



LITERATURE REVIEW ON HATE SPEECH IN SPORT CONTEXTS

**RESPECT IS THE GOAL
HATE SPEECH
THREATENS SPORT
INTEGRITY .**



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

For more details:
visit [www.https://rights.usmacaselle.org](https://rights.usmacaselle.org)



O1 - D1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

A collection of intercultural stories about hate speech in sport contexts and interviews with different actors involved in sport with specific focus on grassroots of team sports– RIGTHS framework founded on evidences and experiences.

O1 - 1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

A collection of literature and policy papers about hate speech in sport contexts

Edited by

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY

Literature outlined by

AMATEUR SPORTS LEAGUES

GENTLEMEN

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY

KEAN – CELL OF ALTERNATIVE YOUTH ACTIVITIES

ROSTO SOLIDARIO

CA' FOSCARI UNIVERSITY OF VENICE

Project Reference

RIGHTS – Respect Is the Goal, Hate speech Threatens Sport integrity

Erasmus + Programme of the European Union

Lead Partner

USMA CASELLE – Sport and Youth Association [Sport Association, Italy]

Partners

Amateur Sports League – [NGO, Bulgaria]

Gentlemen [NGO, Serbia]

Hacettepe University [University, Turkey]

KEAN – Cell of Alternative Youth Activities [NGO, Greece]

Rosto Solidario [NGO, Portugal]

Ca' Foscari University of Venice [University, Italy]

CREDITS AND DISCLAIMER

This document is the collective effort of many individuals and the partner organisations working on behalf of the project “RIGHTS – Respect Is the Goal, Hate speech Threatens Sport integrity” and every attempt has been made to ensure that the contained information is true and accurate.

Every reader and user is expressly advised to use the content and information of this document on his/her own responsibility.

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

FORWARD NOTE

Literature review has been performed by collecting relevant documents in close cooperation of partners from Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Serbia, and Turkey. Leading partner provided Literature Review Forms to each partner. They reviewed the literature to briefly summarize each document by specifying the category (law, psychology, sociology etc.) and type of the resource (book, article, chapter, manual, toolkit, mass media publication etc.), main topic, target people/group emphasized, context and they provided brief summary. Each partner contributed with around ten review form and each can be found in appendices.

Purpose/importance of the collecting Literature Review Forms from different countries were as follow;

1. To learn if there are counter-speech measures/activities in those countries. Specifically,
 - o As a supporting education programs (for coaches, parents, officials)
 - o Any document emphasize counter measures (i.e. brochure, booklet)

- o Administrative rules / legal measures (i.e. rule in the club/league, legal law)
 - o Best Practices, awareness activities (i.e. campaigns in local, national level, media)
2. To reach academic research which focuses on hate speech which involved cases from each country
 3. To reach any media news/articles which gives an example on hate speech incidences/discussions in each country
 4. To reach other relevant documents targeting hate speech and measures (not only in sports but also in other domains) (i.e. books, guidelines, documentary, movies, legal cases etc.)

Literature review has been organized in different sections. “Introduction” as the first section, aims to provide “conceptual clarity on terminology” and defines Hate speech and its categories. The reader can find recent philosophical discussions on hate speech in the Introduction section including its origins, harms of hate speech. Lastly, the first section questions prevalence of hate speech in sports and provide examples for efforts on counter-hate speech movements.

The second section named as “International Framework” provides brief summary on documents addressing hate speech in sport and development of intercultural competence through education. This section also includes best practices to address and take necessary steps to tackle with its possible affects.

The third section revisits comparative analysis of inter-cultural stories to emphasize experiences of hate speech and reveal common or distinct challenges of different groups.

Recommendations for preventing, inhibiting hate speech in sports is the last topic to be addressed which followed by the concluding remarks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to all those who contributed to the development of this document, namely, to all the partner organizations that contributed to the collection of the literature and provided their feedback on the first version of this document.

Contents

A.1. Conceptual clarity and terminology	7
1.1. Definition of Hate speech	7
2.2. Hate speech in sport settings	8
2.3. Types of hate speech	11
A.2. Hate speech as a multi-layered concept	12
2.1. Common factors affecting Hate speech behaviour in youth sports	12
2.2. Harms of Hate Speech	17
A.3. Counter-hate speech	18
3.1. Counter- Hate speech policies	18
3.2. Best Practices	20
3.3. Role of education:	21
B. INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK	24
4.1. UN documents addressing hate speech in sports	24
C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING, INHIBITING HATE SPEECH IN SPORTS	27
REFERENCES	31
VOCABULARY	34

A.1. Conceptual clarity and terminology

This section presents a definition of hate speech, prevalence of hate speech in sports with its origins and consequences. The counter-hate speech efforts are also presented.

1.1. Definition of Hate speech

There is no universally accepted definition of “Hate Speech” in international human rights law. Some scholars define it as a “generic term that has come to embrace the use of speech attacks based on race, ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation or preference.” (Smolla, 1993). According to Brown (2017) the connotation of “hate speech” might be a complex concept, composed of two basic concepts “hate” and “speech”. Whereas “Hate” is an indication of an emotional state or opinion, and therefore distinct from any manifested action. “Speech” refers to any expression imparting opinions or ideas and it can take many forms: written, non-verbal, visual or artistic, and can be disseminated through any media, including internet, print, radio, or television.

Hate speech, as defined by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, covers “all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin”. (Committee of Ministers Recommendation CM/Rec (1997) 20)2)

Hate Speech is commonly defined as verbal expressions, which are discriminatory towards people or groups due to characteristics such as ethnicity, origin and cultural background, nationality, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. However, hate speech also includes non-verbal expressions such as those contained in images, videos or any communicative form of online and offline activity, as included in the Council of Europe’s definition.

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) clarify forms of hate speech acts in more detail by defining the term as “the use of one or more particular forms of expression – namely, the advocacy, promotion or incitement of the denigration, hatred or vilification of a person or group of persons, as well as any harassment, insult, negative stereotyping, stigmatization or threat in respect

of such a person or group of persons and the justification of all the preceding types of expression, on the ground of "race",¹ color, descent, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, language, religion or belief, sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation and other personal characteristics or status".

As it has been pointed out that hate speech can be recognized as implicit or explicit. "Expression" as an explicit form is understood in the Recommendation to cover speech and publications in any form, including the use of electronic media, as well as their dissemination and storage. It is important to recognize that hate speech can take the form of written or spoken words, or other forms such as pictures, signs, symbols, paintings, music, plays or videos. It also embraces the implicit use of particular conduct, such as gestures, to communicate an idea, message or opinion. Not all the hate speech in use is so explicit, with some publications relying on implicit or "coded" language to disseminate prejudice and hatred.

The use of hate speech and the failure to tackle such use has adverse consequences both for those to whom it is specifically addressed and for society as a whole. The use of hate speech is also damaging for society where it is communicated. It has a negative impact on the character of public discourse and has a potential to result in climate of hostility and intolerance, together with discrimination and hate crimes.

2.2. Hate speech in sport settings

The literature and the individual stories provide how incidents of different forms of hate speech are engaged with different sports. Hate speech is thought to primarily involve incidents between opposing players but also includes other individuals, such as coaches, fans, referees and other officials in the role of hate speakers.

This Project revealed that Fans are seen as dominant actors behind negative discourse with 40.7% incidence rate, while the Coaches (23.3%) and Peer-athletes (youth athletes) (20.9%) were reported as second and third most accountable sources. They are followed by Parents with 8.1%. Reminding that the tendency of children to emulate the practices of others, young athletes having witnessed or experienced hate speech might be negatively affected in terms of their motivation and attitudes towards sports. Although there is an assumption that hate speech has moved to online platforms (*Foxman and Wolf 2013), this project also indicated that hate speech is a long standing problem both on and off the field of play. Total frequency of occurrence in field of play, grandstand and locker room

81.3% signifies how common it is at the workplace of athletes, coaches and officials. It has been reported that 46.7% of cases was occurred in the field of play during either training or competitions. The next two common place was reported as grandstand (30.4%) and online platforms (9.8%).

A study (Gardiner, 2015) investigated the most effective regulatory framework in engagement with hate speech incidents in elite football. Whereas the focus of their study is devoted on the regulation of racial abuse in football, authors point out that sport has a variety of hate speech issues beyond racism including issues of homophobia, sectarianism, sexism and abuse on basis of disability amongst others. Beyond these issues, which are human characteristics protected under many general legal provisions, athletes are exposed to many forms of abusive language from other participants, coaches and spectators.

A study on unwanted behavior in sport (Tiessen-Raaphorst et al. 2008) revealed that 1 in 5 respondents aged 12 years or over reported having been a victim (11%) or a witness of unwanted behaviors including verbal abuse (12%). The authors showed that their participants felt that society is becoming increasingly (verbally) aggressive and less tolerant, and that these tendencies are mirrored in sport. Younger respondents may then perceive and report more aggressive behavior. The increase in self-reported psychological violence in last decade could also reflect an increased intensity in youth sports with the general development of greater competitiveness.

Literature suggested that competitive sport is characterized by unique structures and cultures, a high tolerance of random incidents of physical violence and injuries as being part of the game, asymmetrical power relationships between coaches and athletes, a male-dominated gender ratio, and a sports culture often being associated with authoritarian leadership, often-required physical contact, reward structures, and participation at an early age (Alexander, Stafford, and Lewis, 2011; Brackenridge, 2010; Cense and Brackenridge, 2001; Kirby, Greaves, and Hankivsky, 2000). These characteristics emphasized that sport is a conducive climate for different form of inter individual violence including hate speech (as a form of psychological violence through an abusive language) against child athletes. As it is one of the responsibilities of leaders in organized sport to create a safe climate, a better understanding of the nature and frequency of the occurrence in youth sport is essential (Vertommen et al. , 2015). Alexander and colleagues (2011) recorded prevalence estimates of 75% for emotional harm (including abusive language or hate speech) in athletes under the age of

16 in UK. Another study (Romijn et al. 2013) shows that nearly 4 in 10 of those who regularly participate in organized sport experience or witness unwanted behaviors including hate speech.

Vertommen et al. (2015) studied interpersonal violence against children in sport in the Netherlands and Belgium. Using a dedicated online questionnaire, they prescreened over 4,000 adults on having participated in organized sport before the age of 18 were surveyed with respect to their experiences with childhood psychological, physical, and sexual violence while playing sports. The survey shows that 38% of all respondents reported experiences with psychological violence, 11% with physical violence, and 14% with sexual violence. Ethnic minority, lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGB) and disabled athletes, and those competing at the international level report significantly more experiences of interpersonal violence in sport. Even though authors did not mention “hate speech” explicitly, they examined respondents’ childhood experiences while playing sports and they defines “psychological violence” as aggressive verbal intimidation, negative critique on performance or body, threats, and neglect which is examples of hate speech in our point of view. They further define such abusing behaviors, e.g. harassment, peer-to-peer bullying and verbal intimidation, as the forms of psychological violence (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, and Lozano, 2002; Pinhiero, 2006).

One of the key finding of the same study (Vertommen et al. ,2015) is that in perpetrators of the psychological violence, in our definition the hate speaker, were mainly peer athletes. Authors emphasized the same trend was also observed in several other studies focusing of other violence categories (Alexander et al.,2011; Elendu and Umeakuka, 2011; Gündüz et al., 2007). Elendu and Umeakuka (2011) claims that this incidence rate may be due to the fact that peer athletes spend the most time together and often have a closer relationship with each other than with other sport participants. Although female perpetrators are reported as a minority, female victims of psychological violence accordingly most often report ‘several female athletes’ as the perpetrators. Alexander and colleagues (2011) also found that children reported having been subjected to different forms of peer bullying in a sport context. Studies in other social settings, such as schools, also show high rates of peer bullying involving verbal and emotional abuse (Stassen Berger, 2007; Tapper and Boulton, 2005).

Cleland (2014) presents findings of a discourse analysis two prominent association football (soccer) message boards that examined fans’ views toward racism in English football. The overall findings are that social media sites such as fan message boards have allowed racist thoughts to flourish online, in

particular by rejecting multiculturalism and other religious beliefs through the presentation of whiteness and national belonging and an outright hostility and resistance toward the other.

2.3. Types of hate speech

While many types of hate speech are relatively straightforward and “in your face” (Borgeson and Valeri, 2004), hate can also be expressed in a more implicit or covert form. A further distinction is made between two types of hate speech events; the first type is face-to-face encounters and the second is incidences of general circulation (Gelber and McNamara, 2016).

The distinction between face-to-face encounters and general circulation hate speech is not always clear in the everyday experiences. For example, hate speech yelled at a target from another athlete constitutes a face-to-face encounter. On the other hand, even if an athlete doesn’t hear the hate speech at the time, others will hear of it through word of mouth, community events or in the media. In legal or regulatory perspective, Heinze and Phillipson (2016) argue that these two types of events ought to be treated discretely. This is because face-to-face encounters can more easily be limited to the legal category of causing an incitement to violence, whereas generally circulated hate speech is often harder to regulate due to the fact that the evidence of the harms of generally circulated hate speech to be insufficient (Heinze, 2013).

Besides where and how it is practiced, hate speech in general reflects abusive behaviors in sport settings. Gervis and Dunn (2004) performed a retrospective analysis of their experiences as elite child athletes. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews and response-coding techniques. Abusive behaviors reflecting hate speech cases were categorized under eight headings: belittling, humiliating, shouting, scapegoating, rejecting, isolating, threatening and ignoring. The results showed that all of the twelve participants reported experiencing belittling and shouting by their coach, nine athletes reported frequent threatening behavior, nine reported frequent humiliations, seven reported scapegoating, six reported rejection or being ignored and four reported being isolated when they were elite child athletes.

A.2. Hate speech as a multi-layered concept

The lack of an agreed definition causes difficulty in determining when exactly an expression constitutes hate speech. There is also debate on counteracting hate speech and the right to freedom of expression. Indeed, Hate speech is a complex and multi-layered concept. For instance, psychologists look at hate speech focusing on its effects on victims of hate speech and motivation of hate speakers. Sociologists have sought to understand the relationship between hate speech and group dynamics and power relations. Linguists have investigated the extent, nature and origins of dehumanising metaphors, verbal or non-verbal expressions used in hate speech. And political scientists and cultural ethnologists have employed the techniques of discourse analysis to assess uses of the term ‘hate speech’ in public discourse, including in newspaper articles, or discussion on the Internet etc. Discourse analysis looks upon the term ‘hate speech’ not as something with a universal, trans-contextual meaning, but as a term that is used by people whose discourse is embedded in particular social practices, psychological states of mind, institutional structures, cultural environments, ideologies, hierarchies and conflicts. One must first understand something of these contexts in order to understand the many meanings of the term ‘hate speech’ (Brown,2017).

2.1. Common factors affecting Hate speech behaviour in youth sports

Many factors and competing demands influence the interpersonal interactions in youth sport and especially in competitive sport. These include the behaviour of (child) athletes and their parents, the focus of staff members (managers or those responsible for policy and coaches) and the reactions of parents and spectators (De Martelaer and Vertommen 2008). Each of these interpersonal and organizational elements can affect the decision-making of those involved and lead to actions that can be labelled as ‘unethical’ and sometimes even as ‘unlawful’ (Livingston 2010).

In this project, grassroots sports have been also portrayed as a place of discriminating behaviours (35%) and negative experiences (12.7%). Hate speech has also an impact on self-esteem and performance (27%), Interpersonal communication (12.7%). Whereas the focus of youth sports is expected to be on enjoyment and fun, findings regard hate speech as a threat to establish an encouraging healthy environment for all parties. 37.6 % of the cases point out “intrinsic pressures”

(e.g., stress); and that of 26.3 % signify “perceptions of negative social dynamics” (e.g. negative feelings toward team, coach or fans and drop outs). Effect of hate speech on Performance and Moral Values seemed equally often across respondents and comprise near 19 ± 1 % of the cases.

-Negative Stereotyping :

One of the subcategory of implicit hate speech is labelled “negative stereotyping” and was coded when users expressed overly generalized and simplified beliefs about (negative) characteristics or behaviors of different target groups(Rieger et al,2021) . In this historical process, ideas emerged that one group was superior or inferior to others and systems were put in place to justify and sustain these unequal social relations (class distinctions, gender relations), for example, by limiting access to education or sport settings on the basis of ideas that some groups are by nature less capable. “Negative stereotyping” which can be defined as threatening some groups, or individuals, as inferior, different, and less worthy of respect (Ellie and Mara,2004) is therefore one of the underlying cause of hate speech.

Aronson et al (2013) argues that stereotype threat is the unpleasant psychological experience of confronting negative stereotypes about race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or social status. Hundreds of published studies focus on the consequences for targets contending with negative stereotypes based on race, ethnicity, gender, or physical appearance and, specifically examine how the experience of stereotype threat can impair intellectual functioning and interfere with performance. Stereotype threat appears to impair performance by inducing physiological stress and by prompting attempts at both behavioral and emotional regulation—all of which, independently or in concert, have the effect of consuming cognitive resources needed for intellectual functioning (Schmader et al, 2008; Johns et al. 2008).

For instance, studies show that laboratory experiments find that stereotype threat elevates blood pressure, induces anxiety, and increases aggressive behavior, overeating, and a host of other failures of self-regulation (Blascovich et al,2001; Inzlicht et al, 2010). The importance of such direct effects is clear, but stereotype threat also poses risks that may be less obvious, by complicating social interactions. Stereotype threat appears to increase effort and arousal, reflecting the desire to disprove the negative stereotype—or prove oneself—by performing well (Jamieson and Harkins, 2007). Chronic

exposure to stereotype threat can result in avoidance of threatening situations and, through this withdrawal from the domain, result in lower cognitive performance (Massey and Fischer, 2005). The immediate effects of stereotype threat appear to be vigilance, arousal, impaired self-regulation, alone or in combination, is also likely to effect on athletic performance (e.g., impairing athletic performance, maintaining the underrepresentation of minority athletes in certain sports).

Even though stereotype threat has been extensively studied in academic and cognitively-based tasks, it has received little attention in sport. Beilock and McConnell (2004) claim that if stereotype threat operates in sport in much the same way as it operates in academic tasks, then making negative stereotypes about athletes salient should have a negative impact on the athletic performance of members of the stereotyped groups.

In sport settings, one might expect that such individuals would be highly motivated to disconfirm the negative stereotype rather than reveal it. Surprisingly, however, stereotype threat seems most likely to occur for individuals who are highly skilled and highly invested in performing well (see Aronson et al., 1999). If one considers this idea in the context of sport, expert athletes should be especially susceptible to the detrimental consequences of a negative performance stereotype (Baker and Horton, 2003).

In one of the first studies exploring stereotype threat in sport, Stone et al. (1999) found support for this idea. Results demonstrated that Black participants who were told that the putting task was a test of sports intelligence did worse than Blacks who were not given this information. In contrast, White participants who were told that the putting task was a test of natural athletic ability performed worse than Whites who did not receive this information. Thus, merely framing a sports activity as diagnostic of a negative racial stereotype (e.g., “African Americans are not athletically intelligent,” “Whites are not naturally athletic”) harms the performance of members of the negatively stereotyped group.

The contemporary research on the role of stereotype threat in sports performance shows that negative stereotypes tied to race and gender can produce differences in the way athletes prepare for and perform in sports. Carefully controlled studies reveal that people hold both positive and negative racial and gender stereotypes about athletes, and that when the negative stereotypes are brought to mind in a sports performance context, they create the burden of stereotype threat that robs athletes of their potential. Both blatant and subtle reminders of a negative stereotype can sabotage athletic performance, and ironically, the athletes most susceptible to the negative impact of stereotype threat are those who are the most psychologically invested in their sport. The available evidence suggests

that the threat of confirming a negative stereotype in a sports context causes athletes to focus on avoiding failure, which weakens performance because it interrupts sensorimotor responses (Stone et al.2012).

-Coaching practice :

Vertommen et al. ,(2015) reported that all participants reported that the behavior of their coaches changed and became more negative after they were identified as elite performers. It seems that, there is a critical area of coaching behavior which to date has not been debated, that of emotional abuse by coaches as a function of ‘normally’ accepted coaching practice.

Studies also reveal that the most frequently reported abuse in sports settings in the form of abusive language or hate speech was that of shouting. It would appear that this was a habitual ‘coaching tool’ used by coaches of elite child athletes. Such behavior was often reported as having a very negative impact on the elite child athlete. This further reinforces the view that what these athletes reported experiencing as children must be categorized as emotionally abusive behavior on the part of the coach. Participants of many studies reported feeling stupid, worthless, upset, less confident, humiliated, depressed, fearful and angry as a result of the behavior of their coaches. These results are indicative of a destructive cycle in which the athlete exhibits a lack of belief in their own ability to perform. This is often referred to as low performance self-efficacy, which culminates in performance detriments. These in turn intensify the abusive behavior of the coach, as performance expectations are not met.

Children who participate in sport would not in normal circumstances be considered ‘at risk’, therefore, they are not previously identified as a vulnerable population. However, these reports provide tentative evidence that the behavior of some coaches is a threat to the psychological well-being of elite child athletes. Those behaviors can also be considered as ‘abuse’ which is interchangeably used to define ‘psychological abuse’, ‘emotional abuse’ and ‘mental cruelty’ (Glaser and Prior,1997; Glaser,2011). Garbarino et al.(1978) identified eight key behaviours as being indicative of emotional abuse. Some of these behaviors also fit into verbal and non-verbal hate speech categories such as belittling, humiliating, shouting, scapegoating, rejecting, isolating, threatening and ignoring. To date, research focusing the frequency of these behaviors has been extensively employed to explore emotional abuse in the family context. Doyle’s (1997) pointed out that ‘Such acts are committed by parent figures who are in a position of differential power that renders the child vulnerable. Such acts

damage immediately or ultimately the behavioral, cognitive, affective, social and psychological functioning of the child.’ As it is the case for youth sports.

- Parental influence :

Characteristic issues regarding parents in youth sport include examples of negative verbal and non-verbal behavior demonstrated during competitions. Numerous studies have done to highlight while parents possess a great potential for positively influencing the sport experience, they can also exert a considerable negative influence by engaging in a range of non-preferred and inappropriate behaviors (Elliott and Drummond, 2017).

Undoubtedly, parents comprise a major contributing factor in children’s sport (Cote, 1999). According to Fredricks and Eccles’ (2004) model of parental influences on their children’s motivation and achievement, parents fulfill three distinct roles in children’s sport experiences: that of a provider, an interpreter, and a role model. Parents, then, influence children’s motivation and behavior through the beliefs and values that they espouse and the behaviors they exhibit. For example, parents make it possible for their children to participate by providing transportation and paying fees (i.e., providers of experience), helping children interpret their sport experience by doing things such as reacting in certain ways to victory and defeat (i.e., interpreters of experience), and modeling critical behaviors such as work ethic and composure (i.e., role models). These behaviors and beliefs, in turn, influence children’s beliefs, values, and goals and ultimately their motivation and performance (Eccles and Harold, 1993).

However, a considerable body of evidence suggests that parents can also exert a negative influence on the sport experience. Besides, there are frequent reports from coaches of “problem” parents and their unintentional but negative effects on player development. In addition to sensational media accounts of tragic parent behavior, coaches, athletic administrators, young athletes, and parents themselves report increasing concerns (such as fights, violent language) with parents that are more subtle (Gould et al, 2007).

Numerous studies have done well to highlight the problematic nature of parental verbal behaviour in children’s and youth sport (Holt et al., 2008; Kidman and McKenzie, 1999). DeFrancesco and Johnson (1997) surveyed junior tennis players and their parents. Of those surveyed, 20% reported that they had displayed inappropriate behaviors while they were watching matches. Moreover, 29% of the players reported being embarrassed by their parents during matches. These parental actions included

walking away from the court (61%), yelling or screaming at them (30%), and, most disturbing, hitting them after the match (13%).

Bowker et al. (2009) examined spectator behaviour at youth hockey games and found that while most verbal comments were positive, those comments negatively oriented were aimed at referees. Omli and Lavoie (2009) reported similar findings from the youth soccer context, claiming that verbal behaviours such as parents yelling at children occur with moderate frequency. Furthermore, Holt et al. (2008) observed the nature of parental involvement in youth soccer games and revealed that approximately 35% of all verbal behaviours consisted of supportive comments such as 'good effort', while 15% comprised of negative verbal behaviours such as publically labelling children 'pathetic'. These studies underline aspects of parental behaviour which pose problems for youth sport participants, coaches, officials and other parent-spectators (Elliott and Drummond, 2017).

2.2. Harms of Hate Speech

The use of hate speech and the failure to tackle such use has adverse consequences not only for those to whom it is specifically addressed. The use of hate speech in sports is also damaging for sporting environment as a whole. It is not just that it has a negative impact on the athletes, fans, coaches or other officials. Of greater significance is the resulting climate of hostility and intolerance, together with a readiness to accept or excuse discrimination undermines mutual respect and threatens peaceful environment. Hate speech, the "words that are used as weapons to wound, humiliate, and degrade," damages not only the targeted group or individual's physiological and emotional state, but also personal freedom, dignity, and society at large. (Cowan et al, 2002). There is an evidence showing a relationship between hate speech and serious consequences including discrimination and violence (Baker, 2012; Dworkin, 2009).

In assessing the harms of hate speech, there are two distinctions in the literature. The first is a distinction between two types of harm, and the second is between two types of hate speech events. The literature distinguishes between constitutive (during speaking) and consequential harms (Maitra and McGowan, 2012), namely, between harms that are occasioned in the saying of a hate speech act, and harms that occur as a result of it.

Consequential harms can occur in four ways (Maitra and McGowan, 2012b, p. 6);

- persuading hearers to believe negative stereotypes that lead them to engage in other harmful conduct;
- shaping the preferences of hearers so that they come to be persuaded of negative stereotypes;
- conditioning the environment so that expressing negative stereotypes and carrying out further discrimination become (often unconsciously) normalized;
- causing hearers to imitate the behaviour.

On an individual scale, it is established that there are psycho-physiological effects of hate speech such as that "the immediate, short-term harms of hate speech include rapid breathing, headaches, raised blood pressure, dizziness, rapid pulse rate, drugtaking, risk-taking behavior, and even suicide". As discussed earlier, research examined the effect of stereotype threat on physiological functions revealed similar findings. The psychological harm of hate speech also includes fear, nightmares, and withdrawal of the targeted individual or group from society. Research studied the effects of racial discrimination and hate speech, believe that such speech affects children and youthful targets more than adults (Bakircioglu,2008).

A.3. Counter-hate speech

In the context of hate speech in sport there is a conundrum on how regulatory frameworks operating in sport, including the law, can effectively deliver healthy environment, substantive measures and act as a social tool to bring about positive change. Regulations might be set both by the relevant sports-based disciplinary procedures and through legal interventions.

3.1. Counter- Hate speech policies

They provide a workable framework within which the complex dynamics of the coach–athlete relationship can be explored and a better understanding of the experiences of the elite child athlete can be developed. Future research is needed to build upon this with a view to establishing sport-specific theory to understand the unique issues in this context.

ECRI addresses policy recommendation that focuses on the phenomenon of hate speech and the damaging consequences of its use for individuals, certain groups of persons and society as a whole. These consequences have been noted particularly in the course of ECRI's country monitoring but are more generally appreciated.

The Recommendation thus sets out ECRI's understanding of what constitutes hate speech and identifies the measures that can and need to be taken to combat its use. In so doing, it builds upon and strengthens certain aspects of General Policy Recommendations

- Ratifications, reservations and recourse
- Causes and extent awareness and counter-speech
- Raising awareness and counter-speech
- Support for those targeted
- Self-regulation
- Media and the Internet
- Administrative and civil liability
- Administrative and other sanctions against organisations
- Criminal liability and sanctions

Preventive measures pointed out in recommendations are as follow;

- identifying the conditions conducive to the use of hate speech as a phenomenon and the different forms it takes, as well as to measure its extent and the harm that it causes, with a view to discouraging and preventing its use and to reducing and remedying the harm caused, (e.g. developing tools, monitoring and gathering data, support research to develop strategies to tackle the use of hate speech)
- raising public awareness and to discourage and prevent (the use of such speech, (actions includes; promote a better understanding of the need for diversity, facilitate and exemplify intercultural dialogue; combat misinformation, negative stereotyping and stigmatisation; develop specific educational programmes for children, young persons, public officials and the general public and strengthen the competence of teachers and educators to deliver them;
- provide support for those targeted by hate speech both individually and collectively, (e.g. to help them, through counselling and guidance, to cope with any trauma and feeling of shame suffered; ensure that they are aware of their rights to redress through administrative, civil and criminal proceedings and are not prevented from exercising them through fear, ignorance, physical or emotional obstacles or lack of means; encourage and facilitate their reporting of the use of hate speech, as well as the reporting of it by others who witness such use;

- provide support for self-regulation by public and private institutions (eg. encourage the adoption of appropriate codes of conduct which provide for suspension and other sanctions; support appropriate training as to the meaning and negative effects of hate speech, as well as about the ways in which its use can be challenged; promote the monitoring of misinformation, negative stereotyping and stigmatization; promote and assist the establishment of complaints mechanisms)
- other measures relevant to civil and administrative law and sanctions

3.2. Best Practices

Manuals:

www.nohatespeechmovement.org : The No Hate Speech Movement campaign stands for equality, dignity, human rights and diversity. It is a project against hate speech, racism and discrimination in their online expression. The Campaign is against the expressions of hate speech online in all its forms, including those, which most affect young people, such as forms of cyber-bullying and cyber-hate. The Campaign is based on human rights education, youth participation and media literacy. It aims at reducing hate speech, combating racism and discrimination in their online expression and contributes to the prevention and rejection of all forms of violent extremism.

Manual Bookmarks - A manual for combating hate speech online through human rights education (Revised edition) (2016) . It was published to support the “No Hate Speech Movement” youth campaign of the Council of Europe for human rights online.

Education and trainings:

EU: Coach Learn Project: (www.coachlearn.eu) This initiative and the establishment of the European Sport Coaching : Framework contribute to the education, mobility and employability of coaches. Sport and education play a key role in building active citizenship. In this regard, the coach’s role is not just to teach technical skills, but also to educate and promote values, solidarity and respect. As the people who are often the closest to our youngest generations, coaches can effectively contribute to a better and more inclusive society.

3.3. Role of education:

Sport is often seen to be a 'social workshop', within which young athletes will learn pro-social behaviour spontaneously and where coaches should guide them towards ethically correct reflection (De Martelaer and Struyven, 2012). Many factors and competing demands influence the interpersonal interactions in youth sport and especially in competitive sport. These include the behavior of (child) athletes and their parents, the focus of staff members (managers or those responsible for policy and coaches) and the reactions of parents and spectators (De Martelaer and Vertommen, 2008). Each of these interpersonal and organizational elements can affect the decision-making of those involved and lead to actions that can be labelled as 'unethical' and sometimes even as 'unlawful' (Livingston 2010).

Coaching should involve fostering pro-social behaviour, help individuals to develop physical literacy and empathy, and contribute towards developing socially appropriate interaction with others. To achieve this learning the coach has to be trained in relevant content and teaching strategies.

Pro-social behaviours in sport are defined as being behaviour intended to benefit another individual or group of individuals.

Over the past decade national and international organizations have paid increasing attention and commitment to promoting ethically sound sport, focusing on specific problems associated with youth sport, codes of conduct, campaigns on fair play, and the identification and exchanging of good practices in youth sport policy. According to Livingston (2010), this is due to limited formal training in ethics and, subsequently, the limited knowledge base for those who are central to fostering ethical practice in youth sport. This includes athletes, coaches, medical and other officials, and those involved in management and business. While there is a significant amount of philosophical literature on sport ethics there is far less on pedagogical applications.

Because of the importance of interaction between the individual and the organization, De Martelaer and Struyven (2012) recommend using an ecological approach in order to have a complete picture of the relevant content of pro-social behaviour in youth sport. An ecological model emphasizes the importance of considering multiple levels of influence and the influence of the environment on behavior (Ward et al. 2007). Table 1 is inspired by Ward et al.(2007), and is used to describe strategies/interventions and for research on pro-social behaviour in youth sport. It is provided as a way of summarizing key issues at different levels in order to illustrate the importance of multi-level approaches.

When reflecting on the ideal content for the education and training of professionals and volunteers in youth sport, it is helpful to screen the daily practice of these different levels in combination with the existing research in coaching. Because of the impact of the coach and the environment, illustrations will be given of the interpersonal and organizational influences and the community level. Taking into account the research domain covering relevant topics, lessons can focus on philosophical and historical issues, behavioural codes, verbal and non-verbal communication, respecting rules and techniques, campaigns and good practices, laws and decrees (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Content of learning to teach sport ethics related to the scientific subject in sport sciences (De Martelaer and Struyven, 2012).


	Content	Scientific subject in movement sciences	
Individual – interpersonal	Individual, developmental approach	Sport psychology	
	Rules, techniques, teaching methods, interaction, communication	Sport pedagogy, movement education	
	Phenomenological, philosophical thinking, historical aspects	Sport philosophy, sport history	
Organization policy	Cultural, situational, contextual	Sport sociology	
	Structures, campaigns, policy, management	Sport policy management	
	Justice, official declarations and regulations	Sport law	

Table 1. An ecological approach influencing learning pro-social behaviour
in youth sport (Ward et al. 2007)

<i>Influences on pro-social behaviour (constructs from theories)</i>	<i>Increased pro-social behaviour comes when:</i>
<p><i>Individual</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – self-efficacy and competence (actual and perceived) – expectations (including perceived benefits and barriers) – intentions to be physically literate, with empathy and effective interpersonal interaction – behaviour, interpersonal skills and capability <p><i>Interpersonal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – social environment (including modelling and observational learning) – social support/social network – social influences/approaches <p><i>Organizational</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – organizational change – policies <p><i>Community/policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inter-organizational relations – community development – advocacy approaches 	<p><i>Individuals:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – have confidence in their ability to be literate sportspersons with empathy and effective interpersonal interaction with peers and adults – expect benefits from being socially engaged – intend to be literate sportspersons – have the behavioural skills needed to become and stay socially engaged <p><i>Significant others:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – friends are active together with empathy and effective interpersonal interaction – family provides support (such as emphasis on ethically sound sport) – adults support, encourage, and model socially engaged physical literacy; youth sport instruction is designed to develop behavioural skills for pro-social behaviour <p><i>Organizations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – youth sport programmes are modified to increase individual learning possibilities of pro-social behaviour as (1) participant and (2) practitioner with a guiding role (referee, coach, organizer ...) – have policies that support the active use of codes of conduct for coaches, parents, officials, managers ... – staff are skilled at stimulating pro-social behaviour – information on preventive policy for athlete protection is available for the general public – organizations are responsible for protection of youth athletes (report and follow-up of maltreatment and abuse) <p><i>Community/policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – image of sport competitions and communication in the media – national and international cooperation on expertise in sport ethics – organizational collaboration among all stakeholders protecting children's rights

B. INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

4.1.UN documents addressing hate speech in sports

Many of the Recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and the Recommendations and Resolutions of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe have been concerned with particular forms of hate speech, such as aggressive nationalism, extremism, neo-Nazism, ethnocentrism and racial hatred. Others have focused on those targeted against specific groups of persons, such as those concerned with anti-Gypsyism, antisemitism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, homo/transphobia, migrant status and religious affiliation. Some others have addressed its use in particular contexts, notably, in cyberspace, online media, political discourse and video games.

The topic of hate speech and discrimination was always a matter of concern both for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, in particular, in the case of sports events, since the adoption of the T-RV Convention. Also bearing in mind the ECHR and the Spectator Violence Convention, the Committee of Minister adopted several relevant documents on this topic, namely:

- Recommendation N° R (97) 20 to member States on “hate speech”;
- Resolution No. 4 on preventing racism, xenophobia and intolerance in sport adopted at the 9th Conference of European Ministers responsible for Sport in Bratislava in May 2000; and
- Recommendation Rec(2001)6 to member States on the prevention of racism, xenophobia and racial intolerance in sport.

Resolution 2276 (2019) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and the Report Entitled “Stop hate speech and acts of hatred in sport”, the Resolution calls on the Council of Europe Member States as well as on sports federations and other sports organizations to adopt policies and procedures aiming at effectively preventing and tackling racism and other discriminatory behavior related with sport.. More specifically, Item 10 in the Resolution 2276 calls on the Council of Europe member States to promote research and data collection on hate speech with following statement;

“In the light of these considerations, the Assembly calls on the Council of Europe member States to:

10.1. promote research and data collection on hate speech and hate crime in the sports environment. Data should be comparable and disaggregated by geographic location, sport, victim and perpetrator – distinguishing between athletes (professional and amateur) and spectators – and the grounds of discrimination”

This report highlights the need of i) better identifying the problem, ii) developing holistic, collaborative and educational pedagogical approaches, iii) promoting awareness; In this regard, Resolution 2276 calls on States to:

- "conduct awareness-raising campaigns targeting the general public on the dangers posed by hate speech, the reporting mechanisms available and the importance of countering impunity by reporting incidents";
- “integrate sports ethics into school curricula, in the framework of citizenship education”; and
- “encourage media to provide pluralistic, unbiased information on athletes, particularly those most exposed to hatred, and their performance, and to report accurately and without bias on hate speech incidents and hate crimes”.

The Assembly also makes two very concrete recommendations, in particular:

- “appoint outstanding athletes as “ambassadors for equality and non-discrimination”, and
- “require all players to formally commit to refraining from hate speech and manifestations of hatred and intolerance”.

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) : The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) is a unique human rights monitoring body which specializes in questions relating to the fight against racism, discrimination (on grounds of “race”, ethnic/national origin, color, citizenship, religion, language, sexual orientation and gender identity), xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance in Europe.

In its country monitoring work ECRI analyses the situation closely in each of the member states and makes recommendations for dealing with any problems of racism and intolerance identified there. A

country visit is organized before the preparation of each new report in order to obtain as comprehensive a picture as possible of the situation in the country.

ECRI issues General Policy Recommendations (GPRs) addressed to the governments of all member states. These recommendations provide guidelines which policy-makers are invited to use when drawing up national strategies and policies.

Two important ECRI General Policy Recommendations are relevant on the subjects of hate speech, racism and racial discrimination in sport:

- ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 12, on combating racism and racial discrimination in the field of sport, adopted on 19 December 2008; and
- ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 15, on combating Hate Speech, adopted on 8 December 2015.

General Policy Recommendation No. 15 defines hate speech as follows: it is based on the unjustified assumption that a person or a group of persons are superior to others; and it incites acts of violence or discrimination, thus undermining respect for minority groups and damaging social cohesion. ECRI recommends the following measures:

- rapid reactions from public figures to hate speech
- promotion of self-regulation of media
- raising awareness on the dangerous consequences of hate speech
- withdrawing financial and other support from political parties that actively use hate speech
- criminalizing its most extreme manifestations, while respecting freedom of expression

Moreover, ECRI recalls that anti-hate speech measures must be well-founded, proportionate, non-discriminatory, and not be misused to curb freedom of expression or assembly nor to suppress criticism of official policies, political opposition and religious beliefs.

ECRI's concrete recommendations are notably:

- ensuring that adequate legal provisions are in place to combat racial discrimination and to penalise racist acts; and

- providing training to the police to enable them to identify, deal with and prevent racist behaviour at sporting events.

As regards the legal framework, Member States are called to enact specific legislation against racism and racial discrimination in sport, based on the following principles: security regulations should allow police and security to stop, report and document racist behaviour; and sports clubs and federations should be held responsible for racist acts.

The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) publishes and regularly updates important compilations of case law on different topics, notably on sports safety security and service hate speech in general, which deserves the attention of all stakeholders:

- https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Sport_ENG.pdf
- https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Hate_speech_ENG.pdf.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING, INHIBITING HATE SPEECH IN SPORTS

The comparisons of national and international sport environments in which hate speech occurs will tell us more about potential cultural variability, risk factors, and differences in the dynamics and characteristics of the incidents reported.

A systematic review of cases of hate speech in sport settings will not only broaden our knowledge about the nature and impact of the incidents being described and victim and hate speaker or perpetrator characteristics but also provide us with information on current situation in organized sport and legal procedures and consequences. This will benefit the development of new and improvement of ineffective prevention policies. Comparisons of national and international sport environments in which hate speak occurs will tell us more about potential cultural variability, risk factors, and differences in characteristics of the incidents reported. A better understanding of its causes and consequences will enable us to draft targeted interventions and alter the behaviour. Further scientific scrutiny of the beneficial effects of sports may encourage sport administrators to get more involved in both preventive and promotional strategies towards hate speech.

Within a pluralistic model of regulation, the law has a part to play alongside sporting rules and sports-related policies that have developed to engage with manifestations of abusive behaviors in sport (Gardiner, 2015). Non-legal models such as conciliation, with the emphasis on consensus, victim empowerment, awareness and education campaigns for the abuser, can be argued as being more successful in bringing about positive and enduring change in culture and attitudes.

Vertommen (2017) provides shortlist of recommendations that can help sport organisations to improve their prevention strategies.

1. A broadly framed policy strategy aimed at the prevention of all integrity threats in sport is essential. Evidence shows that there is substantial overlap between the various types of IV perpetrated against athletes (Chapter 4). The ICES policy pyramid in which actions are taken at three different levels (Chapter 7) gives a comprehensive overview and provides sport organisations with user-friendly tools to start up the policy-making and implementation process. Actions are best implemented top down as well as bottom up. As our and previous studies point out, subgroups that are particularly vulnerable due to disability, ethnicity, sexual orientation and high performance level require special attention. Considering the prevalence of IV against children in general society, some young athletes will have been victimised outside sport who are thus most at risk of (re-)experiencing IV in the sport setting as well. Using the beneficial and protective effects of sport, sport organisations can teach these children that protection within their club can continue outside sport. A policy vision aimed at improving the quality of interactions among all stakeholders as well as pro- and reactive measures will not only benefit the athletes but also the coaches and others involved in the sport organisation.

2. A contextualised monitoring and evaluation framework set up in collaboration with researchers will be helpful for sport organisations to monitor the use, implementation and effects of newly implemented initiatives as well as the feelings, attitudes, hesitations and objections in the people who are in charge of implementing the intervention. By finding out what works and what does not and why some approaches are effective and others not, individual organisations can adjust their strategies in a timely manner. Each approach and its effects can then significantly contribute to the wider evidence base.

3. Networks within and outside the sport sector are vital to acquire know-how and share experiences, practices, pitfalls and ideas. IV is a complex, multifaceted issue and, as the knowledge

of (volunteering) sport administrators about legislations, regulations and psychological care is commonly limited, it is crucial to seek and exploit the expertise of experts on child protection outside sport. By building networks with other sport actors, both nationally and internationally, good practices can be exchanged, which can enhance an organisation's competence. European funding provides an excellent opportunity to link up with foreign organisations. Teaming up with specialists in child maltreatment, protection and safeguarding from outside the sport context will enable sport administrators to learn from the experiences of and effective approaches in other sectors and to translate relevant good practices into their specific contexts and thus improve their own approach to IV prevention.

4. Child protection and safeguarding should become common ground in sport, which can be achieved by:

- a. educating and training (aspiring) sport leaders on the prevalence, risk factors, dynamics, and impact of IV against child athletes;
- b. implementing a minimum set of mandatory measures in every sports organisation and linking this with a positive stimulus such as the promise of extra funding or a quality label;
- c. setting up an ethical commission, an incident reporting system as well as a detailed complaint procedure, prescribed in the organisations' disciplinary law;
- d. encouraging athletes to speak up about negative experiences in sport. Athletes can only be candid if they know that they will be heard and taken seriously. To promote reporting, it is crucial to create a local, low-threshold contact point with an expert back office as well as alternative communication channels, such as an online chat service to be developed in collaboration with children and young people. A viable but comprehensive data collection tool should be adopted or developed to support adequate service delivery as well as scientific research;
- e. and, finally, there is an ongoing need for continued positively framed awareness-raising campaigns targeting different audiences and types of IV.

Case study : Awareness raising targeting coaches:

In addition to their core role, coaches contribute to the development of athletes as people and in today's landscape, coaches work with increasingly diverse populations and face heightening demands

from their athletes, their athletes' parents, administrators and fans. Coaches are required to fulfil a variety of roles, such as educator, guide, sport psychologist and business manager. At higher levels of competition, coaches are asked to emphasize positive interaction and overall development of athletes rather than simply the win-loss record. Ahlberg et al. (2007) conducted a study involved an Action Research (AR) methodology to create a greater awareness of practices in the participant coach, who was keen to develop his coaching. The authors followed the AR design that encouraged the coach to reflect on his practice through analysis of video footage, his own field notes, and the field notes of both the critical friend and an observer. Based on the increase in his own understanding of his practices and their impact on his players the participant coach sought to make some changes to his coaching behaviors. The data collection and review, planning, action, assessment and evaluation, and review stages were employed to manage the coach's reflection process. The study suggest such an approach can be beneficial in: (a) increasing a coaches' awareness of own and players' behaviors; (b) developing a systematic coach review process - with information from varying sources-that promotes coach development; the coach reported an increase in awareness of his own coaching practices, and of the player's subsequent responses to them. This finding supports previous research (e.g., Kidman and Carlson, 1998) that also found coaches reported an increased awareness of their coaching practices, which is the first step in behavior change (Ahlberg et al.,2007) .

REFERENCES

- Ahlberg, M., Mallett, C. J., & Tinning, R. (2007). *Developing autonomy supportive coaching behaviours: An action research approach to coach development*. University of Queensland.
- Ahlberg, M., Mallett, C. J., & Tinning, R. (2007). *Developing autonomy supportive coaching behaviours: An action research approach to coach development*. University of Queensland.
- Alexander, K., Stafford, A., & Lewis, R. (2011). *The experiences of children participating in organised sport in the UK*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Aronson, J., Burgess, D., Phelan, S. M., & Juarez, L. (2013). Unhealthy interactions: The role of stereotype threat in health disparities. *American journal of public health, 103*(1), 50-56.
- Aronson, J., Lustina, M. J., Good, C., Keough, K., Steele, C. M., & Brown, J. (1999). When white men can't do math: Necessary and sufficient factors in stereotype threat. *Journal of experimental social psychology, 35*(1), 29-46.
- Bakircioglu, O. (2008). Freedom of expression and hate speech. *Tulsa J. Comp. & Int'l L.*, 16, 1.
- Beilock, S. L., & McConnell, A. R. (2004). Stereotype threat and sport: Can athletic performance be threatened?. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 26*(4), 597-609.
- Blascovich, J., Spencer, S. J., Quinn, D., & Steele, C. (2001). African Americans and high blood pressure: The role of stereotype threat. *Psychological science, 12*(3), 225-229.
- Borgeson, K., & Valeri, R. (2004). Faces of hate. *Journal of Applied Sociology, (2)*, 99-111.
- Bowker, A., Boekhoven, B., Nolan, A., Bauhaus, S., Glover, P., Powell, T., & Taylor, S. (2009). Naturalistic observations of spectator behaviour at youth hockey games. *The Sport Psychologist, 23*, 301-316.
- Brown, A. (2017). What is hate speech? Part 1: The myth of hate. *Law and Philosophy, 36*(4), 419-468.
- Cleland, J. (2014). Racism, football fans, and online message boards: How social media has added a new dimension to racist discourse in English football. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 38*(5), 415-431.
- Cowan, G., Resendez, M., Marshall, E., & Quist, R. (2002). Hate speech and constitutional protection: Priming values of equality and freedom. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(2), 247-263.
- Smolla, R. A. (1993). *Free speech in an open society*. Vintage.
- Council of Europe. Parliamentary Assembly. Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination. Resolution 2276 Stop hate speech and acts of hatred in sport. (Doc. 14842 18/03/2019) <https://pace.coe.int/en/files/27479>
- DeFrancesco, C., & Johnson, P. (1997). Athlete and parent perceptions in junior tennis. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 20*(1), 29-36.
- De Martelaer, K., & Struyven, J. D. B. K. (2012). Youth sport ethics: Teaching pro-social behaviour. In *Ethics in Youth Sport* (pp. 69-87). Routledge.
- De Martelaer, K. and Vertommen, T. (2008) 'Youth sport children's rights in Flanders, International', in Y. Vanden Auweele, K. De Martelaer, M. Maes and T. Vertommen (eds) *Ethics Management in Youth Sport Implementation of the Panathlon Declaration. Strategies and Good Practices*, cd-rom, 5-7 November. Ghent: PVLO
- Eccles, J., & Harold, R. (1993). Parent-school involvement during the early adolescent years. *Teachers College Record, 94*(3), 568-587.
- Elliott, S. K., & Drummond, M. J. (2017). Parents in youth sport: what happens after the game?. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(3), 391-406.
- Ellie, K., & Mara, G. (2004). *Bookmarks—A manual for combating hate speech online through human rights education*.
- Elendu, I. C., & Umeakuka, O. A. (2011). Perpetrators of sexual harassment experiences by athletes in southern Nigerian universities. *South African Journal for Research in Sport Physical Education and Recreation, 33*(1), 53-63. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajrs.v33i1.65486>
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2004). Parental Influences on Youth Involvement in Sports. In M. R. Weiss (Ed.), *Developmental sport and exercise psychology: A lifespan perspective*

- Garbarino, J. (1978). The elusive “crime” of emotional abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 2(2), 89-99.
- Gardiner, S. (2015). Disciplinary provisions for hate speech in football: comparative perspectives. *Sport in Society*, 18(5), 552-564.
- Gervis, M., & Dunn, N. (2004). The emotional abuse of elite child athletes by their coaches. *Child Abuse Review: Journal of the British Association for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect*, 13(3), 215-223.
- Gelber, K., & McNamara, L. (2016). Evidencing the harms of hate speech. *Social Identities*, 22(3), 324-341.
- Glaser, D., & Prior, V. (1997). Is the term child protection applicable to emotional abuse?. *Child Abuse Review: Journal of the British Association for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect*, 6(5), 315-329.
- Glaser, D. (2011). How to deal with emotional abuse and neglect—Further development of a conceptual framework (FRAMEA). *Child abuse & neglect*, 35(10), 866-875.
- Gündüz, N., Sunay, H., & Koz, M. (2007). Incidents of sexual harassment in Turkey on elite sportswomen. *The Sport Journal*, (10), 1–10. Retrieved from
- Hart, D., Atkins, R. and Ford, D. (1998) ‘UrbanAmerica as a context for the development of moral identity in adolescence’, *Journal of Social Issues*, 54: 513–30.
- Heinze, E., & Phillipson, G. (2016). *Debating hate speech*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Heinze, E. (2013). Hate speech and the normative foundations of regulation. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 9(4), 590-617.
- Hendel, J. (2014). *Crime and Punishment Through the Lens of Professional Sports: An Empirical Study of Racial Stereotyping*.
- Kidman, L., McKenzie, A., & McKenzie, B. (1999). The nature and target of parents’ comments during youth sport competitions. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22(1), 54–68.
- Holt, N. L., Tamminen, K. A., Black, D. E., Sehn, Z. L., & Wall, M. P. (2008). Parental involvement in competitive youth sport settings. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, 663–685.
- Inzlicht, M., & Kang, S. K. (2010). Stereotype threat spillover: how coping with threats to social identity affects aggression, eating, decision making, and attention. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(3), 467.
- Jamieson, J. P., & Harkins, S. G. (2007). Mere effort and stereotype threat performance effects. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 93(4), 544.
- Johns M, Inzlicht M, Schmader T. Stereotype threat and executive resource depletion: examining the influence of emotion regulation. *J Exp Psychol Gen*. 2008;137(4):691–70
- Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Livingston, E. (2010) ‘Sport ethics – An oxymoron?’, *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 13S: e87
- Massey, D. S., & Fischer, M. J. (2005). Stereotype threat and academic performance: New findings from a racially diverse sample of college freshmen. *Du bois review: Social science research on race*, 2(1), 45-67.
- Martins, R., Gomes, M., Almeida, J. J., Novais, P., & Henriques, P. (2018, October). Hate speech classification in social media using emotional analysis. In *2018 7th Brazilian Conference on Intelligent Systems (BRACIS)* (pp. 61-66). IEEE.
- Omli, J., & LaVoi, N. M. (2009). Background anger in youth sport: A perfect storm? *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 32, 242–260.
- Rieger, D., Kümpel, A. S., Wich, M., Kiening, T., & Groh, G. (2021). Assessing the Extent and Types of Hate Speech in Fringe Communities: A Case Study of Alt-Right Communities on 8chan, 4chan, and Reddit. *Social Media+ Society*, 7(4), 20563051211052906.
- Sage, L., Kavussanu, M. and Duda, J. (2006) ‘Goal orientations and moral identity as predictors of and antisocial functioning in male association football players’, *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 24(5): 455–66.
- Stone, J., Chalabaev, A., & Harrison, C. K. (2012). The impact of stereotype threat on performance in sports. In M. Inzlicht & T. Schmader (Eds.), *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application* (pp. 217–230). Oxford University Press.

Stassen Berger, K. (2007). Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental Review*, 27(1), 90–126.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2006.08.002>

Schmader, T., Johns, M., & Forbes, C. (2008). An integrated process model of stereotype threat effects on performance. *Psychological review*, 115(2), 336.

Stone, J., Lynch, C. I., Sjomeling, M., & Darley, J. M. (1999). Stereotype threat effects on black and white athletic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1213-1227.

Tapper, K., & Boulton, M. J. (2005). Victim and peer group responses to different forms of aggression among primary school children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31(3), 238–253.

Vertommen, T. (2017). Interpersonal violence against children in sport. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium*. Retrieved from: www.publicatie-online.nl/publicaties/t-vertommen.

Vertommen, T., Schipper-van Veldhoven, N., Wouters, K., Kampen, J. K., Brackenridge, C. H., Rhind, D. J., ... & Van Den Eede, F. (2016). Interpersonal violence against children in sport in the Netherlands and Belgium. *Child abuse & neglect*, 51, 223-236.

Ward, D. A., Saunders, R. P. and Pate, R. R. (2007) *Physical Activity Interventions in Children and Adolescents*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

VOCABULARY

“discrimination” : any differential treatment based on a ground such as “race”, colour, language, religion, nationality or national or ethnic origin, as well as descent, belief, sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics;

“denigration” : the attack on the capacity, character or reputation of one or more persons in connection with their membership of a particular group of persons;

“gender”: the socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for women and men;

“negative stereotyping” : the application to a member or members of a group of persons of an generalised belief about the characteristics of those belonging to that group that involves viewing all of them in a poor light regardless of the particular characteristics of the member or members specifically concerned;

“racism” : the belief that a ground such as “race”, colour, language, religion, nationality or national or ethnic origin justifies contempt for a person or a group of persons, or the notion of superiority

“homophobia” : prejudice against, hatred towards, or fear of homosexuality or of people who are identified or perceived as being bisexual, gay, lesbian or transgender;

“hostility” : a manifestation of hatred beyond a mere state of mind

“stigmatisation” : the labelling of a group of persons in a negative way;

“trivialisation” : the making of something seem unimportant or insignificant;

“vilification” : the abusive criticism of one or more persons in connection with their membership of a particular group of persons;

“violence” : the use of physical force or power against another person, or against a group or community, which either results in, or has a high likelihood of resulting in, injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation

“xenophobia” : prejudice against, hatred towards, or fear of people from other countries or cultures.

“vulnerable groups” : those groups who are particularly the object of hate speech, which will vary according to national circumstances but are likely to include asylum seekers and refugees, other immigrants and migrants, Black and Jewish communities, Muslims, Roma/Gypsies, as well as other religious, historical, ethnic and linguistic minorities and LGBT persons; in particular it shall include children and young persons belonging to such groups;

“youth” : children, child athletes refer to the age category from 7 to 18 years old.



Project Partners



USMA CASELLE ASD



ROSTO SOLIDARIO



HACCETEPE UNIVERSITY



AMATEUR SPORT LEAGUE



FAN ASSOCIATION "GENTLEMEN"



KEAN



CA' FOSCARI UNIVERSITY OF VENICE



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

For more details:
visit [www.https://rights.usmacaselle.org](https://rights.usmacaselle.org)