

Whistleblowing of bullying in professional football: to report or not to report?

NEWMAN, James <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4957-836X>>, Warburton, Victoria E. and Russell, Kate

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/29990/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

NEWMAN, James, Warburton, Victoria E. and Russell, Kate (2022). Whistleblowing of bullying in professional football: to report or not to report? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 61. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

Whistleblowing of bullying in professional football: To report or not to report?

Despite the claim that professional football (or soccer) clubs take “safeguarding extremely seriously,” and provide “significant reporting mechanisms” for raising concerns, recent allegations have highlighted that staff have been unable to disclose abusive and bullying behavior (BBC, 2018, 2021a). This inability to “blow the whistle” may partly be explained by the normalization of abusive and intimidatory practices in professional football (Kelly & Waddington, 2006), which often leads to feelings of anxiety, isolation, and occupational uncertainty (Parker & Manley, 2016). Worryingly, the football industry assumes players will avoid expressing discomfort with practices such as abuse and bullying, due to their lack of status within their organizations (Parker & Manley, 2016).

The lack of whistleblowing of bullying is a concern, as bullying leads to higher levels of burnout, physical symptoms of stress, turnover intention, and lower levels of subjective wellbeing in the workplace (Hewett et al., 2018; Verkuil et al., 2015). In sport, bullying leads to feelings of lowered self-esteem, isolation from teammates, and other mental health issues (Jewett et al., 2019). Despite these concerns, sporting organizations have highlighted how they often do not have policies to address bullying or deal with sensitive whistleblowing cases around harassment and abuse (Verschuuren, 2021). Furthermore, despite recent examples of research being undertaken that explores whistleblowing experiences of bullying in the workplace (Park et al., 2020), to our knowledge, there remains no study of this within elite sporting contexts such as professional football. This is alarming, given that bullying can often be “celebrated” in this context (Parker, 1996) which may reinforce the “code of silence” that some in football have suggested acts as a barrier to reporting wrongdoing (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020). Therefore, the present study sought to explore the lived experiences of whistleblowing within the professional football context.

Defining Whistleblowing

Whistleblowing is defined as “the disclosure by organization members (former or current) of illegal, immoral or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers, to persons or organizations who may be able to effect action” (Near & Miceli, 1985, p. 4). This definition can be further categorized into internal and external whistleblowing (Verschuuren, 2020). As Verschuuren (2020) summarized, internal whistleblowing covers reporting through systems that have been formally instructed by the organization itself to manage these allegations, even if reporting is situated outside of the organization. Using professional football in the United Kingdom (UK) as an example, this could be through official channels such as the Professional Footballers’ Association (PFA). External whistleblowing by contrast occurs through reports to parties that are not tasked by the organization concerned with managing these complaints, for example, the media (Verschuuren, 2020). To date, while some sporting organizations have set up internal whistleblowing reporting procedures to safeguard their participants, others have not (Verschuuren, 2021). Furthermore, disclosures made by athletes to these systems are problematic when allegations revolve around institutional corruption, harassment, and abuse (Verschuuren, 2020). For the whistleblower, internal whistleblowing poses potential risks around ostracism, threats, and career damage (Miceli et al., 2008).

The Drivers of Whistleblowing

While research on whistleblowing in sport is sparse (Erickson et al., 2017), findings in organizational literature conceptualize a range of individual, contextual and organizational determinants of this behavior (Verschuuren, 2020). On an individual level, reporting wrongdoing appears to revolve around aspects such as moral identity, organizational power and status, and organizational commitment or identification (Alleyne, 2016; Fieger & Rice Bridget, 2018; Zhou et al., 2018). Those with stronger moral and ethical values, who hold greater status and power within an organization are more likely to whistleblow, although no

single profile of a whistleblower exists (Verschuuren, 2020). Though this profile does not exist, an individual's perceived status within the stratified hierarchy of power proposed by Foucault (1977) may help understand potential whistleblowing in sport. Foucault's (1977) propositions on disciplinary power may be important here, as individuals may feel they have little power to speak out about culturally accepted wrongdoing within the wider culture of professional football. These propositions, coupled with the micro-political perspective in sport (Gibson & Groom, 2018) whereby individuals' central concern is with their professional self-interests (e.g., selection on the team), may also drive the degree to which individuals whistleblow in this context.

From a contextual standpoint, whistleblowing of negative behavior is more likely if the evidence is available for the observer, such as frequent, intentional, and noticeable acts of serious harm (Chen & Lai, 2014; Keil et al., 2018; Miceli et al., 2012). In sport, this may make reporting wrongdoing problematic, as this type of evidence may not be available. Also, behaviors such as bullying, do not conform to established definitions of this concept in sport. For example, bullying in football has been found to result from "one-off" acts which do not necessarily carry an intent to harm (Newman et al., 2021). In contrast, Olewus' (1993, p.8) much-cited definition of bullying highlights the repetitive, intentional nature of this "negative action which inflicts injury and discomfort on another." Thus the targeted view of bullying, in the workplace literature (e.g., Sprigg et al., 2019), contradicts findings in sport where participants are unaware that their behavior is abusive (Stirling, 2013). This raises questions about the degree to which bullying is noticeable. Even if sporting participants are aware of these negative practices, they are often bound by a "code of silence" where they suppress deviant, unethical behaviors for the "benefit" of their group or organization (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020). This has been described as a form of intense organizational loyalty (Adler & Adler, 1988). The result is that individuals may end up trading the morality of fairness (e.g.,

what is seen as right irrespective of the individuals in the situation) for the morality of loyalty, where they avoid whistleblowing to safeguard individuals or their sporting group (Erickson et al., 2019).

Organizational variables relate to whether a whistleblower perceives an ethical climate or culture, and the subjective norms around the social pressure to engage in whistleblowing (Verschuuren, 2020). For example, an organizational culture supporting and protecting potential whistleblowers encourages whistleblowing intention and behavior (Alinaghian et al., 2018; Cho & Song, 2015). In other workplaces, individuals may receive greater bullying resulting from whistleblowing (Park et al., 2020). Initial findings in sport appear to corroborate this finding, as whistleblowing schemes often do not protect whistleblowers and instead leave them vulnerable to greater harassment (Verschuuren, 2021). This effect may be exacerbated in the potentially volatile context of professional football, where players are already expected to “put up” with excessive banter and derogation (Parker, 2006), meaning they may be even less likely to report their concerns for fear of retribution.

Reporting Welfare Concerns in Sport

To date research in sport has tended to focus on how whistleblowing is reported, the consequences and emotions of reporting, as well as the cultural barriers against this behavior (Erickson et al., 2017; Erickson et al., 2019; Moriconi & de Cima, 2020). While these sources provide an important contribution to whistleblowing research in sport, they have tended to focus on areas such as doping, match-fixing, and corruption, rather than abusive and bullying behaviors. This is an important limitation given issues have recently been highlighted within reporting systems for safeguarding concerns relating to abuse (G. Kerr & Stirling, 2019). Despite interventions in the form of online manuals and educational programs to prevent maltreatment of athletes (R. Kerr & Kerr, 2020) and a global strategy to safeguard children against abuse in sport, policies can be seen as reactionary and tokenistic in their response to

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

safeguarding (Rhind & Owusu-Sekyere, 2020). This mirrors findings in professional football, where even with the introduction of Education and Welfare officers (Brackenridge et al., 2004), players still do not engage with safeguarding programs (Parker & Manley, 2016). Here, safeguarding programs may highlight a paradox where the risks a whistleblower might face are highlighted to the players in situ (Verschuuren, 2020). This challenges the view that education around whistleblowing promotes a rise in reporting of wrongdoing (Caillier, 2017). The risks individuals face may be even more pertinent to team sports where initial findings suggest participants face a moral dilemma, compared to individual athletes, around reporting teammates and are more likely to adhere to a code of silence to protect them (Whitaker et al., 2014).

In summary, research has tended not to focus on whistleblowing as a contextually and socially bound behavior (Verschuuren, 2020). To this end, men's professional football appears to be an ideal context to explore experiences of whistleblowing of behaviors such as abuse and bullying. Football's legitimization of abusive behaviors (Kelly & Waddington, 2006), as well as its inherent power differentials around bullying (Newman et al., 2021), may create vastly different experiences of whistleblowing depending on where individuals fit within their club's hierarchy. Furthermore, the sense for footballers that they need to align their values to their club for the sake of the collective organization (Parker & Manley, 2016), raises questions around the degree to which whistleblowing is possible in this context.

Therefore, the present study answered an important call to explore whistleblowing in climates where power differentials exist and where the perception of support (or not) within an individual's organization shapes reporting (Verschuuren, 2020). Specifically, our study aimed to explore professional footballers' individual lived experiences and perceptions of whistleblowing of bullying, within the professional football context. Through utilizing Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) our study unearthed the individually

nuanced (J. A. Smith et al., 2017) nature of professional footballers' lived experiences of whistleblowing. The focus on perceptions of whistleblowing also aligned with IPA's appropriateness for identifying how individuals view situations they encounter (Reis et al., 2021). Furthermore, as whistleblowing is individually and contextually determined (Verschuuren, 2020), IPA was seen as the ideal approach to explore this behavior. IPA prioritizes how the researcher and participant make sense of the interdependent relationship between the person (e.g., the footballer as a potential whistleblower) and their world (e.g., the context of professional football) (J. A. Smith et al., 2009). This was relevant to the current study as footballers may perceive a vastly different status around their ability to report wrongdoing due to the inherent power differentials within professional football (Newman et al., 2021).

Method

This study was part of a larger research project which explored bullying within professional football.¹

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)

The study was guided by the principles of IPA, which was ideal for addressing concerns that experiences within the professional football workplace are varied (J. A. Smith, 2016). Whistleblowing experiences are dependent on perception and context-bound (Verschuuren, 2020), making IPA ideally placed to address participants' subjective experiences of reporting abuse and bullying (Shinebourne, 2011). Through unearthing whistleblowing experiences specifically within professional football, the present study maintained the "contextualist" position of IPA (Larkin et al., 2006), whilst a broadly social constructionist stance was adopted (Shinebourne, 2011). The present study was consistent

¹ To date a previous research article focusing on conceptualising bullying in football has been published from this research project and a second paper has been accepted for publication at the time of writing. The data presented in the present study are unique from this previously published research as is the focus of this work.

with IPA endorsing social constructionism's claim around the centrality of sociocultural and historical processes in how individuals experience and understand their lives (Eatough & Smith, 2008). For example, it was important to explore how experiences and understanding of whistleblowing were shaped by the expectations of the professional football context. Moreover, the present study echoed the agreement between IPA and social constructionism that understanding the language used by footballers was important to this enterprise (Eatough & Smith, 2008). Finally, utilizing IPA offered a detailed examination of each participant's lifeworld, which was crucial for understanding their lived experience of whistleblowing, rather than being limited to objective measurements of it (J.A. Smith & Osborn, 2006). This idiographic commitment unearthed convergent and divergent features of participants' whistleblowing experiences, within and across accounts (Brown et al., 2018) providing rich meaning to their data.

Participants and procedure

Consistent with IPA guidelines a purposive sample (J. A. Smith, 2016) of 18 male professionally contracted footballers ($M = 19.83$, $SD = 2.96$, range = 18-31 years) from three English professional football clubs were recruited (see Table 1). Clubs were in the English Premier League or English Championships divisions at data collection. This study was contextualized to men's professional football as abusive and intimidatory practices have been specifically reported in this environment (BBC, 2018, 2021a). In keeping with recent research in workplace bullying (e.g. Sprigg et al., 2019), there was no requirement for players to have been a whistleblower, but they needed to be sufficiently experienced within this context to discuss their views of whistleblowing. The players had between 2 and 14 years of experience as professionals.

Following institutional ethical approval, gatekeepers were contacted at professional football clubs to seek permission to recruit players. Participants were then briefed and those

who were willing to take part were given information sheets before providing their informed consent. Given the nature of the study, a semi-structured interview guide was utilized, which retained the phenomenological commitment to meaning-making (Eatough & Smith, 2006). Questions were created in such a way that participants' experiences of whistleblowing could be explored "can you tell me about the degree to which you can report bullying in football?" Probing techniques were also utilized to better understand experiences of whistleblowing (e.g. "Can you tell me more about that?") so researchers could help the participant make sense of their account (J. A. Smith & Osborn, 2006). To authenticate the contextual focus of the study, interviews were conducted at the matchday stadium or training ground of the participant. Interviews lasted between 35-70 minutes ($MDuration = 44.11$, $SD = 10.81$). To maintain participant confidentiality, all names were replaced by pseudonyms.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in accordance with the idiographic commitment of IPA, whereby a detailed examination was undertaken for each case before data were compared cross-cases (J. A. Smith et al., 2017). Throughout, the transcripts were analyzed for points of descriptive, linguistic, or conceptual note (J. A. Smith et al., 2017). Stage one of the analysis involved familiarization with the accounts involving repeated listening to audio plus re-reading of transcripts while maintaining an open mind and exploratory attitude to the data (J. A. Smith & Osborn, 2006; J. A. Smith et al., 2017). At this stage the focus was on exploring the experiential nature of whistleblowing, the language used by the participants (e.g., the negative view of "snitching"), and how these interpretations were contextualized (e.g., how "snitching" or reporting might be seen in professional football). Stage two (see J. A. Smith et al., 2017) involved returning to the notes and transforming them to emergent, experiential themes (e.g., the institutionalized nature of football). Next, emergent themes were clustered into superordinate (e.g., professional football's influence on whistleblowing) and constituent

subordinate themes (e.g., the unique, institutionalized nature of football). This was developed within and across cases, using the processes of abstraction and subsumption (J. A. Smith et al., 2017). Finally, once all transcripts were analyzed a master table of themes (see Table 2) was created which linked all participant accounts (J. A. Smith & Osborn, 2006). Through identifying superordinate themes around whistleblowing in professional football, concerns were addressed for both convergences of views across accounts and divergence of views within individual accounts (J. A. Smith et al., 2017). Furthermore, this fulfilled the idiographic commitment of IPA (Brown et al., 2018) by conveying individual perceptions of whistleblowing (the person), within professional football (the context).

Research Quality and Rigor

Within the present study, the researchers adopted a relativist, rather than criteriologist position to maintain data trustworthiness (B. Smith & McGannon, 2018). Although it is acknowledged that there is no pre-defined “checklist” of what constitutes good quality IPA research (J. A. Smith, 2011), the present study followed the latest guidance for researchers to produce excellence in IPA papers (Nizza et al., 2021). First, a “compelling, unfolding narrative” was constructed (Nizza et al., 2021). In the present study, a story that conveyed a sense of progression was prioritized over a narrative, with carefully selected participant quotes and interpretation of these accounts in the discussion section. As subordinate themes were presented below the superordinate themes, the organization occurred at this level, creating a sense of coherence (Nizza et al., 2021). This was achieved as the themes of the unique, institutionalized nature of football and the efficacy in education and welfare linked to the overall narrative around professional football’s influence on whistleblowing in an interconnected manner (Nizza et al., 2021).

Second, following Nizza et al.’s (2021) guidance a “vigorous experiential account” was developed. Here the present study paid close attention to the experiential and existential

significance of what the footballers were reporting by paying particular attention to their meaning-making. For example, in “the unique, institutionalized nature of football” theme, players discussed a normalization of workplace practices in football which would not be seen in other domains. Through strong data and interpretation (Nizza et al., 2021), it was possible to demonstrate that players may find bullying difficult to identify and report here.

Third, the present study engaged with a “close analytic reading of the participants’ words” (Nizza et al., 2021). To achieve this, quotes were not left to “speak for themselves” and instead were analyzed and interpreted to reveal the further meaning to the data. Using Nizza et al.’s (2021) recommendation features such as the choice of words and phrases were considered (e.g., “snitching”) as well as the use of repetition and emphasis (e.g., Kevin’s account within the lack of efficacy in education and welfare subordinate theme).

Last, convergence and divergence were attended to by illustrating similarities and differences across the participants (Nizza et al., 2021). Specifically, a balance was struck between commonality and individuality, by generating superordinate themes across the participants such as the challenges of reporting bullying, whilst reflecting the idiosyncratic characteristics of the participants in their ability to report (J. A. Smith et al., 2009). Participants were quoted across the sample, allowing for “representation, prevalence, and variability within the analysis” (Nizza et al., 2021).

Results

Participants highlighted two superordinate themes: (a) “professional football’s influence on whistleblowing” including the subordinate themes of “the unique, institutionalized nature of football” and “the efficacy in education and welfare” and (b) “the challenges of reporting bullying” comprising the subordinate themes of “the ability to report” and “witnessing and bystanding.” The themes hosted divergent perceptions around the degree to which the professional football workplace shaped whistleblowing and the extent to which

249 players felt they could report bullying.

250 **Professional Football's Influence on Whistleblowing**

251 A consistent theme was the influence the professional football context has on shaping
252 whistleblowing behaviors. Players portrayed an environment perceived to be unique from other
253 industries. More specifically, football was characterized as being laden with institutionalized
254 practices which negatively shift the tolerance of banter, so it becomes more extreme and where
255 bullying becomes accepted. In this sense, football can be viewed as a large social institution
256 where disciplinary regimes are prevalent to the extent that players become subservient and
257 normalize bullying as well as more severe forms of banter (Foucault, 1977; Jones & Denison,
258 2016). This had implications for the degree to which players felt they could report wrongdoing.
259 Subsequently, despite efforts to address education and welfare in this context, players held
260 inconsistent views around the efficacy of these channels.

261 *The Unique, Institutionalized Nature of Football*

262 Despite the variation in players' ages, experiences, and clubs (see Table 1) they
263 unanimously saw professional football as different from other workplaces. Seemingly,
264 expectations regarding behavior are shaped by the encompassing tendencies of professional
265 football as an institution (Goffman, 1961). There is also a lack of standardized protocols to
266 address bullying. Greg provided an initial sense of how the football workplace normalizes
267 behaviors that might not be appropriate elsewhere, raising questions around how much players
268 might report wrongdoing:

269 But the way we talk to each other on the football pitch probably wouldn't be right in
270 another job, but we know that in the football environment it's just talking because they
271 want the best for the team and each other to do well.

272 Greg's intimation that "it's just talking" as well as framing potentially inappropriate
273 communication as wanting the best for each other, provided evidence for "situated learning"

in professional football (Parker, 2006) where players may have misguidedly learned that these behaviors are acceptable. Charlie reaffirmed that this unique cultural expectation is ingrained into professional footballers' experiences within this workplace environment by stating, "you have to get used to taking a bollocking², and if you can't take a bollocking then..." Players' seeming acceptance that potential abuse is inevitable (and necessary) in football, highlighted issues around what bullying is in the first place (Newman et al, 2021). This acceptance would certainly raise questions around the extent to which they would go against the expectations of the sport to whistleblow.

The ritualistic nature of professional football, which places an expectation to go through initiation ceremonies, added weight to the sense that any form of reporting of bullying would lead to severe sanctions. Rob provided a vivid account of this:

An example could be like in the young kids, if you go into the first team you have to sing. If you go into an office or a workplace, if you make someone sing, you'd probably be sacked the next day, 'cos it's not right it's not appropriate to put someone in that situation. But in football, that's just part of the job, you have to do it...Or otherwise, I've heard stories where players are like "I'm not gonna sing" and the manager's said "well I'm not gonna play you then" and they've had to leave the club because they won't become part of the team.

Rob's account raised various issues. It demonstrated that any form of reporting would lead to potentially career-ending dismissal, reasserting a sense of potential fragility on behalf of the players. It also revealed the disciplinary power coaches and managers hold to prevent this reporting (Foucault, 1977). Meanwhile, it maintained a thread across players' accounts that the situation is *different* in the football workplace compared to others. This implies a feeling of

² A 'bollocking' is British slang for being reprimanded.

297 entrapment to football's demands or even a passive, perhaps willing, subservience that players
298 and managers hold towards bullying.

299 The perception of a general lack of adherence to standard workplace conventions in
300 professional football was evident from James:

301 (Bullying) would never go on in a workplace. Because...is it HR? Or there are things
302 that can be done about it, if people are talking badly to you or you think you're being
303 bullied in a workplace you can say something.

304 This account was damning of the lack of formalized workplace policies and practices
305 available to players and the belief that support services do not exist. As such, professional
306 football clubs appear to operate outside of the practices of appropriately functioning
307 organizations with players feeling helpless to bullying behavior. James reaffirmed this view
308 when discussing discriminatory bullying:

309 I talked about this PFA (Professional Footballers' Association) thing and there are all
310 these words you can say about race, religion and all that you can't...you
311 wouldn't...you'd never because you're not allowed to say anything like that outside,
312 you'd get arrested.

313 Here despite the intervention of bodies such as the PFA, players feel that discriminatory
314 bullying can go unreported in a way not permitted in other contexts. Interestingly, the use of
315 the term "outside" drew potential parallels with prison-like conditions. The enclosed,
316 segregated nature of professional football shapes the working lifeworlds of players (Goffman,
317 1961; Parker & Manley, 2016), leaving a sense of helplessness that shapes beliefs around the
318 extent to which bullying occurs in other occupations.

319 *The Efficacy in Education and Welfare*

320 Despite notable attempts from professional football organizations to educate players,
321 introduce codes of conduct, and boost player welfare (see Parker & Manley, 2016) players held

322 mixed views of these potential reporting channels. Some felt that the support on offer has been
323 beneficial, yet others were less certain about the efficacy of the delivery of these approaches
324 and were damning of them. Mickey outlined a positive view:

325 There's a lot more awareness of what you can and can't say, religions and races 'cos
326 there are so many people from different countries, so you just have to be fair to different
327 people. People do come in from the Premier League and give speeches and
328 presentations on what is bullying, and what is banter, and what is racism and stuff like
329 that.

330 From Mickey's perspective, it was clear effort has been put into considering player
331 welfare and education about bullying and banter. Engagement from key stakeholders such as
332 the Premier League was important in distributing safeguarding material to players. At 20 years
333 old and with three years of experience as a professional, it may reflect that these programs have
334 been efficacious for younger, less experienced players like Mickey. This was supported by the
335 view of Dave who was of a very similar age and experience:

336 We've got a website xxx. You can go on and read and go and check. You can go and
337 speak to the safeguarding officer, and she can give us leaflets... There are leaflets dotted
338 about the classroom, signs everywhere about bullying.

339 While on the surface this was encouraging as Dave talked positively about the resources
340 available to footballers which raised their awareness around bullying, other players were more
341 dubious about the quality of the resources available to them. This potentially explains why
342 codes of conduct may be limited in encouraging whistleblowing and that safeguarding
343 strategies in UK sports do not effectively target those over the age of 18 (Moriconi & de Cima,
344 2020; Rhind et al., 2015). The apparent skepticism around the efficacy of the presentations
345 delivered by the Premier League and other organizations reinforced this.

346 Phil discussed specific issues around the appropriateness and quality of the delivery:

347 Some are engaging, some aren't. I think you've gotta engage the group. If you don't
348 engage the group, I don't think you'll benefit. The team won't benefit and you won't
349 benefit, cos what you're trying to implement won't be implemented. So you've got to
350 entice the group into your session and make them come out thinking. You want the
351 session to be that memorable and some of them are. "Do you remember this da da da"
352 a few months ago?

353 Taken on face value, Phil's view may be reflective of educational provision in
354 professional football being viewed as survival management for those leading the sessions
355 (Parker, 2000). Moreover, in saying "do you remember this da da da" a few months ago, Phil
356 conveyed the mundanity of a professional footballer's world (Parker & Manley, 2016), where
357 educational provision lacks stimulation and impact in terms of benefiting the team. This may
358 create a larger cultural problem within the sport in which belief in the value of the sessions is
359 low and therefore not worthwhile.

360 A teammate of Phil's, Kevin delivered an even more damning assessment of potential
361 inadequacies within the delivery of programs. For Kevin education programs promoted explicit
362 and implicit messages around bullying:

363 (The PFA) give presentations and they'll be asking the whole team. What person is
364 going to put their hand up to say something in front of the whole team? When
365 subconsciously they're going to hold back because what I say everyone's gonna hear it
366 and what reaction are they going to have? They're gonna have a reaction...Cos'
367 football's a team environment, you need to do everything as a team.

368 This was interesting as, despite the similarity of players' ages and experience across
369 this subordinate theme, they held markedly different views of the education programs available
370 to them. Kevin revealed deeply ingrained cultural beliefs around remaining silent, where the
371 presence of internal whistleblowing mechanisms adds to the reluctance and fear to speak out

about inappropriate behavior. It is noteworthy to consider whether this represents a failure of wider organizations such as the PFA or is something more specific to players' clubs. Seemingly, the issue may be with the former based on Kevin's quote. Nonetheless, the views of Kevin and to a lesser extent Phil were markedly different from the earlier views of Mickey and Dave. The pairs of players were from different clubs (see Table 1), questioning the degree to which whistleblowing behavior may be encouraged or not depending on the organization. For some players, perceptions of whistleblowing may be grounded in their experience of socialization to their club's expectations around behavior, working practices, and the conformity to norms around disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977) within their organizations.

Kevin delivered a further indictment around the education and welfare on offer to players:

We could have a meeting this week, have a presentation this week, next week you don't remember anything we've talked about and next week nothing's changed. You just talk about things (racism) or raising awareness about something, but you'll have forgotten about it next week...

This assessment is worrying on a couple of levels. First, these programs do not maintain long-term engagement and behavioral change. Second, despite this education, it suggests bullying remains commonplace rather than being reported. The degree to which Kevin suggested that players return to normal, despite this awareness, suggested a deeply institutionalized prejudice that may be particular to his club. Alarming, this was reiterated with Kevin's overall assessment that:

There's nothing set up where if you are being bullied in football that there's no form of solution to it. It's more like it's in control of the people being bullied or the people doing the bullying... I think the club likes to think they employ people, not many people; they

like to think they employ people to help with that kind of stuff. But a coach is not there to stop you from getting bullied.

This reflected a sense of abandonment on behalf of some players that there is nowhere to safely report bullying. It also suggests that despite professional football's attempts to address inappropriate behaviors, the welfare "people" Kevin referred to, are perceived to be a tokenistic, reactionary attempt to safeguard players. Kevin's assertion reaffirms the sense that both the potential to whistleblow in football, as well as bullying itself, is governed by disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977). As coaches do not protect players from being bullied, it reinforces wrongdoing such that it becomes expected and rewarded, rather than prevented (Jones & Denison, 2016). Moreover, from a Foucauldian perspective, professional football acts as a panopticon, where players appear to be coerced from speaking out, particularly as those responsible for maintaining discipline in coaches do not provide any support. This dangerously leaves the resolution of bullying to bullies and victims. However, given the range of views across cases within this theme, it was unclear whether this issue is particular to certain clubs such as Kevin's or is more of an issue for the wider professional football context.

The Challenges of Reporting Bullying

This theme provided a genuine depth of convergence and divergence in participants' accounts. Significant tensions were reflected across and within participants around whether the bullying act can be reported. It also highlighted potential outcomes for the whistleblower and the contextual influences which may act as a barrier to reporting.

The Ability to Report

Kevin was a powerful voice in the discussion around whistleblowing. He drew on a seemingly culturally accepted view of "banter" to illustrate how for some, reporting wrongdoing in football is regarded as forbidden:

You'd never go and tell someone or go and complain to the coach about someone getting banter. I've seen people getting banter to the point where I feel sorry for them and they still won't go and say anything just because of the football culture you won't, you can't, it's a really hard thing... because you're selling out your teammates in a way. You can't it's meant to be a team thing and in the same way, you can't sell them out. You can't get them in trouble when really, you're meant to be able to take it, so you've got to find a way to combat it without going to the coach. If you speak to most lads, they won't think of going to the coach to deal with banter or tell him or anyone at home.

The unease in Kevin's account where he recounts “you won't, you can't, it's a really hard thing” illuminates a sense of imprisonment for victims of bullying and shows how some players believed reporting behavior akin to this is a “no-go” area. Kevin's experiences reinforced a sense of entrapment within the enclosed world (Goffman, 1961) of professional football. This shapes a collective identity where players cannot show weakness and must accept banter, regardless of their feelings. Thus banter acts as a form of “discipline” which reinforces both expected and accepted behaviors around conforming to a particular identity as a professional footballer (Jones & Denison, 2016). Equally, reporting a teammate is seen as treachery and contrary to the team dynamic, as supported by Ed:

‘Cos you're a team and you're with each other every day. Cos you're with each other, relying on each other. So, if someone's getting bullied, even though it shouldn't happen and they go and tell someone, they might see it as someone going against the group and stuff like that and feel like they shouldn't be part of their team.

For Ed, breaking from the group and reporting bullying would leave the player disowned from their team with surveillance acting as a mechanism for disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977). As Foucault (1977) described whistleblowing would represent a departure from correct or accepted behaviors. In football the result of this is that players are punished

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

445 through ostracism from the group. This ultimately acts as a subtle form of “discipline,” which
446 prevents each other from speaking out. Charlie concurred:

447 If a coach stepped in to defend a player who is being bullied or bantered maybe. I think
448 that could make the situation worse.....'Cos the person who's doing the bullying or
449 banter could stick on them saying “why's the manager sticking up for you?” It's like
450 [he is] his pet of whatever.

451 Language such as “snitching” used by players such as Kevin and Dave supported an
452 underlying perception that reporting bullying would leave the whistleblower as an outcast. This
453 acts as another form of punishment with the player receiving further bullying for breaking from
454 the group's order. These dominant cultural beliefs which players passively or actively accept,
455 strip individuals of the ability to report. This is to avoid further bullying because of
456 whistleblowing (Park et al., 2020).

457 On a wider and perhaps even more alarming level, players illustrated that despite
458 knowledge of different potential supporting organizations, reporting bullying to these would
459 be avoided at all costs:

460 We have the PFA don't we and you have a phone number you can ring but how many
461 people have the balls to admit they're being bullied because if that ever got out, you'd
462 get bullied even more. (James)

463 Do you know like even if you were to ring up the PFA to say someone's bullying me,
464 you wouldn't actually get someone to come in and do something about it cos we're all
465 men? People laugh and all that and (would) be like 'he's not being bullied.' You know
466 what people are like 'we're only having a laugh; we're just having banter'. That's when
467 people sweep it under the carpet, they try and hide it under the banter carpet. (Kevin)

468 Kevin provided one of the most disturbing quotes within all the participants' accounts,
469 as it highlighted a potentially systemic, organizational failure across professional football to

support victims of bullying and instead to conceal this behavior under the guise of banter. Our participants viewed organizations responsible for players' welfare and education, such as the PFA, as complicit in the bullying process. As such this reflects what Ahern (2018) articulates as an institutional betrayal of victims. In addition, at the individual level the image of victims being laughed at reinforced a highly degrading feeling for them. Pertinently James' reference to having the "balls to admit" being bullied demonstrates the high stakes risks around reporting in football. Despite their differences in terms of age and experience, Kevin and James (see Table 1) reaffirmed the secluded environment of football leaves them with the feeling that reporting these behaviors is futile.

It should be noted though that this was not the case throughout participants' accounts. Elsewhere, Ed and Dave highlighted contradictory views to other cases (as well as their own within this theme) which suggested that you cannot go against the team:

The coaches do come and have a lot of talks with us and say obviously there should be no bullying but if you do have a problem, come talk to us or the head of welfare and stuff like that. (Ed)

Obviously, it's not a nice thing. It needs to be stopped...but that's why it's a safe environment and you can go and speak to someone. (You can go to) the safeguarding officer and say I'm not comfortable. (Dave)

These views offer more encouragement in that reporting channels are available for the players and that some individuals feel a greater ability to report. Nonetheless, the views only express a potential to report from individuals who claimed reporting would be challenging elsewhere in their accounts. This creates doubt around the ability to speak out. Moreover, these accounts were only indicative of players at one club (see Table 1). While this was encouraging for this club, it suggests there may be issues with reporting in other organizations and professional football more broadly.

495 *Witnessing and Bystanding*

496 Although most participants framed whistleblowing from the context of challenges and
 497 potential outcomes for the victim of bullying, it is important to note that some players also
 498 addressed the potential challenges for witnesses and bystanders. In some cases, as James
 499 alluded to: “even if you feel sorry for people it's hard because if you are seen to be sticking up
 500 for them, then you're in danger of getting the brunt of it as well.” Thus, whistleblowers are at
 501 the risk of ending up as victims of bullying themselves for speaking out, reinforcing a code of
 502 silence (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020) in professional football.

503 Some did, however, suggest wrongdoing could be reported with other players acting as
 504 intermediaries to help resolve the situation. Alfie promoted a more positive view of
 505 surveillance as an enactment of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977):

506 I think in our changing room we've got a lot of bonding from the younger lads and older
 507 lads, so I think if there was a problem, they'd say to me or one of the older lads. I think
 508 it would be resolved.

509 One potential explanation for this contrasting opinion may be that this is a result of
 510 individual differences around reporting. Alternatively, Alfie's and James' views may reflect
 511 differences in their experiences in the operation of power differentials at their clubs, which
 512 shape the ability to speak out within a team. Alfie's teammate Phil concurred with this more
 513 positive view of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977), where whistleblowing was possible and
 514 the responsibility of the whole team, not just the victim of the behavior.

515 Because as a team you need to know when it's all banter and then you need to understand
 516 when someone's fully overstepped the mark. 'Cos then as a team if you understand what
 517 boundaries...you can push and what you can't, and you can all clamp it out together it's
 518 much better, well it's much easier, 'cos you can't let one person get away with it.

Players like Phil may feel an obligation to avoid organizational bystanding and instead engage with the process of altruistic bystanding, acting from a compassionate subjective state, to prevent harm to the victim of bullying (Linstead, 2013). This may be shaped by the moral atmosphere of specific clubs or is reflective of individual differences in moral values and personalities from club to club. Nonetheless, the framing of Phil's quote is potentially problematic as it infers that the players are left responsible for determining the appropriateness of behavior. This may only be effective if the players adopt higher-level moral reasoning and leave a lingering doubt about professional football's attempts to address bullying.

Discussion

Our study aimed to explore professional footballers' individual lived experiences and perceptions of whistleblowing bullying, within a professional football context. Players revealed important findings around the influence professional football has on potential whistleblowing of bullying through its unique, largely institutionalized culture. Furthermore, players held inconsistent views around the efficacy of professional football's attempts to provide education and welfare to address bullying. Consistent with this, players identified convergent and divergent accounts around the challenges with reporting bullying, as well as some of the potentially severe outcomes of whistleblowing in the professional football context for victims, witnesses, and bystanders alike.

The present study extended previous research by providing empirical evidence for how individual, organizational and contextual factors (Verschuuren, 2020) play a crucial role in the degree to which whistleblowing occurs in professional football. From a contextual stance, players largely discussed how the encompassing tendencies (Goffman, 1961) of professional football serve to legitimize behaviors that would be inappropriate in other industries and act as a barrier to potential whistleblowing. Professional football serves, to some degree, as a "total institution" where players follow both formal and informal rules such

that any deviation from these (e.g., reporting wrongdoing) can be seen as a major infraction (Goffman, 1961). Seemingly what is “legitimate” or “illegitimate” in professional football depends on who defines wrongdoing, meaning that behaviors that may be seen as deviant, are widely accepted in the culture of this sport (Young, 2019). This reflects potential overconformity to the sport ethic (Coakley, 2015) in professional football, whereby tolerating deviant behaviors like bullying may be seen as a necessary part of team membership.

Furthermore, players’ accounts reinforced the coercive power of managers and coaches (Anderson & White, 2017) to punish those who offer an individual view that differs from the institutional perspective of these rules (Goffman, 1961). Grounded within Foucault’s (1977) theoretical propositions, players feared disciplinary punishments such as being deselected from the team for those who may want to speak out around bullying during initiation ceremonies. This finding carries a potentially important implication for other workplaces which are characterized by initiation ceremonies. For example, although attempts have been made to address hazing behavior in contexts such as the military (Keller et al., 2015), the current study highlights questions around the degree to which individuals can report wrongdoing in certain industries. There may still be a perception that whistleblowing leads to greater bullying (Park et al., 2020), especially when organizations like professional football remain underpinned by authoritarianism, subservience, and “rule-bound” behaviors (Parker & Manley, 2016). Therefore, in industries such as professional sport, individuals appear to trade the morality of principle around reporting wrongdoing, for the morality of loyalty (Erickson et al., 2019). The result is a level of commitment to their organization that goes beyond other occupations (Adler & Adler, 1988) which may be problematic in creating a psychologically unsafe climate. Here whistleblowing wrongdoing may be viewed as a “risky” interpersonal behavior that receives a negative response from other team members (Edmondson, 2004).

The contextual and organizational influence of professional football on reporting bullying was also reflected in participants' views of education and welfare systems in place. Players at certain clubs talked favorably of the implementation of education and welfare at clubs to facilitate reporting wrongdoing. This was consistent with Caillier's (2017) research demonstrating positive associations between whistleblowing education and reporting. For some in the present study, football clubs are seen to be keen to address wrongdoing, and individuals feel supported in raising concerns about bullying. These players highlighted a preference for using internal whistleblowing mechanisms should they need to voice their concerns (Caillier, 2017).

Nonetheless, others were much less complimentary about their clubs' ability to manage concerns, as well as the other internal whistleblowing mechanisms which professional football promotes. This adds important empirical evidence to claims that whistleblowing training programs may have a counterintuitive effect by highlighting the risks a whistleblower might face (Verschuuren, 2020). There was a worrying trend in the data that professional football that organizations who are leading on players' welfare such as the PFA, indirectly perpetuate the issues of failing internal disciplinary systems and victim silencing (Nite & Nauright, 2020). Most graphically, players feared ridicule for reporting bullying, which reinforced the sense that reprisals are a taken-for-granted response to whistleblowing within sports organizations. This further represents the enactment of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977), whereby players potentially surveil one another from the bottom up and preserve bullying as a mechanism to maintain the group's order in professional football. Furthermore, the apparent worthlessness of the education on offer highlighted by certain players demonstrates a potentially systemic failure of professional football to address concerns with educational provision (Parker, 2000). Thus, the present study challenges the view that whistleblowing education can help change whistleblowing culture in sport, by

signaling that an organization values reporting wrongdoing and protects whistleblowers against retribution (Erickson et al., 2019). The present data reveal that until proper mechanisms are in place to protect whistleblowers, the process of raising awareness becomes delegitimized (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020).

Furthermore, it was evident from the players' accounts that organizational and contextual factors not only determine (Verschuuren, 2020) but also interact to impact players' ability to report bullying. Professional football promotes a code of silence (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020) where an individual's need to demonstrate "intense loyalty" to their club (Adler & Adler, 1988) means whistleblowing of bullying remains more difficult than in other workplaces. Alarming, attempts to report wrongdoing increases the relationally abusive element of ostracism (Newman et al., 2021), which underpins bullying in football. Through "situated learning" it appears players absorb informal rules within professional football (Parker, 2006), which in this case means they do not report bullying for fear that whistleblowing may affect their survival within this workplace. Once more this may reflect more broadly, workplaces that are similar to professional football such as the army and prisons (Parker & Manley, 2016).

It should be noted though that in occasional cases players contested this notion. Players appeared to provide evidence for the claim that an individual's perception of power (see Verschuuren, 2020) is a potentially important determinant of whistleblowing in sport. Given that characteristics such as age and experience appear not to drive this view within the present findings, alternative mechanisms may be in place. An individual's perception of power to report wrongdoing may instead be determined by their apprenticeship to the cultural norms of football when they are socialized as an academy player (Parker & Manley, 2016). Furthermore, personality traits such as high extraversion and dominance and low agreeableness (Bjørkelo et al., 2010) may fuel agency in reporting, as well as an individual's

morality (Zhou et al., 2018), though further work is required to corroborate this in professional football. Nonetheless what was more apparent was that when clubs provide supportive conditions, the process of reporting is facilitated.

Although there appear to be some isolated signs of encouragement regarding the potential to whistleblow in professional football, the potential outcomes for the whistleblower as either the victim, witness, or bystander to bullying are central in preventing reporting of wrongdoing. In the present study, players gave a sense that a whistleblower would be dismissed by internal organizations which are set up to protect them such as the PFA. For some, the PFA was almost seen as part of a silent discreet mechanism of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977), which prevents rather than supports players to whistleblow wrongdoing. These findings may help explain why sporting participants are less likely to report their concerns to authorities connected to their sport, but rather highlight the wrongdoing to another individual such as a coach (Erickson et al., 2017). Albeit potentially indirectly, these organizations such as the PFA appear to maintain the culture of victim silencing (Nite & Nauright, 2020), rather than leaving individuals with a strong sense that they will be protected. This potential failure represents institutional betrayal whereby footballers' expectations for safety and at work are violated (Ahern, 2018), which may explain why some individuals are driven to the point of considering suicide (BBC, 2021b).

The present findings also add to limited previous research (Richardson & McGlynn, 2014) which has explored the potential retaliation that may take place for whistleblowers in hypermasculine, highly competitive sporting environments. For many victims, witnesses, and bystanders of bullying in professional football, it is evident they go through a cost-benefit analysis (Richardson & McGlynn, 2014) where the risks of reporting are too great in terms of further bullying or threats to their position on the team. These beliefs appear to be exacerbated by the hypermasculine culture of professional football, where players determine

that their “professional” identity and “will to win” needs to be displayed by conforming to these practices (Parker & Manley, 2016). The tolerance players are expected to display to severe banter means that their need for closeness, intimacy and respect gets converted into a narrow form of group-oriented bonding based on competitive one-upmanship, self-destructive behaviors, and silent conformity to group norms (Messner, 2002). Furthermore, this adds to the sense that codes of silence (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020) become more entrenched in team sports, where the primacy of culture and hierarchy means that subordination is more likely and individuals may be less willing to speak out (Verschuuren, 2020). On occasions, though this view was contested, offering some hope that altruistic bystanding is possible, which could address some of the negative impacts of organizational bystanding for both witnesses and victims (Linstead, 2013).

Practical Implications

The present study provided key practical implications concerning whistleblowing of bullying in professional football. First, within historically masculine, authoritarian industries such as professional football, education programs need to challenge the prevailing organizational culture which may be a barrier to reporting. Players’ accounts suggest that many do not speak out for fear of going against implicit and explicit rules within this sporting workplace. To address this, interventions need to take place at the organizational level, including key stakeholders such as the PFA, boards of directors, managers and coaches, players, as well as sport psychologists. Sports psychologists especially can play a proactive role in facilitating these educational efforts (Fisher & Dzikus, 2017) to challenge the issues highlighted in the present study. Importantly these interventions need to reassure individuals that they will not be ridiculed for reporting wrongdoing such as bullying.

Second, professional football needs to raise the confidence in players of the quality of its educational and welfare provision. In the present study, players reflected a view that

education programs are something which to survive and “get through” (Parker, 2000). Future educational programs need to offer clearer guidance on how to whistleblow and its benefits (Erickson et al., 2019) but these need to be accompanied by proper mechanisms to protect whistleblowers to act on their complaints (Moriconi & de Cima, 2020). Organizations such as the PFA, need to provide clear evidence of how allegations are responded to and how bullies are addressed. Sport psychologists are potentially critical here in creating psychologically safe and respectful environments (Edmondson, 2004; Fisher & Dzikus, 2017) which can address fears that players will be ridiculed for reporting wrongdoing.

Finally, the inconsistency in the players’ accounts around their ability to whistleblow within their club, as well as the sense that it may be difficult to report concerns to outside organizations such as the PFA, suggests that education and welfare programs need to be tailored more to the individual organization. From the participants’ data, it further reflects that classroom education programs are too remote and not effective in professional football (Higham et al., 2021), resulting in players not having the courage to call the PFA to report their concerns. By involving coaches, players, and sports psychologists to co-construct education and welfare policies at a club level, it may better integrate empirical and experiential knowledge (Stone et al., 2020) to address bullying within their organization. In this regard, sports psychologists can assist in developing ethical guidelines, policies, and practices for their club (Fisher & Dzikus, 2017). This may raise the profile of bullying to coaches who can be seen to originate abusive behavior, whilst also regulating who can whistleblow in the first place (Kelly & Waddington, 2006; Verschuuren, 2020).

Limitations and Future Research

Common with recent research into safeguarding in sport (Rhind & Owusu-Sekyere, 2020), the present study may have been limited by the sensitive nature of the topic area and the degree to which participants may have been apprehensive about sharing their data. This

effect may have been exacerbated, given the concerns highlighted by players about their careers and fear of ridicule for reporting bullying behavior in professional football. While these are notable concerns, significant efforts were made to build rapport within the interviews to reassure players through the process of gaining consent (Rhind & Owusu-Sekyere, 2020) and to remind the players of the confidentiality of their data. Importantly, this study also addressed limitations highlighted by previous research (Newman et al., 2021) by exploring the degree to which education and welfare provision supports players in their ability to report bullying.

An additional point worthy of consideration for future research to consider is to focus on the views of various stakeholders concerning whistleblowing of bullying within professional football. The present study was limited to the expressions of players, whereas recent research into workplace bullying has advocated a broader sampling strategy (Sprigg et al., 2019). It might be useful to employ this approach within an organization to recruit participants other than the players. This aligns with beneficial advancements around safeguarding in sport where an organizational focus has been adopted (Rhind & Owusu-Sekyere, 2020). To address concerns raised by some players regarding the involvement of coaches in terms of preventing whistleblowing, it may be useful to involve the views of this group. By doing this it may sensitize this group (Newman et al., 2021) to the issues with reporting bullying in professional football, while hopefully encouraging their moral engagement to administer protection for whistleblowers (Verschuuren, 2020).

Conclusion

The present study makes an important contribution to whistleblowing research in the sporting workplace while demonstrating the potential for understanding this behavior in organizations and workplaces more broadly. It demonstrates the importance of organizational and contextual factors and the degree to which these shape the reporting of workplace

719 bullying in professional football. Furthermore, it highlights the need for relevant, tailored
720 education and welfare programs that individuals feel they can access. The present study also
721 illustrates the important interaction between these organizational and contextual factors and
722 an individual's perceptions around their ability to whistleblow and the potential ramifications
723 for them of doing so. Overall, the findings present a vital challenge for sport to develop
724 appropriate policies and procedures for whistleblowers while providing safeguards for those
725 wishing to report wrongdoing.

726 **Acknowledgments**

727 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial,
728 or not for profit sectors.

729 **Disclosure Statement**

730 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1988). Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(3), 401-417.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2392716>
- Alinaghian, N., Nasr Isfahani, A., & Safari, A. (2018). Factors influencing whistle-blowing in the Iranian health system. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(2), 177-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1349703>
- Alleyne, P. (2016). The influence of organisational commitment and corporate ethical values on non-public accountants' whistle-blowing intentions in Barbados. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 17(2), 190-210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-12-2013-0118>
- Anderson, E., & White, A. (2017). *Sport, theory and social problems a critical introduction* (Second edition. ed.). Routledge.
- BBC. (2018). *Chelsea FC 'paid me £50,000 over abuse'*. Retrieved 31 January from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-38179882>
- BBC. (2021a). *Cardiff City suspend two academy staff over alleged bullying*.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/56385775>
- BBC. (2021b). *Fulham open investigation into academy allegations*. Retrieved 26 February from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/55813618>
- Bjørkelo, B., Einarsen, S., & Matthiesen, S. B. (2010). Predicting proactive behaviour at work: Exploring the role of personality as an antecedent of whistleblowing behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 371-394.
- Brackenridge, C. H., Bringer, J. D., Cockburn, C., Nutt, G., Pitchford, A., Russell, K., & Pawlaczek, Z. (2004). The Football Association's Child Protection in Football

- Research Project 2002–2006: Rationale, design and first year results. *Managing Leisure*, 9, 30–46 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360671042000182943>
- Brown, C. J., Webb, T. L., Robinson, M. A., & Cotgreave, R. (2018). Athletes' experiences of social support during their transition out of elite sport: An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 36, 71-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.01.003>
- Caillier, J. G. (2017). An examination of the role whistle-blowing education plays in the whistle-blowing process. *The Social Science Journal*, 54(1), 4-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2016.09.005>
- Chen, C.-P., & Lai, C.-T. (2014). To blow or not to blow the whistle: The effects of potential harm, social pressure and organisational commitment on whistleblowing intention and behaviour. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 23(3), 327-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12053>
- Cho, Y. J., & Song, H. J. (2015). Determinants of whistleblowing within government agencies. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(4), 450-472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015603206>
- Coakley, J. (2015). Drug use and deviant overconformity. In V. Moller, I. Waddington, & J. Hoberman (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of drugs and sport*. Routledge.
- Eatough, V., & Smith, J. A. (2006). I feel like a scrambled egg in my head: An idiographic case study of meaning making and anger using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 79(1), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1348/147608305X41100>
- Eatough, V., & Smith, J. A. (2008). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607927>

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

Edmondson, A. C. (2004). Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: A

Group-level lens. In *Trust and Distrust in Organizations : Dilemmas and Approaches*

(pp. 239-272). [https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84903359074&partnerID=40&md5=75505303b87fa191e9a7ab2d32b889d8)

[84903359074&partnerID=40&md5=75505303b87fa191e9a7ab2d32b889d8](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84903359074&partnerID=40&md5=75505303b87fa191e9a7ab2d32b889d8)

Erickson, K., Backhouse, S. H., & Carless, D. (2017). “I don't know if I would report them”:

Student-athletes' thoughts, feelings and anticipated behaviours on blowing the whistle

on doping in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 30, 45-54.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.01.005>

Erickson, K., Patterson, L. B., & Backhouse, S. H. (2019). “The process isn’t a case of report

it and stop”: Athletes’ lived experience of whistleblowing on doping in sport. *Sport*

Management Review, 22(5), 724-735.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2018.12.001>

Fieger, P., & Rice Bridget, S. (2018). Whistle-blowing in the Australian Public Service: The

role of employee ethnicity and occupational affiliation. *Personnel Review*, 47(3), 613-

629. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2017-0203>

Fisher, L. A., & Dzikus, L. (2017). Bullying in sport and performance psychology. In: Oxford

University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage.

Gibson, L., & Groom, R. (2018). The micro-politics of organisational change in professional

youth football: Towards an understanding of “actions, strategies and professional

interests”. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 14(1), 3-14.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954118766311>

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums*. Doubleday.

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

- Hewett, R., Liefoghe, A., Visockaite, G., & Roongrerngsuke, S. (2018). Bullying at work: Cognitive appraisal of negative acts, coping, wellbeing, and performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 71-84. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000064>
- Higham, A. J., Newman, J. A., Stone, J. A., & Rumbold, J. L. (2021). Coaches' experiences of morality in english professional football environments: Recommendations for creating a moral atmosphere. *International sport coaching journal*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2021-0026>
- Jewett, R., Kerr, G. A., MacPherson, E., & Stirling, A. E. (2019). Experiences of bullying victimisation in female interuniversity athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1611902>
- Jones, L., & Denison, J. (2016). Challenge and relief: A Foucauldian disciplinary analysis of retirement from professional association football in the United Kingdom. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 52(8), 924-939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690215625348>
- Keil, M., Park, E. H., & Ramesh, B. (2018). Violations of health information privacy: The role of attributions and anticipated regret in shaping whistle-blowing intentions. *Information Systems Journal*, 28(5), 818-848. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12168>
- Keller, K. M., Matthews, M., Hall, K. C., Marcellino, W., Mauro, J. A., & Lim, N. (2015). *Hazing in the U.S. Armed Forces: Recommendations for hazing prevention policy and practice*. R. Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR941.html
- Kelly, S., & Waddington, I. (2006). Abuse, intimidation and violence as aspects of managerial control in professional soccer in Britain and Ireland. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41(2), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690206075417>

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

Kerr, G. A., & Stirling, A. E. (2019). Where is safeguarding in sport psychology research and practice? *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(4), 367-384.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2018.1559255>

Kerr, R., & Kerr, G. (2020). Promoting athlete welfare: A proposal for an international surveillance system. *Sport Management Review*, 23(1), 95-103.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.005>

Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 102-120.

<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp062oa>

Linstead, S. (2013). Organizational bystanding: Whistleblowing, watching the world go by or aiding and abetting? *M@n@gement*, 16(5), 680-696.

Messner, M. A. (2002). *Taking the field: Women, men, and sports*. University of Minnesota Press. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/shu/detail.action?docID=310589>

Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., & Morehead-Dworkin, T. (2008). *Whistle-blowing in organizations*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., Rehg, M. T., & Van Scotter, J. R. (2012). Predicting employee reactions to perceived organizational wrongdoing: Demoralization, justice, proactive personality, and whistle-blowing. *Human Relations*, 65(8), 923-954.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712447004>

Moriconi, M., & de Cima, C. (2020). To report, or not to report? From code of silence suppositions within sport to public secrecy realities. *Crime, Law and Social Change*,

74(1), 55-76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-019-09875-0>

Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00382668>

- Newman, J. A., Warburton, V. E., & Russell, K. (2021). Conceptualizing bullying in adult professional football: A phenomenological exploration. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 101883. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101883>
- Nite, C., & Nauright, J. (2020). Examining institutional work that perpetuates abuse in sport organizations. *Sport Management Review*, 23(1), 117-129. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.06.002>
- Nizza, I. E., Farr, J., & Smith, J. A. (2021). Achieving excellence in interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): Four markers of high quality. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 369-386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1854404>
- Olewus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Park, H., Bjørkelo, B., & Blenkinsopp, J. (2020). External whistleblowers' experiences of workplace bullying by superiors and colleagues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 161(3), 591-601. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3936-9>
- Parker, A. (1996). *Chasing the 'Big Time': Football Apprenticeship in the 1990s*. Unpublished PhD manuscript Department of Sociology, University of Warwick]. Warwick. <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/36183/>
- Parker, A. (2000). Training for 'glory', schooling for 'failure?': English professional football, traineeship and educational provision. *Journal of Education and Work*, 13(1), 61-76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/136390800112231>
- Parker, A. (2006). Lifelong learning to labour: Apprenticeship, masculinity and communities of practice. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(5), 687-701. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920600895734>
- Parker, A., & Manley, A. (2016). Identity. In E. Cashmore & K. Dixon (Eds.), *Studying Football* (pp. 97-112). Routledge.

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

- Reis, N. A., Kowalski, K. C., Mosewich, A. D., & Ferguson, L. J. (2021). 'That's how I am dealing with it – that is dealing with it': exploring men athletes' self-compassion through the lens of masculinity. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2021.1920455>
- Rhind, D. J. A., McDermott, J., Lambert, E., & Koleva, I. (2015). A review of safeguarding cases in sport. *Child Abuse Review*, 24(6), 418-426.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2306>
- Rhind, D. J. A., & Owusu-Sekyere, F. (2020). Evaluating the impacts of working towards the International Safeguards for Children in Sport. *Sport Management Review*, 23(1), 104-116. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.009>
- Richardson, B. K., & McGlynn, J. (2014). Blowing the Whistle Off the Field of Play: An Empirical Model of Whistle-Blower Experiences in the Intercollegiate Sport Industry. *Communication & Sport*, 3(1), 57-80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479513517490>
- Shinebourne, P. (2011). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In N. Frost (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Psychology: Combining Core Approaches* (pp. 44-65). Open University.
- Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 101-121.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357>
- Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1), 9-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2010.510659>

- Smith, J. A. (2016). Interpretative phenomenological analysis in sport: Getting experience. In A. C. Sparkes & B. Smith (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 219-229). Taylor and Francis.
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Sage.
- Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2006). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (pp. 51-80). Sage.
- Smith, J. A., Spiers, J., Simpson, P., & Nicholls, A. (2017). The psychological challenges of living with an ileostomy: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology, 36*, 14S 151. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000427>
- Sprigg, C. A., Niven, K., Dawson, J., Farley, S., & Armitage, C. J. (2019). Witnessing workplace bullying and employee well-being: A two-wave field study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(2), 286-296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000137>
- Stirling, A. E. (2013). Understanding the use of emotionally abusive coaching practices. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 8*(4), 625-639. <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.8.4.625>
- Stone, J. A., Rothwell, M., Shuttleworth, R., & Davids, K. (2020). Exploring sports coaches' experiences of using a contemporary pedagogical approach to coaching: an international perspective. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 1*-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2020.1765194>
- Verkuil, B., Atasayi, S., & Molendijk, M. (2015). Workplace bullying and mental health: A meta-analysis on cross-sectional and longitudinal data. *PLoS ONE, 10*(8), e0135225. . <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135225>

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

- Verschuuren, P. (2020). Whistleblowing determinants and the effectiveness of reporting channels in the international sports sector. *Sport Management Review*, 23(1), 142-154.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.07.002>
- Verschuuren, P. (2021). Integrity washing? The implementation of reporting mechanisms by international sports organisations. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2021.1882204>
- Whitaker, L., Backhouse, S. H., & Long, J. (2014). Reporting doping in sport: National level athletes' perceptions of their role in doping prevention
[<https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12222>]. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 24(6), e515-521. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12222>
- Young, K. (2019). *Sport, violence and society* (2nd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group.
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/shu/detail.action?docID=958811>
- Zhou, L., Liu, Y., Chen, Z., & Zhao, S. (2018). Psychological mechanisms linking ethical climate to employee whistle-blowing intention. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33(2), 196-213. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-09-2017-0292>

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

Table 1: Participant ages and years of experience as a professional football player

| Participant | Age | Years as a professional | Club | Division of club |
|-------------|-----|----------------------------|------|------------------|
| James | 31 | 14 | A | Championship |
| Oli | 21 | 6 | A | Championship |
| George | 20 | 3 | A | Championship |
| Charlie | 19 | 4 | B | Championship |
| Alfie | 19 | 2 | B | Championship |
| Ricky | 19 | 2 | B | Championship |
| Peter | 19 | 2 | B | Championship |
| Jamal | 19 | 9 | B | Championship |
| Paul | 18 | 4 | C | Premier League |
| Ed | 18 | 7 | C | Premier League |
| Dave | 18 | 2 | C | Premier League |
| Grant | 20 | 5 | C | Premier League |
| Mickey | 20 | 3 | C | Premier League |
| Greg | 20 | 3 | B | Championship |
| Lenny | 18 | 2 | B | Championship |
| Rob | 19 | 2 | B | Championship |
| Kevin | 21 | 3 | B | Championship |
| Phil | 18 | 2 | B | Championship |

WHISTLEBLOWING IN FOOTBALL

Table 2: Master table of themes in relation to whistleblowing of abuse and bullying

| Superordinate themes | Subordinate themes |
|---|---|
| Professional football's influence on whistleblowing | The unique, institutionalized nature of football The efficacy in education and welfare |
| The challenges of reporting bullying | The ability to report The outcomes for the whistleblower Witnessing and bystanding |