial level, mandated places for athletes based on skin colour is national policy and it clearly affects how White South African cricketers perceive their situation. The broad feeling is that the quota system restricts their opportunities. Another cricketer explained the more recent developments about player selection while playing for a club in Devon in 2014:

Basically, unless you’re a real, real talent… Unfortunately, stats aren’t what get you into the actual side. So [it is] based on quota [where] if a black player is not as good as you and your stats are better, he will end up making the side. The quota is 60/40. 60% colour and 40% white in a provincial team.

The percentages asserted here do not match the provincial level mandates and actually overstate the ratios considerably. The actuality of mandated racial representation notwithstanding and the perceptions of what these cricketers have experienced suggests that those White cricketers attempting to develop their own
careers feel that their opportunities in South Africa are being unjustly restricted. The underpinning basic value of sport as a meritocracy, in which the best players will be selected, is not paramount here and that calls into question the “real” value of sport. Because of this perceived unjustness, seeking to play or coach cricket overseas where there is no explicit social engineering, like the quota system in South African sport, becomes a logical choice.

Quotas were installed at the highest level of domestic cricket in 2004 by the South African government that Cricket South Africa was expected to implement. That initial policy required teams to field at least four players of color, but not necessarily four Black Africans. Quotas have increased over the years. For the 2016-2017 season, teams must have at least six players of color on their rosters, including at least three Black Africans (Hart, 2016). There are no quotas when it comes to the South African national side, the Proteas, in international cricket, although there are allegations that the Sports Minister Fikele Mbalula put pressure on the national team coach to include an injured Black player on the World Cup roster over a healthy White player (ibid.).

Many critics claim that selecting black players over white players based on skin color rather than statistical evidence is only setting athletes up to fail and that Black athletes would never be selected for provincial, never mind the national squad, if not for these policies. Yet what those critics ignore is the endemic inequalities in South Africa that prevent large swathes of the population, primarily impoverished, most of whom are non-White, from ever learning the sport, much less developing skills at it.

While the ongoing struggle over the social value of cricket in South Africa affects athletes and coaches in a number of ways, the government’s quota system does not fully explain the constant stream of South African cricketers to the UK. A second
powerful factor is the ability to make more money while doing what amounts to the same job. This motivating factor is not straightforward either. The endemic politics of cricket, manifest in clubs in this case, still shape South Africans’ perspectives of British cricket that like the quota system, may not be based on actual experience but on perceptions.

There is no inherent reason why South African cricketers migrate to the UK. They can and do migrate elsewhere, such as Australia, Ireland, and New Zealand. However, the UK, especially England, is seen as the best place to go although that is not necessarily simply because that is where the best cricket is played. That perception is highly debatable. However, the history of British clubs hiring South African cricketers and the remuneration provided are what place British cricket above other destinations. In general, the migrant cricketers whom we interviewed over the years all perceive British cricket clubs as seeking out foreign talent for playing and coaching purposes. One long-time seasonal migrant who spent the past ten years traveling back and forth between England and South Africa before settling in Britain spoke about British cricket clubs hiring overseas players:

Most clubs that can afford them will get them in and I think it’s a good thing to do because it improves the standard of cricket for the young English players they play with and against also. Bringing an overseas player to your club, it helps the general sort of feel in the club over the summer. Obviously some clubs in the league can’t afford overseas players. A lot of them these days are asking for a lot of money so that’s the sort of barrier you’ve got to come over but if you can afford them or you can find players that want to come over for cheap enough, I think it’s a big positive.

What many cricketers expressed was that their contributions were expected to be much more than merely playing cricket. Interestingly, wages are not per week or for a season, but are often tied directly to the athlete’s performance on the pitch each match. One club cricketer explained his contract situation in 2013:
Of course we had a written contract with the money they were going to give me so much per run and per match which was fine. And also, the incentives that they offered on top of that were the free accommodation that I had throughout the period of time that I was in the city. Erm, [there was] sort of a little bit of coaching on the side as well that was a little bit of money coming in. But not too much.

Three points about a migrant cricketer’s wages become immediately apparent. One, a professional’s wages are not based on time as is common in most other professions. Instead, wages are based predominantly on one’s performance week by week on the pitch. This makes the cricketer’s ability to earn a wage precarious, for if he does not perform well or if he is injured and unable to perform, then he will have trouble earning enough to live on. Even without that precarious situation in which one’s wages are based solely on athletic performance, there is a tacit recognition that those wages are not enough. That is the second point: the provision of accommodation as part of a cricketer’s wages allows works in the favour of the club. It means their actual wage bill is less, reducing employer’s tax bill, and as Carter’s fieldwork demonstrates repeatedly (Carter et al 2003), the club providing a property in which to live is, more often than not, a property owned by a prominent club member. This set of circumstances, of course, benefits the club. The third apparent point is that the wages on offer solely as an athlete are insufficient. Professional coaching opportunities at the youth level are also a possibility as a second stream of income and for many that is essential as coaching provides a regular and steady stream of income that is not based upon one’s athletic performance.

That precariousness is reinforced when the expectations of the migrant and the club do not match. A problem repeatedly identified was that the financial remunerations were not always forthcoming, sufficient, or matched what the athletes had thought was initially agreed with their club. We are not suggesting that club
officials are deliberately misleading cricketers or that something unethical is happening on a regular occurrence. Nevertheless, far too many cricketers recounted experiences that did not match expectations.

I was promised a job as soon as I got there and they did stick by their word but it took about two and a half months to actually find a job. I was promised a job to start, when I wanted it basically. So I saved up enough money thinking I would be able to work as soon as I got out there and that wasn’t the case.

Part of the disparity between expectations and experiences has to do with the information provided to the migrant. The club’s interest, as mentioned previously, is to get a “good” professional as cheaply as possible. This can lead to difficult situations where the reality of living expenses were not what the migrant was led to believe.

Financially I was offered really good rates of rent, which actually turned out to be kind of very expensive. They did amend that halfway through, which was good but I was told that it would be a lot cheaper than it actually was to live out there.

These situations are unfortunate, but we do not suggest they are rife or deliberate. However, some incidents were recounted where the migrant clearly felt aggrieved by their employer and that English clubs were taking advantage of them.

They, they didn’t. They didn’t keep all the promises. I think my expectations were very different and I found that there is actually a lot more politics than you realise and to go from a country which has politics in order to go to a place where there isn’t you realise that there’s politics wherever you go. So I found that promises weren’t kept …ummm and yeah.

This cricketer’s experiences mirrored several others. However, his significant realization is that politics were not so easily escaped. Although the politics of South African cricket were left behind, the politics of the club could not be so easily left behind. As another cricketer put it when describing his experience in an English club in the South of the country: “There were challenges with the club, with the actual
people inside the club. People not keeping their promises. It’s difficult to stay loyal to a club who isn’t loyal to you.”

So where should loyalty lay for the South African cricket migrant? They already feel let down by Cricket South Africa and thus look elsewhere to develop their athletic careers. England is a logical and historically viable place to migrate to continue their career. English cricket however is not as straightforward as many South Africans first imagined. Their experience is just as rife with politics in England as it was in South Africa. Those politics, however, are localized in clubs in England whereas the politics percolate throughout South African cricket because of Cricket South Africa’s policies that shape South African cricketers’ experiences of the sport in their homeland.

**Conclusion**

As much as the internal politics of English cricket clubs can affect the kinds of experience South African migrants have working in England, those specific circumstances do not affect the perceptions of what it is like to work in England. Of greater impact is the precarious situation in South Africa. The overthrow of the apartheid system and the rise of Mandela and Mbeki transformed the leadership of the South African state. But the inequities of apartheid remain because South Africa’s class hierarchy has not changed as evidenced by the notion of privilege discussed above. The poor remain in an apartheid-like divide and equitable access and inclusivity do not fit the county’s class divisions. These migrant cricketers are one form of labour caught up in these rules as they are applied within the global sport industries. They search out a way to earn a living because of the local conditions in South Africa and those who are migrating comprise a specific class position within
South African society. Not all cricketers are able to migrate to England; only those of a specific race and class.

Even as this piece was being written, the contexts for cricket migration were changing. The South African government announced in 2015 further increases to the quota system after failure to win the 2015 Cricket World Cup (Boorland, 2015; Moonda, 2015; Zama, 2015). Following on, the South African sports minister, Mbulala, announced in April 2016 that South African governing bodies would be prohibited from bidding to host international sport events (BBC Sport, 2016). He instigated this punitive policy because the national governing bodies did not meet the quota levels in their sport. This will directly affect South African cricketers’ desire to migrate. Greater enforcement of the quota system will have an impact on young White cricketers attempting to make the sport their career.

Mbulala is not preventing South African athletes from leaving. In fact, this policy will only encourage greater migration out of South Africa because of these increased quotas and related governmental interference. Migrating to England remains an option for White South Africans because their perceptions of their situations in South Africa motivates them to do so. Combine those perceptions of increasingly limited options and opportunities in South Africa with the possibility of earning more money by working in the UK and it becomes easy to see why so many cricketers aspire to migrate to the UK. What is striking is that cricketers’ perceptions of their situations matter more than their actual experiences on the ground in South Africa or in England. Their experiences do matter but those experiences are made to fit their established perceptions rather than their experience shaping how they understand their situations in either country. In the end, no matter what experience these migrants have in England, it remains a better place to swing one’s bat than in
South Africa. Their differences in the perceptions of the South African and English systems of the sport spur migratory movements. Of course, the political economic conditions of each country inform these perceptions, but the cognitive image of each place overrides actual experience, particularly when weighing one locality against the other. This cognitive difference drives cricket migration from South Africa to England.
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