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1. INTRODUCTION

Women’s football is undergoing a period of dramatic growth and unprecedented professionalisation. FIFA claim that around 30 million women play football,\(^1\) nearly five million of whom are registered with a national association.\(^2\) The number of international tournaments, professional, and recreational leagues has also dramatically increased.\(^3\) Its fan base has also grown,\(^4\) and there are signs that the traditional sparse amount of television coverage dedicated to women’s football is changing, with international women’s tournaments in particular receiving an increased profile.\(^5\) As the recent CIES Report summarises: ‘Women’s football is currently undergoing a welcome development. At the elite level, the process of professionalisation is well underway in several countries worldwide.’\(^6\)

However, there are still significant problems afflicting the women’s game, with claims that women’s football does not receive the attention it merits, its players are under-rewarded, and the dominance of the men’s game means an entrenched gender imbalance.\(^7\) Elite female players’ achievements are under-reported in the media,\(^8\) female players are often provided non gender-specific medical support,\(^9\) and the professionalisation of a small number of leagues and elite clubs threatens to upset the competitive balance and leave the bulk of Women’s clubs and players behind.\(^10\)

The developments, opportunities, and long-standing and emerging problems surrounding the women’s football means that now is an idea time to reflect on the state of the women’s game. Although there have been a number of studies of the experiences of female footballers at national level,\(^11\) and the 2014


\(^4\) Jacobs, J (2014) ‘Programme-level determinants of women’s international football performance’ European Sport Management Quarterly 14/5 521-537.


\(^7\) e.g. Bell, B. 2012 “Levelling the playing field? Post-Euro 2005 development of women’s football in the north-west of England” Sport in Society Vol. 15 349-368. It should be noted that this analysis was made prior to a reported $44.3m investment by FIFA in developing the women’s game.


\(^10\) Poli et al. (2017), op cit n. 6.

\(^11\) E.g. Dunn (2015) op cit n. 8.
FIFA Women’s Survey, this FIFPro report aims to provide a global picture of the women’s game from the perspective of the players for the first time.

The objective of this 2017 FIFPro Global Employment Report: Working Conditions in Professional Women’s Football is to present the most comprehensive and far-reaching study to date of the labour conditions and experiences of registered female footballers throughout the world. This report analyses and provides academic commentary from researchers at the University of Manchester on the 2017 FIFPro Global Female Football Players Survey (hereafter the Women’s Survey). The Women’s Survey entailed 3,295 questionnaires completed by female footballers in 33 different nations including in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and Oceania. The Women’s Survey provides a snapshot of the career of female footballers in 2017, covering issues ranging from age, education and salary, to contracts, pay and expenses. It also gathers data about longer-term experiences of female footballers throughout their careers on issues such as childcare, discrimination, abuse, violence, and match-fixing. This report is designed to assist FIFPro, national player unions, clubs, leagues, federations, event organisers, fans, and public authorities in understanding some of the challenges and problems facing female footballers. Where appropriate, it also aims to support these stakeholders in developing strategies to manage or counteract challenges and barriers.

This is FIFPro’s fourth major survey into the labour conditions of Professional Football Players but the first to focus on the women’s game. In 2012, FIFPro’s ‘Black Book’ on football players in Eastern Europe was published, surveying male players across the region. In 2014, the FIFPro Asia Survey surveyed 1,078 male players affiliated to the Asian and Oceanian Football Confederations. In 2016 the Global Survey of Professional Footballers (hereafter the Men’s Survey) canvassed nearly 14,000 male players from Africa, the Americas, and Europe and was published as the 2016 FIFPro Global Employment Report: Working Conditions in Professional [Men’s] Football.

The Women’s Survey is the first major survey of female footballers and the first survey canvassing players from all five continents where football leagues have been established. Currently 36 of the 59 FIFPro member unions are equipped to register female players to become members and FIFPro sent the invitation to participate in the survey to all FIFPro member unions. National player unions cooperated in distributing and collecting the anonymous questionnaires to female ‘professional’ players under their jurisdiction. Identifying and reaching this target group was not straight-forward and these challenges are central to how the data and analysis in this report was approached.

FIFPro’s remit is to represent professional football players. However, there currently exists significant ambiguity around the term ‘professional’ in the women’s game. This ambiguity is reflective of the considerable disparity and lack of standardization with respect to the professionalization of the sport.

---

12 See discussion below on the term ‘professional’.
for women across countries, regions and internationally. According to the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (FIFA RSTP):

A professional is a player who has a written contract with a club and is paid more for his (sic) footballing activity than the expenses he (sic) effectively incurs. All other players are considered to be amateurs.13

While FIFPro finds this definition of professional according the FIFA RSTP to be adequate, many female players who are competing at the top of the sport may fit within the definition but are not recognized as such. For example, elite female players playing in amateur leagues and on amateur contracts may qualify as professional under the FIFA RSTP, but they are often not treated as professionals in terms of rights and protections. Conversely, other female players competing in top national leagues and national teams may not be considered professional according to the FIFA RSTP, but are training and competing in professional leagues and tournaments. FIFPro are understandably concerned about the inconsistent levels of protection for players.

Against this context, in order to include the players that FIFPro believes should be counted as professionals in the analysis in this report, FIFPro developed its own more inclusive working definition of ‘professional’ player:

Players who receive income from any source for participating in football activity, in contrast to amateurs who do not receive any income for the same activity.

This should not be taken as a political statement that FIFPro have a desire to substantively change the FIFA RSTP definition, but because for this survey they wanted to include players they believe should be covered by this definition (before investigating what changes are needed to ensure that these women are recognized as professional under the FIFA definition in the near future). The FIFPro working definition allows us to count many more of the elite women playing in a game not yet fully professionalized in many corners of the world, and to more accurately capture the reality of the experiences and working conditions at the top of women’s football today. The current dissonance between the regulatory framework and actual practice may present significant challenges for federations, clubs, and players, including importantly lack of protection from a labour law perspective and limited rights in terms of contractual stability.

13 Article 2, FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players. Although according to FIFA RSTP definition’s section: ‘Terms referring to natural persons are applicable to both genders. Any term in the singular applies to the plural and vice-versa’, it is illustrative of how the assumption of a characteristically male game has influenced the regulatory framework itself. FIFPro advocates changing the pronouns in the FIFA RSTP to be gender inclusive.
In total, over 3,600 female footballers,\textsuperscript{14} of 55 different nationalities, playing in 55 countries,\textsuperscript{15} responded to the survey and of these, data from 3,499 was inputted by the research team. Once questionnaires missing key data and geographical outliers were excluded (including small samples from 22 countries, leaving 33 countries), a final total of 3,295 were analysed. The survey includes data from national leagues, including all five of the world’s ‘most developed leagues’ (Germany’s Frauen Bundesliga, Sweden’s Damallsvenskan, France’s Division 1 Féminine, England’s Women’s Super League, and the US Women’s National Soccer League).\textsuperscript{16}

The Women’s Survey included responses from 584 professional players according to FIFA’s definition of professional (this accounted for 18% of the final analysed sample). This accounts for 66.5% of professional players active globally (878) from the most recent audit. This is a very large representative sample with only a 3% margin of error for our global findings (based on a 99.77% confidence level).\textsuperscript{17} When we include self-identification (i.e. players identifying as professional), the number of professionals who responded to the survey jumps to 758. Utilising FIFPro’s working definition of professional, we received responses from 1,870 professional players (60% of our final analysed sample).

The Methodology chapter towards the end of this report provides greater detail about how the survey was developed and the data collected, collated, and analysed. It is important to note three limitations here. Firstly, we did not look to collect a specific sample from each country but instead looked to include all players who had completed a questionnaire. Secondly, while we carry out some country-by-country comparisons, given the low number of responses from many countries (in some cases only one player per country responded), we could not include all the countries represented in these comparative analyses. For these analyses we excluded countries with fewer than 25 responses to ensure our country-by-country analyses were not misleading. Finally, because this is the first global survey of female players, a comparison over time is not possible. However, we have been able to make some telling comparisons with the 2016 Men’s Survey. It is hoped that the data in this report will be the starting point for longer term analysis of the issues that will allow meaningful comparison in the future.

\textsuperscript{14} The team inputted data from 3,568 surveys but there were a number of additional surveys that could not be inputted due to vital missing data fields, suspected duplication, and time constraints.\textsuperscript{15} The number of countries may be greater as 61 surveys did not include this information.\textsuperscript{16} Poli et al (2017) op cit n. 6.\textsuperscript{17} At national level, this fluctuated considerably.
2. PLAYER STATUS

This chapter analyses the survey findings with regards to the status of professional female football players. We discuss how and why FIFPro developed its own working definition of professional and also highlight the importance of looking at player status according to self-identification. The findings reveal an important discrepancy between how players construct their status and how they formally relate to their clubs – a player’s interpretation of her professional or amateur status may be different to the view of their club or governing body. It is these types of discrepancies that must be interpreted as critical clues for addressing the lack of professionalization in the women’s game. These findings also raise important questions around player status, player rights, and obligations, the spectrum that may exist between amateur and professional, and whether and how there may be pathways present for amateurs to become professionals. These findings support FIFPro’s view of the importance of professionalizing the women’s game through the creation of professional leagues with minimum standard contracts and protections for all female players competing in them.

2.1 Overview
The present chapter investigates what ‘professional’ means in the context of women’s football in 2017. It considers several different ways of measuring what it means to be a professional player and justifies the definition FIFPro chooses for the analysis in this report. Whether a player is classed by their club as professional or amateur may not necessarily have a direct impact upon their working rights and obligations. However, players classed as professionals are more likely to provide such a service under a formal employment relationship (normally evidenced by a written employment contract); this in turn means they should enjoy minimum domestic employment rights (such as sick and maternity pay, indemnity, and unfair dismissal protection).

2.2 Self-identification
An important part of understanding the challenges in identifying and categorizing professional female players today is listening to how these players categorize themselves. With lots of female players falling somewhere between the formal and informal labour market structures, the survey asked players how they conceptualise their player status.

Respondents were asked whether they considered themselves a professional player, a semi-professional player or an amateur player. Our findings suggest that around 44% of respondents considered themselves amateurs (figure 2.1). 32% described themselves as semi-professionals and there were only 24% professionals. According to FIFA Regulations the category of ‘semi-professional’
does not exist and neither have FIFPro expressed a desire for it to be incorporated into football’s regulatory structure. However, ‘semi-professional’ was offered as a response option in this section of the Women’s Survey because of how prevalent the category is as a self-identifying term in the women’s elite game across geographies today. FIFPro did not elaborate or define the term in the questionnaire for respondents, and we do not propose one here; it is sufficient to say that about one-third of respondents saw themselves as falling somewhere on the spectrum between professional and amateur.

A cross-tabulation of the findings regarding the relationship between perceived player status and region confirms that professional players were more likely to be playing in the Americas: 56% of players were professionals there in contrast to 22% in Europe. Semi-professionals formed a significant percentage of players in Europe and Asia (34% and 33% respectively) and amateurs were particularly prevalent in both Africa (56%) and Europe (44%). Country data suggests that the highest percentages of professional players were found in the USA (92%), Uzbekistan (83%) and England (82%) (figure 2.2). A number of countries had a considerable percentage of semi-professional players, including Australia (65%), Israel (58%) and Iceland (53%). Finally, Bulgaria reported the highest number of amateur players (99.6%), followed by Ireland (72%) and Kyrgyzstan (71%).

![Figure 2.1 Perceived players’ status](image-url)
When the perceived player status data is analysed on the basis of nationality, the findings confirm that it was mostly those players who considered themselves professionals (20%) that were playing in a country other than that of their own (figure 2.3).
Further analysis on the basis of age distribution and perceived player status reveals that amateur players tended to concentrate in the under-18 and over-33 age groups (57-58%) (figure 2.4). Around one third of players in the 24-33 age groups self-identified as professionals. Still in the context of perceived player status, those who claimed they were professional players were more likely to have an undergraduate\textsuperscript{18} degree (30% of professional players in comparison to 22% of semi-professionals and 19% of amateurs). There are a number of possible explanations for this, but one is that continuing education beyond 18 is more conducive to playing top level football than going into the workplace.

An analysis into the type of contracts among those self-defining as semi-professionals reveals that slightly more than one third had an employment contract in place (figure 2.5). This was followed by 32% of semi-professionals who had an amateur contract. In 27% of cases, players lacked awareness about the type of their contract and in 4% it was a case of civil law contracts or self-employment.

\textsuperscript{18} Also known as a first Degree, or a Bachelor’s Degree.

---

\textbf{Figure 2.3 Perceived player status and nationality}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player Status</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Non-National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An amateur player</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A semi-professional player</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A professional player</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 2.4 Age and perceived player status}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>A professional player</th>
<th>A semi-professional player</th>
<th>An amateur player</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above 33 years of age</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-33 years of age</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-28 years of age</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23 years of age</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years of age</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When examining the sources of football income for semi-professionals, we see that the majority of self-identified semi-professional players received income from their club; the rate for this stood at 62% (figure 2.6). In almost a third of cases, players did not receive any money to play. The third most popular answer (15%) was income from the national team (for an analysis of the working conditions of female players in national teams see chapter 6).

Further analysis regarding salary levels on the basis of contract type suggest a complex interplay between the two. As figure 2.7 shows, 47% of all respondents that reported lacking awareness of their contract type received no salary for playing, 32% of players with amateur contracts received no salary either. Importantly, 10.5% of those who claimed to be working under an employment contracts reported receiving no salary. At the same time, more than a third of semi-professionals (39.5%) reported receiving between $301 and $2000 per month. Of those, the majority had either an amateur
or employment contract, with the exception of those receiving a salary in the range of $301-$600 per month, where civil law/self-employment contracts were particularly prevalent.

Analysis of the relationship between self-identified player status and salary confirms that it was mostly players who considered themselves amateurs that did not receive any salary at all (73.5% of all amateurs) (figure 2.8). However, slightly more than a quarter of self-identified amateur players received remuneration. In conjunction with the fact that a significant percentage of those players earned between $201 and $2000, this means they were not amateurs by FIFPro’s definition. Different reasons may be in operation here in terms of this particular self-assessment, including classification of certain leagues as amateur ones, which have shaped the self-perception and subjectivity of female football players.
Semi-professional players constituted a considerable proportion of the players. When it came to their salary levels, more than one third of players (38.5%) did not receive any salary at all (figure 2.9). A considerable percentage of players (almost 13%) received very low salaries, i.e. $1-$100 per month. Perhaps most interesting though is that a number of semi-professionals received salaries that ranged from $301-$600 per month (13%) to $601-$1000 (9%) and $1001-$2000 (10%) per month.
At country level, there were a number of cases where a noteworthy proportion of semi-professional players were clustered to the low to middle-level salary groups. For instance, in Australia, 47% of semi-professional players received between $301 and $1000 per month; this was in contrast to 44% of (self-identified) professional players. In Denmark, 60% of self-identified professionals earned between $601 and $2000 per month and the respective rate for semi-professionals stood at 24%. In England, 22% of semi-professionals reported earning between $2001 and $4000 while the same rate for professionals was 7%. Similarly, in France, 28% of semi-professionals earned $601-$1000 per month and the figure for professionals was 10%. In Germany, 50% of all semi-professionals earned between $1001 and $2000 (for professionals this stood at 45.5%). In Greece, 50% of semi-professionals earned $301-$600; the rate for professionals was 30%; regarding the same salary bracket, the rate for semi-professionals in Italy was 19% and for professionals 14%. In Israel, 33% of semi-professionals earned between $1001 and $2000 while for professionals this stood at 43%. Morocco was one of the countries where a considerable higher rate of semi-professionals (40%) earned between $601 and $2000 (in comparison to 21% of semi-professionals). Similar trends were observed in Norway and Sweden with semi-professional players being clustered in the $301-$600 category (at around 20-21% in comparison to 3% of professionals). We speculate, therefore, that many players interpreted ‘semi-professional’ to mean ‘part-time’.

Ultimately, although self-identification tells us a lot about the state of the women’s game, it was decided not to use this measure for our analysis in this report. The main reason for this was that the answers were very subjective and context specific in terms of both language and geography. The ‘semi-professional’ category seemed to have more meaning for first-language English speakers and elsewhere there was considerable geographical difference between those reporting to be professionals. As such, the category of semi-professional is only used in this chapter of the report; for the rest of the report, self-identified semi-professional players are grouped into either the amateur or professional FIFPro-defined categories.

2.3 FIFA Definition

When assessed vis-à-vis the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players, our findings suggest that the large majority of players could not be considered professionals: only 18% of players fulfilled the criteria of having a written contract and covering their expenses for playing football. A regional breakdown suggests the prevalence of non-professional players in Africa (98.5%). In the rest of the regions, the rates of professionals were still low but not to the same extent with that of Africa: the highest percentage of professionals was reported in Asia/Oceania, where it stood at 25%.

A country breakdown of the data regarding formal player status reveals that of all respondents the greatest percentages of professional players were found in Germany (75.5%), England (57%) and
Sweden (55%). Interestingly, Uzbekistan (2017 FIFA ranking of 76\textsuperscript{19}), reported a significant rate of professional players (47.5%). On the other hand, countries where there were no professional players included Kyrgyzstan, Ireland, Namibia, Montenegro, Cyprus, Bulgaria and Botswana (figure 2.10).

Not surprisingly, the percentage of professional players that were non-nationals was comparatively higher than that of non-professionals (20% and 3% respectively). When considered vis-à-vis the FIFA definition of professional players, namely availability of a written contract and payment of expenses, the findings are consistent with other research that suggests that the majority of professional players is found in the two age groups of 18-23 and 24-28.

2.4 FIFPro’s Working Definition

As previously discussed, the distinction between professional and amateur in women’s football lacks clarity. As seen in the sections above, players who do not possess a written contract and are not paid more for their footballing activities than the expenses they incur are considered amateurs under the FIFA Regulations.

FIFPro’s view is that a player has the potential to be a professional even without a written contract or receiving a particular level of remuneration. This position corresponds to the orthodox labour law position in a number of legal systems which do not require a written contract to exist in order for formal employment status to exist; an employment contract can be in writing or oral, express or implied, and the terms may be contained in a single document or across a number of documents. In this respect, a professional employment relationship may be also recognised even in the absence of a sport-specific contract concluded by the parties. This is due to the existence, in many systems, of the labour law principle implying a contract in circumstances where the existence and presence of the necessary elements of the employment relationship can be demonstrated in practice (e.g. through the principle of subordination, the obligation to perform duties on a habitual basis and the requirement of personal provision of labour).

Secondly, what might be classed as payment is in itself unclear. As will be detailed in Chapter 5, although only 50.5% of players received remuneration for playing from their club, 58% reported receiving payment to play. Additionally, 57% of players reported receiving benefits for playing (see section 5.3), which could include housing, subsistence or retirement support. FIFPro considered defining professional as players who receive income for playing from their club, or players receiving either income or benefits. However, both FIFPro and the academic research team agreed that the best available measure was players who received any monetary income, however low, for participation in football activity. As seen in figure 2.1, this income usually came from the club but in 13% of cases the source was the national team. In 4% of cases the players’ income came from a company or sponsor and in 3% of cases respondents were not aware of the source of their income from football.

---


21 See, for instance, the case of Brazil, Leonardo Andreotti Paulo de Oliveira. Employment Relationships at National Level: Brazil, in Colucci and Hendrick, op.cit. 20.
Therefore, for the purposes of the remainder of this report, when we analyse according to ‘FIFPro Professional Status’, this refers only to those who receive monetary income for participating in football activity; it does not refer to their possession of a contract or to the amount or adequacy of their income. Where we refer to ‘FIFPro Amateur Status’, we are referring to those players who do not receive monetary income for playing (although some of these players may receive benefits of some kind). As seen from figure 2.12, 60% of respondents to this survey would be considered professionals under the FIFPro definition and 40% amateurs.

An analysis of player status on the basis of the FIFPro definition per region reveals that more than two-thirds of players in Asia (75.5%) were professionals. The lowest percentage of professionals was found in Africa and the Americas (both 57%); in Europe, the rate stood slightly higher at 59%. Further, the
findings confirm that the greatest percentage of professionals was found in countries that are characterised by FIFA as having the most developed leagues for women football in the world (figure 2.13).\textsuperscript{22} This was the case with Germany (FIFA rank 2), where all respondents were professionals, Sweden (97.5% professionals) (FIFA rank 11), England (FIFA rank 3) and the USA (FIFA rank 1) (92% of respondents in both countries were professionals). While the list with the greatest percentage of professional players included other such top countries, e.g. Norway (80%) (FIFA rank 14), France (75%) (FIFA rank 4) and Japan (66%) (FIFA rank 8), it also included a number of others such as Uzbekistan (92%) (FIFA rank 41), Ukraine (85%) (FIFA rank 27) and Poland (78.5%) (FIFA rank 30). At the other end, countries where the majority of players were amateurs included Bulgaria (98% were amateurs), Ireland (87%) and Botswana (81%).

\textsuperscript{22} http://www.fifa.com/fifa-world-ranking/ranking-table/women/index.html - Accessed 1/9/17
Our data further reveals that the largest concentration of professional players was in the 29-33 age group (83%), followed by those in the 24-28 age group (73%). 67% of respondents above 33 years’ old but only 32% of players under 18 years’ old were professionals by the FIFPro definition (figure 2.14). However we cannot be sure from this data whether professionalism encourages players to remain in the game, or whether the longer a player remains in the game, the more likely it is that they are to receive remuneration.
When further examining the characteristics of professionals and amateur players, we can see significant differences in terms of their educational attainment. There was a positive relationship between educational attainment and professional status. As seen in figure 2.15, 85% of players that had not finished primary school were amateurs. The rate of amateur players reduced progressively the higher the level of education and reached the lowest in the case of players with an undergraduate degree (only 31% of players were amateurs).
3. DEMOGRAPHICS

Over two-thirds of female players in this survey were younger than 24. This is in contrast to the findings of the men’s survey and taken together with the findings discussed in Chapter 10, suggests that women are more likely to leave the game prematurely. Educational attainment was difficult to measure as a high proportion of players were still studying, many of whom are likely to still be at school. Only 6% of female respondents were migrants, but a small number of countries were both importing and exporting much greater numbers of players. Our findings tend to challenge the traditional conceptualisation of women’s football as a homogeneous experience and point to changes in terms of international movements, levels of education and age.

3.1 Overview
This chapter analyses the findings of the survey relating to the demographic information of the respondents. It considers the extent to which players migrate between countries and highlights which countries had the highest and lowest number of non-national players. It examines the life-course of female players by focusing on the distribution of age and shedding light on education levels.

3.2 Nationals and non-nationals
The development of women’s football has been accompanied by a gradual increase of international migration. The survey asked the respondents to indicate whether they were citizens of the country in which they were playing football. The global average for non-nationals stood at 6% (in comparison to 14% of men as reported in the 2016 Global Survey for Men). In terms of regional variation, the highest percentage of non-nationals (as proportion of the population by region) was found in the Americas (12%) and the second largest was in Europe (7%). In Asia/Oceania, the rate stood at 2% and in Africa the rate of non-nationals was negligible (0.3%).

Variation between countries was notably higher (figure 3.1). The country with the greatest percentage of non-nationals was the USA (38%), followed by Germany (24.5%), and Sweden (23%). The finding indicates the beginning of a transfer market in women’s football, as the financially powerful leagues have started importing and paying fees. This supports recent research that has noted that international migration to the most developed women’s leagues has increased dramatically.23 At the other end, certain countries reported that they had no non-national players; these included Botswana, Bulgaria, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Venezuela. As emphasised by Williams, while new markets may

---

23 Poli, Ravenel and Besson, op.cit n. 6.
constitute significant ‘pull’ factors attracting migrant female players, ‘push’ factors can be low salaries, a lack of prestige and the scope to experience new cultures through a career in football.\textsuperscript{24}

Our evidence also suggests that the largest *exporters* of footballers were the USA (10%), Australia (13%) and Serbia (11%).
3.3 Age

Respondents were asked in the survey to identify their age group. The majority of respondents belonged to the 18-23 age group (69%). 22% of respondents belonged to the age group of 24-28 years’ old and only 9% were above 29 years old (figure 3.2). Our findings broadly support those of earlier studies which indicated that in the top-5 leagues the average age of players was 24.1 years\(^2\) (although the average age of all participating teams at the 2015 Women’s World Cup was 25.6).\(^3\) Our findings are also significant given recent evidence concerning the age of peak performance of elite women’s football players. Successive research has highlighted that teams with the best classifications in international tournaments are those with the higher average ages (>26 years in the case of the 2012 London Olympic Games and 26-28 in the case of the 2011 FIFA World Cup).\(^4\)

At the same time, our study points to the existence of barriers for older players to staying in the game. These barriers will be discussed in Section 10.3. Further, since most players do not earn an adequate level of remuneration to secure a decent standard of life (see Section 5.2 on salary), they are likely to attempt to diversify their options in terms of career development outside football early on so as to limit the extent of a difficult career transition later in their lives. The results emphasise the need to promote a longer playing career for female players by providing greater support, not only through measures promoting higher wages and better work-life balance but also through providing adequate health and safety support.

![Figure 3.2 Age demographics](image)

Further analysis points to similarities but also differences in terms of age groups per region. In terms of similarities, our findings confirm that a significant percentage of players in all regions belonged to

---

\(^2\) Poli, Ravenel and Besson, R. op.cit n. 6.


\(^4\) Lagunas, Niessen and Hartmann, op.cit. n. 3. The average age of the winning USA national team at the 2015 World Cup was reported as being 29 years, 5 months (http://www.foxnews.com/sports/2015/06/12/wiser-but-older-will-age-us-womens-world-cup-team-be-factor.html - Accessed 7/11/17).
the 18-23 age group, with the highest rate being reported in Asia, where the rate stood at 49% of all players. A mixed picture was evident regarding the rates of players under 18 and those in the 24-28 age group. With respect to players under 18-years old, Africa reported the lowest percentage (18.5%) and Asia/Oceania the highest (26%). With respect to players in the 24-28 years’ old age group, the rates across all regions were 22%-25%. Different rates were also reported with respect to older age groups, i.e. those between 29-33 and those above 33-years’ old. In the case of the 29-33 age group, while most regions reported a rate of around 8%, the respective rate in Asia was much lower, i.e. 3%. To some extent, differences were found in the distribution of players above 33 years’ old, with the Americas and Asia/Oceania reporting that 3% of their players were above 33 while the respective rate in Europe was 2%. A range of factors may be in operation here including cultural reasons tied to lack of opportunities to pursue education whilst playing and attracting and retaining older players. They may also reflect differences in the extent of difficulties for women to earn adequate salaries and the provision of medical support and treatment of players in the older age groups, either at club level or at the level of the country (see Chapter 7 on health and well-being).

Recent efforts in some countries to promote links between schools and clubs may increase the appeal of the sport to younger age groups. Among others, the FA Football Hubs model in England calls on Further and Higher Education establishments to forge partnerships with the local football community by offering access to their playing facilities - creating greater opportunities to play and boost participation numbers among young.²⁸ When considering the findings at country level, we found significant variation in the distribution of age groups. As figure 3.3 shows, countries with significantly higher percentages of players under 18 years’ old included Bulgaria (55%), Kyrgyzstan (79%) and Slovenia (53%). In Kyrgyzstan and Montenegro, less than 4% of respondents were 24 years old or over. Botswana, Finland, Switzerland and Uzbekistan all reported slightly above 60% of players belonging to the 18-23 age group. Interestingly, the greatest percentages of players in the 24-28 age group were found in England, France, Germany, Namibia, Japan, Sweden and the USA (all 30% or more) while Israel reported a significant rate of players in the 29-33 age group (33%). In the USA, no respondents were under 18 years’ old. This can be attributed primarily to the fact that the majority of players in the NWSL are US players who have competed college football in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (usually between the ages of 18-22) and subsequently joined the NWSL around the age of 20 to 22.²⁹

²⁸ See also the UEFA’s Women’s Football Development Programme (WFDP).
²⁹ In addition, the sample is very small so it is probably only capturing this majority of former college players.
Figure 3.3 Age groups per country
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2.4 Education

Playing football is not dependent on educational qualifications, but sufficient levels of education constitute in many cases safeguards against unemployment and broader challenges in the labour market once the football career has ended. It is therefore important to consider if and how female players are pursuing education alongside their football and the implications of this for post-football careers.

Respondents to the survey were asked to describe the highest level of education or training they had successfully completed (figure 3.4). 44% of women footballers had finished high school (in contrast to 60% of men). However, the relatively lower rate of educational attainment among women players has to be read against the context of a predominantly young group, comprising many individuals who may still be in education (see chapter 10). This was followed by respondents who had completed an undergraduate degree (30% including postgraduate figures for which an undergraduate degree is almost always required) or primary school education (14%). Around 2% of respondents had not finished primary school education and 9% had completed a vocational education programme.

Indeed, an analysis of the relationship between age and educational confirms that age is a powerful explanatory variable for the educational attainment rates of women footballers. As seen in figure 3.5, the majority of young players (i.e. under 18 years’ old) were clustered in the primary and high school categories. Moving to older groups of players, there was a progressive but significant increase in the rates of players with higher educational attainment. This was very apparent in the 29-33 category, where around 40% of players had completed an undergraduate degree, 20% had a postgraduate degree, and 27% had vocational education and training.

---

30 European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound), European Quality of Life Survey 2012 (Eurofound, 2012). Interestingly, the reduced life satisfaction of those with only primary education (compared with secondary) disappears after controlling for income.
A regional breakdown of the groups of respondents by educational level indicates the existence of certain differences across different regions. The majority of players in Africa (63%) had completed high school education, while in other regions (particularly Europe and Asia/Oceania), the proportion of players with high school education was lower: in Europe it stood at 42% and in Asia/Oceania at 45%. In contrast, close to half of the players in the Americas (44%) had an undergraduate degree (albeit this may be skewed due to the case of the USA and the NCAA system). Across the regions, only a small minority of players had not finished primary school while the extent of vocational education was rather similar (12-14%) across most regions with the exception of Europe, which reported only 8%. In contrast, the highest rate of players with a postgraduate degree was found in Europe (8.5%), followed closely by Africa (4%) and then the Americas (3.5%).

Further analysis at country level reveals that the greatest percentages of players who had completed high school education but gone no further was found in African countries (Cameroon and Zimbabwe). This stood in contrast to the USA, Japan and Portugal where the rates of players with bachelor degrees were higher (figure 3.6). Bulgaria, Montenegro and Kyrgyzstan had considerably higher rates of players with no primary education.
When considered on the basis of citizenship (Figure 3.7), the findings indicate that it was disproportionately non-nationals who had undergraduate and postgraduate degrees (41% and 11% compared with 22% and 7% of nationals respectively). This seems to suggest that individuals tend to migrate once they are of a certain age, increasing the likelihood that those playing abroad have a higher educational attainment.
Figure 3.7. Education – Nationals v Non-Nationals
4. CONTRACTS

Despite attempts to integrate female football activities into the broader mechanisms of labour protection, the survey findings suggest that significant obstacles still exist. Almost 50% of female football players surveyed lacked a written contract. Even if they had a written contract in place, there was significant regional disparity in terms of whether players had access to a physical copy. What is also striking is that only a minority of players believed they were operating under an employment contract. Even when players possessed an employment contract with their club, it lasted on average less than two years, leaving little in the way of employment security within football. Finally, there was a negative relationship between age and contract duration: the older the player, the shorter their contract was likely to be.

4.1 Overview
This chapter investigates the contractual (as opposed to regulatory or self-identification) status of players. It analyses the results of the survey regarding whether players had agreed or signed contracts, what type of contract was concluded and whether or not they possessed a copy. It examines these findings against player status, age, educational attainment and geographical location of players. Finally, this chapter considers the length of players’ contracts and compares this against the findings of the 2016 Men’s Survey. The findings broadly support the view that football is a short-lived occupation for many women; on top of this, it is characterised by precariousness in terms of labour standards.

4.2 Contract availability
As discussed in Chapter 2, the FIFA Regulations on the Status and Transfer of Players (RSTP) requires, among others, the existence of a written contract in the case of professional football players. At regional level in the European Union (EU), the 2012 social partners’ agreement (concluded between FIFPro and the employers’ associations ECA and EPFL) regarding minimum contract requirements includes a number of commitments to ensure that player employment contracts throughout Europe meet certain minimum standards. These commitments maintain that contracts must be in writing, that they must define the rights and duties of club and player, and they must address matters such as salary, health insurance, social security, or paid leave. The existence of a written contract (or at least a written principle statement and particulars) is important in ensuring clarity with respect to the obligations of the parties, including on salary and other terms and conditions of employment.

---

31 Although this agreement is couched in gender-neutral terms, to date it has only been applied to the men’s game.
The survey asked players whether they had a written contract with their club. Slightly over half of the respondents (53%) reported possessing a written contract (figure 4.1). However, the rate is still much lower than that of men (92%) (FIFPro, 2016).

A regional breakdown on the basis of the total number of responses reveals that the largest percentage of footballers without a written contract was in Africa (81%), followed by the Americas (52%) and Europe (45%) (figure 4.2). In contrast, around 81% of players had a written contract in Asia/Oceania.

Further analysis sheds light on the availability of written contracts across different countries (figure 4.3). In the Asia/Oceania region, respondents in Australia and Japan were very likely to have a written contract (80% and 96% respectively). In the Americas, the USA stood out with 84% of players having a written contract. A number of countries in Europe reported similarly high rates: these were predominantly clustered in the Nordic region, including Sweden (99.5%), Finland (99%), and Norway (97%), the only exception here being Denmark with 35%. Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Italy, England and Germany also reported rates of over 85%.
We also explored the extent to which there was a relationship between the existence of a written contract and whether the respondents were nationals of the country in which they were playing. At global level, it was disproportionately more likely that non-nationals had written contracts with their clubs: only 12.5% of non-nationals did not have a written contract whereas almost exactly half of nationals did not possess one. Similar discrepancies were reported at regional level in the 2016 Men’s Survey (FIFPro 2016). As in that case, possible explanations include national requirements under immigration law but also that non-national players would be more inclined to relocate only when they had secured a written contract with a club.
When broken down on the basis of status, as defined in chapter 2, professional players were far more likely to have a written club contract in place; more than two-thirds of players with contracts were professionals (figure 4.4). The relationship was approximately the reverse in the case of players with no contracts; slightly more than two-thirds of amateurs did not have a contract in place.

Further examination into the relationship between the availability of a written contract and nationality on the basis of player status reveals that professional players that were non-nationals were much more likely to have a written contract than those that were nationals (figure 4.5). This seems to confirm the hypothesis that foreign professionals with contracts are likely to be ‘transfer players’ whereas for amateurs it could be a variety of reasons.
The relationship between the availability of a written contract and different age groups points to an equally significant problem in football, i.e. the discrepancy in treatment between different age groups and especially the problems associated with the working conditions of very young or older players (figure 4.6). Similar to the 2016 Men’s Survey, the proportion of younger players, especially under-18 years’ old with no written contract was much higher than other age groups: 30.5% of under-18s had written contracts in comparison to 67% in the case of those in the 29-33 age range. The findings seem to confirm the problems female players have pursuing a long-career in football.

![Figure 4.6 Written contract and age](image)

Similarly, the availability of a written contract may be more prevalent where certain factors are in operation, including higher educational qualifications. The findings indicate that within the group of players that had a written contact, the proportion of respondents with undergraduate degree education was much higher compared to those that had not completed primary education or had only finished primary school (figure 4.7). Similar to the Men’s Survey, no major difference was found with respect to other educational levels, namely high school and vocational education and training.

![Figure 4.7 Written contract and education level](image)
Considering only those respondents who fitted the FIFPro definition of professional, there was a positive relationship between the existence of a written contract and educational attainment (figure 4.8). The differences in the availability of a written contract were even more pronounced as the level of education attained by the respondents increased.

4.3 Do players have a copy of their contract?
Aside from having concluded a written contract, awareness of the terms and conditions of employment is significant for the enforcement of the terms of the contract. In our survey, respondents who had written contracts were asked whether they had a copy of the contract personally, whether their
intermediary had one, or whether they had no access to a copy at all. The findings indicated that 81% of players personally had a copy of their club contract and in a further 4% of the cases a copy was kept by the agent (figure 4.9). 15% of respondents did not have a copy at all. Our findings contrast to some extent with the findings of the Men’s Survey, where it was reported that 77% of male players personally possessed a copy of their contract.

The regional distribution in terms of availability of a copy of contract indicates some interesting trends (figure 4.10). Of the respondents who personally had a copy of their contract, the proportion of players in Oceania, Europe and the Americas was much higher than the players in Africa: 76%, 83% and 77% of players in Oceania, Europe and the Americas respectively had personally a copy in comparison to 27% in Africa. In contrast, a greater percentage of players in Africa reported that their intermediaries had a copy of their contract (11.5% in comparison to around 3.5% in the case of Europe and Asia/Oceania).

Rather surprisingly, respondents with only primary-level education were slightly more likely to personally possess a copy of their contact: 90% of respondents who had completed primary school
education had a copy in comparison to around 84% of those with a high school qualification and 85% of those with an undergraduate degree. Some difference was also found with respect to the relationship between copy of contract and citizenship, with 88% of non-nationals reporting they personally possessed a copy in comparison to 80% of national players.

Greater discrepancies were found with respect to the relationship between the availability of a contract copy and FIFPro player status. As figure 4.11 illustrates, amateur players were less likely to have a copy of their contract, either personally or via their agent: out of 24% of players who were amateurs only 10.5% had a copy of their contract either personally or through their intermediary.

![Figure 4.11 Contract copy and player status](image)

### 4.4 Contract type

The existence of an employment contract is significant in terms of the nature and range of rights that professional footballers may enjoy. Lacking an employment contract is an indicator for precariousness, as non-employment contracts may often disguise a relationship of subordination and dependence and may be also associated with worse employment protection and working conditions.

The survey found that of those players reporting that they had a written contract in place, 47% of all respondents had an employment contract in place (figure 4.12). One-third had what they described as an ‘amateur contract’, although it is possible that this is little more than them having signed a league registration form which would not in-and-of-itself fulfil the requirements of a labour contract. A further 4% of respondents had a civil law/self-employment contract, which establishes some formal and transparent legal duties and obligations but – dependent on the national system of employment law – does not usually provide the same protections for employees vis-à-vis sick pay, maternity support, or
dismissal/redundancy protection. What is striking is that 15% of respondents were not actually aware of the type of contract they had.

When examining the distribution of different types of contracts per region, evidence of notable diversity emerges (figure 4.13). Employment contracts were more prevalent in the Americas (76%) followed by Asia/Oceania (54%). Only 46% of respondents in Europe had employment contracts. Further, contrary to the Men’s Survey (FIFPro 2016), the proportion of female players with a civil law/self-employment contract was in Europe low (4%); the highest incidence of civil law/self-employment contracts was found in the Americas (6%). The proportion of respondents that lacked awareness of the type of contract they had was the highest in Africa (17%); Africa also had the highest percentage of players with amateur contracts (57%) and the lowest was found in the Americas (7%).

An analysis of the relationship between contract type and player status (figure 4.14) indicates that the majority of professional players (51%) had an employment contract. It also threw up some surprising figures: 9% of amateur players claimed to have signed an employment contract, despite the lack of any direct remuneration and 28% of players falling under FIFPro’s definition of professional claimed to have signed an amateur contract. Less surprisingly, amateur players were far more likely to lack awareness about the type of contract they had.
A break-down of responses from professional players confirms that employment contracts were particularly prevalent in the Americas (65%) and Asia/Oceania (59%) (figure 4.15). In contrast, in Europe, the rate of employment contract stood at 52%, followed by amateur contracts (27%). It was in Africa where around half of the contracts of professional players were amateur ones.

Country-level analysis on the type of club contracts reveals that countries with above average rates (on the basis of the global rates) of employment contracts (for professional players only) included a number of countries: Ukraine (95%), Uzbekistan (98%), France (80.5%), Sweden (84%), England (79%), USA (76%), Germany (76%) and Norway (69%) (figure 4.16). At the other end, countries with significantly low rates of employment contracts included Ireland (0%), Slovenia (0%) and Cameroon (5%). While the rate of civil-law/self-employment contracts was low globally, there was divergence at national level. Consistent with the broad characteristics of their labour markets, Poland and Romania reported high levels of such contracts, 42% and 20% respectively. Outside Central and Eastern Europe, Japan stood out with 9% of contracts being self-employment/civil law ones. Botswana and Kyrgyzstan were
outliers with respect to the level of player awareness regarding the nature of their contract: 100% of professional players reported that they did not know the type of contract they had. Other countries with above the average rates of lack of awareness included, among others, Cyprus (61.50%), Greece (53%) and Slovenia (50%). This is a key finding that must lead to action towards addressing this lack of awareness.
## Figure 4.16 Contract type per country – professional players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amateur contract</th>
<th>Employment contract</th>
<th>Civil law contract/Self-employment contract</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
<td>47.60%</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>75.90%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>94.60%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>60.50%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>84.20%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>60.50%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>60.50%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>25.90%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>42.40%</td>
<td>36.40%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>25.90%</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>80.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>79.30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>61.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>58.60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast to the Men’s Survey findings, our findings for women indicate that there was a relationship between the existence of an employment contract and whether the players were nationals of the country where their club was located. 75% of non-nationals were employed on the basis of an employment contract while the equivalent figure for nationals stood at 44%. Perhaps not surprisingly, nationals were significantly more likely to have an amateur contract in place (37% as compared to 10% in the case of non-nationals). In terms of the relationship between age groups and contract types, figure 4.17 illustrates that employment contracts were mostly prevalent in older age groups, particularly the 24-28 and above 33 years’ old players. There was an almost equal distribution between amateur and employment contracts in the case of players under 18 years’ old and a significant percentage of players in this category lacked awareness of the type of contract they had. Civil law/self-employment contracts were more common for 24-28 years’ old players (the rate stood at 6% in contrast to the lowest 2% in the case of players under 18 years’ old).

Further analysis of the sample containing only professional players reveals that employment contracts were significantly more prevalent across all age groups (figure 4.18). At the same time, a greater percentage of players, again across all age groups, lacked awareness of the type of contract they had.
4.5 Contract duration

A contract itself does not guarantee job security; the duration of the contract is a crucial element. The FIFA Regulations on the status and transfer of players specify that the minimum length of a contract shall be from its effective date until the end of the season, while the maximum length of a contract shall be five years. Contracts of any other length shall only be permitted if consistent with national laws. Employment protections often arise after certain minimum periods, for example in much of Europe dismissal and redundancy protections will only arise after a 1-year period has been served. A minority of female football players surveyed had an employment contract, and the average (mean) duration was 17-18 months. This was shorter than the average duration of men’s contracts, which stood at 22-23 months (FIFPro 2016). However, when we focus on professional players only, the gender gap closes.

The contracts of professional female players under 18-years’ old were longer than the rate for all players and the median (that is the middle value) stood at 22-months (figure 4.19). What is more noteworthy here is the drop in the contract duration for professional players that were older; importantly the drop was first significant in terms of contract duration (i.e. from 22- to 12- and then 11-months) and second, it took place immediately once players moved from the under-18 years’ old group. This was also confirmed when an analysis was made according to educational attainment: the median figure for contract duration in the case of respondents who had not finished primary school stood at 20-months. In all other cases, contract duration ranged from 11- to 12-months (median). The findings seem to confirm a negative relationship between age and contract duration: the older the player, the more likely that the duration of the contract is shorter. Older players are effectively forced out of the game. However, no notable difference was found with respect to nationality: contract
duration in the case of professional players who were nationals of the country where they played stood at 12-months while the respective rate for non-nationals was 11-months. No significant differences were found between professional and amateur players in terms of contract duration, with the contract lasting on average 18 months in the case of professionals and 17 months in the case of amateurs.

Finally, when looking at the relationship between contract duration and contract type for all players, figure 4.20 shows that the median for employment and self-employment/civil law contracts was the same, i.e. 12-months. In the case of the amateur contracts, duration was slightly shorter, namely 11-months.
5. THE MARKET

The market for female football players is a complex one where players are paid from a variety of sources. 42% of respondents did not have any income from football and half of respondents reported receiving no salary from their club. A small majority of players received other benefits for playing. Whether players felt the pay they received was adequate varied depending on the country in which they played football, with a considerable rate of players in Asia/Oceania and the Americas reporting they received sufficient funds to cover their expenses. 37% of all players reported experiencing delays in the payment of salaries, although only 9% of players reported payment delays of more than 3 months. 72% of players felt secure in their current football club, with security being the lowest in Africa. Only 14% of players had an intermediary to represent them. On the whole, this chapter sheds light on the precariousness of the working conditions of female football players confirming that it is only a very small number of players who can rely on their football playing career.

5.1 Overview

This chapter investigates the salary and benefits received by female players. It compares amateur players and professionals and investigates the regional and country-by-country variance. In considers the extent to which intermediaries are involved in the women’s game and analyses data provided by respondents about the extent to which they feel secure in their employment, whether they received adequate funds to cover their expenses for playing football, and were paid on time.

5.2 Salary

Survey respondents were asked a series of questions regarding salary and benefits. First of all, we sought to acquire detailed information regarding the source of their football income. As seen from figure 5.1, 42% of players reported that they did not receive any money to play football. Where players did receive income, this came predominantly from their clubs (i.e. 50.5% of the total number of respondents) and in 13% of cases the source was the national team. In 4% of cases the players’ income came from a company or sponsor and in 3% of cases respondents were not aware of the source of their income from football.
Players were then asked to identify which salary band they fell into on the basis of the remuneration they received playing for their club. Figure 5.2 shows the percentage of players globally receiving different monthly remuneration. What is striking is that 50% of respondents reported receiving no salary. In cases where players received a salary, most responses were clustered at the lower end of the salary bands, namely between $1 and $2000, with the most common being $1 to $100 (10%) followed by $1001 and $2,000 (9%). Salaries of over $4000 a month were particularly rare, with under 1% of respondents being paid this amount or more.

An analysis of the relationship between salary levels and nationality amongst the total number of respondents (that is professionals and amateurs alike) reveals that 53% of nationals received no
remuneration at all; this was in contrast to 9% of non-nationals (figure 5.3). Non-nationals were more likely to earn considerably higher wages: 36.5% of non-nationals earned between $1001 and $2000 per month, in contrast to just 7.5% of nationals. Instead, 10.5% of nationals reported earning between $1 and $100 per month; the respective rate for non-nationals stood at 2%. Interestingly, it was only nationals that earned over $8001 per month.

Further analysis into the relationship between salary levels and age groups (across the whole sample of professional and amateur players) reveals that it was mostly young players, namely under 23-years old, that received no salary at all (figure 5.4). A considerable number of respondents (15%) belonging to the oldest age group, that is above 33-years of age, were paid between $301 and $600. The 24-28 and 29-33 age groups were clustered in the $1001-$2,000 salary bracket (18% and 19% respectively). This finding is very significant both for female footballers themselves but also for the sport itself. For the players, it means that unless they are able to sustain a long period of very low or no income, their chances of earning a living wage are very low. For the sport itself, it means that it is very difficult for women’s football to become an aspirational career path for talented female athletes.32

32 Williams, op.cit n. 25: 46.
Given the existence of different categories of female football players, it was anticipated that player status would be a significant determinant of salary levels. When examining salary levels on the basis of status, we see a significant reduction of the percentage of players receiving no remuneration (18% of professionals in contrast to 53% of the total sample) (figure 5.5). Despite this, the greatest percentage of players was clustered in the low end of the salary levels, with a significant percentage having earnt $1-$100 (15%) and $101-$200 (13%) per month, while 16% of professionals in comparison to the 9% of the total sample having earned between $1000 and $2000.
A cross-tabulation of salary levels with contract types across all players also reveals the existence of considerable dispersion of players with employment contracts across different salary bands (from $1 to $4000) (figure 5.6). At the same time, a sizable percentage was concentrated in the $1001-$2000 salary bracket. In the case of players with a self-employment/civil contract, there was an almost equal distribution between those that received no salary at all (28%) and those that were in the $301-$600 salary bracket (29%). Not surprisingly, the majority of players with amateur contracts (46%) and those that lacked awareness about the type of their contract (51.5%) received no salary. At the same time, it was reported that 0.7% of amateur players responded receiving more than $10000 per month. Once again, those players reporting working under an ‘amateur contract’ but receiving income were classified as professional for the purposes of this survey.
When we consider professional players only, some similar trends appear (figure 5.7). Close to a third of professionals with employment contracts received between $1000 and $2000 per month. In contrast, 38% of professional players with civil law/self-employment contracts received between $301 and $600 per month. While the rate of players that lacked awareness of their contract type was reduced in the group receiving no remuneration at all, rates were higher across the majority of other salary groups.
A positive association was also found in terms of the relationship between contract duration and salary levels. As figure 5.8 illustrates, longer contracts were associated with higher salaries. The difference was particularly pronounced with respect to those earning between $4001 and $8000 per month: 23-months in comparison to 11- or 12-months in the lower salary categories. While the findings confirm that elite players in these categories are able to secure not only higher salaries but also longer contracts, even in these cases the average contract duration was shorter than that of higher-paid men (FIFPro 2016). More importantly, the findings point to the precariousness of working conditions with respect to players in the lower salary brackets, who are also more likely to be employed on the basis of short-term contracts.

5.3 Provision of additional benefits
In addition to the fact that 50% of respondents did not receive any salary, our empirical findings also indicated that many players did not receive any benefits either. Respondents were asked whether they received any non-financial benefits playing for their club. 43% of the total number of respondents (that is, professionals and amateurs alike) reported that they did not receive any benefits (figure 5.9). Where players received benefits, it was gym benefits that were the most common ones (33%), followed by health insurance (24%) and housing (20%).
An analysis of the findings per region suggests considerable variation in terms of the distribution of additional benefits. First all, the majority of players in Africa received no additional benefits at all; the lowest percentage of players with no benefits was then found in Asia/Oceania (32%). Where players in Africa received benefits, these were mostly in the form of public transportation. In the case of Asia/Oceania, slightly more than a third of players received food benefits. In Europe 24% of players received health insurance and in the Americas, it was housing benefits that were available to almost a third of players (32%). No clear patterns emerge when examining the country data on the availability of benefits in a given country (figure 5.10). Countries with the highest rates of respondents receiving no benefits at all include Slovenia (88%), Ireland (74%), Switzerland (73%), Cameroon (71%), and Montenegro (67%). Retirement fund benefits were available only in a handful of countries, namely England, Poland, Sweden, and Uzbekistan. In contrast, gym benefits, transport benefits, food and housing benefits and car benefits were more readily available.
It is logical that some of these benefits are traditionally provided in the context of an employment relationship and our findings confirm the existence of significant differences between the FIFPro definition of professional and amateur. As seen from figure 5.11, it was predominantly amateurs who lacked access to any type of benefits (60% of amateurs in comparison to 32% of professionals). However, the most common benefits included health insurance, gym subscription and housing benefits across both categories of players.
When additional benefits are considered in conjunction with salary levels, the findings are striking with respect to the double penalty that a significant percentage of players experienced. 58% of players received neither salary nor any additional benefits (figure 5.12). While the percentage of players receiving no benefits at all reduced across the next salary groups, this was not the case in terms of players receiving more than $10000 per month: surprisingly, 43% of players receiving more than $10000 reported receiving no additional benefits. When examining the distribution of different benefits across different salary groups, we see that there was a positive relationship between higher salaries and the provision of housing benefits. Health insurance benefits were particularly common in the mid-range salary groups, with no occurrence in the $8001-$10000 group. Retirement fund benefits were uncommon across all groups, albeit with an exception in the case of those paid more than $10000: 14% of this category of players received retirement fund benefits.
When the provision of additional benefits is assessed on the basis of the type of contracts (figure 5.13), we see first of all that close to half of players with amateur contracts (42%) received no additional benefits; the same was true with respect to players who lacked awareness of the type of contract they had. Players with employment contracts had access to all available benefits, albeit to varying degrees: 57% of players with employment law contracts received gym benefits but only 8% of this category of players received car benefits. With respect to players with civil law/self-employment contracts, evidence suggests that gym and housing benefits were particularly popular.

In short, those players who do not receive remuneration for football activity are also unlikely to receive other benefits in lieu of this and if they did, it was typically low-level support such as food, public transport, or gym membership. Those receiving low levels of remuneration were likely to receive some benefits, but again, the benefits were of this transient nature. Only at the elite level do we start to see the more meaningful and long-term benefits of retirement support.
5.4 Payment adequacy

The question of whether players are able to cover their expenses incurred playing football is significant for the purpose of determining professional status under the FIFA Regulations. In order to explore the issue, players were asked whether they were paid enough by their club to meet their expenses incurred playing football. This question was open to significant subjective interpretation by the respondents, but it provided a good opportunity to identify the numbers of players who have to pay to participate in football activity. In 35% of cases, players did not receive any payment at all to play and in 36% of cases they did not receive sufficient funds to cover their expenses (figure 5.14). It was only in 25% of cases where players received adequate funds to cover their expenses. 3% players themselves had to pay to participate in the game.
At regional level, there was some evidence of disparities (figure 5.15). The highest share of respondents not receiving sufficient funds to cover the expenses incurred during playing football was found in Africa (59%). It was in Asia/Oceania, where almost half of the players received sufficient funds to cover their expenses (42%). In contrast, around a third of players in the Americas, Europe and Africa received no payment at all. It was only in Africa where there was no incident of players having to pay to play; this was in contrast to the all the other regions, where around 3% of respondents reported being asked to pay to play.

An analysis of the findings at country level reveals again significant differences with no clear geographical pattern (figure 5.16). Countries where players received adequate funds to cover their expenses include Germany (79%), Uzbekistan (75%), England (67%), Sweden (60%) and the USA (53%). A number of other countries were still above average (25%), namely France, Japan, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Switzerland. In contrast, respondents in Australia, Botswana, Cameroon, Cyprus, Croatia, Morocco, Namibia, Japan, Romania, Serbia, Ukraine, and Venezuela were less likely to be paid adequately to cover their expenses. However, in a number of countries, these are Norway, Poland, Iceland, Israel and Switzerland, there was an even split between those that were paid enough and those who were not. Out of the respondents who received no expenses at all, the highest percentages were found in Ireland (85%) Bulgaria (78%), and Namibia (71%). Bulgaria was also one of the countries with the highest percentage of players having to pay to play (15%); others that stood out include Slovenia (21%) and Switzerland (10%).
5.5 Late payment

Late payment of salaries was found to be a significant problem in the 2016 Men’s Survey, with 41% of male players reporting payment delays in the past 2 years. Players in the 2017 Women’s Survey were asked the same question and similar findings were uncovered. The proportion affected by late payment was slightly lower than in men’s football; 37% of all respondents (professionals and amateurs alike) reported late payments (figure 5.17). Importantly, of those reporting late payment, 75.5% had the situation resolved within 3 months. Put another way, 9% of players experienced payment delays of over 3 months.
One important caveat to this is, of course, that as we saw in Section 5.2, 48% did not receive a salary. When we look at late payment by expected salary, we can see that just under half of those not receiving salary reported that in the previous two years they had experienced payment delays (figure 5.18). 12% reported experiencing delays of over 12 months, meaning that some of those in this $0 salary bracket were almost certainly expecting some income. After that, the general trend as we move up income brackets is to see fewer payment delays: between 65% and 80% of those earning between $2001 and $8000 a month reported no delays. Then at the highest end of the pay scale we see between a quarter and a third of players experiencing delays of 1-6 months. Payment delays for those earning $101-300 were much more common (only 53-54% reported not having been paid on time), but delays were usually resolved within 1-3 months.
This may be supported by our data when we compare professional players to non-professionals (figure 5.19). Amateur players reported they were more likely to experience payment delays than professionals and were more likely to experience longer delays. Our definition of amateur, however, excludes those receiving income, so it is unclear whether the reports of late payment from amateurs relate to the fact that they did not receive a salary they were thought they were entitled to, or whether they are referring to delays in the provision of other benefits.

![Figure 5.19 Payment delays per player status](figure)

Whether players had written contracts in place was important for the likelihood of payment delays. Payments delays dropped to 33% for all players with a written contract, whereas 49% of those without one had experienced delays. Finally, there was also a positive relationship between having an intermediary and avoiding payment delays. Only 26% of players with an agent had experienced payment delays in the previous two-years but this rose to 39% for players without an intermediary.

5.6 Intermediary relationship

In men’s professional football, it is usual practice that players are represented by intermediaries, also known as agents (FIFPro 2016). This is not the case in the women’s game; our findings indicate that only 14% of all respondents (that is professionals and amateurs alike) had an intermediary to represent them. A regional breakdown suggests that the existence of an intermediary was more prevalent in the Americas (36%). The second highest rate was found in Europe (13%) while in Asia/Oceania and Africa the rates stood at 10.5% and 9% respectively (figure 5.20).
Further analysis at country-level shows that countries where higher rates of respondents (across both professionals and amateurs) were represented by intermediaries included the USA (64%), England (55%), Germany (44%) and Sweden (37%) (figure 5.21). In contrast, none of the respondents in Botswana, Bulgaria, Hungary, Montenegro nor Morocco reported using an intermediary.
An analysis of the findings on the basis of nationality of players provides further confirmation of a move to a transfer market of brokered cross-border transfers. As seen in figure 5.22 non-national players were disproportionately more likely to be represented by an intermediary than national players.
As perhaps anticipated, there was considerable difference in the use of intermediaries between professional and amateur players. As figure 5.23 provides, 22% of professionals were represented by intermediaries while the respective rate for amateurs stood at 2%. Across all respondents (professionals and amateurs alike), intermediaries were paid in 20% of cases by the player’s club.

5.7 Employment security
The survey also focused on the level of employment security players felt in their football career, both in terms of their current club and generally in terms of their football career. Respondents were asked to answer on the basis of a scale from 1 (feeling very insecure) to 5 (feeling very secure). As seen from figure 5.24, the majority of respondents (72%) felt secure in their employment as footballers at their current club.
Considerable divergence existed at regional level (figure 5.25). Africa stands out as the region with the highest percentage of respondents experiencing insecurity (including ‘moderately insecure’); the total rate in the region stood at 48%. This was followed by the Americas, where 32% of players felt insecure. A quarter of players in Europe and Asia/Oceania felt similarly. Countries with considerable rates of insecurity (insecurity and moderate insecurity) included Australia (59.5%), Cameroon (46.5%), France (47%), Israel (41%), Ireland (45%), Morocco (56%) and Namibia (44%), with Italy standing out with 75%. At the other end, countries with high rates of respondents expressing employment security (secure and very secure) included Bulgaria (68%), Croatia (63%), Denmark (53.5%), Germany (73%), Hungary (65%), Iceland (56%), Kyrgyzstan (74%), Montenegro (78%), Norway (53%), Poland (75%), Serbia (57%), Sweden (70%), Switzerland (68%), Ukraine (73%) and Uzbekistan (92%). In the important market of women’s football in the USA, the rate of employment security (secure and very secure) stood at 43% of all players.

Similarly, differences were found depending on whether the respondents fell into the FIFPro definition of professional. As seen from figure 5.26, 26% of professional players felt insecure (including moderately insecure); insecurity rates were considerably higher in the case of amateurs and stood at
31%. In a similar manner, a higher percentage of professional footballers felt secure or very secure; the rate for this was 52% for professionals but only 46% for amateurs.

When employment security is evaluated against contract duration, the findings indicate, unsurprisingly, a positive relationship between insecurity and short-term contracts: players reporting feelings of insecurity were employed on the basis of an average 10-month contract. Conversely, players reporting feeling very secure had 12-month contracts on average. Aside from contract duration, the type of contract may be an important determinant of precariousness and employment insecurity. Figure 5.27 shows that a significant percentage of players in employment contracts reported feeling secure (31%) and very secure (29%); this was in comparison to 16% of players feeling insecure who had employment contracts. Not surprisingly, the highest percentages of insecurity were found in the case of players with amateur contracts; the rate there stood at 39%.

It is not only the type of contract that may interact with levels of employment security, but also levels of remuneration. In the case of footballers, the relationship may be even more important, as the career
of players is short. An analysis of the relationship between the two on the basis of the survey findings illustrates the complexity of the interaction of these issues. As seen in figure 5.28, respondents across different salary groups reported feeling secure about their employment as footballers. Interestingly, this was the case even with respect to respondents receiving no salary and with respect to those players receiving low salaries ($1-$100 and $101-$200 per month). However, insecurity and moderate insecurity levels were higher in the $201-$300, $301-$600 and $601-$1000 per month groups. High earners (over $8001) overwhelmingly reported feeling secure or very secure.

When asked more generally about their feeling of security as footballers (i.e. their overall career, not just at their current club), a slightly greater percentage of all respondents reported feeling less secure (figure 5.29): one third felt insecure in their football career in general in comparison to 28% of respondents who felt insecure at their current club.
Evidence at regional level suggests the existence of differences when compared with the findings of security at the players’ current club. In Europe and Asia, a higher percentage of players were feeling greater employment insecurity in general (5.30). In Europe, there was a considerable drop of around 8% when it came to a feeling of moderate security. The only exception here was the Americas, where feelings of employment security in general were higher than with respect to security at club level. When evaluated on the basis of contract type, the findings suggest an increase of general employment insecurity (figure 5.31). This was the case with respect to players with amateur contracts but also with employment contracts: in the latter case, the increase in the levels of employment insecurity was particularly pronounced: from 16% at club level to 26% generally. A similar trend was also found in the case of players with civil law contracts or self-employment: 24% of this category of players expressed employment insecurity in general in contrast to 19% at club level. The findings suggest that even in the cases where female players were relatively secure at club level, they were particularly concerned about their career trajectory.
When examined on the basis of salary levels, the findings are not surprising; as with security at the current club, players earning over $8001 were dramatically more likely to record feeling ‘very secure’ about their career (figure 5.32).

As well as examining how secure female footballers felt, we also tried to establish if players were considering leaving the game earlier than they otherwise might have. Our findings indicate that a significant majority of players (87%) considered indeed leaving earlier the game, which is discussed in more detail in Section 10.3.
6. THE NATIONAL TEAM

International football makes up an important part of the women’s game: 45% of respondents globally had played for their national team. However, there was a high level of confusion in terms of the employment relationship between many national teams and their players; 79% of national team players said they did not know what type of contract existed between them. Outside of the Americas, less than 10% of players said they had a written contract. There were considerable discrepancies in the amount that players reported being paid on international duty (sometimes within the same national team). 35% said they received no payment from their national team for playing and a small minority in a handful of countries said they had to pay to play. 38.5% of national team players reported a delay in payment and clashes between national team duty and club duties were also reported.

6.1 Overview

Women’s international football competitions are developing quickly and becoming an important stage for more national teams. At the 2015 FIFA Women’s World Cup, 24 teams competed for the first time. Also for the first time, 16 teams competed in the 2017 UEFA Women’s EURO, which positively reflects the development of women’s national football in Europe. The Copa América Femenina, South America’s competition in women’s football between national teams, has been held already eight times in total with the participation of ten national teams. In 2018, the 19th edition of the Asian Football Confederation (AFC) Women's Asian Cup, the quadrennial international football tournament in Asia will take place in Jordan. Recent evidence suggests that the most successful women’s club teams field almost exclusively players with national team status. Yet despite the growth of women’s football at international level, players in national teams may still be marginalised from economic and sport support systems at national level. Bearing these issues in mind, a separate section was incorporated in the questionnaire that was designed to gather information on the working conditions of female players in national teams. This chapter analyses the results from that section, focusing primarily on the demographics of national team players, their contracts and pay.

6.2 Demographics and national teams

45% of all respondents to the survey stated that they were playing in the national team. Even taking into account the fact that this question took into account one of their country’s youth teams as well as the national A-team, national team players are over-represented in this survey. The breakdown by countries played in at club-level demonstrates that some of the country responses to the survey were dominated by players who played in their national teams (figure 6.1). This should be borne in mind

---

33 Poli, Ravenel, and Besson, op.cit. n. 6.
34 Even in the elite women’s teams studied by CIES for their June 2017 report, only a third of the teams were made up of footballers who had already played in their national A-team (Poli, Ravenel, and Besson, op.cit. n. 6).
when we analyse the results; results from these teams may be unrepresentative of non-national team players in those countries.

Respondents who answered the section regarding working conditions in national teams were then distinguished on the basis of the country of their citizenship, if they reported it. On the basis of the players that provided this information, the findings indicate that 87% of all Israeli nationals participating in the survey played for the Israeli national team. The respective rates for Uzbekistan,
Slovenia, Australia and Montenegro were equally high. At the other end, countries with low rates of national team players that answered the questionnaire include Ukraine (20%), Italy (22%) and Romania (22.5%).

In terms of age distribution, almost half (48%) of all national team players were in the 18-23 years’ old group (figure 6.2). The 24-28 and under 18 years’ old groups accounted each for 21% of the responses, 9% of players belonged to the 29-33 years’ old group and only 2% were above 33-years of age.

6.3 Contract and national teams

Respondents were asked whether they had a written contract. Our findings suggest that slightly less than one in ten players (9%) had a written contract in place with their national team. A regional breakdown of the findings indicates that the greatest difference was found between the Americas and the rest of the regions. The Americas had the highest percentage of players with written national team contracts; the rate stood at 14%. It is important to explain though here that this was influenced by the high rate in the USA, i.e. 27%, where national team players receive an annual salary from their US soccer federation. At the other end was Asia/Oceania with 5%, followed closely by Africa (around 6%) and finally the rate in Europe stood at 10%.

An analysis of the findings at national level sheds light on a number of countries where none of the respondents had a written contract (figure 6.3). With the exception of Japan and Uzbekistan, the rest of the countries were all in Europe and included Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Iceland,

---

The figure is based on the analysis of the information on player citizenship in conjunction with the cumulative percentage of players reporting being members of the national teams. Please note that we have excluded from the figure countries where fewer than 10 players answered the survey as well as those who did not provide an answer for their country of citizenship. The same approach has been followed in respect of the rest of country figures in the chapter.
Italy, Romania and Serbia. In contrast, the highest percentages of written contracts were reported in Namibia (86%), Portugal (70%), Sweden (42%) and Great Britain (31%).

As players were asked to identify the country of their citizenship, the analysis refers to the United Kingdom when it discusses the findings from the players who reported being UK citizens. This could include players representing England, Scotland, Wales, or Northern Ireland.

---

36 As players were asked to identify the country of their citizenship, the analysis refers to the United Kingdom when it discusses the findings from the players who reported being UK citizens. This could include players representing England, Scotland, Wales, or Northern Ireland.
As in the case of club contracts, there was a positive relationship between the availability of a written contract and professional player status. As figure 6.4 shows, 12.5% of professional players (FIFPro definition) had written national team contracts in place; this compared to only 2.5% of amateur players.

Our findings also suggest a relatively strong and positive relationship between the existence of a written contract and educational attainment, confirming other research that has highlighted the interplay between education and the employment relationship. The interplay between the two is very clear; respondents who were educated at higher levels were more likely to have written contracts in place. In contrast, none of those that had not finished primary school had written contracts. But it is important to add here that the high percentage of players without written contracts can be attributed to the fact these players were predominantly young (see discussion of the findings in chapter 3). Similarly, there was a positive relationship between age and the provision of written contracts: the older the players, the more likely that they had access to written contracts: while only 5% of players under 18-years of age had written contracts, this increased to 14% in the case of players above 33-years of age.

Where national team players had a written contract in place, they were then asked to answer whether they had personally or through their intermediaries a copy of their contact. As figure 6.5 illustrates, only 15% of respondents had personal copies and in 4.5% of cases were there copies with the players’ agents. As such, a striking finding was that 80% of national team players lacked a copy of their contract.
National team players were also asked about the type of contract they had in place with their national team or association. Only 17% of respondents reported having an employment contract. Strikingly, 79% lacked awareness of the type of contract they had while civil law/self-employment contracts were present only in 4% of national team players (figure 6.6).

A breakdown of the type of contracts by region suggests significant differences (figure 6.7). The highest employment contract rates were in Europe (20%). In Asia/Oceania, the respective rate stood at 12.5%, followed by the Americas (10.5%) and last Africa (7%). Despite the increased use of civil law contracts in some parts of Europe, the rate of such contracts was low in the region (4%). In contrast, the use of civil law/self-employment contracts was more common in Asia/Oceania, where the rate stood at 6%. What was striking across all regions was that the majority of respondents lacked awareness of the type of contract they had. This was particularly pronounced in Africa, where 90% of national team members reported lack of awareness.
Where players had a written contract in place, they were asked about the basis for determining the contract duration (figure 6.8). A key finding here was that more than two thirds of players (74%) reported lacking awareness about this. In 13.5% of cases, the contracts with the national teams were determined for every camp, followed for a calendar year (7%) and with a specified start and end contract date (4%). The least popular practice was on the basis of every tournament (2%).

A regional breakdown of the findings provides evidence of significant diversity across different regions (6.9). First, it is important to note that it was in the Americas where a greater percentage (47%) of national team players reported being aware of the bases through which the duration of their contracts was determined. In contrast, in the rest of the regions, the rates of players with no awareness were particularly high, 76% in Africa, 67% in Asia/Oceania and 75% in Europe. Determining contract duration for a calendar year was particularly common in the Americas (21%) as well as in Asia/Oceania (12% of all contracts). In Africa, the rate for determining contract duration for every camp stood at 18% and this was followed closely by the Americas (16%) and then Europe (13%).
Further analysis into the means of determining the contract duration and age reveals that certain mechanisms were more prevalent in specific age groups (figure 6.10). This was the case most notably with respect to specifying a start and end of contract, which accounted for one third of responses in the case of players above 33-years of age. The same held true in the case of determining contract duration for a calendar year, which was also used more widely in the 33-years old age groups. In contrast, determining contract duration for every camp was only used in the rest of the age groups (under-18, 18-23, 24-28 and 29-33 years’ old). Determination on the basis of a calendar year was more prevalent in the above 33 years’ old group (17%) in comparison to 2% in the case of players under 18-years old. Importantly, the findings also indicate the existence of a negative relationship between age and lack of awareness: the younger the player, the more likely it was that they were not aware of the basis for determining the duration of their contract.
Further analysis on the relationship between the basis for determining contract duration and educational attainment confirms, as in the case of club contracts, the existence of a positive relationship between higher educational qualifications and awareness. 100% of players who had not finished primary school were not aware of the basis for determination the duration of their contract. At the other end, those with postgraduate degrees were the least likely to lack information about this. In the case of this category of players, the most popular means for determining contract duration was for a calendar year (16%), followed by every camp (13%). The reverse was true for those with an undergraduate degree: in 12.5% of cases, the contracts were determined for a calendar year and in 16% for every camp.

5.4 The market

As with club players, we sought to gather information regarding the market conditions for players in national teams and specifically the extent to which players were paid. Globally, almost half of national team players received a daily allowance, a quarter received match payments, and 20% did not receive any payment (figure 6.11).
Daily allowances were modest, with a mean value of $75 (monthly payments also equated roughly to this daily amount). Bonuses for winning a match, although only paid to 8% of respondents, averaged $754, with the highest win bonus being reported as $3000 (figure 6.12).
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A global overview of the figures suggests that a little more than a third of players did not get paid at all to play for the national team (figure 6.13). But even in cases where they get paid, a significant rate (42%) said they did not get paid enough to cover their expenses. It was only in 22.5% of cases where players were paid enough. Importantly, in 0.5% of cases players themselves had to pay to play.
A breakdown of the global figures on the adequacy of payment reveals that there were noteworthy differences within and between country teams (figure 6.1). Within country teams, evidence of discrepancies was provided, among others, in Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Nigeria and France. In some cases, these discrepancies may be explained by the fact that a considerable percentage of respondents were young (and hence could have been members of junior national teams). Aside from this, they seem to suggest lack of uniformity in terms of the application of policies across all players. Such differences are arguably a reflection of the lack of minimum requirements in place in the women’s game. More broadly, they are also found in the men’s game and are related to pay inequity in football, a problem that needs to be addressed. On the other hand, countries where the large majority of players reported not being paid to play included Bulgaria (92%), Kyrgyzstan (80%), USA (77%), Uzbekistan (85%), Bosnia (67%), Ireland (65%), France (62.5%), Croatia (57%), and Norway (54%). Countries where a significant percentage of players reported being paid adequately included Portugal (100%), Japan (67%), Italy (60%), Hungary (65%) and Germany (80%). However, Hungary was also the country, where 9% of respondents reported having to pay to play. Other cases, albeit with lower rates, included Ireland and Israel, both with 5%, as well as Finland (2%).
Significant differences were also reported on the basis of age. As figure 6.15 indicates, very young players (i.e. under 18 years’ old) and older players (i.e. above 33-years of age) were less likely to get
paid adequately or at all to cover their expenses for playing for their national teams. The finding regarding pay and younger players may be due to the fact that a considerable percentage of respondents were members of junior national teams, it may also indicate that the payment of national team players was more frequent in countries with developed economies, as it was in those where we found that players were older on average. But even when players were paid, our findings suggest that the most frequent phenomenon in all age groups was for players to not be paid sufficiently to cover their expenses. Further, 1% of players in the 29-33 age group were even asked to pay to play for their national team. It is important to acknowledge here that there are different payment structures in the women’s game, as opposed to men’s, and the response of federations can be an important determinant.

As anticipated, professional players (by the FIFPro definition) were more likely to be paid enough to cover their expenses for playing for their national team: 30% of professionals were paid adequately in contrast to only 7% of amateur players (figure 6.16). While 65% of amateurs (in comparison to 22% of professionals) did not get paid to play, professionals were more likely not to be paid adequately (48% of professionals in contrast to 28% of amateurs). These findings are significant because on the one hand, women’s professional teams do not get as much as men and national team pay should still be significant; on the other hand, non-professional women need the national team to support them fully, because the clubs won’t. Surprisingly, 0.6% of professional players had to pay to play for the national team; this contrasted to 0.3% for amateur players.
6.3 Late payment

Players were also asked if they had experienced a delay in payment related to the national team. 38.5% of national team players reported a delay in payment (figure 6.17). This is slightly above the figure for club-related delays (the rate for club-related delays stood at 37%, see chapter 5). Mostly this was a delay of under 3 months, but a worrying number of players reported delays of over six months or even, for 3.5% of players, over a year.

As seen in figure 6.18, countries where all players reported being paid on time included Ukraine, Venezuela, Switzerland, Portugal and Germany. These were complemented by Australia (79%) and the USA 74%). At the other extreme, countries with the worst rates of payment delays of more than 12-months included Botswana (44%), Croatia (27%), Namibia (17%) and Slovenia (29%). 100% of national players in Bulgaria faced delays between 6 and 12 months, 56% in Croatia and 47% in Greece. 28% of players in Greece experienced delays between 3 and 6 months and 30% of players in Serbia faced delays of 1 to 3 months. A number of countries reported delays of less than 1 month, including Cameroon (21%), Hungary (23%), Ireland (25%), Morocco (55%), Norway (26%) and Uzbekistan (33%).
6.4 Country/Club clashes

International matches between national teams take place throughout the year. Clubs are required to release a player called up to represent her national team for any match on a date designated by the FIFA International Match Calendar. The FIFA International Match Calendar determines the dates for
official international matches and friendly matches. Beyond the dates of the FIFA International Match Calendar, many countries, especially ones without a regular or stable national league competition, invite their national team players to compete in international matches outside of the Calendar. Officially, clubs are not required to release their players for national team matches that occur outside the FIFA International Match Calendar; such demands can force a player to have to confront a choice between her club commitment and her national team commitment.

In this survey, national team players were asked to consider whether they had ever experienced a clash between their club commitments and their national teams’ commitments that fell on dates outside the FIFA international match calendar (figure 6.19). Survey evidence suggests that more than two thirds of the respondents did not experience such a clash, 16% did and 14% did not experience it personally but knew a teammate who had experienced such a clash. 30% represents a significant figure of players who are allegedly being forced to choose between their club and national team commitments.

![Figure 6.19 Clash between club and national team commitments](image)

**6.5 Prize Money**

Prize money at international football competitions has been a subject of recent debate, particularly with regards to questions of gender equality and the disparity in prize money between men’s and women’s tournaments. National team players in this survey were asked whether they are satisfied with the prize money available for major football tournaments, regional and global ones. Two-thirds of all national team player respondents were not satisfied, and 40% were not satisfied at all (figure 6.20). Only 2.5% of players were very satisfied with the prize money available for such tournaments.
Figure 6.20 Prize money satisfaction
7. HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELLBEING

Professional players reported experiencing more satisfaction with the quality of medical support provided by their club than amateur players. At national team level, players were even more satisfied. A similar increase was also seen in satisfaction levels with psychological support, although the percentage of players reporting that they were very satisfied with this support remained fairly static. Just short of two-thirds of players reported that they had never been asked about their menstrual cycle in relation to their performance, with little difference between professional and non-professional players. The majority of players received sick pay from their clubs when injured, although a large minority received no such income. Sick pay from National Teams was less common.

7.1 Overview
In a special supplement of the British Journal of Sports Medicine in 2007, Dvorak et al. argued that ‘there has been little research on the incidence and risk factors for injuries sustained by female football players’. Fitness and injury-prevention programmes, it would seem, took insufficient account of the gender-differences and tended to replicate programmes developed for male players. Ten years has passed since this assessment, and the Women’s Survey asked players a number of questions relating to the physical and psychological support provided to them.

7.2 Satisfaction with Medical and Psychological Support
Players were asked to rate their satisfaction with the medical support provided by the club for physical health. 73% were satisfied with the support provided and 27% of players were unsatisfied. This mirrored the findings from the 2016 men’s report, although a smaller proportion reported being ‘very satisfied’ (21% for women, 24% for men).

Although one might expect that clubs paying professional players would have more developed medical infrastructure and better trained staff, resulting in a higher satisfaction rate, there was little difference when professional player experiences were compared with the overall picture. This could be explained if, for example, professionals expectations are higher than their amateur colleagues. However it could also be explained by the significant variation in minimum standards of developed infrastructure within

---

clubs with professional players; some clubs may be investing in paying wages for players before they have invested in adequate medical staff and facilities.

At national team level, satisfaction did rise, with only 8% unsatisfied and 38% very satisfied. It is therefore probably safe to assume that medical support in the international game is significantly better than at club level, even than for the elite clubs where the professional players ply their trade.

Although psychological support performed slightly worse than medical support from the standpoint of respondents, the majority of players reported satisfaction with the psychological support provided at club level (59%). Nevertheless, amongst all players, 31% expressed dissatisfaction. Clubs where professionals played saw a slight decrease in satisfaction levels (33% expressed dissatisfaction); again,
expectation levels make it difficult to reach firm conclusions about the quality of support on offer, but it is clear that professional players felt support was lacking.

Psychological support provided by the national team was reported by players as being of slightly better quality, but the results did not reflect the disparity shown between clubs and national teams for physical medical support when it came to players reporting they were ‘very satisfied’. It is important to note that no distinction was made between performance enhancement psychological support and more general mental health support. This is an area for further investigation. Nevertheless, it seems that there is still work for both club and national teams to do in order to provide sufficient psychological support for their players.

7.3 Menstrual Cycle and Performance
The survey questioned whether players were asked by coaching or team medical staff about their menstrual cycle. Research on the effect of the menstrual cycle on physical performance is limited, and
the effect of both the menstrual cycle and the use of oral contraceptives to inhibit it, \(^{38}\) ‘remains fundamentally unknown.’ \(^{39}\) Bruinvels et al. argue that, ‘a greater understanding of the menstrual cycle is needed to address the reported negative impacts on exercise training in order to encourage participation and avoid further disparity in gender representation’. \(^{40}\) However, a number of small-scale or pilot studies have indicated that a sports competitor’s menstrual cycle can have a negative effect upon at least some aspects of their performance. \(^{41}\) Menstrual dysfunction relating to physical exertion in sport is also common and can have an adverse effect upon the health and performance of female players. \(^{42}\)

Therefore, relevant club staff should be aware of a player’s menstrual cycle, which is potentially very important to contextualise and improve their training and match performance, and guard against potential health risks. However, nearly two-thirds of respondents (62%) reported that they had never been asked about this by either coaching or team medical staff.

---


\(^{40}\) Bruinvels et al. ibid: 478.

\(^{41}\) Julian R, et al found, ‘there is potentially a reduction in maximal endurance performance during the LP of the menstrual cycle. However, this reduction in performance was not observed for jumping and sprint.’ In terms of competitor perception of the impact of the cycle, a 2015 UCL/St Mary’s study found that 42% of female athletes surveyed online claimed their menstrual cycle impacts their training and performance (Bruinvels G, Burden R, Brown N, et al. ‘The prevalence and impact of heavy menstrual bleeding (menorrhagia) in elite and non-elite athletes’. PLoS ONE 2016;11: e0149881).

We were surprised to find that the number of players asked this question showed hardly any increase for professional players; the percentage of professionals asked rose only by one percent.

### 7.4 Injuries and Sick Pay

Players who earned a salary were asked whether they continued to be paid by the club when they were injured. Here we have only analysed those who are professional (and therefore receive an income for playing). 60.5% of responding players reported receiving over 80% of their salary when injured, compared to 27% who did not continue to be paid. 12% received less than 80%. In summary, although the majority of professional women’s clubs are providing substantial sick pay for injured players, many clubs are lagging far behind, leaving injured players without an income from football.\(^{43}\)

![Pie chart showing the provision of sick pay when injured](image)

In comparison, and given the irregularity of international fixtures not surprisingly, national teams were unlikely to pay any salary to injured players (76%). 19% of those playing for their national team, however, continued to be paid over 80% of their salary when injured.

---

\(^{43}\) It should be noted, however, that if we had used FIFA’s definition of ‘professional’, 73% of would have received over 80% of their salary, with only 11.5% receiving no sick pay.
As we can see, sick pay provided by national teams varied significantly, with the results suggesting that Romania and Ukraine, and Uzbekistan paid over 80% sick pay to their players in the event of injury but Botswana, Cyprus, Morocco, Ireland, and Serbia provided no financial support. Again, these results are for players playing club football in these countries rather than players playing for those national teams (although given the low rate of migration there is likely to be a strong relationship). This, along with other factors, may account for results suggesting only some players from a particular country received sick pay from their national team, although anomalies in the results to this question mean we should treat the results with caution.

---

44 This figure appears to be a wild anomaly as 85% of respondents from Uzbekistan reported not receiving payment for playing for their national team participation (Fig.6.18) and all respondents from Uzbekistan were Uzbek nationals (Fig.3.1).
Figure 7.8 Do you continue to get paid your salary when you are injured (National Team)

- Yes Over 80% of my salary
- Yes 50-80% of my salary
- Yes 30%-49% of my salary
- Yes, under 30% of my salary
- No

Countries: Serbia, Morocco, Japan, Ireland, Germany, Cyprus, Botswana, Croatia, Greece, Montenegro, Israel, Slovenia, Switzerland, Hungary, Norway, Poland, France, Sweden, Iceland, Denmark, Australia, Cameroon, Finland, USA, Brazil, Namibia, Portugal, Italy, New Zealand, Great Britain, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Romania.
8. DISCRIMINATION AND ABUSE

The proportion of female players reporting to have experienced violence, harassment, bullying, or discrimination was notably lower than the proportion of male players who reported similar abuse in the 2016 Men’s Survey. The exception to this was gender discrimination, which 17% reported to have experienced; this in itself is remarkably low given the inequalities we believe are inherent when we compare the men’s and women’s games. With the exception of violence and threats of violence from other players, fans tended to be the perpetrators of what abuse occurred and amateur players appeared to be slightly more exposed to this than professionals.

8.1 Overview

Players were asked whether they had suffered violence, discrimination or abuse related to their role as a football player. The headline figures including, where comparable, the levels reported by in the 2016 Men’s Survey were as follows:

8.2 Physical Violence

The overwhelming majority of players (93%) reported that they had never been subjected to physical violence linked to their role as a footballer. This was similar to the results of the 2016 Men’s Survey (90.5%). Of those suffering physical violence, 70.5% (so 5% overall) reported the perpetrator to be another player. The questionnaire specified that this should exclude fouls during a match or training.
8.3 Threats of Violence

12% of respondents reported having been threatened with violence, compared to 16% of men in the 2016 survey. Of these, 67.5% (8% of all players) were threatened by other players and 62% of players reported threats by fans on match-days (again, 8% overall). While one would expect the number of fans attending matches where professionals are playing to be significantly higher than other matches, thereby increasing the risk of abuse, threats of violence by fans on matchdays was actually lower for professional players, and dramatically, at 3% compared to 14%. This may tell us something profound about the difference in supporter culture between crowds at elite matches and those who attend amateur matches.
8.4 Non-Sexual Bullying or Harassment

6% of respondents reported non-sexual bullying or harassment, which was spread fairly evenly across a number of sources. This compared to a much higher 15% of male players in the 2016 survey. In comparison to the 2016 men’s survey, we believe there is a pattern emerging when it comes to abuse: the problems in terms of violence, threats, and harassment from within the club (players, management, coaching staff) within the women’s game are less pronounced than in the men’s game.

We were interested to see whether the increased employment pressures that might be expected upon professional players in contrast to amateur players also brought with it bullying or harassment by other club workers. However, although there was a slight increase (2% of professionals reported bullying/harassment in contrast to 1.7% of amateurs) this was not as great as we might have predicted. Interestingly, while professional players reported far fewer threats of violence from fans than their amateur counterparts, they reported slightly increased levels of harassment/bullying by fans on a matchday.

8.5 Sexual Harassment

In terms of sexual harassment, 3.5% of players reported being victims of this. While the proportion was low (116 individuals from the sample of 3,295), this should not belittle the experiences of the victims. Furthermore, it was clear that some players had been the victims of sexual harassment from a number of different perpetrators. Sexual harassment perpetrated by coaching staff was a particularly worrying finding, and was reported to us by 46 players (1.39% of overall respondents). It is likely that
for such a sensitive subject, which is known to have the potential to trigger feelings of embarrassment, shame, or even guilt in victims, the actual figure is likely to be significantly higher.\footnote{45}

![Figure 8.5. Experienced Sexual Harassment by source (% of players experiencing it overall).](image)

8.6 Racism

4.5\% of players reported experiencing racism. Non-nationals (11\%) were more likely to report having experienced racism (which included discrimination on the grounds of nationality) than nationals (4\%).

![Figure 8.6. Racism: Experience of non-Nationals](image)

Of those incidents, 72\% of the perpetrators were reported to be fans on matchday; 107 players (3\%) reported having experienced this.

\footnote{45 Research into sexual harassment in the workplace ‘consistently demonstrates that reported SH represents only the tip of the iceberg’, with as few as 5\% of victims reporting it. Furthermore, in many cultures sexual harassment is often not recognised as such (McDonald, P. (2012) ‘Workplace Sexual Harassment 30 Years on: A review of the literature’ \textit{International Journal of Management Reviews} 14/1 1-17).}
Cyprus stood out in terms of reports of racism by spectators; we have listed in Figure 8.8 the 10 countries where racism was most likely to be experienced. 20% of respondents from Brazil, which due to a low response rate was not included for the global analysis, also reported experiencing racism.

8.7 Homophobia
Drury argues that, ‘homophobia and heteronormativity are so deeply ingrained in the discourse of football that they are often reproduced and perpetuated by female football players. It is the lesbian presence in football that is discursively depicted as the “problem”, not the homophobic attitudes themselves,’\(^{46}\) and a number of anglo-centric studies have noted the problem of homophobia, even

---

\(^{46}\) Drury, S. (2011) “It seems really inclusive in some ways, but … inclusive just for people who identify as lesbian”: discourses of gender and sexuality in a lesbian-identified football club’ *Soccer and Society* 12/3: 421-442
including incidents of physical violence.\textsuperscript{47} Players were asked if they had experienced homophobia and if so in what contexts. It should be noted here that the question focused on homophobia rather than all discrimination based on sexuality, despite evidence of discrimination against bi-and pan-sexual players (by both heterosexual and lesbian women) and heterosexual women by lesbian players.\textsuperscript{48} Numbers reporting homophobia were, however, lower than we were expecting given the qualitative research in this area, with 5.4\% reporting having experienced it in connection to their employment as a football player, and fans most likely to be the perpetrators by a significant margin; 113 players (3.4\%) reported having experienced homophobia by fans on match-day.

Geographical analysis indicated that there were a number of hotspots when it came to homophobic experiences. 63\% of Moroccan respondents (from a healthy sample of 106 responses) reported having experienced homophobia, suggesting a very serious problem affecting women’s football in Morocco. 17\% of respondents from Venezuela experienced homophobia, with Israel and the USA also above 10\%. Brazil was not included in the global analysis because only 15 players responded, but of these, 27\% reported experiencing homophobia. Respondents from six countries (Denmark, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Serbia and Uzbekistan) reported no instances of homophobia. However, some of these responses need to be analysed with care; in Kyrgyzstan, the 2016 ‘anti-gay propaganda’ law has been reported to have led to a 300\% increase in reported homophobic attacks\textsuperscript{49} whereas in Uzbekistan, the 2017 Human Right Watch World Report noted that, ‘(l)esbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people face deep-rooted homophobia and discrimination’.\textsuperscript{50} It would be unsurprising if, in countries such as these, players were unwilling to report homophobic abuse, meaning that the actual levels of abuse are

\textsuperscript{47} Cauldwell, J. 2007 ‘Queering the Field? The complexities of sexuality within a lesbian-identified football team in England’ \textit{Gender, Place and Culture} (183-196).
\textsuperscript{48} For more on these issues see Cauldwell 2007 and Drury 2011.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{The Guardian}, 4 May 2016. See also https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2017/country-chapters/kyrgyzstan
\textsuperscript{50} https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2017/country-chapters/uzbekistan
almost certainly higher. In countries where the law does not criminalize homosexuality, the cultural stigma associated with it could also lead to underreporting of homophobic experiences. Again, as with the other questions on discrimination in the survey, the respondents were only offered individuals as perpetrators (e.g. fans, players, club management, coaching staff) in the answer column. Therefore, institutionalized homophobia as part of broader overarching structural discrimination must be captured in other ways through future research. In short, our headline global figure is likely to be lower than the experienced reality for female footballers.

8.8 Gender Discrimination
17.5% of players reported experiencing discrimination on the grounds of their gender. Given that professional football is based inherently upon gender division, with the most access, opportunities, resources, and lucrative football careers exclusively available to men, this is a remarkably low figure.
However, respondents were only offered the possibility to select individuals as perpetrators (e.g. fans, players, club management, coaching staff) in the answer column. This means that there was no way to report more structural and institutionalized gender discrimination (e.g. less access to top-quality pitches, goal-line technology etc.). Instead, respondents could only report on overt and expressed discrimination committed by individuals (e.g. verbal abuse based on gender). Of those who did report discrimination, 70% (12.2% overall) reported the perpetrators to be fans on a match-day.

Finally, just over 1% of players reported discrimination on the grounds of religion, with 70.5% of perpetrators again being fans on a match-day (therefore affecting 0.7% of players overall).
9. MATCH FIXING

5% of respondents overall reported that they had been approached to fix a match, with the risk of being approached generally rising the longer a player’s career lasted. For professional players over-33, the number of approaches was almost identical to over-33 respondents in the Men’s Survey of 2016: 10.5%. Overall, the women’s game appears to be less attractive than the men’s game for match fixers, but several different measures illustrated that the amateur women’s game is more attractive than the elite women’s game. Indeed, 6% of amateurs reported having been approached, in comparison to 4% of professional players. Furthermore, players receiving no income or who had to pay their own footballing expenses reported levels of match-fixing approaches that were again comparable to those identified in the 2016 Men’s Survey.

9.1 Overview
Although the financial rewards for clubs for success in women’s football are not comparable to those that led to high-profile match-fixing in the men’s game, the increased profile of women’s football over the last decade has brought the sport onto the radar of bookmakers and those who look to profit from betting on matches. Irregular betting patterns have been identified around an increasing number of women’s matches\(^5\) leading Interpol and others to conclude that women’s football is being targeted.\(^6\)

9.2 Match-Fixing Approaches by Age
The survey could not account for the actual levels of match-fixing, but instead asked players whether they had ever been approached to fix a match. 5% reported they had been approached. This compared favourably with 6.7% of men who reported they had been approached in the 2016 Men’s survey.

The 5% figure is an average across all age-ranges, and in the Men’s Survey, we saw that – as expected - the longer a player’s career lasts, the more exposed the player will be to an approach. Looking at the ages of female players who said they had been approached, we can see that this pattern broadly being followed, starting at under 4% for u-18 players and increasing to over 8% for players in the oldest age bracket.

---
\(^5\) Notts County’s fixture with Everton on 20 April was highlighted by Federbet, an organisation monitoring suspicious gambling patterns (2014) (BBC Sport Online 4/6/14).
\(^6\) The Guardian 20/4/19.
9.3 Other Risk Factors

Respondents from nine countries reported a higher rate of match fixing approaches than the average. It should also be noted that a number of hotspots from this survey also mirrored hotspots in the men’s survey – Namibia, Venezuela, Botswana, Slovenia, Cameroon, and Bulgaria.

In the Men’s Survey, we identified a positive relation between match-fixing approaches and delays in salary payment. In the women’s game there was also a positive relation (albeit with what appeared to be a rogue result for those in the 3-6 month bracket). The situation is, however, more complex for the women’s game due to the number of players not receiving any wage; it may be that those not being paid at all are more likely to be approached. Only 3% of those paid fully and on time reported being approached. Once a payment delay rose above 1 month the risk increased dramatically (to 9%), and
again if the delay lasted longer than a year (17%). There was no greater likelihood of a match-fixing approach based on payment delays when professional players were considered in isolation, although numbers were so low it is difficult to rule this out.

9.4 Comparing the Professional Game to the Amateur Game
One area of interest to the research team was whether professional women would be more likely to be approached than those playing further down the pyramid. We were rather surprised to find that overall, and in all bar the oldest age range, professional women reported fewer approaches. Overall 4.4% have been approached in the professional game, compared with 6.2% of amateur players and 5% overall. Only in the oldest age range did the professional game appear to outstrip the amateur game. When we consider the percentage of professional female players over-33 who were approached during the course of their career (10.5%) to professional male players over-33 (10.7%), there is a striking and remarkable similarity. The similarity in the curve of the line according to age also shows a pattern that suggests perhaps tools for combating match-fixing in the men’s game could be applied to the women’s game. However, the numbers of both amateur and professional players in this category were low and we must be cautious about treating them as representative. One thing is clear though - match-fixing is by no means limited to the men’s game.
On the whole, we can speculate from our data that in women’s football, the amateur game may be more attractive than the elite game for those looking to fix matches. The fact that there were fewer approaches in the professional game was also largely borne out by an analysis of approaches by salary. Over 9% of those earning between $101-200 a month reported being approached. Of the 50% of players who reported to this survey not being paid a salary, over 6% reported being approached to fix a match, again indicating that the problem is not limited to the elite women’s game. In fact, players earning over $201 a month were considerably less likely than the average player to be approached.

Those who reported they were satisfied with the remuneration they received were much less likely to be approached to fix a match (4%). Those who reported not being paid to play were more likely to be approached (6%), broadly matching our findings above. Those who not only received no remuneration but also had to spend their own money to meet their playing expenses were considerably more likely to be approached; over 10% of women paying their own way in football were asked to fix a match.
Figure 9.5. Match-Fixing Approaches (%) by Satisfaction with Income
10. THE FOOTBALL CAREER IN CONTEXT

The survey results suggest that playing football is rarely a full-time job for female players, even those classed as professional. The majority of players are studying, working, or both, usually for over 20-hours a week in addition to their football duties. Few female players have children and of those that do, 61% report no childcare support from within the game or from the state. Clubs and associations provided childcare support for only 11% of players with children. The desire to pursue a full-time career outside of football, and/or the desire to start a family appear to be key drivers behind women considering ending their football career before they were no longer physically capable of playing at the same level. Once over the age of 18, over 89% of women reported considering ending their careers early, and professional players were slightly more likely to consider walking away than amateurs.

10.1 Work and Study

The survey indicated that one third of players in the women’s game were working. Furthermore, of those who were working, the mean number of hours per week was over 27-hours with a standard deviation of over 16. Clearly while some players have casual jobs in which they only work a few hours, others are in significant, and often full-time, employment.

As we have pointed out regularly in this report, the FIFA definition of ‘professional’ does not mean ‘full-time’, and this is borne out by the finding that 64% of professional players were also working away from football. Of those professionals who were working, the mean number of hours per week was 20, so lower than the mean for all players. However, a number of professional players reported working up to 56-hours per week in addition to the time playing football. These figures do not tell us anything about the number of hours that these players spend on training and games. It can often be the
case that female players are taking on football commitments plus additional jobs, and not necessarily playing ‘part-time’.

One of the key differences between the men’s and the women’s game comes in relation to players studying while they play. We saw in Chapter 3 that around one-fifth of players were playing for clubs in higher education partnerships or offering other educational study opportunities and that 23% of respondents were under-18, so the high number of players who are also in a course of study should not be surprising. Nearly half of players reported currently being in a course of study, with the mean number of hours of those responding positively being 27-hours per week. As with employment, education takes up a significant amount of time for a significant number of players.

10.2 Children and Childcare
98% of respondents did not have children and given that nearly 70% of respondents were under-23, this may not be a particular surprise.
However, it is possible that pursuing a career in women’s football may be difficult for those with children, meaning that players may either put off becoming pregnant, or are more likely to leave the game when they do (see Section 10.3 below). The lack of childcare provision in football may be one important reason this is the case. Of those players who had children, 61% reported that they received no childcare support. Clubs or national federations provided maternity pay for only 8% of respondents with children. Childcare support within the game was also extremely limited; only 3% of clubs provided support, and there were no responses saying the national association provided childcare support. 14.5% of respondents with children were provided childcare support by the state.

Childcare support options for professional players only showed little improvement. The number of players receiving maternity pay from their national team or association reduced fractionally, although those provided with childcare support by their clubs increased (albeit only from 3% to 5%).

10.3 Reasons to leave the game early

One of the most worrying findings relating to the development of a player’s career and the stability of the women’s game, came from responses to a question asking whether players whether they would consider leaving the game early for any of the provided reasons. 89% of respondents selected at least one reason, although the lack of an ‘other’ box meant that the number who are considering leaving the game early could be higher. However, perhaps most concerning for the professional women’s game is the fact that a slightly greater proportion of professionals (90% by the FIFPro definition) had identified reasons they might leave the game early than those classed as amateurs (88%).

53 This is more pronounced if we use instead the FIFA definition of ‘professional’. Then 92% of professionals are considering leaving early compared to 86% of amateurs.

---

Figure 10.4: Childcare Support (Players with Children Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional Players</th>
<th>All Players</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No support provided</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided formal childcare by the State</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given maternity pay by the club or Federation</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided formal childcare by my club</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A country-level analysis (Figure 10.6) reveals a similar story across national borders with little discernable pattern based on league development, average (non-football) income, or geographical region. We cannot account for the statistical outliers towards the bottom of the table.
### Figure 10.6. Considering Leaving the Game Early by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A lack of a financial incentive to stay, the desire to pursue career opportunities outside of football, and the desire to start a family dominated the reasons players gave that made them think about leaving the game early, tying in with the findings set out above about low pay and lack of childcare support. When we compare these findings with the results in section 3.3 that nearly 70% of respondents were under-23, we can speculate that one significant factor in this drop off at what should be the peak of a player’s career is the lack of financial or childcare support in the game. Further support is given to this contention when we look at the age in which players are most likely to consider ending their career in football, with players between 24 and 33 the most likely to report considering to leave. Players under-18 were the most enthusiastic about remaining in Women’s football, although even in this age group three-quarters were considering ending their career early.
APPENDIX A – DEFINITIONS

Amateur (*FIFPro Definition*): A player who does not receive any income for playing football from any source.

*Bullying/Harassment:* Unwanted conduct and including either harassment or bullying as: ‘Where one person or persons engage in unwanted conduct in relation to another person which has the purpose or effect of violating that person’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that person’ The conduct shall be regarded as having this effect only if, having regard to all the circumstances and in particular the alleged victim’s perception, it should be reasonably considered as having that effect’.

*Civil contract:* A contract between a club and a player that is not a labour contract. In many occasions such contract is additional to a labour contract but lacks the protection of such contract. Most civil contracts are not registered with the FA.

*Discrimination:* Discrimination is defined as “less favourable treatment” of player based on one or more of: gender, age, race, nationality, religion or belief, sexuality.

*Harassment:* ‘A person (A) subjects another person (B) to harassment where, on the grounds of (insert social identity basis), A engages in unwanted conduct which has the purpose or effect of (i) violating B’s dignity or (ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for B. ’The conduct shall be regarded as having this effect only if, having regard to all the circumstances and in particular the alleged victim’s perception, it should be reasonably considered as having that effect’.

*Match-fixing:* Dishonest activity with the intention of manipulating a match, usually for financial gain (most often through gambling). This includes influencing the result of the match and also less significant match-events (e.g. the timing or number of bookings, red cards, throw-ins etc.).

*Labour/Employment contract:* The relationship between a club and a player is a labour/employment contract governed by national labour law and contractual terms (which incorporate national FA and FIFA regulations).

*Professional (*FIFPro Definition*): A player who receives an income for playing football, whatever the source. It does not mean the player is a full-time professional or that their incomes needs to cover the expenses incurred by playing.
APPENDIX B - METHODOLOGY

B.1 Research Purpose
The purpose of the project was to gain the most extensive insight into the labour conditions and experiences of female football players globally. This included both professional players and amateurs, so long as they were officially registered with the national association. FIFPro wanted to establish a research baseline on the reality in professional women’s football from the players’ perspective. Such a basis did not previously exist and forms a significant baseline for policy development and engagement with external stakeholders. We are very grateful for the time and input provided by FIFPro and the national unions regarding the design and dissemination of the survey as well as to the players who kindly agreed to participate in the survey.

B.2 Research Institution and Team
The research was commissioned by FIFPro, the international federation of professional football players, who approached the University of Manchester in late 2016 to assist in the construction and analysis of the women’s survey. This built upon a relationship that was established in 2015 when the University was approached to analyse and report on the Global Survey of male professional players. The University of Manchester, is the largest single-site University in the UK and has origins going back to 1824. It is part of the prestigious Russell Group of Universities and in 2017 it was ranked in the top-30 higher-education institutions in the world (2016/17 QS University Global Rankings).

The academic team consisted of Dr Aristea Koukiadaki, a senior lecturer at the School of Law with expertise in Labour Law and Industrial Relations and Dr Geoff Pearson, also a senior lecturer at the School of Law and previously Director of the MBA (Football Industries) programme. Aristea has conducted comparative research in working conditions and collective labour rights and published her work in (amongst others) the Industrial Law Journal and the European Journal of Industrial Relations. Geoff has previously published on the football player market in the European Law Journal and European Law Review and worked with the European Commission analysing the legality of the UEFA Home-Grown Player Rule. Koukiadaki and Pearson were the authors of the 2016 FIFPro Global Survey of Professional Football Players. Data cleaning and analysis was conducted at the University and data inputting was conducted by Dr Jacqueline Austin, Alexandra Aldridge.

B.3 The Questionnaire
In contrast to the 2016 men’s survey, FIFPro constructed the final version of the questionnaire, with Koukiadaki and Pearson providing feedback on an earlier draft version. Because the questionnaire would need to be translated into different languages, responses were almost exclusively limited to ‘tick
boxes’. Some questions were drafted to allow comparison with the previous FIFPro Surveys and other labour conditions surveys carried out by organisations such as the ILO, OECD, and Eurofound. A complete copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix D. The questionnaire is focused on six subfields: Demographics, Contracts, National Team, Health, Safety and Wellbeing, Match Fixing, and attitudes to the union. There were 40 questions.

B.4 Research Process and Data Reliability

Players unions and representatives were approached to participate in the survey. FIFPro’s final questionnaire was then translated into the national languages of all the participating countries. Players’ unions and/or other representative groups from 38 countries in Africa, America, Asia, Europe, and Oceania distributed paper copies of questionnaires to union representatives of clubs participating in the national league. Representatives were provided with written guidance on how to explain the questions to players, and a glossary of terms. A secondary internet survey containing the same questions was uploaded to SurveyMonkey. 336 responses were received and were added to the results for the country in which the player reported they were currently playing. Australia, Iceland, Israel, Slovenia, and Norway provided the largest numbers of internet responses. Israel’s responses were internet-based only. Both paper and internet questionnaires were completed by players anonymously. Data collection took place in February, March, and April 2017.

Paper questionnaires were returned to FIFPro and scanned into pdf form before being sent to the University of Manchester for data entry. Collected data from both paper and internet questionnaires was manually entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) by an academic research team trained in the use of the software. The completed questionnaires were checked in detail by the research team to guard against potential manipulation and the academic research team excluded a number of blank or duplicate questionnaires from the data analysis. The final number of usable returns was 3,499, which was considerably more than was originally anticipated. We should note that not all player unions or professional players are affiliated to FIFPro (although candidate and observer countries were included in the survey).

All responses were inputted, and questionnaires missing answers to some questions were not excluded (unless this omitted demographic data necessary to ensure reliability of data). Due to problems in distribution or translation of surveys, not all of the answers in the paper responses by players in Portugal and Iceland could be analysed. However, some data from these surveys was still usable.

SPSS software was used to perform the statistical analysis and the research team looked to, (a) describe the current state of labour conditions for female footballers, (b) identify trends over time in comparison with earlier FIFPro surveys, and (c) look for relationships in the data which may explain some of the findings.
Data analysis consisted of examining frequencies across all themes, analysing the data in order to provide information about the distribution of variables through descriptive statistics, and conducting cross-tabulation analysis to show the relationship between two or more categorical variables. Where we carry out comparative analysis between continents, players from Israel, Kazakhstan, and (potentially) Asian-Russia are classified as Europe rather than Asia as they fall under the auspices of the European governing body, UEFA. A full list of the regional categorisation can be found in Appendix C.

The final report was written for FIFPro by Dr Aristea Koukiadaki and Dr Geoff Pearson in June-November 2017.

B.5 Ethics and Anonymity
Given that some of the questions were sensitive, the questionnaire was anonymous. Players were not asked their name or the name of their team, but instead to merely put the country in which they were playing, the league in which they played, and whether they were a national of that country. Anonymity was aimed for in order to encourage players to answer truthfully about issues such as abuse and match-fixing. It is common practice in the social sciences to protect the anonymity of research participants answering questions which could have adverse effects for them if they were identified.

B.6 Limitations

B.6.1 Sampling
FIFPro were keen to give voice to as many of their members as possible and as such the survey sought to gather the maximum number of responses as possible at country and league levels. As we were not identifying a representative sample from each country’s playing ‘population’, the subsequent analysis and report is merely descriptive of the respondents to the survey. Despite the size of the survey, we cannot claim that our findings are representative of the experiences of all female players or all female players in particular countries (although of course they may be).

However, a number of countries returned a small number of responses, and in some cases the internet-survey returned a single response from one country. Given that we wished to compare countries and regions, this raised the risk of a highly misrepresentative results. After much consideration it was decided to exclude countries with fewer than 25 responses. This would allow us to carry out global, regional, and country-by-country analyses with the risk results would be distorted by answers from a single club (remember that for reasons of anonymity we did not request the names of clubs respondents were registered for). In total 228 responses were excluded for this reason, leaving a final total of 3,295 surveys to be analysed (although reference is made where appropriate to some of the findings from excluded countries with a health-warning). Full details of all countries and responses can be found in Appendix C.
B.6.2 Missing Participants
The survey is not complete in terms of countries where women’s football is played. Players from 57 countries participated in the survey and of these, 24 returned fewer than 25 responses and were excluded from both the global and country-by-country comparative analysis to ensure consistency and assist the representational nature of the national responses. However, in contrast to the men’s survey, all the major female football markets did respond.

B.6.3 Missing Data, Adverse Influence and Data Reliability
As the questionnaire was administered by hand, respondents were able to pass over questions they did not wish to answer, or did not have information for. Some questions went unanswered on a national basis and in these instances the data does not appear in the comparative graphs.

Although the paper survey was designed to be anonymous, and those inputting the data and carrying out the analysis knew neither the players nor clubs who had completed questionnaires, there is a risk that respondents could be adversely influenced by other players or club management individuals present at the time they completed the questionnaire. In order to gain the highest number of responses, paper questionnaires were distributed and collected by local player union representatives. Many questionnaires were filled out in a group setting (e.g. a changing room) and in some cases illiterate players were assisted in completing the survey by their teammates. There is therefore a danger that for sensitive questions in particular (e.g. admitting match-fixing approaches or reporting abuse by other players or club management), players may not be willing to admit they have experienced this. This is a serious methodological problem which compounds the methodological issues that generally attach themselves to survey research on sensitive topics in comparison to, for example, longitudinal observational studies.

B.6.4 Analysis of Trends over Time
Given that this is the first Global Survey of the Women’s game, it was impossible to comment on trends and changes over time. The survey is very much a snapshot of the life of the female footballer in 2017. Some comparison can be drawn with the 2016 Global Survey of the men’s game, but the markets are very different (although some experiences are very much shared).
## APPENDIX C – PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

### C.1 Questionnaires Inputted into Analysis by Country Played In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>INPUTTED QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTSWANA</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULGARIA</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMEROON</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPRUS</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIA</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND (UNITED KINGDOM)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICELAND</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYRGYSTAN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTENEGRO</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMIBIA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANIA</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBIA</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINE</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZBEKISTAN</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENEZUELA</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,295</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.2 Countries excluded due to response rates of fewer than 25 questionnaires:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>INPUTTED QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELARUS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECH REPUBLIC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAZAKHSTAN</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALTA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING DATA</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTLAND</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVAKIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH KOREA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.3 Categorisation of countries by region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (United Kingdom)</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland (United Kingdom)</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIFPro is the global players’ union, or the collective voice of more than 65,000 male and female professional footballers worldwide. Together with the national players’ unions, FIFPro is conducting a global survey amongst female players to better understand the current working conditions of football players around the globe.

This survey is the first of its kind and has been distributed to you because you play in the top league in your country. We understand that the range of experiences and conditions faced by female players is extremely broad when taking into account geographical and cultural context. Whatever your situation is, we want to hear about it. This is an opportunity to have your voice heard and to share what it means to be a female football player today, helping us capture a comprehensive picture of the reality on ground that will be used to improve conditions for players, thereby strengthening the women’s game. The results of this survey will be compiled and published in a global report, in a format similar to the men's FIFPro Global Employment Report (www.footballmap.fifpro.org/#footballmap).

This survey is anonymous. It consists of six (6) sections, 31 or 40 questions depending on if you are a National Team player or not and will take around 20 minutes to complete.

“We can continue to grow the sport, not just the quality of the game itself, but the quality of pitches, the quality of coaches, the money put into it, and to help these players play at a higher level.” (Hope Solo)
SECTION 1 - About You

1. Name the country of your citizenship(s):

________________________________________________________________________

2. How old are you?
   ❏ Under 18 years of age
   ❏ 18-23 years of age
   ❏ 24-28 years of age
   ❏ 29-33 years of age
   ❏ Above 33 years of age

3. What is the highest level of education or training that you have completed?
   ❏ Did not finish primary school
   ❏ Primary School
   ❏ High school
   ❏ Vocational training
   ❏ Undergraduate: Bachelor Degree
   ❏ Postgraduate: Advanced Degree

4. What league and country do you currently play in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>League</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you consider yourself: (Select one only)
   ❏ A professional player
   ❏ A semi-professional player
   ❏ An amateur player
6. Do you have children?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

   If Yes, what support are you provided? (Select all that may apply)
   ☐ I am provided formal childcare by the State
   ☐ I am provided formal childcare by my National team
   ☐ I am provided formal childcare by my club
   ☐ I am given maternity pay by the club or Federation
   ☐ No support provided

7. From which sources do you receive your football income? (Select all that may apply)
   ☐ I do not receive any money to play
   ☐ My club
   ☐ My National team
   ☐ Private individual
   ☐ Company or Sponsor
   ☐ Government
   ☐ University scholarship
   ☐ Olympic Committee
   ☐ I don’t know
SECTION 2 - CONTRACTS – LEAGUE, CLUB

Please answer this section in relation to your club.

8. Do you have a written contract with your club?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No (if you answered No, jump to question 12)

9. Do you have a copy of your contract?
   ❑ Yes, I personally have a copy
   ❑ No, but my agent/intermediary has a copy
   ❑ No

10. What kind of contract do you have?
    ❑ Amateur contract
    ❑ Employment contract
    ❑ Civil law contract/Self-employment contract
    ❑ Don’t know

11. What is the start and end date of your current contract?
    Start: ______/_______ (month/year)
    End: ______/_______ (month/year)
    ❑ Don’t know

12. What is the current net salary you receive playing for your club? (Including average bonuses)
    ❑ 0$/month
    ❑ 1 - 100$/month
    ❑ 101 – 200$/month
    ❑ 201 - 300$/month
    ❑ 301 – 600$/month
    ❑ 601 – 1,000$/month
    ❑ 1001– 2,000$/month
    ❑ 2,001 – 4,000$/month
    ❑ 4,001 – 8,000$/month
    ❑ 8,001 – 10,000$/month
    ❑ more than 10,000$/month
13. Do you receive any non-financial benefits playing for your club? (Select all that may apply)
   - Car
   - Housing
   - Food
   - (Public) transportation
   - Gym
   - Health Insurance
   - Retirement Funds
   - None

14. Are you paid enough by your club to meet your expenses incurred playing football? (Select all that may apply)
   - Yes
   - No
   - I do not get paid to play (jump to question 16)
   - I have to pay to play (jump to question 16)

15. Which of the following applies to you regarding your payment over the last 2 seasons (salaries, bonuses etc.)? (Select only one)
   - I have been paid fully and on time
   - There has been a delay of less than 1 month
   - There has been a delay of 1 to 3 months
   - There has been a delay of 3 to 6 months
   - There has been a delay of 6 to 12 months
   - There has been a delay of more than 12 months

16. How secure do you feel about your employment as a footballer on a scale from 1 to 5:

   (1 feeling very insecure to 5 feeling very secure)
   a. At your current club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. As a female football player in general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Do you have an agent/intermediary?
   - Yes
   - No (if you answered No, jump to Question 19).

18. How much and from whom does your agent/intermediary get paid? (% of your contract value) (Select all that may apply)
   - My agent/intermediary does not get payment from me
   - The club pays my agent/intermediary
   - I don't know
   - My first month's salary
   - 3% of my salary
   - 3-10% of my salary
   - More than 10% of my salary

19. Does your football club have any of the following: (Select all that apply)
   - A partnership with a university that provides scholarships for athletes
   - Other study opportunities
   - Working opportunities
   - None of the above

**IF YOU DO NOT PLAY FOR YOUR NATIONAL TEAM SKIP THIS SECTION AND GO TO QUESTION 30**
SECTION 3 – CONTRACTS, NATIONAL TEAM

20. Do you have a written contract as a member of the National Team?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No (if you answered No, jump to question 24).

21. Do you have a copy of your contract?
   ❑ Yes, I personally have a copy
   ❑ No, but my agent/intermediary has a copy
   ❑ No

22. What kind of contract with the National Team do you have?
   ❑ Employment contract
   ❑ Civil law contract/Self-employment contract
   ❑ Don't know

23. Have you signed your image rights away?
   ❑ Yes
   ❑ No
   ❑ I am not sure
   ❑ I don't know what image rights are

24. How is the duration of the contract with the National Team in your country determined?
   ❑ With a specified start ______ and end date ______ of a contract
   ❑ Determined for every camp
   ❑ Determined for every tournament
   ❑ For a calendar year
   ❑ I don't know

25. What do you currently receive as payment per day for National Team (including average bonuses but excluding non-financial benefits such as car, accommodation etc.)? (Select all that apply)
   ❑ I receive a daily allowance of $ ________ (US Dollars)
   ❑ I receive match payments: Loss $ _______ Draw $ _______ Win $ _______
   ❑ I receive payments for publicity, appearances, events, etc. $ _______
   ❑ I receive payment per camp of $ _______
   ❑ I receive payment per month of $ _______
   ❑ I do not receive any payment from National Team
26. Are you paid enough as a National Team player to meet your expenses playing for the National Team? (Select all that may apply)
   - Yes
   - No
   - I do not get paid to play for the National Team (jump to question 28)
   - I have to pay to play for the National Team (jump to question 28)

27. Which of the following applies to you regarding the payments you received over the last 2 years (salaries, bonuses etc.)? (Select only one)
   - I have been paid fully and on time
   - There has been a delay of less than 1 month
   - There has been a delay of 1 to 3 months
   - There has been a delay of 3 to 6 months
   - There has been a delay of 6 to 12 months
   - There has been a delay of more than 12 months

28. Are you satisfied with the prize money available for major women’s regional or global football tournaments?
   (1 feeling not satisfied to 5 feeling very satisfied)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Have you or any of your teammates ever experienced a clash between your club commitments and your National Team commitments that fall on dates outside the FIFA International Match Calendar?
   - Yes
   - No, but I know a teammate who has experienced a clash
   - No

   Please explain your response:
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
### SECTION 4 - HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING

30. How satisfied are you with the medical support (professionals and facilities) provided for your physical health?
   (1 feeling **not satisfied** to 5 feeling **very satisfied**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(this row only for national team players)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. How satisfied are you with the psychological support provided (e.g. performance enhancement and mental health)?
   (1 feeling **not satisfied** to 5 feeling **very satisfied**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
<th>Never felt need to utilize it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(this row only for national team players)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do you continue to get paid your salary when you are injured? (If you do not get paid to play, skip this question and jump to Question 33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Yes Over 80% of my salary</th>
<th>Yes 50-80% of my salary</th>
<th>Yes 30%-49% of my salary</th>
<th>Yes, under 30% of</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 33. Have you ever been asked by coaching or team medical staff about your menstrual-cycle in terms of your performance- psychological- and/or physical health?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### 34. Have you ever experienced the following related to your role football player? (Tick as many boxes as apply to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Violence</th>
<th>Threats of Violence</th>
<th>Non-Sexual Bullying or Harassment</th>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Racism</th>
<th>Homophobia</th>
<th>Discrimination on basis of gender</th>
<th>Discrimination on basis of religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by fans on match days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by fans on non-match days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Have you ever struggled with substance abuse? (including alcohol, nicotine, amphetamines)
   - Yes
   - No

36. In addition to your commitments as a football player, are you currently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Hours per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What are the reasons that you may consider leaving the game earlier than you otherwise might have? (Select as many as apply)
   - Financial reasons
- To pursue career opportunities
- To start a family
- To pursue study opportunities
- Work/life balance
- Discrimination
- Psychological stress
- Tired of a lack of structure in football

**SECTION 5 - Match Fixing**

38. Have you ever been approached to consider fixing a match?

- Yes
- No
SECTION 6 - Football Unions

39. How strong do you believe is the solidarity amongst you and your teammates to take collective action to defend your rights as players?

(1 feeling no solidarity to 5 feeling great solidarity)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Are you a member of the Players Union in your country or a direct member of FIFPro?

- I don't know
- Yes
- No. Why not?

What are the main issues and/or conditions in the women's game with which you are most concerned?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

If you are willing to provide a more detailed interview or look for help for your current situation, please provide us and your local union with your email address or phone number:

__________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time. You have made a difference to women footballers across the globe!

Caroline Jönsson
Chair
FIFPro Women’s Football Committee

(Thanks for participating in the survey! This last page is for you to keep.)
About FIFPro
As the global players' union, FIFPro's mission is to support the players and act as the collective voice of the world’s professional footballers. In the past couple years, FIFPro has made a commitment to take steps to ensure gender equity in the global union and amongst its national members. This survey is just one of several initiatives that FIFPro is leading as part of growing the global voice of professional female players and working to protect your rights in the workplace at both club and international level.

If you are from one of the following 37 countries, you will be able to join the national players union in your country:


If you are not from one of these 37 countries, you can still be a member. In 2015, FIFPro introduced direct membership for female players from countries where it is not yet possible to become a member of the national players’ union or where there is no players’ union at all. As a direct member of FIFPro you will have access to guidance and legal expertise in protecting your rights as a professional footballer. Adding your individual voice to the global membership is also about building a stronger global collective voice for women's football and ensuring that no female player has to stand alone. This is about building our solidarity across the women's game. We know that this is going to take patience, awareness, and collaboration. We can only achieve this if we work together as players, coaches, clubs, leagues and federations across borders.

Here is the link for you to read more and sign up to become a direct member of FIFPro: https://fifpro.org/en/women-football-committee/join-fifpro-representation-form

Caroline Jönsson
Chair Women Football Committee
Mob +46 706 257879
E-mail: carre_1@hotmail.com
E-mail: c.jonsson@fifpro.org
Twitter: @CarreJonsson

FIFPro House
Scorpius 161
2132 LR Hoofddorp
Netherlands
Tel: +31 (0) 23-5546970
E-mail: info@fifpro.org

---

54 According to FIFA – Article 2: “A Professional is a player who has a written contract with a club and is paid more than the expenses the player effectively incurs in return for the footballing activity. All other players are considered as Amateurs” (10). However, FIFPro acknowledges how the structural barriers and history of exclusion faced by female players in most parts of the world have shaped the professional women’s landscape today. As such, FIFPro expands the above definition of ‘professional’ to include: amateur players who are playing in the highest national competition and/or for their national team.