
The Sexual Abuse of Boys in Organized Male Sports

Mike Hartill

Edge Hill University, Lancashire, United Kingdom

Childhood sexual abuse (CSA) is now a significant issue for organized sports. Since its “discovery” thirty years ago, research on CSA has been guided mostly by the “male-perpetrator–female victim” paradigm; hence, the perspective of the sexually abused male in the sports context has rarely been considered. This article considers organized male-sports as a social space that facilitates the sexual abuse of boys. Through promoting a sociological perspective on child abuse rather than an individualized and pathologized approach, I consider how the institutions of childhood, masculinity, and sports fit together and the contribution that sports make to the adult–child relation. I use Spiegel’s ecosystems model of the sexually abused male (SAM) and the sociology of sports literature to identify how some normative features of male sports contribute to the sexual abuse of male children.

Keywords: *childhood; sexual abuse; sports; masculinity; child protection*

Introduction

For some time, researchers focusing on the context of sports have warned that we should be cautious in approaching sports as an effective tool for tackling social problems and increasing harmony and well-being in our society (see Coakley 2002). They have also argued that sports are often counter-productive to such goals and are better conceptualized as a bastion of male (white) privilege (Hargreaves 1994; Theberge 1985) and a key agency for socializing boys within the framework of a “masculinist” backlash against feminism (Brackenridge 2002; Messner 1988). Over the last two decades, male (pro-feminist) researchers such as Michael Messner and Don Sabo (1990) have begun to explore the juncture of sports and masculinity. Whereas many important issues have been explored, including violence (e.g., Pappas, McKenny, and Catlett 2004) and sexual violence (e.g., Benedict and Klein 1997), the specific issue of sexual violence against males and the male-child, specifically, within the practice of sports has remained, at best, implicit but mostly absent

Author’s Note: I am grateful to all the reviewers for their comments on an earlier draft.

from the analyses of masculinity scholars. In this article I will specifically address the sexual abuse of boys in organized male sports.

A brief discussion of key terms may be useful. Childhood sexual abuse (CSA) has been notoriously difficult to define. However, I concur with Brian Corby's (2000) recommendation of the definition offered by Glaser and Frosh (1988, 5):

Any child below the age of consent may be deemed to have been sexually abused when a sexually mature person has, by design or by neglect of their usual societal or specific responsibilities in relation to the child, engaged or permitted the engagement of that child in any activity of a sexual nature which is intended to lead to the sexual gratification of the sexually mature person. This definition pertains whether or not it involves genital contact or physical contact, and whether or not there is discernible harmful outcome in the short-term.

By *organized* I am specifically referring to sports contexts that cannot properly be described as casual, *ad hoc*, or merely playful; organized contexts involve a regular, established grouping that is affiliated to and/or adheres to a governing body's codes and regulations, and is bound by them. In addition, these groupings are often characterized by some form of organizing structure such as an established space for participating and/or an organizing committee. By *male sports* I am referring to those sports contexts that are designated exclusively (or virtually so) for male children and organized predominantly by men. This does not preclude some female involvement in a participative, voluntary, or organizing/leadership capacity, but it excludes those contexts that are specifically designed for and aimed at female participants or where females have a dominant role in organizing those activities at all levels of participation and administration. Whereas sports in the twenty-first century is no longer a social field hermetically sealed from the "intrusions" of females (if it ever was), and despite the advances made through feminist movements, there are many settings within organized sports for which this would still be an accurate description. The crime of sexual abuse against children, male or female, is an overwhelmingly *male* phenomenon (although certainly not exclusively—see Elliot 1993). In this context, the characteristics of forms of masculinity identified as dominant within sports by many researchers over recent decades (e.g., Messner and Sabo 1994; Pronger 1990) take on new meaning when married to the findings of research from those in the sexual abuse literature (e.g., Etherington 2000; Mendel 1995) that conclude that the forces of patriarchy lie at the root of an understanding of sexual abuse (Brackenridge 2001; Kitzinger 1997; Seymour 1998; Struve 1990). These meanings will be explored here, largely with reference to the sexual abuse of boys by men.

Context

The sexual abuse of children was recognized in the nineteenth century, although it was generally referred to in euphemistic terms (Jackson 2000), but it was not until after

Henry Kempe described it as “another hidden pediatric problem” (Kempe 1978; Kempe and Kempe 1978) that it began to be acknowledged as a significant social problem. This followed the “discovery” of physical abuse some twenty years earlier (Kempe et al. 1962). Research that followed tended toward a “reductionist” approach, ignoring “many of the macro-level, fundamental political issues” (Hunter 1990, 7) that shape the environment in which CSA flourishes. In addition, research has generally been guided by the “male perpetrator–female victim paradigm” (Ellerstein and Canavan 1980; Mendel 1995) and social science has generally paid relatively little attention to the experiences of sexually abused *male* children. The largely unregulated, conservative world of children’s sports has, somewhat typically, considered the problem of child abuse rather later than other fields of childhood endeavor.

According to Corby (2000, 56) “the main developments in the 1990s were largely in relation to the movements of offenders released from prison and to the tightening up of systems of criminal checks for those seeking employment involving contact with children.” Such a development clearly included organized sports. Thus, for the institution of sports, comprising a private, public, and voluntary sector workforce, the abuse of children is very much a twenty-first century challenge. In the United Kingdom, Sport England and the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) have jointly funded a distinct unit with responsibility for the protection of children in sports—the Child Protection in Sport Unit (CPSU, see Boocock 2002). Across many parts of the industrialized world, child protection in sports is increasingly becoming a feature of governing body policy rhetoric; for example, the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) has a wealth of online information on child protection (see www.ausport.gov.au/ethics/childprotect); the *Canadian Strategy for Ethical Conduct in Sport* (2002) contains specific reference to anti-harassment and abuse, and in the United States all adults involved with Little League are required to undergo background checks (see www.littleleague.org/common/childprotect/index.asp). While policy development has gathered pace, research into the problem of child abuse, particularly child sexual abuse, in the context of sports is very limited, with the voices of sexually abused male children largely undisclosed.

My objective is to build on work that has begun to question and theorize the role of organized sports in the perpetuation of the abuse of children in contemporary society (e.g., Brackenridge 1994, 1997, 1998; Donnelly 1999; Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky 2000; Leahy, Pretty, and Tenenbaum 2002). Given the string of criminal convictions secured since the early 1990s against coaches and sports personnel for sexually abusing children in their care (Boocock 2007), growing media attention (e.g., Downes 2002; Mackay 2001, 2005; Nack and Yaeger 1999) and some early propositions on the sexual exploitation of children within the context of sports (Brackenridge 2001), I want to consider how we are to begin to articulate more thoroughly the relationship between organized sports and the childhood sexual abuse of boys.

Following a short contextualization of the issue, I consider recent theory in the field of childhood studies and suggest how we might use developments in this

emerging field to consider the issue of CSA in sports. Finally, I draw attention to wider developments in the theorizing of the sexually abused male child. In this last instance, Josef Spiegel's (2003) comprehensive review of existing literature and subsequent model of the phenomenon of the sexual abuse of boys is used to draw out features of organized male sports that make it an environment conducive to the sexual abuse of boys. I suggest that, through thinking of sports as an element within the *ecology* of childhood sexual abuse (Jack 2001), Spiegel's model may provide an analytical framework that can be mapped onto sports to further clarify the distinct process by which boys are sexually abused through sports and those contextual features that may assist this process (work begun in part by others: Brackenridge 2001; Donnelly 1999; Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky 2000; Leahy, Pretty, and Tenenbaum 2002; Robinson 1998). To demonstrate the analytical teeth of Spiegel's model I present an application of Spiegel's first stage—*subjection*—(more commonly known as *grooming* or, as Gallagher (1999) prefers, *entrapment*). Celia Brackenridge's (2001, 35) work on the “grooming” of females by men in sports represents considerable progress in this area. However, I would argue that the role of masculinity is yet to be fully considered, and I hope that this and future work on the experiences of sexually abused boys can contribute essential contextual and conceptual detail toward the development of a “global” theory (Ward and Hudson 1998) of sexual offending against children in sports. Empirical data, such as it is, is drawn from non-sport research sources and anecdotal material from within sports studies and the sports media. Particular attention is given to the only widely available, full testimony from a male sexually abused as a child in a sport, the recently published *Why I Didn't Say Anything* by the ex-NHL player Sheldon Kennedy (2006).

Understanding the Issue: Research, Theory, and Policy Development

In addressing the extent of the sexual abuse of male children it is crucial to note that official statistics on CSA are generally accepted to be unreliable (Corby 2000; Finkelhor et al. 1986), largely because of the high rate of underreporting, while prevalence rates from research “vary remarkably depending on the nature of the sample, the method of assessment, the types of questions used and the definition of abuse adopted” (Lisak 1994, 525). Whereas Finkelhor and Jones (2006, 710) have recently reported on the gradual decline of child victimization in the United States, including sexual abuse, they conclude that “by almost any standard, levels of child victimization, even after the declines, are still disturbingly high” (see also Jones and Finkelhor 2003). Mendel (1995, 6) reports: “studies of the prevalence of CSA of boys suggest that between one-in-six and one-in-eight boys experience sexual maltreatment,” whereas in a study where researchers focused on the testimony of *non-incarcerated* perpetrators, it was found that 153 male subjects targeting extra-familial

males had sexually abused 22,981 individuals, an average of 150.2 people per abuser (Abel et al. 1987). It is interesting then to note Sheldon Kennedy's (2006, 78) testimony:

The police estimate that Graham molested 75 to 150 kids who were under his care during his time as a coach, manager, and scout. Many of those players were great talents but almost all of them dropped out of minor hockey before they had a chance to be drafted.

According to Gallagher (2000, 795), "the sexual abuse of children by persons who work with them—institutional abuse—is a focus of major concern among policy makers, practitioners and the public" but knowledge about such abuse is generally "thin." Gallagher found that while institutional abuse represents only 3 percent of overall referrals of CSA, individual cases often involve large numbers of children, especially in community settings, and that over half of institutional sexual abuse occurs in "community settings," including sports-related contexts. Elliot, Brown, and Kilcoyne (1995, 585) interviewed ninety-one convicted offenders and found that 53 percent of the sample claimed to have recruited children and their families by offering "to play games with the children, or teach them a sport, or how to play a musical instrument." Gallagher (2000, 813) argues that abusers in community settings "are as big a threat to children as those in foster homes and residential establishments." He also found that where perpetrators were held in high-esteem by the local community, children faced additional difficulties in "resisting and disclosing the abuse" (2000, 810); this is a point of particular significance for sports where high-profile cases of sexual abuse have involved coaches with enviable coaching records who are generally held in high regard. We might then surmise that, for some children, if not many, those "difficulties" might well be insurmountable and they will never disclose their experiences. This is compounded by the fact that in attempting "to protect the reputation of the institution or cover the lack of procedures within the organization," staff and managers have failed to act on disclosures from children (Sullivan and Beech 2002, 162; see also Corby 2000). This is supported by evidence and anecdote from sports contexts (Brackenridge 2001; Kennedy 2006). Gallagher (2000) also found, in line with other studies, that the proportion of male children sexually abused in institutional settings is much higher than in intrafamilial settings. Thus, according to Sullivan and Beech (2002, 153) "whether public or private, voluntary or statutory, institutions and organizations have provided abusers with almost limitless opportunities for the manipulation and abuse of children."

It is widely acknowledged within the sociology of sports that the institution of sports is based on a performance-driven value structure (e.g., Morgan 1994) that prioritizes and reproduces patriarchal notions of the dominant, heterosexual male (e.g., Hall 1985; Hargreaves 1994). It is, therefore, heavily populated by those men who most closely conform to such ideals (Burstyn 1999). If abuse is constructed by those who believe that boys should be able to "look after themselves," that sex with adult females does not constitute abuse, or that only those boys who desire such sexual

activity risk being abused (see Etherington 1995, 2000; Spiegel 2003 for discussion of “abuse mythology”), then the prospects for many male children are bleak. In a U.K. study of institutional abuse funded by the NSPCC, Westcott (1991) suggests that there are four barriers to the reporting of abuse within institutions: (1) lack of procedures/policies for reporting and investigating a complaint of institutional abuse, (2) institutional abuse viewed as the problem of the individual member of staff, not the institution, (3) the closed nature of institutions, and (4) the belief system surrounding institutions (in Sullivan and Beech 2002, 161). While there has been development toward the first of these in sports, I would argue that these are all salient to understanding why abuse in the international arena of organized sports generally does not get reported.

As those who take an interest in sports will no doubt be well aware, organized sport has not provided an oasis for children in which their safety and well-being is assured, despite assumptions to the contrary. As Donnelly (1999, 108) notes, “. . . generally, sports organizations have, until recently, acted as if such things could not possibly occur in the pristine world of sport.” Early research in this area has demonstrated that a range of exploitative practices and abuses take place in the context of organized sports (Brackenridge 1994; Coakley 2003; Curry 1991; Donnelly 1997; Jones, Glimtmeier, and McKenzie 2005; Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky 2000). The work of such esteemed and groundbreaking scholars of sport as Celia Brackenridge and Peter Donnelly has not only highlighted a great deal about the reality of childhood experiences in sports but has also emphasized some important conceptual and political/legal tools with which we can approach this issue. For example, the notion of athletes’ rights (Donnelly 1997; Brackenridge 2001) and children’s rights in organized sports (Armstrong 2004; Brackenridge et al. 2007; David 2005) provide particularly powerful ideas with which to address the issue of child welfare and abuse in sports.

However, it is only very recently that a more comprehensive theoretical framework, as developed by the new social studies of childhood (e.g., James, Jenks, and Prout 1998; James and James 2004; Jenks 2005a) for considering the nature of childhood and its construction within sports has been considered (Pitchford et al. 2004; Brackenridge et al. 2007). The notion that the child is a legitimate social actor in the child’s own right, with the child’s own rights, and for the child’s own sake underpins this perspective. Theorists in this field have been highly critical of the developmentalist approach that ascribes standardized patterns and timeframes to childhood development, the corollary of which are the inevitable “scientific” labels to indicate normality or otherwise (see Jenks 2005a; Prout 2005). Such an approach comprises the building blocks of organized sports where performance norms meld with age- and gender-specific expectations, formalized and scientified through the monitoring and recording of performance and evaluations that are ultimately expressed through ascriptions of normality/abnormality and the discourses of *ability* or *talent*. The child’s voice and the child’s right to participate in decisions that impact on the child are now, theoretically at least, legitimate, enshrined in international legislation

(UN 1989). In the United Kingdom the new children's agenda Every Child Matters arguably attends to this development, as does recent sports policy (see Sport England 2006). Currently however, "the opinions of young people have generally not been taken seriously into account in sport" (Brackenridge et al. 2007).

Leading on from classic feminist work on sports in the 1980s (e.g., Hall 1985; Hargreaves 1986; Lenskyj 1986), the 1990s saw a number of publications documenting sexual exploitation and CSA in sports (Burton-Nelson 1994; Ryan 1995; Benedict 1997; Robinson 1998). Throughout the 1990s, as academic interest (Brackenridge 1992, 1994, 1996; Donnelly 1999; Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky 2000; Tomlinson and Yorganci 1997; Volkwein et al. 1997) and media reports (British Broadcasting Corporation 1993; Donegan 1995; Nack and Yaeger 1999, Spencer 1995) on sexual exploitation in sports grew, pressure mounted on practitioners and policy makers to implement change (see Brackenridge 2001). The "moment of truth" for U.K. sports occurred in 1995 when Paul Hickson, a former Olympic swimming coach, was convicted for rape and sexual assaults against female teenaged swimmers previously in his care (Brackenridge 2001). Similarly, in Canada, a TV documentary told of female international rowers who had been sexually abused by their coach as children (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 1993). Further revelations were to come in the late 1990s when it was revealed that Canadian ice hockey youth "Coach of the Year" Graham James had sexually abused two of the boys in his charge (Kennedy 2006); Brian Shaw, "former owner and general manager of the Portland Winter Hawks . . . was revealed as a long-term sex abuser" (Robinson 1998), and a "pedophile ring" was exposed at the Toronto Maple Leafs ice hockey rink (Donnelly 1999). The popular view was that such incidents were isolated and perpetrated by sexually and psychologically deviant individuals (Robinson 1998).

In contrast, academic research was gradually making bolder claims about the widespread and normalized nature of abusive behavior in sports within a sexually charged environment (Brackenridge 1994; Curry 1998; Griffin and Genasci 1990; Hargreaves 1994; Kane and Disch 1993; Lenskyj 1992; Pronger 1990; Ryan 1995). Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky (2000, 46) found, "athletes describe what appears to be a thriving sexist environment in high performance sports not unlike that of the chilly climate of the workplace." The main outcome of this pressure for change in U.K. sports, led by Celia Brackenridge, one of the foremost advocates for recognizing and preventing sexual exploitation in sports, was a Child Protection in Sport Task Force in 1999: "its work led directly to the production of the Child Protection in Sport Action Plan and a framework for a co-ordinated response to child protection" (Boocock 2002). Most crucially, the work of this task force established the CPSU in 2001, which, according to its director, "can be seen as an effective model for changing attitudes and practice and reducing the risks of abuse."¹

Organizing bodies of sports in the United Kingdom, which appear to be the most advanced in this regard internationally, are barely past the starting post of attempting to make the environment of sports a safe one for children (Hartill and Prescott

2007). The recently published *Strategy for Safeguarding Children and Young People in Sport 2006-12* (Sport England/NSPCC 2006) followed up the previous *Standards for Safeguarding and Protecting Children in Sport* (Sport England/NSPCC 2003), which provides national benchmark standards for governing bodies to work toward and on which state funding depends. Recently, Brackenridge has acknowledged the “transformative effect” such policy developments have had on “ethical reflection in sport,” but she questions whether prioritizing the category of the child above other subordinated groups will actually have the effect of increasing inequality for those “othered” groups, “especially adult women,” through diverting resources and political will (Brackenridge 2004, 334).

Despite developments in policy, the United Kingdom still has no sports-based prevalence study on which to base its legislation—the CPSU is seeking to address this by replicating Leahy, Petty, and Tenenbaum’s (2002, 16) study of Australian sports in which the authors looked at both club- and elite-level sports and found that “results from the total sample (n = 370) revealed that 31% of female and 21% of male athletes reported experiencing sexual abuse at some time in their lives. Of these, 41% of females, and 29% of males had been sexually abused within the sports environment.” The authors (2002, 35) claim that, “for people who report being sexually abused, and who are involved in competitive sports at the elite level, the odds are almost even that someone associated with that environment will have abused them.” For club level athletes the ratio rises to one in four.

Approaching Childhood Sexual Abuse in Organized Male Sports

As already noted, the work of researchers and practitioners who argue for the inadequacy of the “male perpetrator–female victim paradigm” (e.g., Hunter 1990; Mendel 1995; Spiegel 2003) has generally not been taken up by sports-focused researchers (Hartill 2005). Social science now needs to develop a fuller account of the relationship between male sports and the childhood sexual abuse of males: such an account must be based on empirical data. A fundamental assumption here is that there is actually a relationship to be accounted for. By positing that a relationship exists, I intend to indicate that there is something more substantial to be said than simply recognizing that sports can be a location for CSA. This is evident simply by virtue of the mass of children in its midst. Broadly speaking, I fundamentally see sports, particularly organized male sports, as a social field that plays an active role in the practice and perpetuation of CSA *per se*. More specifically, I argue that the everyday practice and discourse of male sports (its cultural norms) provide an environment conducive to the sexual abuse of male children.

Central to this approach is the notion that CSA is culturally and institutionally supported (Kitzinger 1997).² In approaching CSA it is crucial to consider how institutions, in this case the institution of sports, contribute to the construction and maintenance of

a social system in which CSA is a widespread and persistent feature. According to Hunter (1990, 4) "most discussions of CSA focus on . . . clinical intervention . . . [with] a footnote to acknowledge that this problem occurs within a larger socio-political context." Jenks (2005a, 114) argues that explanations for abuse, "should really be sought in the way that we have, over time, come to organize our social relationships"; the potential for abuse, "resides within the differentials of both power and status" (2005a, 93). Such an approach is considerably indebted to David Gil's early study of the roots of child abuse. Gil's (1975) seminal article "Unraveling Child Abuse," originally published in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, remains one of the most comprehensive and insightful arguments into the problem and is the foundation on which a number of key theorists have built. According to Gil (1975):

The most fundamental causal level of child abuse consists of a cloister of interacting elements, to wit, a society's basic social philosophy, its dominant value premises, its concept of humans; the nature of its social, economic, and political institutions, which are shaped by its philosophy and value premises and which in turn reinforce that philosophy and these values; and, finally, the particular quality of human relations prevailing in the society, which derives from its philosophy, values, and institutions (in Donnelly and Oates 2000, 65).

This early approach made it clear that understanding the abuse of children did not lie primarily within the province of individually oriented, medicalized, psychological-science, and clinical-based approaches, but within the nature of the prevailing adult-child (boy-man) relation and the structural inequalities built into that relation. However, the former has proved by far the most dominant discourse in the construction of the problem, especially in relation to *sexual* abuse.

In considering the context of sports in relation to CSA, it would, therefore, appear salient to ask, How do the institutions of "childhood" and "sports" fit together? What is the product of their amalgam? As James and James (2004, 213) argue, "childhood as a social space is structurally determined by a range of social institutions and mechanisms." Clearly children are integral to the practice of organized sports and the child's participation in such sports is overwhelmingly considered to be a virtue, politically and culturally. Thus, if the institution of childhood is itself integral to the practice of CSA, it is important to consider the role that the closely related institution of sports plays in constructing the child and childhood. As the recent Change for Children agenda in the United Kingdom has demonstrated, there is often (or always) a role for organized sports where social policy initiatives are introduced to address child welfare: "Culture, sport and play organisations have a unique role to play" (Department for Education and Skills [DfES] 2007). Brackenridge and colleagues (2007, 205) recently concluded, "youth sport . . . may now have assumed the status of the 'sixth social service'" where sports are constructed as a "purity system" (Brackenridge 2006). Therefore, discussion, such as that regularly featured within the social critique of sports that calls into question the normative practices of

(boyhood/childhood) sports (e.g., Burstyn 1999; Messner and Sabo 1994; Miedzian 1991) through and within which the boy/child is constructed, has been met with considerable resistance from those who govern sports (see Brackenridge 2001) and rely on its positive popular image both to promote its widespread practice and to finance its growth through commercial sponsorship, not to mention the plethora of commercial organizations that have a more basic motivation for sustaining this “healthy” image. The modest aim here then is to identify some normative contextual features of male sports (within which male children are located) that might, given findings from the sexual abuse literature, be considered conducive to the practice of sexually abusing boys.

The SAM (Sexually Abused Male) Model

Following a review of nearly five hundred studies, Josef Spiegel (2003) developed the SAM model, based on the observation of fifty-six dynamics (such as victim/perpetrator characteristics, location of abuse, nature of abuse, etc.) and forty-four effects (such as depression, suicide, eating disorders, etc.) of CSA. This is the most comprehensive compilation to date on the sexual abuse of *male* children and represents a considerable piece of interdisciplinary scholarship. Given the dearth of empirical data and/or theory on the sexual abuse of boys and the sports context, and the need to develop gender-distinct (as well as uniform) theoretical models for understanding the experience of CSA, Spiegel’s work presents a “grounded” framework for thinking through the sexual abuse of boys in the context of sports and some of the challenges facing those who seek to prevent it. The aim, then, is both to highlight the “unique experiences of male victims” (Courtois in Spiegel 2003, viii) as well as to begin to move toward a more empirically grounded, cultural analysis and articulation of the relationship between sports and the sexual abuse of boys.

Spiegel presents CSA as a biopsychosocial problem. Following other theorists in the contemporary study of child abuse (e.g., Belsky 1993; Jack 2001) he frames this problem within an “ecosystems perspective.” According to Sidebotham (2001, 111) the ecological paradigm incorporates “psychodynamic and sociological models” and “sees abuse as being multiply determined by forces at work in the individual, in the family and in the community and culture.” As per Gil (1975) within an ecological model, “child abuse is understood to be a product of the characteristics of the environments in which it occurs rather than simply being the result of the actions of certain individuals” (Jack 2001, 185). Through adopting such a perspective Spiegel (2003, 137) was able to develop a seven-category model that focuses on “precipitating events, abusive episodes, their aftermath, and the sociocultural context in which these events occur.” While Spiegel gives greater weight to physiological/medical and psychological approaches to child abuse than theorists such as Gil (1975), Jack (2001), Kitzinger (1997), and Parton (1985), ultimately he argues:

A conceptual and applied understanding of [the] SAM's greater social context is imperative, including, but not limited to, his relationship with parents, caretakers, siblings, relatives, neighbors, teachers, and ministers, as well as relations with gender, sexual orientation, and racial, ethnic, socio-economic, religious, and cultural reference groups . . . Further, *knowledge of the social environment . . . is essential as it holds the socially constructed attitudes and beliefs that foster the existence of sexual abuse in the first place* (Speigel 2003, 318; my emphasis).

Given the emergence of the sexual abuse of boys in sports, it seems reasonable, if not urgent, to extend consideration of the social environment to include the context of organized male sports. Spiegel's seven-stage model³ is developed from a considerable array of CSA research studies as well as his own in-depth case studies of seven men with sexual abuse histories. However, as this volume and depth of data is not available within the context of organized male sports it would be inappropriate to attempt to validate this model through reference to the limited and sporadic data that has come to light over recent years, largely through the popular press and one autobiographical text (Kennedy 2006). Instead, I consider his first category, *subjection*: "the process of predisposing a boy to sexual abuse by means of subtle or blatant interactions" (a preferable alternative to the more media-friendly, individualized term, *grooming*) to shed some light on the manner in which normative cultural practices in sports might be seen to be conducive to effectively preparing the ground for the sexual abuse of boys. In focusing on the sports context I realize that I am artificially isolating one element of the social environment. However, as already noted, this element has been something of a blind spot for research that considers the sexual abuse of boys, indeed children as a whole.

Organized Male Sports and the Subjection of Boys to Sexual Abuse

Boys to Men: Constructing Childhood in Male Sports

Spiegel (2003, 139) identifies an "evolutionary process" employed by perpetrators, designed to diffuse and confuse traditional boundaries and roles between adults and boys. In the context of organized male sports, the boundary between "boy" and "man" is easily and frequently blurred (Brackenridge 2001). Boys regularly train, play, travel, and compete for, with, and against adults. To all intents and purposes, organized youth sports are organized (thus controlled) by adults; in a very real sense, youth sports are an adult-oriented practice.

As a hockey player, you are told from a very young age that if you want to get anywhere and advance in the game, you have to impress the scouts. You've heard about

these powerful men since you laced up your skates in your first house-league game . . . These men, and the coaches and managers they report to, are like gods in the eyes of the young players (Kennedy 2006, 24).

Thus, children in sports often socialize in the company of adults, particularly men, in and around the sports context. The thirteen-year-old boy whose skill level is equal to or beyond that of most adults, while viewed as an exceptional child, good beyond his years, is often included within the activities, practices, and rituals of older boys or adults. As social historians of sports have pointed out, organized male sports for boys (e.g., physical education) has always been primarily about “making men” (Burstyn 1999; Nauright and Chandler 1996).

Spiegel found that the psychological literature on perpetrator type can be encapsulated within two broad categories, the *fixated* and the *regressed*: the fixated perpetrator (relatively rare) relates to the popular construction of the child sex abuser—the “evil pedophile”—who “emotionally and sexually prefers children to adults.” For example, in Elliot, Brown, and Kilcoyne’s (1995) study, only 16 percent of their sample of convicted offenders stated that sex with children was more attractive than “adult sex.” In contrast, the more common regressed perpetrator is “socially competent” and leads “a more traditional lifestyle” (Spiegel 2003, 140). The latter is well supported by the increasing number of cases of highly qualified, widely respected abusing adults in sports, exemplified by two high profile cases: Mike Drew—U.K. swimming, and Graham James—Canadian ice hockey. “Psychologically and behaviourally, just as the fixated perpetrator becomes a ‘child,’ the regressed perpetrator perceives and experiences the child as a pseudo-adult” (Spiegel 2003, 140). Theory development by Ward and Hudson (2000, 190) suggests a rather more complex model where “individual offenders may exhibit a range of offending styles depending on their circumstances and overall goals.” Whether we agree with the somewhat reductive categories Spiegel draws on, there seems little doubt that offending strategies often involve a process whereby the perpetrator subjectively constructs the child in a fashion that enables him (or her) to commit sexually violent acts against the child.

In organized sports, where boys are perpetually required to prove themselves through an adultist, hetero-patriarchal model of success in a context structurally and socially arranged to value conquest above all else, the adult–child distinction is constantly under negotiation. Despite age-group distinctions, one use of organized sports in (late) modernity is to fulfil the role of an initiation rite (Burstyn 1999) where the dominant script for a boy to be successful at being a boy means to be man-like and to adopt “manly” qualities such as bravery, aggression, stoicism, and risk-taking (Connell 1995). Such a standard opens up a considerable amount of “grey” area where boys are often expected to “suck-it-up,” “shrug-it-off,” and “take it like a man.” Among others, Burstyn (1999), Messner and Sabo (1994), and Pronger (1990) have drawn attention to the homo-erotic current that runs through much of organized male sports. It is not difficult to see how such expressions, generally

intended, ostensibly to encourage resolve in the face of adversity or physical discomfort, can be used to coerce many boys into all manner of exploitative practices. Certainly, evidence on sports-related hazing rituals attests to such an analysis (Bryshun and Young 1999) and, as Sheldon Kennedy (2006, 81) puts it: “you are in a closed world with its own codes of conduct . . . based on demonstrating your physical and emotional toughness.” The following testimony is from a male coach convicted of the sexual abuse of boys in sports:

I think your attitude towards them as well, is very important because, er, I always treated them older than they were, and as such they felt you know that, that little bit, six inches taller, that sort of thing . . . it's very much a person to person thing even adult to child, it gives them more confidence and thinks “Oh well somebody's prepared to listen, and somebody's prepared to talk to me at sort of my level rather than above my head or below my head.” It's very intricate (cited in Brackenridge 2001, 36).

Significantly, this coach adopted a position *ostensibly* in line with a children's rights perspective! The child is permitted to speak and is heard; the coach treats the child as a peer to develop trust and to (seemingly) reduce the power imbalance—of course the structural position of the child in relation to the adult is so firmly entrenched (Kitzinger 1997) that this strategic illusion can be reversed in an instant. However, the point is that the effectiveness of this strategy is based on the discrepancy between this experience and the boy's usual experience of men in sports, where military-style discipline (Burstyn 1999) and the “discourse of control” inherent in dominant constructions of the adult–child relation (Hendrick 2003), among other factors, prohibits them from expressing an opinion—and even if they do it carries little or no weight (Brackenridge et al. 2007). There are few clearer examples of the urgent need to (re)establish children as agents in their own right and childhood for its own sake within the fabric of society and within the culture of organized sports. Currently, however, sports provide ample room to construct boys as *pseudo-men*.

Heterosexuality and (Hyper-) Masculine Ideals

Sport is a key site in contemporary society for the acting out and reaffirming of gender identities (McKay, Messner, and Sabo 2000; Hargreaves 1994). As such, for boys involved in sports, particularly those heavily involved, sports are a primary arena through which a boy establishes his (hyper-/hetero-) sexual status and through which hegemonic masculine identities are forged and reinforced (Light and Kirk 2000; Renold 1997, 2007). According to Spiegel (2003, 145):

Gender role confusion is a key strategy for rendering a boy vulnerable to sexual abuse; for a boy, regardless of age, gender-discordant labels include “sissy,” “faggot,” and “Daddy's little girl.” . . . Five year old Nicholas stated . . . “the worst hurt was when he kept calling me a ‘girl’ and makin’ me wear my Mama's nightie. That means I'm a big mistake.”

The emotional/psychological element of CSA is clearly evident here. Spiegel (2003, 145) argues, “perpetrators . . . often try to impair the worth of a boy’s sense of gender identity in order to render him vulnerable . . . Other perpetrators . . . strive to enhance and amplify his sense of gender identity.” According to Sheldon Kennedy (2006), “I was totally flattered that this smart worldly man was taking an interest in me (p. 31). He was always there . . . watching me, criticizing me, flattering me” (p. 71). The hypermasculine, homophobic, and misogynist world of male sports provides a forum where such strategies are commonplace (Pronger 1990; Rotella and Murray 1991). Within traditional male sports, particularly team sports (but certainly not exclusive to these), boys are often required to engage with and successfully negotiate a heterosexist discourse that valorizes certain forms of masculinity and rejects others (Robertson 2003). Within this environment, heterosexuality is presumed but continually questioned, necessitating continual demonstration and reaffirmation (Curry 1998) as it is in other homosocial contexts (Bird 1996; Stoudt 2006); for those who conform most closely to the ideal, great “riches” await. Potential membership to this exclusive club, and the “symbolic capital” (Bourdieu 2001) it provides access to, is always on offer through male sports (Connell 1995, 2000) but has to be continuously earned in a context where failure or “otherness” can be met with violence (Curry 1998) or rejection (Stoudt 2006). Within such an environment, sexuality, and therefore gender identity, is always under the spotlight and must be regularly performed to the satisfaction of the general criteria of male (heterosexist) sports and specific criteria of particular sports (often hyper-masculinist).

Central to this environment is the derogatory use of gender-/sex-role related terms. With regard to CSA at least, being called such names as *faggot*, *puff*, *homo*, or *queer* will not ring any alarm bells for the sports-child, nor indeed for initiated adults. The incessant questioning, explicit or implicit, and reaffirming of gender identity is, then, a constant and eminent feature of the male sports environment, particularly traditional team-sports. This has been recognized for some time; however, Spiegel’s model allows us to see how such discourse is not only a form of symbolic violence (Bourdieu 2001) against females and those males who do not identify (strongly) with a heterosexist identity, but, perhaps counter-intuitively, may also be a strategy for facilitating sexual activity with those who may have most invested in and, therefore, most closely conform to the (masculinist) identity demands of the male sports world. According to Sheldon Kennedy (2006), his abusing coach constantly used the threat of revealing him as homosexual as an instrument to ensure his silence (see also Elliott, Brown, and Kilcoyne 1995). As Connell (1995) points out, few men may live the hegemonic standard, but many men support and construct this standard—for the vast majority of boys in organized sports this standard is most definitely not homosexual. In contemporary society the successful sportsman is almost a blueprint for this ideal. It is not difficult to imagine, then, the power vested in the

gatekeepers to a world sought after by many young males: "They held the keys to the kingdom we were all dreaming about" (Kennedy 2006, 32).

Additional facilitative behaviors, such as "the misuse and abuse of drugs and alcohol, and the use of pornographic materials" can serve to further "disinhibit the perpetrator" (Spiegel 2003, 141). The extensive and frequent use of alcohol, pornographic material, sexually explicit conversation, and sexual violence have been well documented in certain sports environments, particularly those characterized by traditional, male team sports (e.g., Bryshun and Young 1999; Curry 1991, 1998; Robinson 1998; Welch 1997) but certainly not exclusive to them (Laurendeau 2004). Hockey player Scott McLeod told how on his sixteenth birthday his senior teammates used a funnel to force beer down his throat (an instrument common to many sports "socials") at a team party thrown by one of the owners of the Tilbury Hawks hockey team, following which he and a teammate were ordered into a garage and sexually abused in front of "coaches, owners, managers, trainer and senior players" (Robinson 1998, 66). One convicted coach reported that he distributed pornographic material among boys to test whether they would keep it within the group (they did) (Brackenridge 2001). In preparing for the abuse, the perpetrator is able to use such "disinhibiting" techniques through drawing on practices and discourses that are, to varying degrees, a normative feature within many, if not all, male sports contexts. The chance of such behavior or practices being widely questioned as inappropriate/abnormal is therefore low.

Victims

Spiegel (2003, 141) argues that research has identified characteristics that may indicate a child's vulnerability to sexual abuse including:

Children hungry for acceptance, care, and affection . . . and girls and boys who appear to be older, more developed, and therefore, from the perpetrator's perspective, more inclined to view the sexual interaction as mutual and reciprocal. . . . perpetrators often possess an uncanny penchant for identifying and selecting vulnerable children.

According to Kennedy (2006, 79):

He looked into a prospective victim's family situations, looking for boys who didn't have a very solid home, boys whose fathers were angry and had drinking problems. Kids with single moms were on the top of his list of potential victims . . . He wanted to find boys who needed a father figure in their lives, boys who were confused and unsure of their masculinity and needed a man they could trust and confide in.

But what boy does not welcome a "father-figure," even if they already have one? What boy is not confused and unsure of their masculinity? What boy does not need a man (or men) they can trust and confide in? The environment of sports provides a

context where often intimate knowledge of an athlete (child or adult) is considered part of the coaching process. To be able to develop an athlete, a coach must “know” his or her athletes *in the round*. It is not sufficient for a coach to simply know their athletes’ abilities and skill level; an effective coach must be able to sense, almost intuitively, how their “charge” will react in certain situations, what “switches” them on, how far they can be “pushed,” physically and mentally (see Jones, Armour, and Potrac 2004). With the emergence and ever-increasing importance of psychology within competitive sports, particularly at, but not confined to, the elite/professional level, knowledge of athletes’ psychological makeup is seen as crucial to success. Similar arguments can be made about nutrition and diet, physiology and training regimes, and biomechanics and training techniques. Clearly, such knowledge can be gained only through lengthy and frequent contact between a coach and the athlete; thus, the need for such knowledge and the requirement for intensive contact is legitimized through appeal to “scientific” discourse. This discourse now clearly underpins sports performance development, especially where aspiration toward excellence is evident, as well as coach education. Consider the comments of one coach convicted of sexual abuse (Brackenridge 2001, 130):

Q: How much dedication do you think someone has to give to coach?

A: Well, if you’re going to do it properly 110 percent. It is very time consuming.

Q: What is so time consuming about it, what does coaching entail?

A: It entails a lot of preparation . . . plus you have to bear in mind that each individual child has different characteristics as far as their learning capabilities plus their own abilities, so you virtually have to run a program, an individual program for each one of them, if they’re of competition standard.

Q: And what age group of kids were you teaching?

A: . . . it varied very much . . . mostly say the twelve- to fifteen-year-olds.

Q: And was this boys and girls?

A: Boys and girls but mostly boys, yeh.

I would add that it is rare within youth sports generally that some aspiration toward excellence (and certainly “competition standard”) does not exist at some point in a child’s sporting endeavor; most boys want to be the next Beckham, Gretzky, or Jordan at some point, however briefly. While intense, sustained contact may be a more obvious reality for children who perform at the elite level in sports, the crucial point is that the *discourse* is legitimate—*there is no gain without pain*—and is generally reinforced by parents and can therefore be drawn on by any coach at whatever level of performance. Few children at the local level may experience such focused “support” from their (volunteer) coach/manager but, if they do, this is seen as only to their benefit within the performance/achievement, individualized

discourse that pervades Western culture (Bauman 2001; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001). This is perhaps best exemplified in male sports, and simply provides “evidence” of the adult’s philanthropic commitment to the children. Thus, it would seem those traits that Spiegel identifies as characteristic of children who may be particularly vulnerable would be relatively easy for a perpetrator to spot. Indeed, given the opportunity for and normalization of intimate and prolonged contact, in addition to the shroud of a “science” discourse legitimizing almost any request for the most intimate type of information, the ability of a perpetrator to select a child who may be more vulnerable seems not so much “uncanny” as unsurprising. However, I would add that the emphasis should be firmly on the way a boy is rendered vulnerable through the discourse of masculinity and childhood that underpins the socialization of boys generally, rather than through specific psychological traits. The latter approach may well give rise to misguided risk analysis.

The relatively “closed” environment of male sports where, in addition to the above, various states of undress are normalized (including nakedness), would seem an ideal forum for the selection (and subjection), of children for sexual abuse. Indeed, in reference to *intra*-familial sexual abuse, Spiegel (2003, 143) argues, “the abusive family culture normalizes unusual sleeping arrangements, nudity, overt sexual behavior, pornography, and other acts and utterances that may unduly stimulate children and, in turn, give ‘license’ for their maltreatment.” Thus, for the extra-familial abuser, it is evident that the cultural context within many male sports settings provides a made-to-measure environment.

Spiegel (2003, 144) argues, “the vast majority of prevention and intervention programs emanate from the ‘male perpetrator–female victim paradigm,’ leaving boys more confused, less understood, and with little or no recourse to prevent further abuse.” Given the dominant constructions of masculinity in male sports (Messner and Sabo 1990; McKay, Messner, and Sabo 2000), it is not surprising to find that many within sports (as well as beyond sports) do not believe that boys are sexually abused; not *real* (sports) boys at any rate (Kennedy 2006).

Location

In her work-in-progress, risk-based contingency model of sexual exploitation in sports, Brackenridge (2001, 139) argues that a significant risk factor for predicting abuse is that the “task demands of the sport allow frequent geographic isolation and/or visits away from home and/or visits to the coach’s home.” Attention to the potential for isolating children in a legitimate manner would seem to be crucial; according to Spiegel (2003, 145), the “predispositional” activity of the perpetrator often:

. . . takes place in both public and private bathrooms. It might include invasive observation, exhibitionism, bathing . . . the administration of enemas for nonmedical reasons, and the use of sexually explicit language with an eye to taunt or entice.

It is not difficult to see that the sports context offers many opportunities for such activities. As noted above, the natural sciences are dominant within sports at all levels, and disciplines such as physiology and biomechanics underpin elite performance. Thus, the appropriation of such pseudo-scientific testing/measuring is within easy reach of anyone with the status of coach. Such “scientific” testing, even though it may include invasive procedures, is often welcomed by parents, who want “the very best” for their child, and often goes unchallenged. Furthermore, the changing room/locker room space is a legitimate space for many activities other than simply changing clothes and showering/bathing—team selections, meetings (formal and *ad hoc*), stretching, warm-up, weight training, injury assessment, physiotherapy, rehabilitation, and general socializing are all common activities within sports changing rooms. According to one “survivor”: “he used to make us shower and strip off completely to get weighed. It wasn’t necessary and we always did it in the seclusion of the dressing room” (cited in Brackenridge 2001, 38). The centrality of the locker room space to the male sports world borders on the sacred where unwritten protocol demands that what is seen and heard goes no further (Young 2005). One mother went so far as to complain about the physically aggressive manner in which an ice hockey coach had treated her young son; according to another coach she was told, “. . . if she wanted her son to go anywhere, never to mention what goes on in the dressing room” (Robinson 1998, 85). The phrase, “what goes on tour, stays on tour” applies to many sports environments as a general rule, not only to away-game trips or social excursions. Thus, aside from the fact that normal changing room activities include many that are appealing or instrumental to the child sex abuser, the changing room environment (indeed the sports club environment) is cloaked in silence and, of course, it is silence that sponsors the actions of a perpetrator and silence that enables him or her to persist (Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky 2000).

Conclusion

Child protection policy is a necessary and welcome addition to the world of organized sports. Sport England’s recently published six-year safeguarding strategy requires “sports bodies” to have, “a commitment to empower children and young people by advising them of their rights and how they should be treated” (Sport England 2006). The clear articulation of such an ambitious objective within sports is highly desirable and represents a clear response to the spirit and demands of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989). However, the sociocultural analysis of sports over the past thirty years demonstrates well the magnitude of the task of creating the conditions to facilitate such a goal; the distance between the cultural character of organized sports and the child-centered philosophy of the Convention are significant, to say the least. In addition, we should not forget that there remains critical

discussion about “man–boy” sexual relations (see debate between Bauserman, Finkelhor, and Mrazek in Sandfort, Brongersma, and van Naerssen 1991) which, for some, are a potential source of healthy, positive experiences for the child (e.g., Sandfort 1987). Whereas such research offers an important contribution to academic debate it should not detract from the considerable literature that clearly articulates the damaging impact of CSA, and as Finkelhor (1991, 315) states, “it has little relevance for policy.”

Abuse of children is a problem rooted in the social construction of human relations (the adult-child relation); therefore the centralizing of children’s rights in policy is a very welcome development. Yet, despite considerable work on risk factors in sports to inform policy (Brackenridge 2001), it is unlikely that child protection/safeguarding policy in sports (where it exists) will make a significant impact on the activity of adults who are determined to engage in sexual activity with children in sports, even when/if policy is fully and rigorously implemented (which is unlikely in the near future given the sporadic and very recent introduction of such policy within a global sports context that is not generally conducive to its underlying philosophies). Protection policy is ultimately a necessary but blunt tool with which to address the resolve of those for whom children present either a habitual or situational means to achieve sexual gratification. I would posit that this is especially true when such resolve fundamentally originates within the construction of a masculinity based on domination (Bourdieu 2001). However, its potential lies in its ability to quietly foster social and cultural change toward an environment where the welfare of the child is prioritized, at all times, above the welfare of sports. Given the increasing commodification of organized sports and athletes within it (Morgan 1994), not to mention the specific targeting of children for political ends (Giroux 2000), occasionally as part of terror campaigns (Jenks 2005b), we may reasonably be sceptical about the will of the global village to seriously attend to this change.

Alongside this emerging rights-based discourse, Hendrick’s (2003) notion of a “discourse of control” (which he opposes with a “discourse of welfare”) is a useful analytical tool for examining the construction of childhood in sports: “. . . he tells you when and how you play, who you play with, who you can talk to outside of the team” (Kennedy 2006, 45). Boys in sports are controlled by men to the extent that they are told *how to be*; they are expected to (and do) conform without even the opportunity to question (Pitchford et al. 2004). Not surprisingly, the thesis presented in Michel Foucault’s (1977) *Discipline and Punish* has been frequently used to draw out the mechanisms and practices inherent with organized sports (see Shogan 1999). It is well established within the sociology of sport that sport is not a unified, homogenous entity but a deeply politicized, heterogeneous one. According to Brackenridge (2001, 88), “within that terrain there have been many attempts to transform the masculine and to challenge misogyny”: however she concludes, “but even in sports that ostensibly shun hypermasculinity the heterosexual imperative is as strong as ever.” Similarly, the construction of boyhood through a discourse of

control is not confined to those sports such as ice hockey, boxing, rugby, gridiron, and soccer, where the hetero-patriarchal current runs strong and is clearly traceable (Burstyn 1999; Hargreaves 1994). The use of punitive measures in the training/coaching of boys is commonplace within many, if not all, sports (see Miedzian 1991, 177-206), and the absence of children's perspectives in organized children's sports is a universal issue. It may be polemical to suggest that *all* children's sports are based on an instrumental rationality that permits adults to treat children as objects or tools in the pursuit of their own ends and with little regard for the long-term well-being of the child, but anyone who has spent even a little time in male sports will recognize there is at least a strong kernel of truth in this analysis. The commodification of childhood (Giroux 2000) is as rampant in organized sports as any other field of social practice, and corporate enterprise shows little sign of reducing its interest in sports or those that will shortly fill the resident "great" one's shoes, boots, or skates. As Chomsky (in Bakan 2004) has cogently argued, the corporation is legally bound to ignore such trivial matters as the welfare of children. Certainly, more needs to be known about individual sports cultures; nevertheless, there appears to be considerable legitimacy in referring to organized male sports as a single entity when discussing the treatment of boys and the manner in which the child/boy is constructed in organized male sports.

Attention to the "new social studies of childhood" (James, Jenks, and Prout 1998) in light of the emergence of the problem of CSA demands that sport examines the manner in which it constructs childhood and child-adult relations; a children's rights agenda directs cultural change far in excess of most child protection policy or initiatives, even though these may be a primary tool for cultural change. Some sports organizations and bodies across the world are now ready to accept that a "few bad apples" may infiltrate the ranks of sports to abuse children, but general recognition or acceptance that it is often the very fabric and *milieu* of organized sports (Brackenridge 2001) that constitutes part of the problem seems some way off. Male sports, in most if not all of its forms, currently provides a context conducive to the sexual abuse of boys and it is only through radical cultural change that this problem can be addressed. In this article I have tried to outline the beginnings of an account of the relationship between childhood sexual abuse and male sports, while recognizing that to do so without greater knowledge of the lived experiences of (and the meanings given to them by) boys sexually abused in sports and of the adults who abuse them, gives always only a partial perspective.

Notes

1. The Child Protection in Sport Unit attends to all forms of abuse, not just sexual abuse.
2. This clearly does not necessarily mean that institutions deliberately and consciously exhibit *overtly* supportive attitudes for childhood sexual abuse; rather, this is unlikely.

3. The SAM (sexually abused male) model of dynamics and effects comprises the following seven categories: subjection, sexual abuse, concealment, invalidation, reconciliation, compensation, and the cycle continues.

References

- Abel, G. G., J. V. Becker, M. Mittelman, J. Cunningham-Rathner, J. L. Rouleau, and W. D. Murphy. 1987. Self-reported sex crimes of nonincarcerated paraphiliacs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 2(1): 3-25.
- Armstrong, G. 2004. The lords of misrule: Football and the rights of the child in Liberia, West Africa. *Sport in Society* 7(3): 473-502.
- Bakan, J. 2004. *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power*. London: Constable & Robinson.
- Bauman, Z. 2001. *The individualized society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). 1993. *On the line: Secrets of the coach*. BBC Television. August 25.
- Beck, U., and E. Beck-Gernsheim. 2001. *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage.
- Belsky, J. 1993. Etiology of child maltreatment: A developmental-ecological analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 114:413-34.
- Benedict, J. 1997. *Public heroes, private felons: Athletes and crimes against women*. Boston: Northwestern University Press.
- Benedict, J., and A. Klein. 1997. Arrest and conviction rates for athletes accused of sexual assault. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 14:86-94.
- Bird, S. 1996. Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society* 10:120-32.
- Boocock, S. 2002. The child protection in sport unit. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression* 8:99-106.
- . 2007. The NSPCC Child Protection in Sport Unit: Safeguarding children in sport. Child Protection in Sport Conference, McKay Law Conferences, February 28, Marriott Hotel, London, United Kingdom.
- Bourdieu, P. 2001. *Masculine domination*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brackenridge, C. H. 1992. *Sexual abuse of children in sport: A comparative exploration of research methodologies and professional practice*. Pre-Olympic Scientific Congress, Malaga, Spain. July 14-19.
- . 1994. Fair play or fair game: Child sexual abuse in sport organisations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 29:287-99.
- . 1996. *The paedophile and the predator*, unpublished paper, College of Higher Education, Cheltenham and Gloucester.
- . 1997. "He owned me basically": Women's experience of sexual abuse in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 32(2): 115-30.
- . 1998. Healthy sport for healthy girls? The role of parents in preventing sexual abuse in sport. *Sport, Education and Society* 3(2): 59-78.
- . 2001. *Spoilsports: Understanding and preventing sexual exploitation in sport*. London: Routledge.
- . 2002. Men loving men hating women: The crisis of masculinity and violence to women in sport. In *Gender and sport: A reader*, eds. S. Scraton and A. Flintoff, 255-270. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. Women and children first? Child abuse and child protection in sport. *Sport in Society* 7(3): 322-37.
- . 2006. Purity and danger: Researching child protection and welfare in youth sport. Conference presentation, Researching Youth Sport: Diverse Perspectives, Loughborough University, September 20.
- Brackenridge, C., A. Pitchford, K. Russell, and G. Nutt. 2007. *Child welfare in football: An exploration of children's welfare in the modern game*. London: Routledge.

- Bryshun, J., and K. Young. 1999. Sport-related hazing: An inquiry into male and female involvement. In *Sport and Gender in Canada*, ed. P. White and K. Young, 269-92. Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Burstyn, V. 1999. *The rites of men: Manhood, culture and the politics of sport*. London: University of Toronto Press.
- Burton-Nelson, M. 1994. *The stronger women get, the more men love football: Sexism and the American culture of sports*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Television. 1993. Crossing the line: Sexual harassment in sport. *The Fifth Estate*, November 2.
- Canadian Strategy for Ethical Conduct in Sport. 2002. Quebec: Sport Canada.
- Coakley, J. J. 2002. Using sports to control deviance and violence among youths: Let's be critical and cautious. In *Paradoxes of youth and sport*, eds. M. Gatz, M. A. Messner, and S. J. Ball-Rokeach, 13-30. New York: State University of New York Press.
- . 2003. *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- . 2000. *The men and the boys*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Corby, B. 2000. *Child abuse: Towards a knowledge base*, 2nd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Curry, T. J. 1991. Fraternal bonding in the locker room: A profeminist analysis of talk about competition and women. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8:119-35.
- . 1998. Beyond the locker room: Campus bars and college athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 15:205-15.
- Courtois, C. A. 2003. Foreword. In *Sexual abuse of males: The SAM model of theory and practice*, ed. J. Spiegel, vii-x. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- David, P. 2005. *Human rights in youth sport: A critical review of children's rights in competitive sports*. London: Routledge.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) website: Every Child Matters: Change for Children. Cross-government working with local partners to achieve better outcomes for children and young people. <http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/culturesportplay/> (accessed March 20, 2007).
- Donegan, L. 1995. Olympic coach jailed for rapes, *The Guardian* 11, September 28.
- Donnelly, A. C., and K. Oates, eds. 2000. *Classic papers in child abuse*. London: Sage.
- Donnelly, P. 1997. Child labour, sport labour. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 32: 389-406.
- . 1999. Who's fair game: Sport, sexual harassment, and abuse. In *Sport and gender in Canada*, ed. P. White and K. Young, 107-128. Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Downes, S. 2002. Sport and sexual abuse. *The Observer Newspaper*, Sport Magazine, April: 36-40.
- Ellerstein, N. S., and J. W. Canavan. 1980. Sexual abuse of boys. *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 134:255-57.
- Elliott, M. 1993. *Female sexual abuse of children: The ultimate taboo*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Elliott, M., K. Brown, and J. Kilcoyne. 1995. Child sexual abuse prevention: What offenders tell us. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 19(5): 579-94.
- Etherington, K. 1995. *Adult male survivors of childhood sexual abuse*. Brighton: Pavilion Publishing.
- . 2000. *Narrative approaches to working with adult male survivors of child sexual abuse: The clients', the counsellor's and the researcher's story*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Finkelhor, D. 1991. Response to Bauseman. In *Male intergenerational intimacy: Historical, socio-psychological and legal perspectives*, ed. T. Sandfort, E. Brongersma, and A. van Naerssen, 313-15. London: Harrington Park Press.
- . 1994. The international epidemiology of child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 18(5): 409-17.
- Finkelhor, D., and L. Jones. 2006. Why have child maltreatment and child victimization declined? *Journal of Social Issues* 62(4): 685-716.
- Finkelhor, D., and Associates, with S. Araji, I. Baron, A. Browne, S. D. Peters, and G. E. Wyatt. 1986. *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse*. London: Sage.

- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.
- Gallagher, B. 1999. The abuse of children in public care. *Child Abuse Review* 8:357-65.
- . 2000. The extent and nature of known cases of institutional child sexual abuse. *British Journal of Social Work* 30(6): 795-817.
- Gil, D. 1975. Unraveling child abuse. In *Classic papers in child abuse*, ed. A. C. Donnelly and K. Oates 2000. London: Sage.
- Giroux, H. A. 2000. *Stealing innocence: Corporate culture's war on children*. New York: Palgrave.
- Glaser, D., and S. Frosh. 1988. *Child sexual abuse*. London: Macmillan.
- Griffin, P., and J. Genasci. 1990. Addressing homophobia in physical education: Responsibilities for teachers and researchers. In *Sport, men and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*, eds. M. Messner and D. Sabo, 211-22. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hall, M. A. 1985. How should we theorize sport in a capitalist patriarchy? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 1:109-13.
- Hargreaves, J. A. 1986. Where's the virtue? Where's the grace?: A discussion of the social production of gender relations in and through sport. *Theory, Culture & Society* 3(1): 109-21.
- . 1994. *Sporting females: Critical issues in the history and sociology of women's sports*. London: Routledge.
- Hartill, M. 2005. Sport and the sexually abused male child. *Sport, Education & Society* 10(3): 287-304.
- Hartill, M., and P. Prescott. 2007. Serious business or "any other business"? Safeguarding and child protection in British Rugby League. *Child Abuse Review* 16(4): 237-51.
- Hendrick, H. 2003. *Child welfare: Historical dimensions, contemporary debate*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Hunter, M., ed. 1990. *The sexually abused male, vol.1: Prevalence, impact and treatment*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Jack, G. 2001. An ecological perspective on child abuse. In *Children in society: Contemporary theory, policy and practice*, ed. P. Foley, J. Roche, and S. Tucker, 177-92. Basingstoke: Palgrave in association with The Open University.
- Jackson, L. A. 2000. *Child sexual abuse in Victorian England*. London: Routledge.
- James, A., and A. L. James. 2004. *Constructing childhood: Theory, policy and social practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- James, A., C. Jenks, and A. Prout. 1998. *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jenks, C. 2005a. *Childhood*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- . 2005b. Editorial: A new death of childhood. *Childhood* 12(1): 5-8.
- Jones, L. M., and D. Finkelhor. 2003. Putting together evidence on declining trends in sexual abuse: A complex puzzle. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 27(2): 133-35.
- Jones, R., K. Armour, and P. Potrac. 2004. *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, R. L., N. Glintmeyer, and A. McKenzie. 2005. Slim bodies, eating disorders and the coach-athlete relationship: A tale of identity creation and disruption. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 40:377-91.
- Kane, M. J., and L. J. Disch. 1993. Sexual violence and the reproduction of male power in the locker room: The Lisa Olson Incident. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 10:331-52.
- Kempe, C. H. 1978. Sexual abuse: Another hidden pediatric problem. *Pediatrics* 62:382-89.
- Kempe, C., F. Silverman, B. Steele, W. Droegmueller, and H. Silver. 1962. The battered-child syndrome. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 181:17-24.
- Kempe, R. S., and C. H. Kempe. 1978. *Child abuse*. London: Fontana/Open Books.
- Kennedy, S., with J. Grainger. 2006. *Why I didn't say anything: The Sheldon Kennedy story*. Toronto: Insomniac Press.
- Kirby, S. L., L. Greaves, and O. Hankivsky. 2000. *The dome of silence: Sexual harassment and abuse in sport*. London: Zed Books.

- Kitzinger, J. 1997. Who are you kidding? Children, power and the struggle against sexual abuse. In *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood*, ed. A. James and A. Prout, 165-89. London: Falmer Press.
- Laurendeau, J. 2004. The "Crack Choir" and the "Cock Chorus": The intersection of gender and sexuality in skydiving texts. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 21:397-417.
- Leahy, T., G. Pretty, and G. Tenenbaum. 2002. Prevalence of sexual abuse in organized competitive sport in Australia. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression* 8:16-36.
- Lenskyj, H. J. 1986. *Out of bounds: Women, sport and sexuality*. Toronto: The Women's Press.
- . 1992. Sexual harassment: Female athletes' experiences and coaches' responsibilities. *Coaching Association of Canada* 12(6).
- Light, R., and D. Kirk. 2000. High school rugby, the body and the reproduction of hegemonic masculinity. *Sport, Education and Society* 5(2): 163-76.
- Lisak, D. 1994. The psychological impact of sexual abuse: Content analysis of interviews with male survivors. *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 7(4): 525-48.
- Mackay, D. 2001. Sport faces up to its final taboo. *The Guardian*, October 27.
- . 2005. Comment: When ends do not justify means: Putting children through excessive training regimes might bring Olympic success, but at what cost? *The Observer*, November 20.
- McKay, J., M. A. Messner, and D. Sabo, eds. 2000. *Masculinities, gender relations, and sport*. California: Sage.
- Mendel, M. P. 1995. *The male survivor: The impact of sexual abuse*. London: Sage.
- Messner, M. A. 1988. Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5: 197-211.
- Messner, M. A., and D. Sabo, eds. 1990. *Sport, men and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Leeds: Human Kinetics.
- . 1994. *Sex, violence & power in sports: Rethinking masculinity*. California: Crossing Press.
- Miedzian, M. 1991. *Boys will be boys: Breaking the link between masculinity and violence*. London: Virago Press.
- Morgan, W. J. 1994. *Leftist theories of sport: A critique and reconstruction*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Nack, W., and D. Yaeger. 1999. Every parent's nightmare. *Sports Illustrated* 91(10).
- Nauright, J., and T. J. L. Chandler, eds. 1996. *Making men: Rugby and masculine identity*. London: Frank Cass & Co.
- Pappas, N. T., P. C. McKenny, and B. S. Catlett. 2004. Athlete aggression on the rink and off the ice: Athlete violence and aggression in hockey and interpersonal relationships. *Men and Masculinities* 6(3): 291-312.
- Parton, N. 1985. *The politics of child abuse*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Pitchford, A., C. Brackenridge, J. Bringer, C. Cockburn, G. Nutt, Z. Pawlaczek, and K. Russell. 2004. Children in football: Seen but not heard. *Soccer in Society* 5(1).
- Pronger, B. 1990. *The arena of masculinity: Sport, homosexuality and the meaning of sex*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Prout, A. 2005. *The future of childhood: Towards the interdisciplinary study of children*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Renold, E. 1997. All they've got on their brains is football: Sport, masculinity and the gendered practices of play ground relations. *Sport, Education and Society* 2(1): 5-23.
- . 2007. Primary school "studs": (De)constructing young boys' heterosexual masculine identities. *Men and Masculinities* 9(3): 275-97.
- Robertson, S. 2003. "If I let a goal in, I'll get beat up": Contradictions in masculinity, sport and health. *Health Education Research* 18(6): 706-16.
- Robinson, L. 1998. *Crossing the line: Violence and sexual assault in Canada's national sport*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

- Rotella, R. J., and M. M. Murray. 1991. Homophobia, the world of sport and sport psychology consulting. *The Sport Psychologist* 5:355-64.
- Ryan, J. 1995. *Little girls in pretty boxes*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sandfort, T. 1987. *Boys on their contacts with men: A study of sexually expressed friendships*. New York: Global Academic Publishers.
- Sandfort, T., E. Brongersma, and A. van Naerssen. 1991. *Male intergenerational intimacy: Historical, socio-psychological, and legal perspectives*. London: Harrington Park Press.
- Seymour, A. 1998. Aetiology of the sexual abuse of children: An extended feminist perspective. *Women's Studies International Forum* 21(4): 415-27.
- Shogan, D. 1999. *The making of high-performance athletes: Discipline, diversity and ethics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sidebotham, P. 2001. An ecological approach to child abuse: A creative use of scientific models in research and practice. *Child Abuse Review* 10:97-112.
- Spencer, R. 1995. Swimming chiefs face legal action. *The Daily Telegraph*, September 29.
- Spiegel, J. 2003. *Sexual abuse of males: The SAM model of theory and practice*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Sport England. 2003. *Standards for safeguarding and protecting children in sport*. Child Protection in Sport Unit. Leicester: Sport England/NSPCC.
- . 2006. *Strategy for safeguarding children and young people in sport—2006-2012*. Child Protection in Sport Unit. Leicester: Sport England/NSPCC.
- Stoudt, B. G. 2006. You're either in or you're out: School violence, peer discipline, and the (re) production of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities* 8(3): 273-87.
- Struve, J. 1990. Dancing with the patriarchy: The politics of sexual abuse. In *The sexually abused male vol.1: Prevalence, impact and treatment*, ed. M. Hunter, 3-46. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Sullivan, J., and A. Beech, 2002. Professional perpetrators: Sex offenders who use their employment to target and sexually abuse the children with whom they work. *Child Abuse Review* 11: 153-67.
- Theberge, N. 1985. Toward a feminist alternative to sport as a male preserve. *Quest* 37:193-202.
- Tomlinson, A., and I. Yorganci. 1997. Male coach/female athlete relations: Gender and power relations in competitive sport. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 21(2): 134-55.
- United Nations. 1989. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Geneva: UN.
- Volkwein, K., F. Schnell, S. Devlin, M. Mitchell, and J. Sutera. 2002. Sexual harassment of women in athletics vs academia. In *Sexual harassment and abuse in sport: International research and policy perspectives*, ed. C. Brackenridge and K. Fasting, 91-110. London: Whiting & Birch.
- Volkwein, K., F. Schnell, A. Livezey, and D. Sherwood. 1997. Sexual harassment in sports: Perceptions and experiences of female student athletes. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 23(3): 283-295.
- Ward, T., and S. M. Hudson. 1998. The construction and development of theory in the sexual offending area: A metatheoretical framework. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 10(1): 47-63.
- . 2000. Sexual offenders' implicit planning: A conceptual model. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 12(3): 189-202.
- Welch, M. 1997. Violence against women by professional football players: A gender analysis of hypermasculinity, positional status, Narcissism, and entitlement. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 21:392-411.
- Westcott, H. 1991. *Institutional abuse of children—from research to policy: A review*. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC).
- Young, K. 2005. *Chasing shadows: Disclosure, deflection and disguise in the Canadian hazing debate*. Third World Congress of the Sociology of Sport. Buenos Aires, Argentina, November 30.

Mike Hartill is a senior lecturer in sport and sociology at Edge Hill University, Lancashire, United Kingdom, in the Department of Sport and Physical Activity. He has published work on the sexual abuse of boys in sport and also child protection policy in U.K. sports, particularly Rugby League. He can be contacted via email: hartillm@edgehill.ac.uk and would especially welcome contact by men who have experienced abuse in the context of sports.