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ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this thesis was to apply an interorganizational network analysis to the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) to determine the implementation effectiveness of its Speak Out! program. Rose's "Eclectic Model", replete with the four analytical approaches of structural, exchange, decisional, and organizing processes, was utilized as the theoretical framework to guide the study. The "Eclectic Model" was appropriate for use in analyzing a Canadian sport network.

Four research questions were examined as follows: how an interorganizational network evolves and operates as an overall system; how actors come to understand their network; how the network comes to influence their behaviour; and, how the network is shaped by organizational members. Data were collected from semi-directed focussed interviews with both CHA volunteers and staff who were closely linked with the Speak Out! program, and from CHA Annual General Meeting minutes. The QSR NUDIST computer program was utilized to help store, classify, code and categorize the data. Conceptual frameworks and frequency distribution tables represented the analysis.

It was found that the CHA network evolves through distinct organizing processes and operates with dynamic structural, exchange, and decision-making processes, all of which impact implementation effectiveness of the Speak Out! program. Members come to understand the network through its shaping, a result of various organizing processes. In this study, the network influences members' behaviour through mandating Speak Out! educational processes. The network is shaped through various enactment processes, by a variety of members who have interest in the Speak Out! program and athlete safety.
A primary recommendation based on the findings of the current study is to develop and conduct an extended, formalized network-wide evaluation of the Speak Out! program, including a policy review and a research based program assessment. As well, it is recommended that network constituents focus efforts on future Speak Out! planning in order to heighten implementation effectiveness. The current study has added to the non-existent body of knowledge on implementation effectiveness of a sport abuse and harassment program, however additional research of the Speak Out! program is recommended. Conducting future research on the Speak Out! program will aid in further enhancement of implementation effectiveness. This will ultimately affect the safety of the CHAs most valued participants, the players.
To know what you prefer instead of humbly saying amen to what the world tells you you ought to prefer, is to have kept your soul alive.

Robert Louis Stevenson
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been blessed with meeting so many great people along this Graduate journey to whom I extend heartfelt thanks. To my chairperson, Dr. Margery Holman, whose strength and energy I admire, and whom I regard as a constant academic and community role model. Thank you for your friendship, perseverance and encouragement in helping to develop within me a spirit for important research. To Dr. Gordon Olafson, whose friendship, support and inspiration truly instilled an appreciation for critical thought and its creative expression through writing. In doing so, you have accomplished for me what every teacher should hope to accomplish with students. Thank you to Dr. Krista Munroe, for her computer expertise and continual words of encouragement. As I venture forward, I will remember your advice that balance is the key to all that we do. My thanks is further extended to my committee members, Professor Rose Voyvodic and Professor Leigh West, for their insightful input and support.

I would like to thank Dr. Bob Boucher and Dr. Jim Weese for their teaching, encouragement and guidance. I will recollect with fondness the many conversations with Diane Dupuis, Pat Roberts and Sheila Daudlin, who made walking into HK always a pleasurable experience. Thanks for your help with all the important details of Graduate life. Thanks to Dave Banning, for helping to develop writing skills, and to Lynn Authier, whose administrative support and kindness was always appreciated in the three years before actually attending the University of Windsor.

My thanks and gratitude to my fellow HK Grads who have inspired me: Sheldon Baikie, for his pure heart and enlightened spirit; Sharon Lawrie for her steadfast commitment to all she does and her belief in all things equal; and, my chaos and NASSM
companion, Cathi Sabiston, for her creative spirit and intelligence and how, when melded together, makes it look so easy. Thank you for your gifts of friendship.

Further thanks are extended to Bonnie St. Louis, whose friendship, generous spirit, and consummate wisdom have been a constant source of support. Also, to my little sister, Ablavi Dofio, who has more courage than most; from her I learn so much. Much thanks to Allison King, for unconditionally supporting me through this journey and helping me come closer to knowing myself, and to Todd Hurst, who helps redefine friendship. Thanks to Kim Wallace and Doug Gilbert for their technological support. As always, thanks to lifetime friends Sherryll Sobie, and Deborah Jones, who listen carefully.

I have been fortunate to study an issue that has much to do the safety of athletes in sport settings. I wish to thank all interview participants for their candid thoughts and ideas and a special thank you is extended to Todd Jackson for his quick response time to EVERY email I ever fielded and the courtesies extended to me by him during every stage of the thesis process.

Lastly, I wish to thank my parents, Nan and Bob Spence, with all my heart, for their love, and never ending support.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ABSTRACT** ........................................................................................................ iii

** ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** .................................................................................. vi

** TABLE OF CONTENTS** .................................................................................. viii

** LIST OF TABLES** ........................................................................................... xi

** LIST OF FIGURES** ......................................................................................... xii

** LIST OF APPENDICES** .................................................................................... xiii

## CHAPTER

### I. INTRODUCTION

- Nature of the Problem ......................................................................................... 1
- Purpose of the Study .......................................................................................... 5
- Theoretical Justification ..................................................................................... 7
- Assumptions ......................................................................................................... 7
- Limitations ........................................................................................................... 8
- Delimitations ........................................................................................................ 8
- Operational Definitions of Key Variables ......................................................... 9
  - Structural Variables ........................................................................................ 9
  - Exchange Variables ........................................................................................ 9
  - Decision-Making Variables ............................................................................. 10
  - Organizing Process Variables ....................................................................... 10

### II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- Interorganizational Design .................................................................................. 12
  - Network Analysis ............................................................................................ 13
  - Harassment and Abuse Prevalence .................................................................. 16
  - Sport Sexual Abuse and Harassment ............................................................... 17
  - Sport Sexual Abuse and Harassment Theory .................................................. 19
- Risk Management Strategies ............................................................................. 20
  - Policy Development ......................................................................................... 23
  - Canadian Hockey League and the Players’ First Report ............................. 24
  - Canadian Hockey Association Speak Out! Program ................................... 25
    - Speak Out! Initiatives .................................................................................... 28
    - Speak Out! Screening Practices ................................................................... 29
III. METHODOLOGY

The Case Study .................................................................32
  The Case Setting ..........................................................32
Data Collection ..............................................................33
  Purposive Sample .........................................................33
  Sources of Data ..........................................................35
  Pilot Interviews ..........................................................36
  Identification of Interview Participants ............................36
Data Analysis ...............................................................37
  Triangulation of Data ....................................................37
  Case Analysis ............................................................37
  Case Analysis and QSR NUDIST .....................................38
  Further Data Analysis ..................................................39

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Network Structural Analysis ..............................................43
  Structural Variables ....................................................43
  Interlocking Directorates .............................................43
  Common Ownership .....................................................46
  Joint Projects ..........................................................46
  Structural Analysis and Centrality ..................................47
Network Responsibilities ................................................49
  Sub-Committee Responsibilities .....................................49
  National Level Responsibilities ....................................50
  Branch Responsibilities ..............................................51
  Member Association Responsibilities ...............................53
Implications of Structural Patterns on Speak Out! Program ....53
  Network Communication ..............................................54
  Consistency of Program Delivery ...................................55

Network Decision-Making Analysis ...................................57
  Key Issues ..................................................................57
  Abuse and Harassment Policy Implementation ....................58
  Speak Out! Initiatives Implementation ...............................60
  Ongoing Educational Processes ......................................62
Participants .................................................................62
Outcomes ..................................................................63
Appraisal of Decision-Making Influence ..............................65

Network Exchange Analysis .............................................67
  Money Exchange ..........................................................69
  Information Exchange ..................................................72
  Moral Support Exchange ...............................................75
  Summary of Network Exchange ......................................78
LIST OF TABLES

1. Meaning Units and Number of Respondents
   for The Eclectic Model .........................................................45

2. Meaning Units and Number of Respondents
   for Implementation Assessment ..............................................97
LIST OF FIGURES

1. Proposed Four-Phase Theoretical Model .........................................................6
2. Summary of the Research Strategy .................................................................40
3. Summary of Exploratory Research Strategy ...................................................42
4. The Eclectic Model: A Conceptual Framework .............................................44
5. Summary of Decision-Making Analysis ..........................................................66
6. Speak Out! Money Exchange ........................................................................70
7. Perceived National Influence in the CHA Network .........................................82
# LIST OF APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Canadian Hockey Association Harassment Policy</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Organizational and Programmatic Structure of the CHA</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Semi-Directed Focused Interview</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Problem

Harassment in sport has appeared on the agendas of organizations in recent years, primarily due to the revelations of sexual abuse endured by former National Hockey League player, Sheldon Kennedy. In 1997, Kennedy disclosed abusive incidents numbering approximately 300, perpetrated over a ten-year period by his coach, Graham James. Kennedy received support from his courageous disclosure, and consequently, since his coming forward, concern about the presence of sexual abuse in sport has resulted in greater attention given to addressing the problem. While this event proved important, it is worth noting that female and male athletes have come forward in the past with their own stories of sexual violence in sport to little or no support. The infrastructure of sport has not been conducive to such disclosures.

Even though sexual harassment is officially recognized, there remains definitional confusion. Holman (1995) asserts that disparities in personal understanding, individual tolerance levels, and legal versus social motivations that cause people to invoke action, all “...contribute to the failure of creating a unified interpretation of sexual harassment” (p. 1). Sexual harassment in a sport setting is defined as “…a form of discrimination based upon sex, manifested as any verbal or physical acts of a sexual nature that contribute to unequal treatment based upon socially constructed gender differences and that detrimentally affect the athletic environment” (Holman, 1995, p. 22).

Additionally, Kirby (1993), clearly outlines the boundaries of sexual harassment by stating, “...it is unwanted attention of a sexual and/or gendered nature, distasteful
jokes, threats, touching and even sexual intercourse with athletes who may also be minors” (p. 58). In the Players’ First Report policy, commissioned by the Canadian Hockey League (CHL) in 1997, Kirke notes that the term harassment encompasses “…a very broad range of prohibited behaviour, including discriminatory conduct, physical and sexual harassment, emotional, mental, physical and sexual abuse” (p. 2). A grey zone exists, adding complexity to the definition of harassment, in that tolerance levels vary; what one finds as tolerable behaviour, another may find as offensive and harassing behaviour (MacGregor, 1998). Varying sensitivity levels, along with cultural differences, add to definitional ambiguities of harassment.

A working definition of child sexual abuse could include any one or more of the following: exchange of reward or privilege for sexual favours; rape; anal or vaginal penetration by the penis, fingers or object; forced sexual activity; sexual assault; physical/sexual violence; groping; indecent exposure and/or incest (Brackenridge, 1997). Sexual abuse is more broadly defined though, as not only a physical violation, but one that affects a person on a holistic level. Robinson (1998) states, “...damage is done to the sexual, emotional and psychological health of the victim, and also to other group members living in the same poisoned environment” (p. 9). A continuum is outlined by Brackenridge (1997), whereby both sexual harassment and sexually abusive behaviours may be construed as stages of sexual violence. These behaviours constitute a “...spectrum from annoying to offensive to seriously damaging” (MacGregor, 1998, p. 5).

Sexual abuse has far reaching emotional implications for the victim, which may include feelings of distrust toward others, self-blame, shame, withdrawal, suicide, anger, and depression (Rodgers, as cited in Brackenridge, 1997). Although this list is certainly
not exhaustive, it illustrates the severe damage that abusers exert on their victims.

Brackenridge (1997) asserts that "...sexual abuse, then, while not recognized through any universal definition is manifested through a wide range of intrusive behaviours, which violate the person on a sexual basis" (p. 118). In order for an incident to be considered abuse, a five-year gap between the victim and abuser must exist (Finklehor & Williams, as cited in Brackenridge, 1997).

The sensitive and often complex nature of sexual abuse in sport can hinder the gathering of statistics. Brackenridge (1994) suggests that sport organizations exist separately from the regulatory and moral frameworks in other spheres of institutional life, and because of this separation, abuse may go undetected or unchallenged. Thus, sport organizations may indirectly discourage abused athletes from stepping forward, and those working within the infrastructure may downplay the actual prevalence of child sexual abuse. As a result, the identification of coaches who are perpetrators is sometimes prevented.

Public scrutiny of sport sexual abuse has been avoided because of its sensitive and ethical nature; the issue is largely ignored. Sport officials, coaches and athletes encounter embarrassment and fear when confronting sexuality and thus may experience difficulty speaking out on the issue (Brackenridge, 1997). "With few written policies and many unwritten sanctions of sexual abuse, many athletes remain silent" (Burton-Nelson, 1994, p. 186). Athletes may fear being cut from the team or not being believed if they step forward. Also, the level of perceived loyalty between the coach and athlete may deteriorate if the athlete discloses. Finally, the athlete may worry about experiencing levels of shame or embarrassment (MacGregor, 1998).
Empirical research on sport sexual abuse is sorely lacking, due primarily to the ethical concerns that this issue raises and the current ideology of sport organizations, as discussed. Disclosures from a high profile athlete such as Kennedy have helped those in sport organizations acknowledge sexual abuse as a problem and as a result, research development in this area has been stimulated. New initiatives have been directed toward the detection of potential abuse and preventative information has been provided in hopes of stemming the incidence rate in sport.

Kirby (1993) believes that sport managers need to fundamentally “get it”, by recognizing that sexual harassment and abuse is prevalent as indicated by available statistics. Kirby further recommends that responses be organized and strategies developed for initiating change. Such strategies include the production of educational materials, policies and initiatives to help eradicate harassment. Sport managers, progressive in their risk management approach to harassment issues, have employed policy development and screening initiatives as significant strategies.

Harassment policies have been developed in order to provide a process to deal with complaints of a harassing or abusive nature. Additionally, a policy that reflects the inherent values and beliefs of the organization serves as an educational tool for those people who access the organization. Lastly, implementing a harassment policy puts would-be harassers and abusers on notice that the organization takes the issue seriously. To that end, a policy may act as a deterrent for perpetrators seeking alignment with groups of children in a coaching capacity (MacGregor, 1998).
**Purpose of the Study**

Implementation effectiveness of harassment and abuse prevention policies and initiatives in National Sport Organizations (NSOs) are largely undetermined. Much research addressing the benefits of policy exists, as do guides for writing effective policies; however, no literature evaluates the effectiveness of a harassment policy and/or program (Kirby, 1993; MacGregor, 1998; Oglesby & Sabo, 1996). Thus, the purpose of this study was to apply an interorganizational network analysis to determine the implementation effectiveness of the Speak Out! program of the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA).

The theoretical foundations of Rose's (1981) Eclectic Model (see Figure 1) directed the present study. Accordingly, four research questions investigated in the exploratory network analysis of the CHA are: how does an interorganizational network evolve and operate as an overall system; how do actors come to understand their network; how does the network come to influence their behaviour; and how is the network shaped by organizational members. Sub-problems addressed through the use of the Eclectic Model include: identification of CHA structural patterns and their implications on Speak Out! implementation; identification of patterns of resource exchange and network perceived influence and their implications on network processes; and, selection and analysis of specific key issues within the CHA. These issues pertained to the implementation of Speak Out! abuse and harassment policies, the implementation of various Speak Out! initiatives and the ongoing development and dissemination of Speak Out! educational material and resources.
Figure 1 - Proposed Four-Phase Theoretical Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Emphasis</th>
<th>Assumption and Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Analysis</td>
<td>• Structured relationships within the network exist and Will be documented on the basis of observable positional Patterns, to map the structural dimensions of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Analysis</td>
<td>• Patterns of exchange within the network will be mapped And will contribute to an understanding of perceived influence and dynamics within the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional Analysis</td>
<td>• Specific decision issues will be studied in mapping observable patterns of decision making, in the development of the network over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Organizing Processes</td>
<td>• Based on the above, and with more subjective data on the meanings attributed to each of the above, understanding will be gained as to how the network comes to influence the behaviour of actors within it, and how it is shaped by them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretical Justification

This study was conducted to contribute to the body of knowledge on sport harassment and abuse and to aid those sport organizations wishing to implement prevention programs. The study’s results were analyzed and interpreted in order to reach a more specific idea of the effectiveness of a harassment program in a sport setting. The findings provided the basis upon which recommendations for enhanced policy and program effectiveness emerged, allowing organizations to be more proactive than reactive in their response to sexual harassment and abuse of athletes.

Assumptions

1. Perceptions had an effect upon interpersonal communication.
2. The Eclectic Model was a valid instrument for qualitative and quantitative analysis of an interorganizational network.
3. The Eclectic Model could be utilized in a sport interorganizational network, such as the CHA.
4. The Eclectic Model and its variables served as a boundary for data collection.
5. The variables of the Eclectic Model were not mutually exclusive.
6. The respondents answered in an accurate and truthful manner.
7. Managers’ perceptions of the organizational variables under analysis were measured for validity using a Semi-Directed Focussed Interview (SDFI) schedule.
8. Triangulation methods employed provided sufficient data to answer the research questions.
9. Theories and research findings in the administrative, business and
management areas of a sport organization transferred to the sport management field.

Limitations

1. The population under study included a limited number of affiliate sport organizations within the CHA during one period in time.

2. The instrument template used, known as the “Eclectic Model”, developed by Rose (1981), has been used in two previous studies.

3. Since the SDFI is the main method through which data was obtained, ensuring that relevant questions were asked was of utmost importance.

4. The study, exploratory and descriptive in nature, did not present causal or correlational findings.

5. The study may be limited to the sensitivity and potential confidentiality surrounding the issues of abuse and harassment in sport.

Delimitations

1. The study population was delimited to five CHA organizations, in the province of Ontario. These affiliate organizations were chosen in consideration of timely and cooperative responses.

2. The study pertained to the years following implementation of the CHA’s Speak Out! program, from 1997 to January, 2000.

3. The key issues examined for analysis were delimited to the implementation of Speak Out! abuse and harassment policies, implementation of various Speak Out! program initiatives, and the ongoing development and dissemination of Speak Out! educational material and resources.
4. Opinions gathered were from those in organizational positions of Executive Director, and Risk & Safety Manager/Abuse & Harassment Coordinator (where applicable), and from representatives of the CHA’s Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Harassment and Abuse.

Operational Definitions of Key Variables

Rose’s (1981) Eclectic Model served as the template for the interorganizational network analysis of the CHA. Operational definitions for the key sets of structural, exchange, decision-making, and organizing processes variables are provided.

Structural variables. Rose (1981) believes that the organizational linkages inferred from an organizational chart comprise a network’s structure, and is further indicated by the variables of interlocking directorates, common ownership, and joint projects. The first variable, interlocking directorates, refers to the duties and responsibilities shared in common through a Board of Directors. The second variable, common ownership, relates to those organizations outside the network studied who are members of the network and are entitled to nominate directors to the boards of some of the organizations in the network (Rose, 1981). The third and last variable relates to joint projects. These include any activities such as “...committees, investments, special projects, and research in which two or more of the organizations in the network under study have been active participants” (Rose, 1981, p. 54).

Exchange variables. Rose (1981) amalgamated Galaskiewicz’ (1979) work on exchange variables of money, information, and moral support. Money exchange within a network occurs when funds are transferred between two or more organizations. Money is in the form of loans, investments, grants or fees for services or products. Information
exchange between two or more organizations can take the form of written documents, personal contact, or meetings. Lastly, moral support variables refer to the "...expressed support of an organization in the network for acceptance of another's product, political positions or mode of operation, either within the cooperative sector or by other institutions such as government" (Rose, 1981, p. 57).

**Decision-making variables.** The dynamics or processes witnessed over a period of time within a network relate to the decisional variables of key issues, participants, and outcomes. Key issues are those of national interest involving all network organizations under study during recent years. The specific key issues chosen for study in the CHA pertain to implementation of the integrated Speak Out! abuse and harassment policies, implementation of the various Speak Out! program initiatives, and ongoing development and dissemination of Speak Out! educational material and resources. Network participants, the second variable, are identified as key decision-makers, "...who were formally or informally involved in raising, defining, and/or resolving the issue[s] under question" (Rose, 1981, p. 60). The third variable, decisional outcomes, refers to the course of action that was taken, if any, to resolve the issue.

**Organizing process variables.** The variables, adapted from the network analysis work of Weick (1979), include ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention. Rose (1981) defines ecological changes as those "...changes in the stream of information available to the actors within the network" (p. 61). Key issues identified for decisional analysis are examples of ecological change within a network. Enactment refers to "...actions related to the ecological changes, whether in the form of communications
(e. g., proposals) or more substantive action" (Rose, 1981, p. 62). Once the input from the organizational environment is sorted out, particular aspects are enacted upon to ensure further attention.

Selection refers to the processes whereby attention is focussed on the change under consideration within the entire network (Rose, 1981). These processes may be in the form of committee development or task forces. Lastly, retention refers to processes and actions used where the change becomes incorporated into the historical development of the network; for example, through policy rationalization, or program initiation.

The nature of the problem was outlined based on the issue of sexual harassment and abuse in sport. A study designed to assess quantitatively the change in incidence rate of athlete sexual abuse as a result of program implementation would be a valuable but complex undertaking. Bowker (1998) points out that the absence of national estimates of incidence or prevalence rates of sexual abuse in sport makes it impossible to know the actual scope of the issue. With no exact knowledge of the incidence rate, it would be difficult to determine resulting effects the implementation of a prevention program has on the incidence rate of sexual harassment in sport. Furthermore, Kirby believes outright that the effects of a policy on the incidence of sexual abuse are minimal to nil (Kirby, personal communication, Feb. 15, 2000). That notwithstanding, determining the implementation effectiveness of an abuse and harassment program within a Canadian National Sport Organization (NSO) is largely undetermined. Utilizing Rose's (1981) Eclectic Model, a network analysis was conducted of the CHA, in order to determine implementation effectiveness of the Speak Out! program.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature in areas of interorganizational design and sexual harassment is necessary to develop a thorough understanding of this study. Definitions of networks, and network analysis are provided, as is a historical review of interorganizational design. Rose's (1981) Eclectic Model, serves as the template by which the issue of sport harassment and abuse was explored. Thus, a review of harassment and abuse literature is provided, including empirical studies conducted in sport settings, available theory relating to harassment and abuse, and information regarding the CHA's Speak Out program.

Interorganizational Design

Benson (1975) defines the interorganizational network as a basic unit of analysis in the network of organizations that “…consist[s] of a number of distinguishable organizations having a significant amount of interaction with each other” (p. 230). More specifically, an interorganizational design is the comparative study of organizational variables. Stern (1979) outlines that two or more organizations comprise a network, consisting of organizational units and their linkages. These organizational units interact in order to achieve goals (e.g., service delivery) or acquire resources. Further unit activities include achieving programmatic goals, seeking consensus or valued domains, and developing/maintain resource flows.

Research in the field of interorganizational design outlines several determinants that help to measure the state of a network at any one time. Stern (1979) proposes four network determinants: administrative structure, degree of system coupling, multiplexity
of ties, and network resources. These determinants include information regarding the environmental context, interaction processes, historical development and specific structures of the network. The explanatory power of network analysis is enhanced by these essential components. Additionally, Stern (1979) and Benson (1975) recognize that the base of differential power is divided unevenly throughout the network. Some organizations gain power from the centrality of their functions while others gain dominance as a result of their linkages to a larger pattern of social organization.

Network Analysis

A network analysis is necessary in order to assess interorganizational networks. Network analysis is not a new process and its origins are derived from three schools of thought: structural functional theory, where both formal and informal aspects of the organization are considered; exchange theory, which deals with the content, conditions and evolution of relationships between individuals; and role theory, which explains the roles of individuals directly linked in interrelated offices (Tichy, Tushman, & Fombrun, 1980).

These authors believe network analysis to be a method of capturing the interaction of both static and dynamic dimensions of organizations. According to Tichy et al. (1980), network analysis is concerned with the patterning of relationships between groups, people and other organizations and "...[it] seeks to identify their causes and consequences" (p. 373). Therefore, the totality of the network, including the function, structure, and exchange of resources, relationship evolution, and individual roles is measured when conducting a network analysis.
In his examination of the historical transformation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), Stern (1979) applied a network analysis in order to understand interorganizational ties within a sport organizational context. Through analysis of the four determinants of administrative structure, degree of coupling, multiplexity of ties, and new network resources, Stern was able to view interorganizational activity in many parts of the system, rather than at one particular focal point. A network analysis, from his perspective, "...must examine information on process, political interests, historical development and environment in order to avoid empty descriptions of interorganizational relationships" (p. 265). The total context must be considered, not only the measurable determinants.

In Rose's (1981) analysis of relationships between six co-operative (business) organizations, she attempted to understand how an interorganizational network operated and evolved as an overall system; how actors came to understand it; how it came to influence actors' behaviour; and how it was shaped by the actors themselves. Through analyses of the network's structure, resource exchange, decision-making, and organizing processes, she discovered that none of the above analyses, when applied individually, were sufficient to explain the research questions, and a four-phase model was more effective. Thus, interorganizational theory was amalgamated to develop the Eclectic Model.

While Rose (1981) applied the Eclectic Model to co-operative business settings, Olafson (1984) facilitated a comparative study of the Canadian and British sport systems, similarly drawing from interorganizational sources. He noted that little attention had been given to "...the development of a research protocol to investigate the
interorganizational factors related to sport" (p. 354), and thus attempted to formulate a research methodology based on a further theoretical amalgamation. The Government Legislative Involvement (GLI) Model resulted, which compiled the methods of change agent research, conducted by Moriarty, Duthie, and Olafson (1972), and network analysis material developed by a number of interorganizational design theorists (Aldrich, 1979; Benson, 1975; Stern, 1979). By employing the proposed model with the network under study, Olafson (1984) determined that, "knowledge and understanding of comparative management science with reference to national and international sport can be expanded" (p. 356). The link between interorganizational design and network analysis to sport contexts was created with Olafson's comparative study of the Canadian and British sport systems.

The Eclectic Model, created by Rose (1981), was subsequently adopted and applied by Brannagan (1986) to analyze the Canadian Amateur Wrestling Association (CAWA), more specifically, to measure both formal and informal variables over a period of time within the organizational field. Rose's (1981) research questions were employed in this particular network analysis and the results were presented qualitatively, through content analysis, and quantitatively in the form of matrices and sociograms. Overall, Brannagan (1986) found the Eclectic Model to be adequate for the analysis since similarities existed between the study of co-operative and sport environments.

Interorganizational theory has been consolidated over the years, however, few studies conducted have had any generalizable qualities due largely to the discrepancy of variables utilized for examination of organizational networks. Olafson (1984) linked interorganizational theory to sport contexts in the comparative study of Canadian and
British sport systems. In doing so, it was hoped that the GLI Model would be instrumental in becoming "...the catalyst for interorganizational theory to be utilized in sport management" (p. 352). The Eclectic Model proved a more suitable template for Brannagan's (1986) examination of the Canadian amateur wrestling network though, as it helped him to "...gain a better understanding of amateur sport from an organizational perspective" (p. 1). Network analysis occurs infrequently in Canadian amateur sport, yet its value begs for further application. Network analysis of the CHA was facilitated by utilizing the Eclectic Model framework, and extending Brannagan's (1986) study. The CHA's Speak Out! program provided the impetus for this interorganizational network analysis.

Harassment and Abuse Prevalence

With disclosures like Kennedy's, the need to examine athlete harassment and abuse has become more apparent. Information and theory regarding sexual abuse and harassment as well as risk management strategies implemented by the CHA is expanded upon here. Research on child sexual abuse indicates an overwhelming prevalence of male abusers, where over 90% percent of recorded cases feature men as the perpetrator (Brackenridge, 1994). The possibility of abuse by female coaches (toward athletes) should not be overlooked, yet an underrepresentation of women in coaching positions has typically existed within sport organizations.

In the 1985 Fitness and Amateur Sport findings, women comprised only 7% of Canada's head coaching positions (as cited in Whitson & MacIntosh, 1989). In the U.S., legislation from Title IX has resulted in more available coaching positions and opportunities in response to the rise in female participation in athletics. However, male
coaches are ultimately occupying a higher percent of these positions. Moreover, amalgamation of US athletic departments is a factor contributing to decreases in number of female coaches and administrators (Lenskyj, 1990). In their study of British sport systems, White & Brackenridge (1985) found that women are “...underrepresented at the administrative, controlling and decision-making levels” (p. 104).

According to Burton-Nelson (1994), females have the opportunity to participate as a legacy of Title IX, but they do so under male leadership. The male majority in coaching positions has served to widen the potential for sexual abuse to occur. Lenskyj (1990) further iterates that “...men who have authority and power over women and children are frequently perpetrators of sexual abuse and there is some evidence that coaches are also to be found in this classification of abusers” (p. 241).

The prevalence of potential male abusers in positions of authority in sport has grave implications for young female and male athletes. Statistics gathered from psychological studies indicate that child sexual abuse affects at least 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 9 boys (Finklehor, as cited in Brackenridge, 1994). Such statistics widely underestimate the actual prevalence of child sexual abuse in sport, as experts in the field of sexual exploitation of children acknowledge, "...for every child who reports being molested, at least 10 more keep secrets unrevealed" (Special Report, 1999, p. 43).

**Sport Sexual Abuse and Harassment**

First attempts to examine the prevalence of sport sexual abuse and harassment were made by Lackey (1990) when he determined the extent to which sexual harassment occurs among U.S. high school females by their male coaches. His findings indicated that while "...improper relationships between high school female athletes and male
coaches is not widespread it is occurring, and is a social issue in sport that should be identified and addressed" (p. 26). Additionally, Lackey made the point that for too long sport has been highly valued by society and thus negative practices are overlooked.

Volkwein, Schnell, Sherwood, and Livezey reiterate this point (1997). These researchers attempted to determine female athletes' experience with, and emotional responses to, sexual harassment in sport by coaches. More than 20% of the respondents reported being subjected to potentially threatening behaviours; and more than a third of those had experienced potentially threatening behaviours. Furthermore, Volkwein et al. (1997) concluded, "...student athletes are able to distinguish between purely instructional behaviours and advances which overstep the delicate balance of a relationship based on mutual trust and respect" (p. 291). According to Volkwein et al., the athletic world does not differ from other social domains in terms of occurrences of sexual harassment.

While quantifiable and empirical results are difficult to obtain owing to the sensitive nature of the issue, statistics from the Calgary Sexual Assault Centre indicate that telephone contacts directly related to sexual abuse rose from 20 per month to 20 per week soon after Kennedy’s disclosure (Robinson, 1998). Approximately 5 of the 20 contacts were related to abuse of athletes by their coaches. Kirby, a Canadian expert on sport harassment and abuse, conducted over 100 interviews of athletes indicating abusive situations between January and April 1997, which were also a direct result of Kennedy’s admission (Kirby, personal communication, Feb. 15, 2000).

Empirical findings presented by Kirby and Greaves (1997) in their study of Canadian high performance level athletes indicated that approximately 23% of female and male athletes had sexual intercourse with persons in positions of authority in sport,
primarily coaches. Additionally, Holman's (1995) findings of the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU), revealed that 57% of female and male athletes indicated experience with sexual harassment, including jokes, comments, seduction, coercion and/or physical intrusion/assault. The issue of harassment has grave implications for the management of sport organizations, as revealed by available statistical and anecdotal evidence. Studies illustrate the need for continuous examination of sport harassment and abuse within organizational settings, including the development of the body of knowledge through theory and empirical studies, and through the implementation and assessment of risk management programs and policies.

Sport Sexual Abuse and Harassment Theory

Theories developed by scholars maintain a preventative emphasis to sport abuse and harassment, outlining practical information on recognizing potential situations and prevention of possible future situations. However, Brackenridge and Kirby (1997) developed the psychological concepts of sport age and the Stage of Imminent Achievement (SIA). This stage refers to the point when an athlete has reached a high level of performance but still falls below the elite level. For instance, the athlete is working towards a position on the Olympic or world championship team and is classified as a 'B' team athlete. Athletes whose SIA coincides with, or precedes their age of sexual maturity, are at greater risk of sexual abuse than those whose SIA follows their age of sexual maturity. This hypothesis is helpful and suggests that the constructs of sport age and SIA can be employed as a means for identifying and assessing the potential for incidence of sexual abuse across a range of sports. Future testing of this hypothesis across sport will help significantly in the development of child protection strategies.
Finklehor offers four preconditions for sexual abuse to occur: motivation to sexually abuse; overcoming internal inhibitions; overcoming external inhibitions; and overcoming the resistance of the child (as cited in Brackenridge, 1997). These preconditions are useful because for abuse to occur, "...the abuser must demonstrate great persistence in overcoming the various inhibitors he [or she] faces" (p. 120). Prevention of sexual abuse in sport may occur through strengthening the barriers against such abuse. This can be achieved through addressing those external inhibitors specifically and providing education for children and their parents.

Analysis of experiential accounting of sexual abuse cases in sport has identified a combination of factors or variables relating to the coach, the athlete, and the sport itself giving rise to abusive situations. Identifying risk factors early and employing barriers are two preventative measures. The stronger the barriers, the less likely the abuse will occur, regardless of the coach's persistence (Brackenridge, 1997). Researchers are attempting to ascertain the actual scope or incidence of sexual abuse of athletes by coaches. While this has been the case for several years, Kennedy's disclosure in 1997 provided the impetus to raise awareness of sport harassment and abuse, thus signalling a turning point in the development and implementation of risk management strategies in sport organizations.

**Risk Management Strategies**

In attending to the issue of sexual harassment, administrators of large organizations have established policies to minimize the risk of harassing or abusive incidents from occurring. In so doing, those within organizations are asked to address problems of institutional power and "...to regulate themselves in a way that is responsive
to social and community concerns" (Parker, 1999, p. 22). Many administrators have implemented sexual harassment policies and grievance procedures primarily in order to escape liability.

Englander (1992) writes on the subject of organizational liability against claims of sexual harassment and/or abuse and states that the "...promulgation of thorough policies and procedures for dealing with such claims will be invaluable in an employer's efforts to withstand claims totally devoid of merit as well as those which may be somewhat less clear cut" (p. 19). Liability occurs when an employer knows or should have known about harassing and/or abusive conduct or environment within the organization and did nothing to correct it, acted too slowly to correct it or acted insincerely. Englander (1992) notes five steps for organizations to take to avoid liability, including writing a formal sexual harassment policy, establishing grievance procedures, enforcing the written policy, implementing guidelines for remedial action and resisting any forms of retaliation, should a harassment complaint be filed.

In September 1996, Sport Canada issued a stipulation that in order for National Sport Organizations (NSOs) to receive federal monies, implementation of anti-harassment measures would be necessary. Consequently, NSOs responded with development and implementation of a wide variety of policies, rules and regulations (Kirby, Greaves, & Hankivsky, 2000). According to these authors, these organizational responses were reactive and uneven and were "...largely driven by the need to avoid liability and increase public accountability" (p. 129). Thus, too much reliance upon policy for liability sake hinders a "...transformative impact on the cultural context of sport" (p. 129).
Organizational sexual harassment remains commonplace, in spite of established policies and procedures (Firestone & Harris, 1997). Consequently, other preventative risk management strategies must be devised and implemented within sport organizations in an effort to protect athletes from sexual abuse within coaching environments. MacGregor (1998) advocates the establishment of boundaries through discussions and negotiations of physical (appropriate vs. inappropriate touching), social (appropriate vs. inappropriate social behaviours for a coach in a position of trust to display), and sexual boundaries between the actors of trust and authority relationships. Additionally, “safety audits” and equality training on gender relations, sexuality and any other basis of discrimination should be conducted within sport organizations (Kirby, 1993).

Evidently, policy and its implementation is insufficient and systemic change within the sport organizational environment is essential. MacGregor (1998) contends that unless the environmental changes are made to an organization, individual incidents will continually arise. Part of this environmental change requires creating conditions that inhibit and prevent expression of sexual misconduct. Programs that exclusively focus on negative behaviour, facts and/or information should be replaced by organizational adoption of healthy attitudes, values and behaviours, as advised by Berkowitz (1998). Subsequent documenting of harassing situations, supporting their occurrence and acting on them is required in order to prevent sexual harassment and abuse.

Other risk management strategies can be employed. A body of knowledge and research in the area of harassment and sexual abuse as it relates to sport contexts will help to educate sport managers on the issue and can provide concrete suggestions and strategies for implementation. Additionally, those in sport organizations need to create
avenues of support for victims of abuse; an athlete must feel comfortable revealing confidential disclosures. The various risk management strategies not only address the need for protection against organizational liability and public accountability, but also athlete safety and the call for systemic change in sport organizations.

**Policy Development**

To develop an effective harassment policy, Oglesby and Sabo (1996) noted several components crucial for inclusion. Firstly, a general rationale should outline the organization’s purpose for the policy and how it may link to its values and beliefs. Appropriate legal language needs to be applied as sexual harassment and abuse are crimes under the Canadian Criminal Code. Secondly, definitions of sexual harassment should be provided in order to establish a point of reference for those who may be in abusive situations with their coach.

Thirdly, guidelines for behaviour and action should be clearly articulated as well, for coaches, administrators, and athletes. Finally, an effective policy will provide information on accessible community and educational resources. Developing an effective policy “...is an intricate legal and social process” (Oglesby & Sabo, 1996, p. 4), and it is worthwhile for an organization to consider these aspects before producing a harassment policy that will exact desired change. The goal behind implementing a harassment policy is “...ultimately to reduce the incidence of the problem, not to increase complaints” (Robertson, Dyer, & Campbell, 1988, p. 103).

The Canadian Hockey League’s Players’ First Report is briefly introduced, as is the CHA’s Speak Out! Program, detailing its policies, various program resources, and initiatives.
The Canadian Hockey League and the Players’ First Report

As a response to Kennedy’s revelations, the Canadian Hockey League (CHL) commissioned Toronto-based sport lawyer and university law professor, Gordon Kirke, to author the Players’ First Report and Harassment Policy in January of 1997. The report … was a clear directive to bring forward policies and procedures designed to a) decrease the likelihood of it [sexual abuse of an athlete by any personnel in a position of trust or authority] happening in the CHL in the future, and b) provide an appropriate environment and support mechanism in the event that it does happen. (p. 1)

Kirke recommended four main components within the report, including: the undertaking of screening potential volunteers and paid employees; development of educational strategies to explore the causes and consequences of harassment; establishment of a confidential support system; and, a counselling network for players and employees who experience harassment.

The CHL, Canada’s premiere developmental hockey organization, is the primary feeder system for players wishing to enter the National Hockey League (NHL) or other international professional hockey leagues (www.canoe.ca/CHLNews/jan21_kirke.html, 2000). Developing the Players’ First Report was seen as an attempt by junior hockey administrators, “…to restore an image that [had] been tarnished badly by the [Graham] James scandal” (MacLeod, www.detnews.com/1997/preps/9701/23/01230036.html, 2000). Thus, Kennedy’s disclosure provided the inspiration for its development. It is worth noting that the Players’ First Report is not mandated for implementation within the
Ontario Hockey League (OHL), the Quebec Minor Junior Hockey League (QMJHL), or the Western Hockey League (WHL), thus its degree of implementation is unknown.

**The CHA Speak Out! Program**

The CHA, the national governing body for amateur hockey, established the Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Harassment and Abuse in February of 1997, as a direct result of the Kennedy incident and the development of the Players' First Report. A three year plan, focussed on harassment and abuse prevention in amateur hockey, was developed around the theme "Speak Out!: Abuse and Harassment can be Stopped!" The Sub-Committee utilized input from parent focus groups, expertise from those knowledgeable in the field of harassment and abuse, and a review of literature to focus on the development of prevention initiatives and educational strategies. Subsequently, during the past four years, a "...comprehensive program of training education, and awareness of harassment and abuse has been accomplished through workshops, resource materials, and branch and association initiatives" (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/index.html, 2000).

The Speak Out! program is a key factor in accomplishing the CHA's mission, developed in 1993, which aims to provide participants with enjoyable experiences in a safe sportsmanlike environment (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/index.html, 2000). Further to the CHA mission, is the intention of the Speak Out! program whereby "...educating the national sport organization, Branch representatives and local hockey association personnel, the CHA is weaving a tighter safety web around [its] most precious resources.....the players" (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/index.html, 2000).
The Speak Out! program includes an integrated policy on abuse and harassment outlining the principles and practices of the CHA with regard to abusive and harassing behaviour towards participants. Each branch and affiliate organization is responsible for adopting the Nationally written policy and modifying it to suit specific requirements as needed (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/policies.html, 2000). The policies, called the “Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy” and the “Canadian Hockey Association Harassment Policy”, are briefly described.

Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy. This abuse policy stipulates that within the CHA there will be “...no abuse and neglect, whether physical, emotional or sexual of any participant in any of its programs” (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/policies.html, 2000). It is expected that in upholding the safety of participants from maltreatment, all reasonable protective steps are to be taken by parents, volunteers and staff members of the CHA. The policy provides operational definitions of abuse, emotional abuse, physical abuse, neglect and sexual abuse individually. Two categories of contact and non-contact are also outlined (See Appendix A).

Canadian Hockey Association Harassment Policy. Integrated with the Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy is the CHA Harassment Policy. Together, the two policies cover the spectrum of abusive and harassing behaviours in amateur hockey. While some behaviours may be described as harassing when directed toward an adult, the same behaviours can be construed as abuse when directed toward a child or youth by any person in a position of authority or trust over those being harassed. Therefore, these policies delineate the range of behaviours constituting harassment and abuse.
The CHA, through the Harassment Policy, aims to provide an environment "...which actively discourages harassment and builds relationships based on trust and mutual respect, is an environment, which discourages the abuse of children and youth, and encourages the overall development of the individual" (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/policies.html, 2000). Promoting awareness of what constitutes harassment, and responding to any complaints or disclosures in a prompt and expedient manner furthers this aim. The policy outlines a zero-tolerance approach to harassment in any CHA activity or program.

Additionally, all CHA personnel are responsible to deal with harassment by refraining from harassing behaviour, and responding promptly to harassing incidents, using written guidelines for reporting. The CHA has defined harassment as

...conduct, gestures or comments which are insulting, intimidating, humiliating, hurtful, malicious, degrading or otherwise offensive to an individual or group of individuals, and which create a hostile or intimidating environment for work or sports activities, or which negatively affect performance or work conditions.

(http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/policies.html, 2000)

Forms of harassment may be based on the grounds of race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation and religion, all of which are prohibited in Canadian human rights legislation. Harassment may occur between peers (player to player, parent to official, coach to coach), or between one in a position of authority or trust and another in a subordinate position (coach to player, sport organization administrator to employee). The CHA Harassment Policy further outlines specific examples of harassing behaviour as well as the similarities and differences between harassment and abuse (See Appendix B).
Speak Out! initiatives. Various age-appropriate resources include the Speak Out! “puck brochure”, brochure, and poster, featuring current NHL team players and National Women’s team players. These print materials provide definitions of abuse and harassment, information on appropriate contacts if abusive situations arise, and details of how youth can support their peers on abuse and harassment issues. Print resources are distributed through the thirteen Branch offices throughout Canada.

Other print materials include the “Parents’ and Guardians’ Guide to Understanding Abuse and Harassment.” The guide helps parents and guardians how to recognize abuse and harassment, and address and educate children on these issues. Information is provided to help children avoid potentially harmful situations and identifies possible coping strategies children and youth may use if abuse or harassment has occurred. The CHA’s responsibility with regard to abuse and harassment is outlined, as are legal requirements for reporting abuse. Again, this guide is distributed through Branch Offices of the CHA (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/resources.html, 2000).

Additionally, a guide entitled “Speak Out! Act Now!” was developed by the Sub-Committee, in conjunction with the Harassment and Abuse in Sport Collective and Sport Canada to “…assist all local sport clubs and associations to prevent and respond to abuse and harassment” (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/develop/speakout/initiatives.html, 2000). The CHA has aligned themselves with such organizations as the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport (CAAWS), the Canadian Red Cross, and the Canadian Association for Ethics in Sport in order to share information on developing and implementing prevention programs.


**Speak Out! screening practices.** Sport organizations, committed to effective volunteer management and ensuring safer environments for athletes, have begun to utilize screening initiatives for all potential coaches, volunteers and support personnel.

"Organizations are not obliged to accept everyone who wants to volunteer, however, are obliged to do everything reasonable to protect those in their care" (Volunteer Canada, 1998, p. 3). The essence of an effective screening program is to detect any information of a detrimental nature that will affect the safety of the children under the care of a coach or other authority figure within the organization.

The majority of coaches within the CHA conduct themselves with integrity. Kirke (1997) reinforces this notion by stating, “...the power to influence can be a positive dynamic in the hands of a coach with integrity, enabling the coach to have a beneficial effect on the player in terms of both hockey and life skills” (p. 4). However, as the Kennedy incident and other reported incidents illustrated, predators seek out opportunities to exploit or harm children through alignment in positions of trust and authority. Lax or non-existent screening practices have aided these predators in securing positions within sport organizations. Therefore, the suitability of potential candidates should be assessed by background checks, through criminal record searches, and reference reviews. Those candidates who could threaten players’ safety may be spotted in advance and thus eliminated from consideration.

The CHA’s Speak Out! program includes recommendations on screening practices such as extensive review of volunteer and coaching application forms with provided references. The application forms, available to those organizations wishing to adopt a similar application process, can be modified to suit the particular needs of any
organization. These forms help to elicit information from an applicant in order to develop a background of his/her experience and level of qualification, and to assess appropriately the candidate's suitability for the position.

Another screening practice recommended by the CHA includes criminal record search screening. Any potential volunteer or paid employee of the CHA completes a form whereby he/she consents to a criminal record search. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), provincial or municipal police services are thus authorized to disclose an individual's criminal record and to make the CHA privy to any pertinent information (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/dev...speakout/initiatives/crsearch.html, 2000). This consent form also outlines the possible preclusion of an applicant based on any former conviction or charge from a position with the CHA.

The review of available sport harassment and abuse literature has illustrated that evaluation of prevention programs is lacking. An assessment of implementation effectiveness of the CHA's Speak Out! program was therefore timely. This was accomplished by an interorganizational network analysis of the CHA, according to the structural, resource exchange, decision-making and organizing processes variables of Rose's (1981) Eclectic Model. The methodology used to conduct the network analysis of the CHA will be outlined next.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methods and the research design used in the interorganizational network analysis of the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA). The research questions and sub-problems are detailed, as is information about the data collection and analysis procedures. The theoretical foundations of the Eclectic Model (See Figure 1), offered by Rose's (1981) interorganizational network analysis of cooperative businesses, directed the present study. Accordingly, the four research questions used in the exploratory network analysis of the Canadian Hockey Association are: how does an interorganizational network evolve and operate as an overall system; how do actors come to understand their network; how does the network come to influence behaviour; and how is the network shaped by organizational members.

Sub-problems addressed through the use of the Eclectic Model include: identification of CHA structural patterns and their implications on Speak Out! implementation; identification of patterns of resource exchange and network perceived influence and their implications on network processes; and, selection and analysis of specific key issues within the CHA. These issues pertained to the implementation of Speak Out! abuse and harassment policies, the implementation of various Speak Out! initiatives and the ongoing development and dissemination of Speak Out! educational material and resources.

Applying the four research questions above and related sub-problems, the implementation effectiveness of an abuse and harassment program was examined,
through data interpretation. The data, subject to analysis according to respective Eclectic Model variables, were examined using qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The Case Study

Within an interorganizational network such as the CHA, the case study was suitable for studying the real life context of the various network organizations, as it “…seeks to describe the unit in depth and detail, in context and holistically” (Patton, 1990, p. 54). The case study is an effective qualitative tool, however, since large amounts of data is generated, Patton (1990) acknowledges that collection and analysis of data can be unwieldy. Despite this, the case study was appropriate for conducting a network analysis of the interorganizational design of the CHA.

The Case Setting

In this study, the interorganizational network of the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) provided the case setting. A brief historical review of the development of the CHA contextualizes the organizational structure. The Ontario Hockey Association, formed in 1890, was the first organization to administer the sport of hockey in Canada. More than twenty years later, in 1914, the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association (CAHA) was established, to govern amateur hockey in Canada. In 1969, Hockey Canada was established, with the goal of improving the National team’s performance at international events. The CAHA and Hockey Canada worked in concert to represent Canada’s hockey interests until 1994, when the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) was forged, as the sole governing hockey body recognized by the Canadian federal government. Over time, affiliate associations have joined the CHA, resulting in the present day association. This includes two central offices, located in Calgary, Alberta
and Ottawa, Ontario, and 13 Branch offices (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/about/history.html, 2000). The CHA is guided by a large, elaborate network, comprised of Sport Canada, the governing body of the International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF), and the CHA’s Policy, Ad Hoc, Standing, and the Centre(s) of Excellence Committees. Each Canadian province has one affiliate office, except for Ontario, which has three: the Ontario Hockey Federation, the Ottawa District Hockey Association and Hockey Northwestern Ontario (See Appendix C).

CHA administrators are guided by the mission, developed in 1993, which adheres to the “…advancement of amateur hockey for all individuals through progressive leadership by ensuring meaningful opportunities and enjoyable experiences in a safe, sportmanslike environment” (http://www.canadianhockey.ca/e/about/mandate.html, 2000). Accordingly, CHA administrators have been active in addressing the issue of sport harassment, specifically through the implementation of the “Speak Out!” program.

According to Kirby, the CHA has “…aligned themselves [sic.] with some real experts in the field and…they’ve moved mountains in that sport” (Kirby, personal communication, Feb. 15, 2000). The experts identified include the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women in Sport (CAAWS), and the Canadian Red Cross. Since the CHA has been proactively involved with the implementation of the Speak Out! program, this organization provided a rich setting within which to pose, address and answer the research questions.

Data Collection

Purposive Sample

The organizations comprising the purposive sample for this study included the
central (Ottawa) office of the CHA and its Ontario branch affiliates: the Ontario Hockey Federation (OHF), the Ottawa District Hockey Association (ODHA) and Hockey Northwestern Ontario (HNO). The Ontario Women's Hockey Association (OWHA), a member partner of the OHF, was also included as was representation from the Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Harassment and Abuse. These organizations were chosen so that the study represented a network analysis from amateur hockey associations for females and males across Ontario. The timeframe for conducting this study was from July, 2000 to April, 2001. These organizations are briefly described.

The CHA National offices in Calgary, Alberta and Ottawa, Ontario, govern Canadian hockey from entry-level participation to competitive participation in international events such as the World Championships, World Cup of Hockey and the Olympic games. Approximately 4.5 million people are involved directly with administering the game of hockey to over 500,000 registered players throughout Canada. The Ottawa office is specifically responsible for overseeing the Speak Out! program, in addition to managing the insurance and risk management programs.

The OHF, the country's largest branch affiliate has a registered player membership of 185,000 players and more than 11,000 teams, comprising more than 25,000 coaches, trainers and officials. Described as a “mini-CHA”, the OHF has seven member partners, which operate programs within their area of jurisdiction and follow all OHF regulations, rules and policies. As a member partner of the OHF, the OWHA governs the sport of female hockey in Ontario. The OWHA player membership totals approximately 23,000, with 1,556 teams directed by 4 to 5 volunteers each (F. Rider,
personal communication, March 2, 2001). Its jurisdiction extends to include all three Ontario branches, where Regional Directors preside on respective Board of Directors.

The ODHA branch affiliate governs Eastern Ontario hockey and represents approximately 23,000 members. Hockey Northwestern Ontario is the smallest of the Ontario branches; its player membership totals approximately 6,000 with player registration increasing steadily 2% per year. Reformed in 1999, HNO’s territory extends to the Ontario/Manitoba border to the west, White River, Ontario, to the east, the American border to the south and the James Bay region to the north (J. Ward, personal communication, March 1, 2001). The OHF, ODHA and HNO are all CHA branch administrations concerned with managing amateur hockey in Ontario. All are non-profit organizations governed by volunteer Boards of Directors. In all cases, the branch affiliates employ professional staff, responsible for the daily administration of provincial amateur hockey.

Sources of Data

A semi-directed focused interview schedule (SDFI), developed by the researcher, acted as the primary source of data (See Appendix D). It was administered to individuals within the identified organizations to elicit responses pertaining to: the decisional analysis of the key issues surrounding the Speak Out! program; personal and organizational ties within the hockey organizational community; and, information regarding perceived influence within the CHA network. Ten interviews were conducted in person and two interviews were conducted by telephone. Additional data was gathered from analyzing CHA Annual General Meeting (AGM) Minutes from 1997-2000.
Pilot Interviews

Videotaped SDFIs were piloted prior to the collection of data with three individuals who possessed specific expertise related to the research. These interviews were videotaped for analysis afterward. By incorporating clarifications from pilot and video feedback, the instrument’s validity was enhanced and the authentic interview process was expedited more efficiently.

Identification of Interview Participants

A confederate who acts as an advocate of the Speak Out! program and is knowledgeable about the CHAs organizational and programmatic structure aided the researcher in identifying interview participants for the current study. This individual was asked to identify two senior administrators in each of the five identified branch organizations. These interview participants were knowledgeable of the CHA network community and responsible for the implementation of the Speak Out! program in their respective organizations. In addition, two key members from the Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Harassment and Abuse were identified by the confederate and were also interviewed. In total, 12 interviews were conducted.

Patton (1990) noted that qualitative inquiry is a more intrusive methodology because it “...takes the researcher into the real world where people live and work, and because in-depth interviewing opens up what is inside” (p. 356). Ensuring the confidentiality of participants’ identities and their responses was of extreme importance. Through interviews, participants revealed sensitive information, thus it was necessary to conceal any names, locations and other identifying information so that participants were protected from any punitive action (Patton, 1990).
Data Analysis

Triangulation of Data

Patton (1990) acknowledges that triangulation, or "...the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena" (p. 187), helps to strengthen a study design. Triangulation is an important strategy to use as the combination of interviewing, observation, survey methods and document analysis helps to provide cross-data validity checks, thereby increasing the trustworthiness of the data. "Using a combination of data types increases validity as the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another approach" (Marshall & Rossman, as cited in Patton, 1990, p. 244).

The strategy of methodological triangulation is outlined by Denzin (1989), and was employed in the present study. Methodological triangulation is the phenomenon of employing multiple methods to conduct the network analysis of the CHA. In this case, both qualitative and quantitative methodologies were implemented to study and analyze data collected. Using triangulation has its drawbacks in that ensuring that multiple methods are exacted is consuming and expensive. Using triangulation though, ensures that the researcher is amenable to utilizing multiple methods to examine the problem (Patton, 1990).

Case Analysis

Once the data was completely collected, its primary patterns were identified, coded and categorized. This process is known as content analysis (Patton, 1990). In the proposed study, a case analysis approach was facilitated, whereby the data were organized according to the particular CHA participants as specific cases for a more in-depth study.
Case analysis and QSR NUDIST. The QSR NUDIST (Non-Numerical, Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorizing) computer program, was utilized in the case analyses. It is a program “...designed to help users in handling non-numerical and unstructured qualitative data, by allowing them to engage in processes such as indexing, searching and theorizing” (QSR NUDIST Revision 4 User Guide, 1997, p. 3). Additional functions include storing, coding, retrieving and analyzing text (Weitzman & Miles, as cited in Munroe, 1999).

An interpretational analysis was conducted by two investigators following the procedures outlined by Côté, Samela, Baria, & Russell (1993) and further followed by Munroe (1999). The taped interviews were transcribed verbatim and imported into the NUDIST program. Meaning units and core categories were derived from the data, using interpretational analysis. The meaning units, which can be a word, sentence or phrase, indicating an idea or theme, were indexed and coded from interview responses. A hierarchical tree structure thus represented the coding scheme. Nodes, holding the indexed meaning units, represented branches of the tree. The QRS NUDIST was a tool to manage extensive amounts of data, and provided the researcher with an interorganizational overview (QSR NUDIST Revision 4 User Guide, 1997).

Patton (1990) notes the value of a more elaborate classification analysis design, such as NUDIST. Such computer programs can be useful in assisting the researcher with organizing an overabundance of data. Utilizing NUDIST helped to address the four research questions posed and sub-problems, thus aiding in identifying the CHA network’s patterns of structure, exchange resources, decision-making, and organizing processes. The root of the tree, Implementation Effectiveness, is the most general level with the
branches being the higher order nodes (See Figures 4 & 8). The nodes, throughout the
analysis phase remained flexible in order for modification and refinement until a
satisfactory classification system was reached, known as theoretical saturation (Miles and
Huberman, 1990). There was a 98% agreement between the two investigators on the
coding of the meaning units.

Further Data Analysis

Although the primary qualitative methodology was content analysis, further data
analysis was undertaken. Analysis of variable specific information was guided with the
use of Rose's Eclectic Model (See Figure 2). With regard to the exchange variables of
money, information and moral support, analysis of perceived network influence was
adapted from Galaskiewicz (1979), and when applied, helped to determine the more
influential organizations within the network and the implications of perceived network
influence. There was uncertainty about each respondent having the same understanding
of the questions asked in the interview, thus, unique to the exchange variables, response
error may have been an issue in the analysis of data.

The data gathered around decisional variables were analyzed qualitatively.
Decisions surrounding three key issues highlighted were reconstructed for analysis. The
three key issues analyzed centred on the implementation of the Speak Out! abuse and
harassment policy, the implementation of the various Speak Out! program initiatives,
and the ongoing development and dissemination of Speak Out! educational material and
resources.

A difficulty in decision analysis lies in the fact that actors who occupy the
### Figure 2 - Summary of the Research Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Sets of Variables</th>
<th>Predominant Focus of the Data Analysis of Key Sets of Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interlocking directorates</td>
<td>• Positional analysis of centrality within the network and of the network as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exchange</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Money</td>
<td>• Analysis of perceived influence in relation to exchange flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moral support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived influence within and surrounding the network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key issues</td>
<td>• Analysis of problems, solutions, participants and choice opportunities in the decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizing Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ecological change</td>
<td>• Analysis of organizing processes in relation to six developmental points in the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enactment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

position at the time of the decision-making may not occupy the same position at the time of the study. This was the case in the CHA. Additionally, decision analysis was conducted on the basis of perception and documentation factors, rather than on the basis of observing current events and behaviours (Rose, 1981). Because key issues identified provide the impetus for the interorganizational network analysis of the CHA, analysis of the decision-making variables addressed all research questions outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Analysis of the organizing processes variables was conducted, using qualitative and exploratory analyses of the three key issues. Subsequently, the underlying operative rules during the inception of the Speak Out! program were identified and this helped to provide a more developmental view of the CHA.

In summary, the research strategy (See Figure 3), involved the CHA as a case setting for an interorganizational network analysis. Data were collected on structural, exchange, decision-making and organizing processing variables. Analysis included both qualitative and quantitative methods, by content analysis, using the QRS NUDIST computer program and specific interorganizational theory analysis. The results and a discussion of the findings are presented next.
Figure 3 - Summary of Exploratory Research Strategy

1) Identification of:
   a. Methodology
   b. Basic Strategy
   c. Key Issues:
   d. Key Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>• Rose's Eclectic Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exploratory Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>• Implementation of the Speak Out! policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>• Implementation of 12 screening Speak Out! initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>• Ongoing development and dissemination of education materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Canadian Hockey Association (CHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ontario Hockey Federation (OHF) and member partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ottawa District Hockey Association (ODHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hockey Northwestern Ontario (HNO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Collection of Data

|          | • Semi-Directed Focussed Interview |
|          | • AGM Meeting Minutes |

3) Analysis of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories and key sets of variables on which data were collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Functionalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interglocking Directorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | • Predominant focus of the analysis of data on key sets of variables |
|          | • Positional analysis of centrality within the network, and of the network as a whole |
|          | • Analysis on perceived influence in relation to exchange flows of organizations |
|          | • Analysis of problems, solutions, participants and choice opportunities in the decision making process |
|          | • Analysis of organizing processes in relation to developmental points in the network: which organizations were involved in and what were the underlying rules at play during the decision making process |

4) Results

|          | • Illustrated in chart form and described in depth |

5) Conclusions

|          | Drawn from decision making process of the three issues, identified as: |
|          | 1. The implementation of the Speak Out! Harassment and Abuse policies |
|          | 2. The implementation of 12 Speak Out! Initiatives |
|          | 3. The ongoing development and dissemination of educational materials |

6) Recommendations

|          | For future research |
|          | For the CHA's Speak Out! Program |

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Network Structural Analysis

Findings are presented according to CHA structural patterns and their implications as they relate to Speak Out! implementation. Refer to Figure 4 for a conceptual framework and Table 1 for a frequency distribution of structural processes.

Structural Variables

CHA structural patterns were identified through an analysis of the structural variables of interlocking directorates, common ownership, and joint projects. The structural information related to these variables is usually formally mapped on an organizational chart with prescribed communication lines. Although these positional data are the easiest to obtain, Tichy et al. (1980) maintain these data are “…the least informative of all network methods because [they] fail to tap the actual ongoing processes of the organization” (p. 379-380). Because it is least accurate, positional analysis must be used in conjunction with other methods to fully determine structural patterns within the CHA network.

Interlocking directorates. As defined, interlocking directorates, refer to a situation where one or more persons sit on the Board of Directors of two or more firms in a network (Burt, 1980). This type of interlocking presumably promotes organizational closeness, thereby facilitating resource exchange and cooperation (Brannagan, 1986). In this study, interlocking directorates were found to exist between branch affiliates and the National level, whereby OHF, ODHA and HNO Branch Presidents preside on both their respective provincial Executive Boards and the National Board. Interlocking directorates also exist between the OWHA and Ontario branch affiliates. Regional Directors, who
Figure 4
The Eclectic Model: A Conceptual Framework
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Level One  Level Two  Level Three  Level Four
Table 1

Meaning Units and Number of Respondents for The Eclectic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eclectic Model</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>mu</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Processes (244)</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of Structural Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Processes (288)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Processes (299)</td>
<td>Exchange Variables</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral support</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Processes (357)</td>
<td>Ecological Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enactment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Changes &amp; Modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. mu = number of meaning units; r = number of respondents.
administrate female hockey, preside on both the OWHA Board and the Boards of the ODHA and HNO. Additionally, top OWHA administrators interlock with the OHF as a member partner of this branch affiliate.

**Common ownership.** Common ownership denotes a common link through the Board of Directors and are those network eligible to nominate Directors to at least one of the five organizations under study. Similar to Brannagan's (1986) study of the CAWA, all members of the CHA provincial branch affiliates are automatically members of the CHA. Additionally, when provincial branch members elect a Branch President, the members are also electing the same individual to the CHA National Board of Directors. Thus, common ownership exists between the National level and the branch affiliates under study, where the Board of each branch links with the National Board.

Common ownership also exists between the OWHA member partner and its host affiliate, the OHF, as well as with the ODHA and HNO, where OWHA Regional Directors are nominated to the Boards of the branches they represent. Common ownership was evident to the same degree between the CHA National office and the OWHA. All branch affiliate members have common ownership with the National level through the representing Board President. As well, all provincial branch members are members of the CHA. The OWHA has common ownership with the OHF, its parent organization, and thus, does not directly link with the CHA National office.

**Joint projects.** This third structural variable, are activities in which two or more organizations within the network are active participants. These projects can be committees, investments, and/or research. By Rose's (1981) definition, the Speak Out! program is classified as a joint project which involves the entire network. This joint
project is funded through the National Risk Management Committee. Determining all network joint projects was outside of the scope of the study.

**Structural Analysis and Centrality**

The concept of centrality, or the network position of one organization, is associated with structural analysis. Rose (1981) believes that centrality of network organizations correlates to network influence in some way. Additionally, Galaskiewicz (1979) notes that “…the more critical a [network] position, the more ‘status’ it should have and the more its incumbents should be rewarded” (p. 22). Therefore, an actor’s status (i.e., power) within an organization will be a function of his or her centrality. By examining structural variables, a better understanding of CHA network centrality emerges.

From the findings, the CHA National office and the OWHA were the most central organizations of those studied. Interlocking directorates and common ownership was evident in both organizations equally. When examining the network to include all provincial branches, the 13 Branch Presidents interlock and maintain common ownership with the National Board. Thus, while centrality was found to be equal in this study of Ontario CHA network organizations, the CHA National office is a more centralized organization than the OWHA, relative to the entire CHA network.

As the most centralized organization, the CHA National level actors have developed highly interdependent relationships with all other actors in the system and thus have better access to them at a minimal social distance. In turn, other peripherally located actors are dependent upon the National level for the maintenance of network relationships (Galaskiewicz, 1979). Highly centralized organizations are assumed to
benefit from their position to a greater degree than other organizations within networks because of the high level of attributable influence. However, Boje and Whetton (1981) purport that "...central actors are actually in the position of greatest dependence because they are vulnerable to excessive and conflicting expectations" (p. 392). This vulnerability, perhaps as a result of centrality, is evident in network communication patterns, and program delivery inconsistencies, as described later in this section.

The OWHA's central position within Ontario is attributed to several factors. Participant 10 noted that the OWHA is an autonomous organization, relative to the greater CHA network. This Participant stated, "...they [OWHA] pick and choose what programs they want, how much emphasis they want to put on certain programs, and differences in the way they administer the program." Galaskiewicz (1979) explains that decision-making organizations are "...autonomous actors in the community who reserve the right to pursue one public policy or another as they see fit" (p. 139). Autonomous organizations are perceived as very influential within the network as long as they make decisions that do not offend powerful interest groups. Boje and Whetton (1981) agree that a local organization's level of autonomy impacts upon the level of centrality and attributable influence.

The OWHA's uniqueness was referred to by 3 Participants and accounted for 16 m.u.s. Described as a values-based organization, the OWHA is not bound by rules and regulations geared to "win at all costs", as perceived by brother (male hockey) organizations. Participant 7 commented, "...with our brother and parent organizations, we've observed [them] to struggle with historical problems, that winning and some of those great carrots at the end have come." As a result, this Participant feels the male
hockey domain is challenged by high performance and money factors, which are not present in female hockey to the same degree. Also, the OWHA have no residency rules established in Ontario, thus players can live anywhere and play anywhere else. The organization is “player-driven” and no arguments ensue based on geographical or territorial disputes, as witnessed in other CHA organizations, when male players transfer from one branch to another. Thus, the level of centrality could be affected by the uniqueness of female amateur hockey organizations in Ontario.

The high level of centrality found in this study is attributed to the network structure. Participant 7 elaborated, “…a lot of what we [OWHA] have done in Ontario has been done because of our structure, because of our network, because of representing the entire province of all ages, so we don’t have divisions that are splintering between minor and junior.” The structure also lends to a convenient method by which to disseminate information to all female players. Therefore, the amount of centrality the OWHA experiences within the province of Ontario is attributed to its autonomy, differences noted between the male and female game of hockey and the OWHA organizational structure.

Network Responsibilities

To further determine structural patterns, an analysis of Speak Out! responsibilities was conducted at the Sub-Committee, National, Branch and Member Association levels.

Sub-Committee responsibilities. The Sub-Committee was developed as a sub-group of the National Risk Management Committee, in February, 1997, soon after Graham James was convicted of sexually assaulting Kennedy and two unnamed players. Participant 4 described that when the Sub-Committee was developed, “…a lot of trust
was given to those people to do what was right for hockey." Comprised of professionals with expertise in medical, legal and human rights areas and heavily involved in the decision-making processes, this Sub-Committee was primarily responsible for creating the program policies, initiatives and resources.

Resource creation included the writing and editing of the integrated Speak Out! abuse and harassment policies, and the "Speak Out! Act Now!" manual, which is the implementation guide for other organizations wishing to develop a prevention program. The Sub-Committee also designed and created brochures and posters, and developed screening processes, such as volunteer and coach application forms, job descriptions, and criminal record search procedures. The Sub-Committee is now responsible for setting a budget, creating new Speak Out! policies, selecting and editing articles for the Speak Out! newsletter, published twice yearly and continually addressing abuse and harassment issues in hockey. The Sub-Committee Chairperson reports to the National Board of Directors at the AGM. Sub-Committee responsibilities were referred to by 7 Participants, totalling 10 m.u.s.

National level responsibilities. The National offices, located in Calgary, Alberta and Ottawa, Ontario, are the governing offices of Canadian hockey. The Ottawa, Ontario office is responsible for overseeing the continual development and implementation of the Speak Out! program. A Risk and Safety Manager, staffed in Ottawa, represents the National office on the Sub-Committee as a staff resource and supports and directs the Sub-Committee in terms of administrative responsibilities (T. Jackson, personal communication, March 1, 2001).
Implementation responsibilities at the National level were referred to by 9 Participants, totalling 41 m.u.s., and include continual dissemination of Speak Out! educational materials to branches and provision of resources, enabling branches to build and implement their own policies. The National office encourages all branches to work in conjunction with their individual associations, and promotes a two-way flow of communication between themselves and branches. In so doing, the National office maintains a support role and provides direction in implementing the Speak Out! program, continually taking individual branch needs into consideration. The National level is additionally responsible for overseeing branches fulfil the mandate for coaches to complete the Speak Out! workshop by September 1, 2002. The National office is also responsible for sharing information with other sport organizations and to date, has met with several local sport associations in need of implementation information for prevention programming.

Branch responsibilities. The Ontario branch affiliates mirror the National level in their Speak Out! responsibilities. These responsibilities were reflected in 8 Participants responses, totalling 80 m.u.s. The organizational structure, described by one Participant as a “hand-me-down” type, is such that the National office receives the developed master policies and initiatives from the Sub-Committee, and delivers them to the provincial level. The branches are then responsible to deliver policies and initiatives further to the member associations. While each branch office maintains an autonomous identity, there are general Speak Out! responsibilities that each branch is expected to uphold. These responsibilities focus on program development and implementation duties as well as instructor training.
With regard to program development, each branch office is responsible for adapting master Speak Out! policies and Codes of Conduct, and make applicable to its unique organizational needs. Branches are also responsible for adopting screening measures, and again, modify them to fit organizational specificities. When a branch feels comfortable that the program is modified appropriately, implementation to the member associations or the grassroots level of amateur hockey occurs. Participant 1 described the process as, “…the branch is our [National level] distribution point and then from there, it's distributed to the associations, teams, and coaches.” Additional implementation responsibilities include preparing press releases, abuse and harassment committee development, maintenance of communication conduits between the National level and member associations and continual upgrading of distribution methods. The branches are expected to be a strong promoter of Speak Out! materials and to emphasize program accountability to member associations.

Branch administrators are responsible for recruiting appropriate volunteers to complete the Master Course Conductor program, offered by the National level in conjunction with the Canadian Red Cross. This program allows for two branch representatives to receive Speak Out! workshop facilitation training, in an extensive 32 hour program. These representatives return to the home branch and deliver the Speak Out! workshop training to another twenty to thirty coaches, helping to satisfy the workshop mandate of September, 2002. This mandate is monitored at branch levels by tracking the number of individuals who have attended the Speak Out! workshop clinics. Currently, coaches are specifically required to meet the mandate, however many branches administrate the Speak Out! workshop clinics to administrators, players and parents in the
Trainer and Safety Certification programs. The Branch President reports on Speak Out! progress at each National AGM.

Member association responsibilities. The Speak Out! responsibilities of the member associations mirror that of their respective branch affiliate. These responsibilities accounted for 34 m.u.s., and reflected 8 Participants’ responses. Upon receipt of branch-specific policies, member administrators are responsible for policy adoption and modification, according to specific organizational needs. Additionally, member associations are responsible for ensuring that screening procedures are carried out. An Abuse & Harassment Coordinator is appointed to oversee the development and implementation of the policy and program. Other volunteers are recruited to help deliver the program, as well as deal with questions and situations pertaining to abuse. Abusive situations are reported to the authorities, or to a specific child protection agency, whereas situations of a harassment nature are handled within the organization, through consultation with developed policies and Codes of Conduct.

At this level, the main objective is to deliver Speak Out! materials into the hands of the players and their parents. If the branch does not deliver appropriate materials, member associations are responsible for acquiring them. Additionally, plans for implementation and material projections, including budgetary information, must be submitted to the branch affiliate. Communication and feedback channels are kept open between member associations and their respective branch affiliates.

Implications of Structural Patterns on Speak Out! Program

Findings detailing the Eclectic Model’s structural variables and their relationship to network centrality as well as network Speak Out! responsibilities help to illustrate
CHA structural patterns. These patterns were found to affect the manner by which the Speak Out! program develops and is implemented. Discussion of implications on network communication, and consistency of program delivery follows.

Network communication. The CHA network structure was found to influence the development of communication patterns within the CHA. The “hand-me-down” type of organizational structure, as described by one participant, is congruent to another’s description of the CHA’s “tiered” communication processes. Participant 6 further illustrated the meaning of tiered network communication processes by identifying the CHA National level as the vehicle at the top of the pyramid, which then breaks off to the 13 branches that have little say in network matters. A feeling of closed communication is perpetuated in the tiered structure in that, according to this Participant, “…some people sort of feel that if you’re not in the group, you’re not there, but then that’s true from the branch level down to the minor hockey associations, so it’s something that filters through.” Thus, these tiered communication processes are mirrored from the National-branch level to the branch-association level. The Speak Out! program delivery systems are consequently impacted because “…it’s going to take some time to filter to the associations, as does anything when you have such a tiered communication process.”

Specific communication patterns were found to have developed within the network. The National level maintains two-way communication flows with the branch for the delivery of the Speak Out! program. It was the perception of a National level Participant that this two-way flow could be more effective in that “…they [branches] have to know when to pick up the phone and try to access some expertise in [Speak Out!] areas.” In turn, Participants perceived the National office to be ineffective
communicators on such issues as policy direction and guidelines. According to Participant 4, the lack of communication from the National level is a result of hesitating to be more assertive from a staff standpoint. This Participant stated, "...I think a lot of them have a lot of expertise to offer and sometimes I think they're uncomfortable doing that because of the staff/volunteer relationship they have."

Therefore, both National and branch level Participants felt that the two-way communication flows could improve by sharing expertise and important information regarding decision-making. Moreover, the communication flow needs to be open between all network levels in order for all to be educated on issues. Participant 4 observed, "...it's important for our members to feel like they're part of the decisions that are made." Thus, open communication flows will promote development of feedback channels and a sense that constituents are supported as being a part of the decision making process.

**Consistency of program delivery.** The CHA network, replete with differing cultural, language, legal and geographical considerations, is an extremely diversified network. This network diversification has led to an inconsistent level of Speak Out! program delivery across Canada. Situations arise as a result of diversification that challenges written policies. Primarily, CHA branches and local associations have varying operating procedures and as a result, according to Participant 3, "...some branches have an infrastructure to deliver better than others, so they have a greater impact on the issues." Therefore, varying organizational infrastructures impact the degree and rate to which policies are implemented, which in turn affects the type of volunteer who assists in program delivery and the types of screening measures adopted.
It was recognized by Participant 1 that, "...if you don't have policies and procedures in place, there's I guess a lack of consistency in the way it's being handled and it can cause a lot of grief, if you don't have firm policies." Participants expressed that maintaining a high calibre of volunteers knowledgeable in both areas of hockey skill development and child-care policy, is hard to achieve due to volunteer turnover, time constraints, screening and qualification restrictions, and instructor training costs. Additionally, organizations have no control over how a volunteer delivers the Speak Out! program. Participant 6 illustrated this concept by stating,

...it's easy if you and I went out and you took one side of the street and I took the other side and we did it but when you start relying on seven or eight other people to do it, then it fractions off and if one guy decides, 'oh there's nobody here, I'm not even going to leave anything', all of a sudden you've lost and maybe that's the place where it's happening.

Screening measures adopted among individual organizations under study varied. In one branch studied, the criminal record search was the only screening measure in place, while in another, screening procedures were much more established with written job descriptions, application forms and follow-up procedures. In the branch with the record search as the primary screening method, Master Course Conductor training was behind schedule since this organization was experiencing difficulty finding volunteers to be trained. A lack of volunteers ultimately affects how the program can be delivered.

Regional differences within Canada that represent cultural and language diversity also affected the level of program delivery consistency. Participant 2 noted, "...I think just our lack of bilingual capacity would impede our ability to deliver some of our
[National] services directly to Hockey Quebec.” Ensuring all materials are produced in French and English has been one method to alleviate language barriers. Despite these factors dictating inconsistent program delivery, Participant 9 noted, “…each of the branches are different and it becomes incumbent on the CHA to develop something with enough flexibility to allow that to happen because there isn’t that level of control over what is going to happen and how it’s going to be dealt with.” Findings related to decision-making analysis are presented and discussed next.

**Network Decision-Making Analysis**

Analysis of the decision-making processes in the CHA network pertaining to the Speak Out! program addresses the more subjective aspects of the network’s development (Brannagan, 1986). Through decisional analysis, network patterns of influence are determined as both organizational interests and by-products of the decision-making and developmental processes. When analyzing a network’s decision-making processes, a researcher is interested in: examining a number of key issues; identifying the participants in decision-making; determining the outcome; and, then appraising the relative influence within the network (Tichy et. al., 1980). Following this process, a decisional analysis within the CHA was completed, according to Rose’s (1981) variables of key issues, participants, and outcomes. A brief appraisal of relative influence of network decision-making processes will conclude this analysis. Refer to Figure 4 for a conceptual framework and Table 1 for a frequency distribution of decision-making processes.

**Key Issues**

A brief synopsis of CHA decision-making activities, as they relate to the years under study (1996–2000), and the three key issues of policy implementation, initiatives
implementation, and ongoing development and dissemination of educational materials are detailed. Each issue in the present study was of national interest and importance during this time period. Additionally, the issues deeply affected and involved network organizations. The three issues and the data analyzing information on issues, participants, and outcomes, as according to Rose’s (1986) Eclectic Model variables are discussed separately.

**Abuse and harassment policy implementation.** In January, 1997, the CHA National Board approved a charter to develop a Risk Management Sub-Committee as a strategy to address the issues of abuse and harassment in hockey. A Chairperson, appointed by the CHA National Board of Directors, led this committee eventually referred to as the “Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Abuse and Harassment”. This Chairperson hand-selected individuals with specific expertise and knowledge in hockey development, legal, medicine, abuse prevention, and human rights and responsibility issues. The Sub-Committee met between February and May, 1997 to create a hockey-specific master policy on abuse, made available in French and English, for delivery to branches by August, 1997.

At the 1997 Annual General Meeting (AGM), the Sub-Committee Chairperson presented a draft plan, highlighting guidelines for branch implementation of Speak Out! policies. It was recommended that branches adopt the definitions of the master policy while allowing modifications to best suit the specific branch needs. Recommendations were made for policy and procedure creation at the branch level for handling and reporting disclosures to child protection agencies. In creating policy and procedures, the
Sub-Committee encouraged branches to consider organizational structure, membership numbers, and the balance of staff and volunteers. The Board approved the draft plan.

At the 1998 AGM, the Sub-Committee Chair presented a series of recommendations. It was recommended that branches adopt a strengthened policy integrating both abuse and harassment. Another recommendation advocated development of policies and procedures for high performance teams. Plans were outlined for a National promotion campaign for the Speak Out! program, to be held in August or September, 1998, intended to help move the focus of the program from abuse to harassment and to reinforce the ongoing nature of the program. Recommendations for policy revision, new policy creation and policy promotion were accepted at this AGM. The policy on high performance teams was not prepared as planned for the 1999 AGM because in “...developing this policy, there seemed to be more questions than answers available” (CHA AGM Minutes, 1999, p. 190). The projected date for completion instead was for May, 2000, however, this policy remains in draft form at the time of this writing.

At the 2000 AGM, the Mixed Gender Dressing Room Policy (referred to by Participants as the “Locker Room Policy”) was accepted by the National Board. This policy applies when boys and girls, in Ontario, play on the same team. One reason for co-ed teams is that there may not be enough females in a rural area to comprise either a team or a league. A typical team is comprised of a majority of male players with one or two female players. The policy states:

...at the Initiation, Novice and Atom levels (11 years and younger), both genders may dress in the same dressing room, at the same time with the presence of two
adults. From the Peewee level (12 years) and up, players of mixed genders may not dress in the same room at the same time, and it is the responsibility of the coaches that all players are included in the pre and post-game activities. (CHA AGM Minutes, 2000, p. 194)

This policy was necessary to address a situation in Ontario when one branch faced related charges, laid by the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Parents of 12 year-old female players on mixed teams wanted their daughters to dress in the same facilities at the same time as their male teammates. The decisions surrounding the Co-Ed Dressing Room Policy were referred to when one Sub-Committee Representative stated, “...having had a daughter participate on a mixed gender team, that decision was very easy for us to make as parents without any direction. It just wasn’t appropriate” (CHA AGM Minutes, 2000, p. 192).

**Speak Out! initiatives implementation.** The creation and implementation of the Speak Out! initiatives occurred in concert with development of the Speak Out! abuse policy, in 1997. At this AGM, the Sub-Committee Chair presented 11 recommendations to the National Board, 7 of which dealt directly with initiative implementation. Recommendations addressed the implementation of age-appropriate parent guides and brochures, and plans to distribute Speak Out! posters to all arenas, associations and local school systems. The Kids Help Line initiative (including the Kids Help Line toll-free number) was outlined as was the hockey bag tag initiative.

Screening recommendations were given, including the development of coach and volunteer application forms, the necessity of completing reference checks to determine the candidate’s volunteer/employment record and criminal record search procedures. The
draft plan highlighted guidelines for branches and associations to best create, and implement their own Speak Out! programs. A thorough explanation was given by the Sub-Committee Chair at this AGM as to the specific considerations each branch and/or associations should make regarding screening methods. The Board, subject to any revisions made by the Sub-Committee, approved these draft guidelines. Initiative materials were ready for branches and associations for implementation by August, 1997.

In 1998, the Sub-Committee Chair presented recommendations to the Board at the AGM pertaining to revised initiative implementation. The age-appropriate brochures were recommended for reprint, as were hockey bag tags. It was recommended that two new posters be created, as well as a video, both to be incorporated with the development programs. The parent guide, targeted to those with children in the 5–9 year age group, was recommended for publication. If produced, in conjunction with the “Safety Requires Teamwork” booklet, projected savings to the network would total approximately $60,000. It was recommended that a newspaper insert be developed, outlining program details to membership. This insert has now evolved into the Speak Out! newsletter with the premier issues released in January and September, 2000. As well, the Chair recommended that each branch develop two Speak Out! advocate positions and appoint either staff personnel or volunteers to these positions to aid in program delivery. The National Board accepted all recommendations.

At the 1999 AGM, the Sub-Committee report detailed ongoing partnering of Speak Out! efforts with the Canadian Armed Forces and possible opportunities with the International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF). A follow-up of these possible partnering
opportunities reveals that nothing concrete has been implemented (T. Jackson, personal communication, March 23, 2001).

**Ongoing educational processes.** Educational materials were created and revised from February to May, 1997 and were ready for distribution by September of that same year. These print materials included age-appropriate brochures and the parent guide. A recommendation at the 1997 AGM was made to integrate abuse and harassment modules into existing Master Course Conductor seminars in the Coaching, Safety, Training and Officiating programs. No further recommendations as to educational processes were made until the 2000 AGM, where a motion was presented to the Board recommending a change in the Red Cross mass facilitation-training program, as per branch requests. This would allow flexibility in the branches to train their own volunteers as best suited to their unique organizational needs.

The recommendation was accepted by the National board with the caveat that any branch receiving the Red Cross training (a 32 hour program) would be entitled to a $5,000 assistance stipend, contingent upon provision of a post-event report, outlining the costs incurred and the number trained. In addition to this recommendation, a motion was approved to change the date mandated for Speak Out! workshop completion from December 31, 2001 to September 1, 2002. This represented the third revision to the mandated date.

**Participants**

Responses revealed that decision-making processes for the three issues’ outcomes were largely the responsibility of the Sub-Committee. Participant 12, a Sub-Committee representative, assumed what was classified a “pivotal role” in the creation of policies
and the development of an awareness campaign, through designing, writing, and editing all initiatives and educational processes. Participant 9, the other Representative, was not part of the Sub-Committee at the time of the issue outcomes and so this Participant’s decision-making role in the implementation of policies and initiatives was negligible. Now an integral member, Participant 9’s involvement was noted in the ongoing development and dissemination of educational materials.

Specific network positions held by participants indicated the level of involvement in decision-making with the Speak Out! outcomes. Participant 1 stated, “...from a [National] staff standpoint, it [was] more of a logistical support type of thing, where the decisions [were] made at the board level and the committee level.” Many Participants at the branch level indicated their role with Speak Out! outcomes centered around providing input upon review of materials. Participant 6 described the branches’ role as one of support or that of a “sounding board”. This Participant indicated the branches yielded to the expertise of the Sub-Committee and therefore involvement in the issue outcomes was limited. Those who indicated involvement with any of the three issues, participated in the creation of branch-specific policies, implementation of initiatives (most notably, criminal record searches) and implementing instructor training mechanisms at the branch and local association level.

Outcomes

Respondents characterized Speak Out! decision-making processes during the past four years. Each Participant was asked to determine whether the CHA network makes decisions based upon: vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or between groups constantly appearing while discussing National issues; constantly changing coalitions
between various groups or persons, so that coalitions are different depending on the specific issue being considered; or relatively little argument because there is a high consensus among the various leaders and groups about what needs to be done.

Generally, Participants felt that the CHA responds differently, dependent on the issue at hand. However, only one Participant of 12 felt that the CHA network had dealt with conflicts around the Speak Out! program implementation by forming coalitions which constantly change. This Participant reasoned this choice by noting the differences in various policies and laws in Canadian provinces and how this impacts on Speak Out! implementation. Participant 1 commented,

...with a National program, there's going to be discussion and there's going to be different views and there's going to be different ways to do things and when you're dealing with as many people as we deal with, you have to sit down and listen and try to take everybody's needs into consideration.

Participant 6 felt the CHA responds to Speak Out! decision-making differently, dependent upon the personalities involved. This Participant stated, “...sometimes your approach to how you present a certain topic is different depending on your personality, because you have to adapt and I think that creates a head-to-head with the issue.”

Ten of 12 Participants indicated the CHA responded to the implementation of the policies, screening initiatives and educational processes with relatively little argument, and a high level of consensus among organizational members. Participant 2 reflected, "...I think there was no question whatsoever that there was a problem and it needed to be addressed." Participant 5 noted that conflict arises in network areas over issues and one inevitably becomes involved in network politics. Regarding abuse and harassment
however, this Participant commented these issues transcend barriers. "...We may
disagree with the OMHA on issues, we may disagree with British Columbia, we may
disagree with New Brunswick but when it comes to abuse and harassment and I sit at the
table for Risk and Safety, these things disappear." Further, Participant 11 commented,
"...I'd be very surprised if anybody spoke out against not implementing the program." It
is unclear whether this Participant was implying contentious attitudes toward
implementation were not revealed during initial stages of because of the nature of the
issues or whether all members conceded equally to the program's implementation.

Important to note, is Participant 7's comments regarding implementation conflict.
This Participant recognized a sense of collective network responsibility in dealing with
abuse and harassment and therefore relatively little argument surrounding initial
implementation. However, this Participant stated, "...as far as conflicts, between the
issues we're dealing with, there's tremendous conflict in how to implement the program,
in how to deal with the program, because of those factors, not because of the individuals
in hockey make conflict." Based on these findings, decision-making at the time of issue
outcome was expedited officiously due to high consensus and low levels of argument
within the network around issue outcomes. Refer to Figure 5 to review a decision-making
analysis of the three key issues. They are summarized according to issues, participants
and issue outcomes.

Appraisal of Decision-Making Influence

In the CHA network, certain individuals were more influential than others in
decision-making processes of Speak Out! issue outcomes. Sub-Committee
## Figure 5 - Summary of Decision-Making Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Time Frame from Issue to Decision</th>
<th>Network Participants</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak Out! abuse and harassment policy implementation</td>
<td>Feb. 1997 – May 1999</td>
<td>-Sub-Committee&lt;br&gt;-National Board&lt;br&gt;-National Risk Management Committee&lt;br&gt;-CHA Ottawa&lt;br&gt;-OHF, OWHA, ODHA, HNO</td>
<td>Successful implementation of integrated abuse and harassment policies in all organizations under study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Out! initiative implementation</td>
<td>Feb. 1997 – ongoing</td>
<td>-Sub-Committee&lt;br&gt;-National Board&lt;br&gt;-National Risk Management Committee&lt;br&gt;-CHA Ottawa&lt;br&gt;-OHF, OWHA, ODHA, HNO</td>
<td>Implementation (at varying rates) of initiatives in organizations under study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Speak Out! Educational processes</td>
<td>Feb. 1997 – ongoing</td>
<td>-Sub-Committee&lt;br&gt;-National Board&lt;br&gt;-National Risk Management Committee&lt;br&gt;-CHA Ottawa&lt;br&gt;-OHF, OWHA, ODHA, HNO</td>
<td>Successful completion of mandate, scheduled for September 1, 2002 pending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives were given responsibility for major decisions affecting the outcomes of the three key issues highlighted in the current study, thereby attaining higher levels of influence compared to other network Participants. The finding that individuals do not always play the roles that both they and others perceive them to play, were parallel to those of Brannagan’s (1986). Certain Respondents who may be perceived as having a high level of decision-making influence (e.g. Executive Directors, Abuse & Harassment Coordinators), indicated a less significant role in participation at the time of issue outcome.

**Network Exchange Analysis**

Galaskiewicz (1979) defines a network as a “...persisting pattern of influence relations which exist among a set of social actors in a social organization” (p. 16). He asserts that power differentials develop among network actors, which illustrate increased opportunities of some actors and the reduced opportunities of others. Thus, maintaining power differentials within a network is accomplished through resource exchange. Interacting within a network through the exchange of goods and services, actors pursue self-interests, thereby facilitating need fulfillment. Galaskiewicz (1979) notes the important role that network resources have on acquiring and exercising influence within the network.

Schmidt and Kochan (1977) offer two perspectives concerning resource exchange related to interorganizational relationships. The first, from an exchange perspective, is characterized as a symmetrical relationship of perceived mutual benefits between members of two or more organizations. In symmetrical exchange, chances of goal
attainment are increased when interaction occurs between members. This type of relationship is characterized with a high degree of cooperation and problem solving because of common interests and increased levels of trust and loyalty. Non-profit organizations, such as the CHA, are characterized by symmetrical exchange relationships.

The other approach, from a power-dependency perspective, is characterized by asymmetrical exchanges, where resource exchange occurs when one motivating organization forces another to interact (Schmidt & Kochan, 1977). Bargaining and conflict behaviours are forms of interaction in this type of exchange relationship. Another scenario, typical of asymmetrical exchange relationships, occurs when actors come to the aid of others out of obligation. In this exchange relationship, the motives are more selfish. For instance, there may be fear that resources will diminish if support is not provided (Galaskiewicz, 1979). Asymmetrical exchange relationships are typified in private competing firms (Rose, 1981). It is noted that no organization maintains only exchange (symmetrical) or power-dependency (asymmetrical) relationships. Rather, Schmidt and Kochan (1977) indicate that both types of relationships can exist within the same interorganizational field.

The patterns of resource exchange and perceived influence in the CHA are detailed in this section. The three resources of money, information and moral support are further explained and findings related to CHA exchange of these three resources are revealed. Further described are the patterns of perceived influence and network implications, as they relate to the Speak Out! program. Refer to Figure 4 for a conceptual framework and Table 1 for a frequency distribution of Exchange Processes.
Money exchange. Money, the first exchange variable, is defined as a transfer of funds between two or more network organizations in the form of dues, grants, or fees for service or products (Rose, 1981). Money exchanges help to satisfy an organization's adaptive needs. For instance, in acquiring money or providing funds to others, network actors can more readily acquire the facilities for goal attainment. Participants indicated patterns of network money exchange, as they relate to the Speak Out! program. As all participants operate at varying levels within the network, responses are divided by Sub-Committee, National and Branch levels. Refer to Figure 6, which depicts program money flows within the network.

The Sub-Committee receives, as its main source of funding, a portion of the Risk Management Assessment fees from the National Risk Management Committee. The fees are received by the Sub-Committee annually and cover costs for material creation and program implementation. Financial support was also received on a one-time basis from Sport Canada, to create “Speak Out! Act Now!” , a multi-sport manual given to other Canadian sport organizations wishing to implement a prevention program. In turn, the Sub-Committee provides an annual donation to the Kids Help Line for 24 hour telephone support and a $5,000 subsidy to branches that have attended the Red Cross Master Course Conductor training program.

The National level receives funding from Sport Canada, whose directives for spending are different than those of the corporate sector. According to Participant 2, Sport Canada “...allows us some flexibility to sort of play with the dollars.” As well, National membership fees and insurance premiums are received from all 13 branches and portions of these fees are disseminated to the Sub-Committee to cover operating costs.
Figure 6 – Speak Out! Money Exchange

Note. Arrows indicate direction of money flow
Affiliates like the OHF, Hockey Quebec and Hockey Alberta submit the largest amounts, reflective of larger membership numbers. The National level allocates rebate money, and, at times, funding for specialized programs or initiatives within provincial branches.

Branch level Participants indicated that money is given to the CHA in the form of yearly membership fees, calculated per player. These fees cover the costs of the insurance program, referee registration and program materials. The OWHA submits its membership fees to the OHF, which collects from all member partners and submits to the National level. This money is submitted in the same manner as branches submit money to the National level, in the form of insurance fees, charged per Participant.

As all CHA branches under study have unique programs, money is received from a variety of different sources. The Hockey Development Council of Ontario (HDCO) however, was cited by all branch organizations as a common funding source. Grant applications are made to the HDCO, which acts as the funding conduit between the branch affiliates and the Ontario Provincial government. Another funding source indicated was through the Trillium Fund, available from the Ontario Centres of Excellence, where branches submit post-program reports and receipts before funding is granted.

The branches welcome any corporate sponsorship monies for program development. Additionally, rebate money from submitted membership fees is additionally received from the National level. There is money exchange between branches in the form of transfer fees, which occurs when a player transfers out of, or is released from, a particular branch. A schedule of fees, instituted by the CHA, is adhered
to, based on player age, and is paid by the branch from which the player departs to the branch to which the player transfers.

**Information exchange.** Information exchange, the second variable, occurs between two or more network organizations in the form of documents, personal contact or meetings. In exchanging information, uncertainty is reduced for actors and direction is provided as to specific use of resources. As well, information exchanges may serve as the basis for building trust among actors. Trust is essential for successful joint problem-solving efforts (Galaskiewicz, 1979). Responses to specific questions addressing information exchange in the CHA network were analyzed and categorized by the Sub-Committee, National level and branch level responses. The Sub-Committee receives information from a variety of individual and organizational sources, in order for it to effectively continue to deliver the Speak Out! program.

Participant 9 differentiated the Sub-Committee from other CHA network committees in that Sub-Committee members are those who bring expertise in legal and human rights issues, and abuse and harassment prevention from organizations outside the hockey network. In so doing, Participant 9 accedes that Sub-Committee members are perceived to be influential. Other organizations that pass information to the Sub-Committee include the Canadian Red Cross, Sport Canada, and the Centre for Ethics in Sport. The Sub-Committee, in turn, offers information to CAAWS through a National level staff resource person. Additional groups that the Sub-Committee shares information with include Coaching Association of Canada, the Canadian Red Cross and Sport Canada.
National level Participants revealed that information exchange occurs with a variety of sources. Regarding the Speak Out! program, information from CAAWS and Sport Canada was found to be very influential in helping to create the “Speak Out! Act Now!” manual. Additionally, CAAWS is continually accessed for information when necessary. Surrounding hockey matters, three sources were cited. The Coaching Association of Canada provides information on new coach education/training programs, which may impact the development of coaching programs from an abuse and harassment perspective in the future. Additionally, the OHF and Hockey Quebec were mentioned as branch offices that provide information to the National level. The OHF and Hockey Quebec, the two largest branches in the network, carry five votes each at the Board of Directors table. Participant two noted, “as bad as it sounds, if you’re going to move in a certain direction and you wish the Board to move in the same direction, if you have those votes on side, you’ll probably have a better chance of doing that.”

In determining to which organizations the National level disseminates information, again, responses pertained to Speak Out! matters and other hockey matters separately. Through the “Speak Out! Act Now!” manual, information is disseminated to any National sport governing body or other organizations that request it. Regarding hockey matters, the CHL, the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) and the NHL are organizations represented at the Board level. Information about rule changes, safety measures and insurance matters are passed on as they may impact those organizations. Additionally, the National level utilizes the Minor, Junior and Female Councils and information can be disseminated to 90% of network participants through the Minor Council and to all female constituents across Canada through the Female Council.
Patterns of information exchange were found to occur, specific to the organizations under study. Therefore, each is reported upon separately. In the HNO, information is received from the President and Minor Council representatives who gain information from similar representatives at AGM's. Participant 11 indicated that there was no need to receive information from other branches. However, Participant 10 noted that information is received from Hockey Manitoba, due to the close proximity between branches. This Participant reported that a reciprocal exchange of information is also made with the two other Ontario branches, (the OHF and the ODHA) which have similar provincial concerns. Participant 10 also felt that HNO passes information to the CHA National office, and the OWHA, again, because of similar hockey concerns.

Both representatives from the OHF also responded that the OHF receives information from two sources: the CHA National level and all seven OHF member partners, to an equal degree. Participant 4 stated that in receiving information, the OHF has “…the CHA bring stuff down to us and we have our members bring stuff up to us.” Participant 3 acknowledged the high level of influence that the member partners have when giving the OHF information, as they are relied upon to be “…the eyes and ears of what’s going on locally.” These 2 Participants agreed that the OHF passes information primarily to the CHA National level and the member partners. Therefore, in passing and receiving information, the OHF acts as a conduit between the two sources. Participant 3 acceded that the OHF relies “…on both sides very, very much so, almost in the exact reverse order.”

Participant 7 indicated that the OWHA has developed reciprocal information exchange with female hockey representatives from the P.E.I. Hockey Association
(PEIHA) and Hockey Quebec. In citing the PEIHA, a reason given was that the representative, with whom the exchange relationship exists, has 25 years of experience and is able to provide other Maritime links to the OWHA. Hockey Quebec was named because of interlocking leagues between the two organizations. It was recognized by Participant 7 that accessing Hockey Quebec’s expertise and programs are valuable to the OWHA. In turn, Hockey Quebec, one of the largest CHA branches, benefits from OWHA materials, as they are not one of the bigger branches from female participant standards. Participant 8 cited the CHA National level, the Female Council and other OHF member partners as organizations from which the OWHA regularly receives information. This Participant felt that the OHF member partners value the female program and by passing information to the OWHA, the partners support development.

In the ODHA, Participant 5 recognized the OHF, Hockey Quebec and the British Columbia Amateur Hockey Association (BCAHA) as three sources from where information is received. Information sharing between leagues in both Hockey Quebec and the ODHA is easily facilitated because of their history of league interaction. This Participant perceived that the ODHA has established positive relations and provides strong leadership in many areas. Participant 6 noted reciprocal information exchange relationships between the Coaching Association of Canada, for specialized coaching information sharing and between the HDCO for funding information.

**Moral support exchange.** The third exchange variable of moral support refers to a network organization’s expressed support for “…acceptance of another’s product, political positions or mode of operation” (Rose, 1981, p. 94). Moral support exchanges help to establish and maintain actors’ legitimacy in social organizations (Galaskiewicz,
Data were derived from Participants' responses addressing exchange of network moral support. Responses are presented separately by the Sub-Committee, National and branch levels.

The Sub-Committee cited the Red Cross, Kids Help Line, CAAWS and Sport Canada as organizations most likely to offer moral support in times of uncertainty. Participant 9 conceded that receiving moral support is issue dependent due to the nature of the Sub-Committee's role of crossing borders with both hockey and abuse/harassment matters when developing policies and procedures. In giving moral support, both Sub-Committee representatives felt that it would offer moral support to any organization that needed assistance. This can be illustrated with the sharing of the "Speak Out! Act Now!" manual to other non-hockey sport organizations. Participant 9 stated, "...certainly there are none more than others that we'd be likely to assist."

Regarding the Speak Out! program, CAAWS, Sport Canada and the Coaching Association of Canada were organizations Participant 1 felt upon which the National level could rely for providing moral support in times of uncertainty. Further to this, Participant 1 noted CAAWS, Sport Canada and the Canadian Athletic Therapist Association (CATA) as three organizations to which the National level has offered moral support in the past. In addition to naming these organizations, this Participant clarified that, "...any sporting organization that would come to us for help, we would be ready to assist...to break it down to three would be very difficult."

Participant 2 cited the OHF, Hockey New Brunswick and Hockey Quebec as three branches that could be relied for moral support due to the high level of trust developed and maintained between these branches and the National level over time. In
giving moral support to other organizations in need, Participant 2 stated, “…I’d like to say we offer the same support to all of them. The reality is with the personalities involved, you would probably deliver some a little bit better than others.” This Participant felt that it is a network duty to develop open exchange flows and to offer support to other network organizations and to, in turn, ask for help or expertise so that the best programs can be developed and offered to athletes.

Branch responses on the exchange flows of moral support varied. Thus, each branch is reported upon separately. The Maritime branches (Newfoundland, P.E.I., Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) were cited as organizations from which the HNO would receive moral support. Reasons cited were similar philosophies, beliefs and mandates. Participant 11 stated, “…they’re like us, they’re the closest to what we are and what we believe in.” In giving moral support, the HNO representatives reported they would support the CHA National level offices, association members and (fellow) branches.

Both OHF Participants indicated moral support would be received from the CHA National office and member partners because of established, positive relationships. Participant 4 thought the OHF would receive moral support from member partners because “…they’ve been there for us in the past.” Moreover, both OHF representatives indicated that moral support would be reciprocated with member partners. Participant 3 added, “…I would like to think that we would be able to do it equally between any of our member partners because that’s where our influence would be most greatly felt.” Participant 4 mentioned that the OHF would provide the CHA with moral support because of the OHF’s size and influence within the organization, and with other branches requesting information on how to deal with situations, to a lesser degree.
The OWHA has received moral support from the Ontario Provincial government, helping it develop into a sport governing body for female hockey. Additionally, Participant 8 cited sibling partners, the OHA and OMHA, as sources of moral support in sharing expertise in development issues. A specific example of moral support exchange is evident in the OWHA link with the OHA to the OMHA Prevention Services. In giving moral support, both representatives indicated the OWHA would provide moral support to any hockey organization in need.

From Participant 5's perspective, receiving moral support in the ODHA is very much issue dependent and did not choose individual organizations. Participant 6 felt that the CHA is a major supporter of the ODHA. In giving moral support to other organizations, Participant 5 revealed the ODHA would assist any organization in need, however Participant 6 specified the Ontario Centres of Excellence, the HDCO and the CHA as organizations to which the ODHA would first offer moral support.

Summary of network exchange. Analysis of the money, information and moral support exchange variables, as they relate to the Speak Out! program reveals that exchange relationships of both a symmetrical and asymmetrical nature exist within the network, thus confirming Schmidt & Kochan's (1977) findings. Regarding network money exchange, the Sub-Committee is financially dependent solely upon outside sources, and reflect asymmetrical relationships. The National level has symmetrical money exchange relationships with branches, however both depend on additional sources for financial support.

In exchanging information, Sub-Committee Participants indicated existing asymmetrical relationships. The nature of the Sub-Committee’s makeup promotes these
relationships, where non-hockey representatives are selected for particular expertise, thus bringing outside information into the network. However, the Sub-Committee also maintains symmetrical relationships with CAAWS, through a staff resource person. The National level Participants revealed both asymmetrical relationships with specific organizations, when accessing information for the Speak Out! program, and symmetrical relationships with many provincial branches.

Symmetrical relationships were more the norm when analyzing branch responses regarding information exchange. Symmetrical relationships were rationalized based upon similar concerns, length of relationship, interlocking leagues, program support, positive relations, and need for specialized information. Regarding moral support relationships, almost all Participants indicated that while moral support may be received from particular sources, it would be given to anyone in need within the network, again reflecting the fact that both asymmetrical and symmetrical exchange relationships exist. Studying CHA exchange patterns, relative to the strength of the various dimensions of the relationship is worthwhile in order to determine the distribution of power among network organizations and how that affects the success of the Speak Out! policies and program.

Perceived Network Influence

Findings are presented, accompanied by a discussion of factors contributing to levels of perceived network influence. Ten of 12 Participants were asked to identify, from a list, CHA hockey organizations perceived as generally influential at the National level. Data from 2 Participants were not included as they were interviewed by telephone and were not able to view the list. Ten Participants responded with 1 to 4 network organizations, and a total of 31 organizations were named. Participants were then asked
to indicate which CHA organizations they perceived as most influential at the National level. In this question, all 12 Participants responded. Refer to Figure 7 for results of those organizations perceived as most influential at the National level.

There was a perception that the CHA Calgary office was the most influential Nationally. It was chosen specifically 5 times out of a total 31, making it the most frequent choice. The CHA Ottawa office was chosen specifically as well 2 of the 31 times. Finally, 2 of the 31 choices grouped the two National offices together, perceiving them to be equally influential at the National level. Participant 9 perceived the Calgary office to wield greater influence, "...because of the concentration of power there is, that a lot of the top management of the CHA and a lot of decisions flow from there."

Overall, the CHA National level was chosen 9 of 31 times, indicating 29% of total choices.

Many Participants perceived that branch affiliates were most influential at the National level. Participant 11 felt that the level of branch influence could be determined by rank ordering the branches from largest to smallest, based upon membership number. This Participant stated, "...when you sit at a [Board] table, obviously with the numbers, you're supposed to be the top guy, aren't you, in most organizations." The philosophy that larger branch affiliates are more influential than smaller affiliates was reinforced with Participants' choices of perceived influence between branches.

Four of 31 choices reflected the Ontario Hockey Federation alone, 1 reflected Hockey Quebec alone and 3 choices grouped them together. As larger branches have more members, they held more votes at the National Board of Directors level. Regarding the OHF and Hockey Quebec, Participant 2 stated, "...they carry five votes each at our
Board table. A lot of what they say, whether it’s at the Board table or in the back rooms in terms of voting in our new volunteer Board is very influential.” In this particular case, the perception of influence outlines a significance of five votes being counted from a total of 43 votes, accounting for almost an eighth of the total decision-making strategies of the National board.

Therefore, membership number and the number of votes at the National Board of Directors dictated levels of perceived network influence. In findings from Figure 6, the OHF and Hockey Quebec were mentioned more times than other hockey organizations in the list as being generally influential at the National level. In total, branches were perceived as having the most influence at the National level in 15 of 31 choices, and when grouped together, reflecting 48.4% of the total choices.

Participants also perceived Sport Canada to be an influential organization at the National level, in 4 of 31, or 12.9% of choices. Participant twelve acknowledged. “…when they [Sport Canada] pull up and have something to say or want to contribute, or don’t like what’s happening, I see people listening to them, and responding to them.”

With regard to the Speak Out! program, Sport Canada was involved in the funding of the multi-sport manual, “Speak Out! Act Now!” and according to one respondent, “…is in that position to influence the policy of all sport.” Lastly, 3 of 31, signifying 9.7% of choices, reflected the Canadian Hockey League (CHL). The National Junior teams are direct links to the National Hockey League (NHL), therefore the type of elite programming the CHL offers to aspiring male hockey players was a factor cited by participants contributing to perceived influence.
### Figure 7 - Perceived National Influence in the CHA Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Hockey Federation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Quebec</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA (Calgary) office</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA (Ottawa) office</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan Hockey Association</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Amateur Hockey Association</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Hockey League</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Alberta</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa District Hockey Association</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Manitoba</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Northwestern Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick Amateur Hockey Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland Labrador Hockey Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia Hockey Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Hockey League</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Women’s Hockey Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island Hockey Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hockey League</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Minor Hockey Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Minor Junior Hockey League</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Toronto Hockey League</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ontario Hockey Association</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Alliance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Hockey Association</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, branch level affiliates were perceived as the most influential network group, whereas the CHA Calgary office was perceived to be the most influential network organization. Other factors found to contribute to perceived network influence were leadership style, regional location, organizational longevity or history, and the amount of media profiling an organization receives. Additionally, an individual is influential in the decision-making process because of a particular network position, job longevity and/or level of expertise demonstrated. For instance, from a player perspective, a coach wields an extremely high amount of influence with regard to the overall dealings and dynamics of the team.

Implications of Perceived Influence

In this study, the CHA National (Calgary) office, followed by the larger branch affiliates wielded the most network influence, as perceived by participants. Network organizations depend upon the National level for money, information, and moral support, and therefore are seen as more influential in community affairs. Galaskiewicz (1979) suggests that the growth of elaborate exchange systems may place some network actors in strong bargaining positions vis a vis authorities (e. g. branch affiliates negotiating with authorities). This is evident in the relationship between the (larger) OHF and Hockey Quebec and the National level, as witnessed in exchange relationships and established interlocking directorates. Consequently, as systems further develop, a power structure evolves and those in political decision-making positions (e. g. the National level administrators) may hesitate before challenging these actors’ (OHF & Hockey Quebec) interests. The interests of these more powerful organizations may supersede those of others by default.
This scenario, termed "politics by default", benefits a variety of network actors. The authorities (the CHA National level) may maintain the appearance of autonomy, control, and leadership over the network, and their constituents regard them respectfully as an organization with a great deal of influence. Galaskiewicz (1979) stipulates, "...so long as authorities make the 'right decisions', there is no need on the part of the potentially powerful interests to react and create a disturbance" (p. 134). Thus, their power is maintained. Moreover, the more powerful organizations in the network (the OHF and Hockey Quebec) are also advantaged, as they do not need to expend accumulated resources to exercise political influence, insured simply by the establishment of interlocking directorates with the National board. Since network authorities are often held accountable and blamed for their lack of leadership in erroneous decision-making situations, the more influential organizations will experience network controversy to a lesser degree (Galaskiewicz, 1979).

The level of influence attributed to the CHA National level impacts the types of Speak Out! decisions made, and who makes them, since "...the resources of an actor [will] contribute to its overall influence in community affairs and to its success in different issues" (Galaskiewicz, 1979, p. 138-139). Also affected is the evolution of committee formation, which, in turn could affect program delivery and implementation. Lastly, alliance formation between the National level and wealthier organizations could promote inconsistent program delivery across the network.

**Network Organizing Processes Analysis**

The fourth analysis of the Eclectic Model furthers an understanding of how a network evolves through a series of organizing processes. Refer to Figure 4 for a
conceptual framework and Table 1 for a frequency distribution of organizing processes. Weick (1979) develops the idea that the network is a subjective entity. Underlying mechanisms are at work, which continually organize processes to aid in network evolution and shaping. In order to understand organizing processes within the CHA network as they relate to the Speak Out! program, two sub-sections are presented. First, the origins of organizing processes is explained and applied to the current study and second, the implications of the findings.

Origins and Their Network Applications

According to Weick (1979), to organize is “...to assemble ongoing interdependent actions into sensible sequences that generate sensible outcomes” (p. 3). This theorist has developed organizing processes of ecological change, enactment, selection and retention. The analysis of organizing processes focuses on the same three key issues as the decisional analysis, the implementation of the Speak Out! policies, the implementation of the 12 Speak Out! initiatives, and the ongoing dissemination of educational materials and resources are discussed. Analysis of organizing processes requires explanation of the four variables of ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention and how they relate to the development of the Speak Out! program.

Ecological change. Weick (1979) defines ecological change as the “...enactable environment, the raw materials for sense making” (p. 130). Some environmental stimuli enters a system and provokes it into changing those experiences that engage both people and activities. Ecological change provides the source for the other organizing process variables to work. In this study, the key issue of abuse and harassment is considered to be the major ecological change. The mitigating incident receiving considerable media
attention was NHL player Sheldon Kennedy’s disclosure of August 1996. Eleven of
twelve respondents, totalling 23 m.u.s., referred to the specific incident involving
Kennedy and Graham James, his abusive coach.

Participant nine felt that Speak Out! creation was not solely due to Kennedy’s
disclosure. This participant stated, “I think it was a really important factor but I also
think the Speak Out! program evolved out of a couple of different streams, one of which
was Sheldon Kennedy.” Conversely, participant twelve described Kennedy’s disclosure
as a catalyst, saying, “...I don’t know what they [the CHA] were getting before that point
or if they were even knowing. I don’t think they actually looked at the issue before.”
Regardless of whether Kennedy’s disclosure is the single mitigating ecological change,
its high level of influence on program creation cannot be ignored.

Enactment. The second of the organizing processes, enactment, is the
phenomenon whereby network actors attend to the ecological change. This is the only
process, which deals directly with the external environment (Weick, 1979). Enactment
ensures attention to, and communication around, ecological change. In responding to the
ecological change, signified by the Kennedy incident, the CHA enacted immediately
when approached by the Canadian Red Cross, who invited them to link their Abuse
Prevention Services in order to develop an intervention program. Meetings were held to
determine the feasibility of a formal link between the Red Cross and the CHA. From
there, enactment occurred further with Sub-Committee formation, and subsequent Speak
Out! program creation.
Selection. The third variable, selection, refers to attending to the ecological change under consideration through action. According to Weick (1979), the processes subsequent to enactment (selection and retention),

...work on edited raw materials and whatever episodes have been extracted by enactment. The external environment literally bends around the enactment of people...the enactment, as it becomes linked with ecological change, merely provides the equivocal raw materials which then may be seized or discussed by the selection process (p. 131)

After the Sub-Committee created the program policies and initiatives, network shaping occurred once the National level encouraged branches to develop committees best suited to receive the program resources for further dissemination. Some branches created a Harassment and Abuse Committee, like the OHF, while others managed the program within previously established Risk and Safety committees. Further selection processes at the Branch level included appointing a designated Abuse and Harassment Coordinator, who oversees modification of Nationally written policies that, when written, blend with specific branch organizational infrastructures. Any changes and modifications that have been made to the Speak Out! program signify further selection processes exacted by all levels of the network and are further described.

Changes and modifications. Participants were asked to identify any changes or modifications made to the Speak Out! policies, initiatives or educational processes since their inception in 1997. A recurring theme among 5 participants, reflected in 9 m.u.s., was the continual need for clarification of harassment and abuse definitions. The need
for clarification arises when, for example, a coach or other volunteer may be wrongly accused for abusive or harassing behaviour. Participant 1 commented,

...I think we've had to clarify a little bit there on what the actual abuse is and we're not trying to stop parents from calling but what we want to make sure of is the parents realize, this is abuse and this is hockey where a player gets cut fairly and the player or a coach is yelling to take a man or whatever. There's a real line between what actually is harassment and what is merely coaching

Clarification of program definitions and initiatives is a continual enactment process and is communicated to the membership via the selection processes of the CHA website, the Speak Out! newsletter, and creation of revised policies and print materials.

One of the more significant modifications made at the National level, indicated by 10 respondents, totalling 27 m.u.s., is the network-wide Speak Out! mandate of September, 2002. The mandate stipulates that every coach is to be educated in the Speak Out! program by attending a four hour workshop called “Speak Out! It's More Than Just a Game!” Elements of power and trust relationships, within a coach/player relationship are addressed in the workshop and an expectation of appropriate standards for coaching/training behaviour is provided. Additionally, information regarding procedures to handle disclosures, facility safety issues and risk prevention management is also provided. Coaches must attend the workshop, giving them tools to become more prepared to prevent and deal with contentious situations. By mandating the Speak Out! workshop, the CHA hopes to reach the association level with abuse and harassment educational processes. The National level has, over the course of the program’s
evolution, made changes to the implementation timelines in order for branches to meet
the mandate effectively, signifying another selection process.

A significant modification to branch level policies, made in May 2000, was the
Mixed Gender Dressing Room Policy discussed earlier. The issue of program
inconsistency is evident within the creation of this policy. Participant 3 stated,

…it's like, why is this policy on locker rooms so important? It may be in Rubber
Boot, Saskatchewan it's not, people only have the one arena and that's just the
way things are and tough. But here, yeah, it's a problem because you may not
have too many girls playing on that mixed team but you know what? There's a
ton of them around here.

Over time, since inception of Speak Out!, new situations arise, like the Mixed Gender
Dressing Room Policy, setting off several series of organizing processes. Therefore, the
need for a wide variety of selection processes is evident, in order to deal with program
evolution effectively.

Retention. The fourth organizing process variable, retention, is the process
whereby interpretation of the products of successful sense making are stored (Brannagan,
1986). At this point, the stored interpretations become actions that are part of the
network. Weick (1979) refers to the contents of retention as the enacted environment. In
the case of the Speak Out! program, retention is evident throughout the network levels.
At the National level, retention has occurred with the creation of the policies and
initiatives. From there, the branches have displayed retention with policy and program
adaptations of nationally written material. In so doing, the nationally written policies
provide a minimum policy standard from which branches modify their own policies.
Again, retention is evident in those local associations, which have implemented the program to meet organizational needs.

Wicker (1980) helps to further Weick's concepts of organizing processes by portraying them as a natural selection process. He states,

...from the complex of events (ecological changes) that a person might attend to, certain features are isolated and acted upon (enactment). Results of these actions then become the focus; they are classified and interpreted (selection). The chosen interpretations are subsequently stored (retention). (p. 714)

Implications of Findings

The organizing processes analysis can also be applied to determine evolution of the Speak Out! program within the CHA network over the time period covered in the study. As stated, the major ecological change, or environmental stimuli under examination, was the issue of harassment and abuse, brought about by Kennedy's 1996 disclosure. The network enacted at the National level by developing the Sub-Committee in 1997, and subsequent selection processes, including creation of program policies, resources, and educational processes followed.

From there, further selection processes were developed and implemented at branch and local association levels in order to implement the program to retention phases. At all levels, the network is shaped by the Speak Out! workshop mandate of September 2002, stipulating that all constituents complete the required course. In hoping to reach the grassroots level with educational processes, the mandate has influenced the behaviour of network actors and how ongoing enactment, selection and retention processes are
managed. All organizations under study (five in total), were involved in retention of all three issues.

In determining Speak Out! program evolution, it appears as though much development has occurred. While fear and reticence were recurring attitudes among 8 Participants, accounting for 17 m.u.s., no organization under study had disbanded the Speak Out! program. The retention phase encompasses all activities that will help to meet the mandate, and through retention, other organizations have come together to share information and resources. This is illustrated in the OWHA and OHA link with OMHA’s Prevention Services, aiding in program delivery. Therefore, CHA Ontario branch affiliates are demonstrating growing interdependence in implementing the Speak Out! program. This finding parallels Rose’s (1981) study. She states, “...as the network evolves as a system through the selective organizing processes around issues, it also develops a more systematic character in a dynamic sense” (p. 172). If data were still being collected, it would undoubtedly reveal growing interdependence in program implementation at all levels in the network.

In further determining program evolution as per analysis of the organizing processes, Weick’s (1979) definition of system evolution is considered. He believes, ...

an observer watches events happen, imposes on these happenings some preconception about order and this preconception then allows the observer to watch the changing instances, compare them and see whether there is a progression toward orderliness in those portions being observed. If there is, evolution has occurred (p. 119)
When the CHA enacted to the ecological change of abuse and harassment in hockey with a series of actions, they encountered the benefits and hurdles associated with developing the Speak Out! program. In reaching and maintaining full program implementation, smaller series of ecological changes have entered the system, thus putting into place other enactment, selection and retention processes. By Weick’s (1979) definition, although not measurable given the parameters of this exploratory study, Speak Out! evolution has occurred. A thorough program implementation assessment, including Speak Out! benefits and hurdles encountered is provided in section three.

Assessment of Research Questions

The four main analytical approaches that form Rose’s (1981) Eclectic Model were applied in the current case study of the CHA. Each has contributed to answering the four research questions and sub-problems. Each research question is briefly addressed.

Network evolution and operation. The first approach of structural analysis was utilized to outline network linkages based on data related to interlocking directorates, and common ownership. The CHA National level and the OWHA were found to be the most central organizations, largely attributed to structural makeup (National level) and organizational autonomy and uniqueness (OWHA). The second approach of exchange analysis was applied to determine the exchange relationships of money, information, and moral support within the CHA. Perceived influence within the network was also determined.

The CHA (Calgary) office was perceived as most influential and the 13 branch affiliates were perceived as the most influential network group, and the (larger) OHF and Hockey Quebec, as the most influential individual branches. Organizational size, based
on membership number, (dictating the number of votes at the National Board) was a factor affecting level of perceived network influence. Similar to Brannagan's (1986) study, no single exchange variable proved to be an indicator of perceived influence, rather a variety of factors in conjunction with exchange relationships were found to affect the level of perceived influence.

Further complimenting the structural and exchange analyses was the third approach of decision-making analysis. The Sub-Committee, responsible for creating the initial program policies, initiatives, and educational processes, was the primary decision-making body at the program's 1997 inception. However, as the Speak Out! program has evolved, participation is evident within all network levels. Branches, implementing respective programs, have become more interdependent and thus, influential in decision-making processes surrounding the Speak Out! program.

The fourth approach of organizing processes analysis was utilized to illustrate the adaptive nature of the CHA network, as Speak Out! administrators organized through continual stages of ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention. Therefore, the network evolves through these organizing stages and operates as a system as a function of complimentary structural, exchange, and decision-making processes.

Network understanding and influence. The present study did not provide an exact identification of the underlying rules operative at the emergence of the three key issues under study. According to Boje and Whetton (1981), actors construct their own conceptual schema of the network through identification of specific organizations, rather than its totality. This phenomenon was reflected in participants' responses, thus making it more difficult for actors to perceive the underlying dynamics during the inception of
the Speak Out! program. Additionally, some participants interviewed were not in the position they now presently occupy, further hindering development of an understanding.

However, in outlining the operative processes of ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention, the importance of subjective dynamics during the initial stages of Speak Out! creation were highlighted. This importance was exemplified when considering the impact that former NHL player Sheldon Kennedy had on network decision-making processes to initiate the program. Consequent understanding of the network is developed through organizing, specifically after the network shaping occurs, and then further, through the retention process (Rose, 1981). While it was not specifically tested, it was found that the September, 2002 network mandate for coach education training influences actors’ behaviour, regarding the various selection processes CHA network organizations utilize to implement and deliver the Speak Out! program.

Network shaping. As previously mentioned, the informal “behind-the-scenes” interactions should not be underestimated with regard to network shaping. The organizing processes and decision-making analyses helped to illuminate methods in which key actors have helped to shape the evolution of the Speak Out! program. Data gathered in the present study revealed that specific actors, in developing the program, did indeed shape the network in a variety of ways through enacting, selecting and retaining behaviours.

Implementation Assessment

Through analysis of Participants’ responses, findings were extended beyond Rose’s (1981) Eclectic Model. Participants responded to the variety of benefits the program has brought to the CHA network through its implementation. Several indicators
of program success were revealed as were program hurdles encountered since Speak Out!
inception in 1997. See Figure 8 for a conceptual framework and Table 2 for a frequency
distribution of Speak Out! implementation
assessment.

**General Assessment**

Three questions, assessing the Speak Out! policy implementation, initiative
implementation, and the ongoing dissemination of educational processes were posed to
participants. The respondents assessed the Speak Out! program in either a positive or
negative/undetermined manner. Responses are briefly reviewed and discussed.

**Positive Assessment**

Eleven of 12 participants, totalling 41 m.u.s., assessed the Speak Out! program
positively in the three areas mentioned above. Many who responded in a positive manner
made a concession that although they considered the program to be a success, there is still
much to be done in all areas for continual improvement. Participant one reflected, “…we
still have a long way to go but I think that, as I say, every year seems to get a little
stronger and this year was certainly a lot stronger.” The Speak Out! program was
described as solid and nothing but successful with regard to the policies, and from an
organizational standpoint, the educational component is viewed as a positive element.
Participant 6 opined, “…we’ve been fairly successful in reaching the base that we want to
reach.”

**Negative/Undetermined Assessment**

Only one of the 12 Participants responded negatively to the success of the Speak
Table 2

Meaning Units and Number of Respondents for Implementation Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Assessment</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>mu</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assessment (55)</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative/Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Benefits (82)</td>
<td>Education &amp; Awareness</td>
<td>addresses issues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disclosure value</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information sharing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal abuse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trained instructors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deterrent Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of Success (61)</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evident Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measuring Success</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Hurdles (222)</td>
<td>Implementation distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>screening</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>costs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Misuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Hurdles</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(\mu\) = number of meaning units; \(r\) = number of respondents
Out! Program. Participant 11 cited the CHA’s lack of direction as the main reason behind the lack of success. This Participant observed,

…they [the CHA] set dates and guidelines, they eased up on them, they went back, you know, for instance, when they were all in a big rush and a big to-do the first year, everything was going to get done, everything was going to be implemented the following year and then came another meeting where they extended that goal.

Additional complaints from this participant included the CHA’s lack of follow-up of the implementation rates of the individual network organizations. Of particular interest, the branch organization that this individual represents has not held one clinic to date with their coaches. The Speak Out! portion has been covered within the trainers’ program but not within the coach or referee courses or as a stand-alone workshop, even though it has been mandated network-wide for all coaches by September, 2002.

Participant 11 eventually offered the concession that, “…okay, alright, so I really don’t know. I really don’t know if it’s a success or not.” This undetermined assessment was based upon a lack of branch feedback indicating successful resolution of any kind of harassing or abusive situation. Participant 1, while acknowledging the strength and success of the program, conceded that the network is at the point where a proper evaluation method is necessary to measure its actual success, compared to its perceived success.
Program Benefits

Participants responded to many questions outlining the resulting benefits of Speak Out! implementation. Benefits include education and awareness of harassment and abuse issues, provision of a grievance process for dealing with abusive and/or harassing situations, and the deterrent value against possible predators. Each will be briefly discussed.

Education and Awareness

Educational and awareness benefits of the Speak Out! program were widely recognized by 10 respondents and were often referred to in conjunction with one another. Participant 6 defined education as, “…making people aware of what’s going on out there. Emphasizing the importance of understanding abuse and harassment and what we have to do to protect the kids.” This was recognized as a key focus for the program. Participant 4 expressed the opinion that the most important emphasis of the program is education for all involved (players, parents, volunteers, coaches, referees and trainers) because of the constantly high turnover rate. The sentiment of collective responsibility and education was expressed in that it was felt that those who supervise youth in hockey have a responsibility for their safety, protection and education.

Essentially, the benefit of education lies in its cyclical nature, reinforced by Participant 5, who stated, “…it’s important to educate because if you can educate, then you can prevent.” Through dissemination of educational materials and processes, education is ensured at all levels of the network. Many Participants recognized the role of education and the spill over effect that issues of harassment and abuse have in various areas of an individual’s life. Participant 4 reflected, “…there was a lot of concern going
out that this was another clinic that people had to go to and there was concern with that but I think once people get there, it's a good training ground for them, not only hockey but other aspects of their life."

Awareness of abuse and harassment is heightened through Speak Out! educational processes. More specifically, according to Participant 10, the Speak Out! educational program has helped to make people “...very aware of the fact that hockey organizations are watching for such activity, that instead of just say six sets of eyes in a hockey organization, have thousands of sets of eyes watching for any unwanted activity.” Unwanted activity in the context of the CHA can be considered here as sexual, physical or verbal harassment or abuse, as outlined by the Speak Out! policies.

The Speak Out! educational initiatives can raise the awareness of a personal standard of (a coach’s) behaviour, assist players with their awareness of disclosure opportunities, and heighten parents’ awareness of possible avenues available to address problem solving and resolution. The benefits of awareness through the Speak Out! program were expressed by Participant 2, “… it’s just created more of a groundswell of awareness than anything else and if the program itself has had any impact by way of educating some of those eyes on what to look for, that’s probably where the main impact of the program can be felt.”

Education and awareness is further promoted through various information sharing opportunities, both within the CHA network and with other sport organizations. Workshop presentations, conference calls, partnering opportunities, and feedback submissions were strategies mentioned for network information sharing. Information sharing has been facilitated with provision of the “Speak Out! Act Now!” manual,
developed by the Sub-Committee. An organization can adopt segments from the manual easily to fit organizational needs. Levels of awareness have increased through the ongoing educational processes and dissemination of print materials. However, pamphlets and posters will only suffice to a degree, making instructor education and training crucial. Instructor training is part of the ongoing educational processes developed by the CHA National level and is viewed as a Speak Out! program benefit.

Other educational and awareness benefits were reflected in Participants’ responses. It was found that in becoming aware of the issue of abuse and harassment and providing education to network constituents, the issue is directly addressed. Participant 12 noted the CHA “…has played a leading role in the country in its willingness to look at this issue.” Also, raising awareness that verbal abuse is a form of abuse or harassment has been an important offshoot of Speak Out! Furthermore, the Kids Help Line, a toll-free, 24 hour phone service, is a support link that players can access for disclosing of incidents and for information about harassment or abuse.

Provides A Grievance Process

A benefit derived from the Speak Out! program includes the development of a procedural process which helps to guide those in need through questionable situations. Participant 1 asserted, “…I think we’re reaping some of the benefits in that we’re prepared to deal with situations that we might not have been prepared to deal with ten years ago.” Administrators, in an attempt to deal with the issue of abuse and harassment directly, have realized the importance of clear procedures and Codes of Conduct. Having written policy and procedures upon which to rely makes possibly contentious situations easier with which to deal. Codes of conduct are being developed by provincial and local
associations at varying rates and provide guidance for those players involved in potentially harassing or abusive situations. Participant 1 responded,

...abuse is very simple to handle because we say if it's an abuse situation, it goes to the authorities, it gets reported to the police or child protection agency and really, we're hands off; it's the harassment now that becomes a difficult thing to handle in a lot of cases, there's a lot of grey area and if you don't have policies and procedures in place, there's a lack of consistency in the way it's being handled and it can cause a lot of grief, if you don't have firm policies.

Outlined in the Speak Out! policies and procedures are salient directives that give the players, according to Participant 1, "...the support networks they need for whether it's a hockey-related problem or their own life problem, we [the CHA] have that support network and in some senses we've given our coaches and administrators more tools to work with when they have that child who is so needy."

**Deterrent Value**

Implemented screening initiatives like criminal record searches, job descriptions, coach and volunteer application forms, and follow-up reference checks are strategies intended as deterrents for any possible perpetrators. However, similar to the uncertainty surrounding disclosure rates (i.e., uncertainty around the presence of rate of abuse or harassment if a victim doesn't come forward), the Speak Out! policy's deterrent value remains unknown. This is difficult to quantify because the CHA will probably never know the number of people deterred because of screening initiatives. Despite this, the feeling expressed by 3 Participants was that there are probably people not in hockey
leadership positions because of the Speak Out! screening initiatives. Participant 11 commented,

...I’ve often heard about the Criminal Record Search, ‘well, you know, if we have to, if you’re insisting on us doing it, we’re going to lose some coaches.’ And my response is, ‘well, then, perhaps you should lose that person.’ Man or woman, who does oppose to have a Criminal Record Search, maybe that should tell you something and if that person doesn’t want to do it, then maybe you shouldn’t have them there.

Participant 4 felt that announcing the organization was going to be screening volunteers, “…probably scared away a few people.”

A criminal record search, only part of a well developed screening process, may aid organizations in its ability to detect a convicted predator. Participant 7 observed, “…again, there’s no data to back it up but that’s probably a deterrent to the pedophiles and people that shouldn’t be in the program....if you want to get access to kids, that’s the natural way to go and they can’t come into our program because of that.” The deterrent value, difficult if not impossible to quantify, is one of the more unseen benefits of the Speak Out! program.

Other benefits. Respondents commented on many other benefits derived from the Speak Out! program. Developing the program has brought network members together to work on this issue. More specifically, as stated by participant 12, “…it brings men in on this issue and working with us on this issue. Too often it’s considered a women’s issue.” Additional benefits include the potential for growth into other network areas. Growth is evident in how Speak Out! affects the planning focus of administrators and executives.
An emphasis on fun has been a positive planning change. Participant 9 responded, "...so many more of the associations are focusing on how to make hockey fun and part of that is to make sure the environment is free of harassment, that's something that's happening in minor hockey associations across the country."

Initiatives to promote this change in focus include developing fair play codes, changing the practice-to-game ratio, which still promotes skill development but emphasizes the enjoyment of the actual game. Program benefits were revealed solely based on participant perception and observation. No formalized evaluation process has been exacted. However, Participant responses revealed several indicators of the program's success, described next.

**Indicators of Success**

Network feedback, the role of program management, and evident network changes are discussed as contributors to the Speak Out! program's success. Additionally, the concept of measuring program success is addressed.

**Network feedback.** Seven of 12 Participants, totalling 14 m.u.s., accounted for several examples of positive feedback, received in the CHA network. Participant 10 spoke of receiving positive feedback from parents in arenas. Feedback is also received at all network levels from players and coaches who have participated in the Speak Out! workshop. Local soccer, track and field and baseball associations, acknowledging the role the CHA has played in developing Speak Out!, have asked for guidance in developing policies/programs for their own organization (T. Jackson, personal communication, March 5, 2001).
Participant 12 relayed an account, indicating the positive impact that the Speak Out! program has had

…I knew we were really successful when I had a friend phone me from Ontario; he's a CEO of a company down there and he'd just been to a cocktail party with different CEOs, and a number of them coach hockey and he phoned and said, 'well, guess what the conversation at the cocktail party was?' It was the Speak Out! workshop.

This participant emphasized the word-of-mouth value that the program has had, outside the CHA network.

Program management. Various indicators of success are revealed from a program management perspective. For instance, every time a situation is dealt with in a positive manner, this indicates success. The policies aid in achieving case resolution in that they provide, according to Participant 3, “…not only very clear direction but give [us] a hammer when [we] need it on an individual who’s out of line.” Also, many network organizations have dedicated a paid and/or volunteer position solely for fact-finding or case resolution of abusive and/or harassment situations. A fact-finder is one authorized to determine case situations, and report back to the appropriate bodies involved. Creating a fact-finder position is not only beneficial from a resolution perspective, but is important for program representation. It identifies one individual who speaks on behalf of the program and endeavours to maintain a level of awareness in order “…to always have it in the forefront, to always make people think twice before they do or get themselves into a situation that could be a problem.”
Other indicators found within management include fewer requests for branch policies from previous years, possibly indicating more member associations have received the policies and are implementing modified policies and procedures. New materials, received from the National level, can be found in arenas, indicating that members are making resources available, possibly suggesting program support. Participant 8 stated, "...I'm very comfortable that we're reaching, you know, at least 90% or most of our members now." This particular organization has 30,000 constituents, including players, coaches, officials, and parents. The source for determining this percentage is not known because of the absence of a formalized evaluation process but this statement reflects the general belief that materials are being delivered to association members.

**Evident changes.** Other indicators of success are revealed through the change in public and/or media reaction to the issue of abuse and harassment. Participant 12 illustrated this change by stating,

...when Sheldon [Kennedy] came forward, it was just in the news over and over across the country and hockey was constantly in the hotseat. I think last year, another hockey player came forward, another coach was found, had been sexually abusing kids and it was that this prevention program's in place, the organization's doing something about it, there was a whole different reaction to the news.

This "media zoo" climate, as referred to by participant twelve, has changed since program creation in 1997. Both the media and public have responded more positively and with less resistance toward the acknowledgement of issues of abuse and harassment.
Participant 2 reflected upon the Speak Out! program's success by comparing it to other programs (such as the coaching or refereeing program) implemented by the CHA. Referring to these programs in particular, this participant opined, "...they probably didn't achieve the amount of success that this program has achieved in as short a period of time." Implementing Speak Out! has helped to address concerns never raised before within an evidently more open environment.

**Measuring success.** As stated, the CHA has yet to formally evaluate the level of success achieved by the Speak Out! program across the network, primarily because the program is not fully implemented within the CHA. Participant 1 acceded, “...we’re still in the process of building this program. Until it’s built and 100% running, we can’t really measure what the success is.” Regardless of the absence of a formalized procedure, evaluation of the program’s success has generally been expressed on a perception basis. Part of this perception involves evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation strategies of policies, initiatives, and educational processes and the network communication of the Speak Out! program. As a result, informal evaluation has been ongoing since its 1997 inception.

**Program Hurdles**

This section of implementation assessment addresses program hurdles from participants’ perspectives and is described in greater detail. These hurdles are categorized under implementation difficulties, attitudes of abuse and harassment, volunteer concerns and program misuse.

**Implementation Difficulties**
Effective program implementation in any large network is a continual challenge due to network size, cost of implementation, communication difficulties, and various organizational inconsistencies. Hurdles related to these factors were encountered by the CHA when implementing the Speak Out! program.

As the CHA network encompasses the whole of Canada, including the Northwest Territories, it was recognized by 11 Participants, totalling 31 m.u.s., that network size and how it affects implementation of the Speak Out! program is a problematic factor. Participant 7 noted, “...the educational component is the key point and it’s a chronic challenge within hockey to make sure that the dissemination gets to the right people.” Various distribution methods are employed in order to disseminate information to local associations. Mailing to every CHA member does occur, but is unrealistic because of the high costs involved. Therefore, distribution of Speak Out! materials takes place at registration, clinics, or at network AGM’s. One strategy of ensuring more effective distribution has been to appoint an Abuse & Harassment Coordinator in all associations. This individual is responsible for receiving material from the respective branch affiliate and further disseminating materials within local associations.

Implementation cost was a program hurdle, recognized by 8 Participants. Concerns primarily centered on the issue of instructor training costs. Originally, the Red Cross saw an opportunity to tie-in to the CHA with their Prevention Services program. Participant 10 recounted, “...they wanted their first instructor to receive a $300.00 fee for putting, or being part of the instructor team. Well, I can’t name one organization in hockey in Canada who can afford $300.00 a session for an instructor.” CHA
organizations, not able to afford the program, worried about offending the Red Cross after their involvement with developing and implementing other Speak Out! initiatives.

Nine of 12 respondents, totaling 23 m.u.s., expressed concerns with how the CHA communicates certain issues to the network regarding Speak Out!. Participant 6 described the National office as a "closed shop" in that if one is not close to this level, then certain messages are not filtered to branches and local associations. The National level was also accused of not providing enough policy guidelines to the branch associations. Branches have had to make their own policies without CHA direction. Additionally, concern was raised over the lack of follow-up to implementation. Participant 11 claimed, "...they don't seem to care because we don't get any directive from them, you know, like a follow-up, saying in all the branches, 'have you done this, what are you doing, where's your critical path?" A National level Participant confirmed this sentiment and responded, "...I think our communication with our branches has to be a little bit better and I think they have to know when to pick up the phone and try to access some expertise in that area."

Another program hurdle expressed by nine participants, totaling 17 m.u.s, centered on the lack of consistency in message delivery. Participants spoke of inconsistencies related to various network organizational infrastructures and regional differences across Canada and consideration as to how these factors impact program delivery. According to Participant 3, "...what one child may receive in Ottawa, he/she would not even know about in Windsor, or Saskatchewan." Therefore, broad dissemination of material is essential because of constantly changing volunteer and player bases, which also impact program delivery.
As stated, regional differences have impacted on Speak Out! delivery. Differences related to French and English speaking regions have caused implementation rates to vary. The differing needs of a region dictate, to a certain degree, how programs are delivered. Written policy cannot be strictly adhered to in certain regions of the CHA network because, according to Participant 9, "...it would not be unusual in some communities to have a number of individuals who have been convicted of alcohol related assault charges." Similarly, in certain Canadian communities, a potential coach may be married to an athlete, however, the Speak Out! policies discourage coach-athlete relationships from developing. Therefore, branch and local association administrators need to realize that in implementing the program, policies and screening initiatives may have to be altered to fit unique situations, indicative of that particular region.

**Attitudes and Feelings**

Certain themes reflecting the attitudes of both CHA administrators’ and constituents’ feelings towards the Speak Out! program were uncovered. These attitudes are divided into four main themes: fear of harassment and abuse issues; information overload; lack of expertise; and, not regarding harassment and abuse as a hockey matter. These four themes are further described.

**Fear of issues.** Levels of apprehension surrounding the development and implementation of a program of such magnitude as Speak Out! were found and discussed. Participant 12 described a feeling of fear when first presenting the Speak Out! program’s mandate at the 1997 AGM:

...the Sub-Committee people thought that there would be lots of questions, lots of barriers; they didn’t think people would stand around and would stay for it. What
happened that night is, uh, everybody stayed and more came in. So, we had a ballroom full of people listening. You could hear a pin drop and they were just grappling with the topic, so it was a very defining moment that night and from there we went around to all the various groups and talked to them and definitely the opinion I got was that they wanted to make a difference and they wanted to accept the responsibility and deal with the issue. Scared of it, but willing to jump in.

Questions on Speak Out! policy and initiative creation, costs and funding, dissemination of information, and coaching education, may all lead to fear and apprehension at the organizational level. Fear of the unknown was a recurring theme by 12 Participants, accounting for 27 m.u.s., however, awareness of the collective responsibility that hockey organizations have for the safety of players helps to channel this fear into a proactive perspective, as indicated by Participant 7, “…It scared the daylights out of us but then we stepped back and thought, well now, how can we use each one of these things to build a better program and so that’s what our goal is right now.”

Believing that abusive or harassing situations do not happen in the sport of hockey leads to ignoring the issue altogether as illustrated by Participant 5’s comment, “…after all, thirty years ago, you never talked about this stuff. This was all hidden under the carpet and nobody ever dared bringing it out into the open as to what can and cannot happen.” Hesitating to become involved in acknowledging the reality of the issue still occurs in the network. Participant 11 believed the CHA responded to the Sheldon Kennedy incident in a ‘knee-jerk’ fashion and stated, “…I believe the CHA, if it hadn’t been for the Graham James issue don’t know that this would have ever got going and I
will find it very interesting to see how far the CHA takes this and give it the importance that they gave it three or four years ago.” Responses from Participants also reflected volunteer fear surrounding criminal record searches and the idea that Speak Out! was a vehicle “...to get a coach”. Additionally, the risks of vicarious liability and lawsuit action at association levels were other fears uncovered through Participants’ responses.

**Lack of expertise.** Six of 12 Participants indicated that lack of expertise was a hurdle to effectively deal with situations of a harassing or abusive nature. Participant 11 described feeling “…out of my element, when dealing with this”, and not knowing what to do when situations arise. Misconceptions about harassment and abuse issues are a resulting consequence in the network. Participant 11 additionally expressed, “…I’m of the feeling that we’re never going to be qualified.”

Prior to implementing Speak Out!, a directive from the National level for handling complaints of a harassing or abusive nature indicated that branches were to offer little advice. The complainant would be provided with names of a specific agency, such as the Red Cross, the Children’s Aid Society or the police, who would deal with the issue thoroughly. A change in the directive from the National level now mandates branches to deal with complaints directly by using Speak Out! policies and procedures. This directive has left some Participants feeling uncomfortable. This discomfort is due to a perception of lack of expertise in handling abuse or harassment issues. Thus, lack of expertise coincides with a low comfort level and competency to serve as an advocate for the Speak Out! program.

**Information overload.** Two main methods of educating CHA constituents in Speak Out! are through dissemination of print materials and workshop training. In so
doing, a feeling of “information overload” was revealed through Participants’ responses. Participant 11 stated, “…I don’t know how much more material you can get before they just, somebody’s gonna be turned off by it, okay?” Becoming turned off, in this context, could mean decreased interest in, or ignoring, print materials and resources altogether. Participants felt some volunteers question the importance of taking a workshop on harassment and abuse. Participant 2 acknowledged,

…we [the CHA network] don’t change real well and the idea of adding another program for delivery on the backs of some of our provincial sport governing bodies wasn’t necessarily, I wouldn’t say it was ill-received but I think it was just another sort of work load that was forced upon them. I think there was a little bit of backlash there, which I still sense, by the way.

Apathy toward the issue of harassment and abuse and the feeling that additional clinics are an inconvenience may have led some volunteers to decline coaching opportunities. An opposing feeling is that the clinic is worthwhile. This has been reported by once reticent volunteers who, after completing the Speak Out! clinic, found the experience to be valuable.

The problem becomes apparent in how to approach volunteers with the message. Participant 6 advocated a “soft-sell” type of approach because otherwise, “…you may lose a good volunteer because you’re trying to drive something down [his] throat.” Ultimately, the importance of Speak Out! must be conveyed for volunteers to buy in to the program and take ownership.
Volunteer Concerns

Other than paid staff employed at the National, branch and association levels, the CHA network is comprised of volunteers. Four respondents mentioned volunteer turnover as a problem within the CHA network. Dealing with new volunteers on a continual basis within the CHA means that in order for volunteers to be initiated to the Speak Out! program, educational initiatives must be upgraded and constantly delivered.

Other concerns expressed may be linked closely with the turnover factor. Firstly, a program hurdle within the CHA network is finding suitable volunteers to help deliver the program as a trained course conductor, a coach or an official. Finding strong resource people who are knowledgeable in the areas necessary to teach the program has been difficult. Participant 10 outlined the problem as, “…the ideal person would be a person very learned in hockey and very learned in child care policy.” People contribute their free time to the CHA because they love the game of hockey and may not feel inclined to volunteer if additional responsibilities require dealing with abuse and harassment issues.

Secondly, it was recognized that the time commitment of a volunteer has doubled with additional course completion requirements. The retention of volunteers for an extended commitment has become contentious. Participant 6 articulated, “…we’re losing volunteers right now because of the time and the qualifications restriction that we’re putting on these people and we’ll have to be very careful.” The continual examination of program requirements and recognition of volunteers, and strategies for finding and maintaining a strong volunteer pool, are essential for program effectiveness.
Program Misuse

Eight of 12 Participants indicated that constituents may be misusing the Speak Out! program to further individual agendas. An example of program misuse may occur when a child is cut from a team during the selection process. Some parents may view their child’s emotional state as emotional abuse and use the Speak Out! program to make a charge or complaint against the coach or local association. Participant 3 commented that parents are “…using the words harassment and abuse as buzz words to either be vindictive, to get a release, switch teams, whatever it is.” Another reason for program misuse included lack of playing time.

Perhaps one of the more serious consequences of misusing the Speak Out! program is the potential for a player levying a false accusation against a coach or official. Five of 12 Participants indicated concern over the issue of false accusations made to local associations. From a personal perspective, a false accusation can be very damaging to one’s reputation within the community, particularly if that person owns a business or is in a high profile position. Participant 5 stated, “…the worst thing that can happen to you is to be accused unfairly or falsely of something. It doesn’t matter whether you’re guilty or innocent, if that gets out, you might as well move to another town because it’s going to be terrible around any town where you are.” This issue is problematic for administration as well as for the accused because of the organizational ramifications of a false claim. If and when allegations do surface, participant seven recommended that complaints should be kept confidential with as few people as possible apprised of the allegation. The CHA is advised to investigate complaints regardless of whether or not they are believed to be false because, according to Participant 3, “…if that ever got in the papers, that a volunteer
organization was taking one of their volunteers to court over presenting false information, it wouldn't look good.” A summary, conclusions and recommendations are detailed next.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to apply an interorganizational network analysis to determine the implementation effectiveness of the Speak Out! program within (Ontario) CHA organizations. Its completion has contributed to the body of knowledge on sport harassment and abuse and aids sport organizations wishing to develop and implement prevention policies and programs. A case study was conducted, and data were collected from interviewing 12 CHA staff and volunteers with intimate knowledge of the Speak Out! program. Annual General Minutes from 1997-2000 were perused in order to reconstruct events pertaining to network decision-making history. The QSR NUDIST computer program was utilized to sort, organize, code and categorize data. Conceptual frameworks and frequency distribution tables represented the interpretive analysis.

It was found that the CHA network evolves through distinct organizing processes and operates with dynamic structural, exchange, and decision-making processes, all of which impact implementation effectiveness of the Speak Out! program. Actors come to understand the network through its shaping, a result of various organizing processes. In this study, the network influences actors’ behaviour through mandating Speak Out! educational processes. The network is shaped through various enactment processes, by a variety of actors who have interest in the Speak Out! program and athlete safety.

Recommendations

A primary recommendation based on the findings of the current study is to develop and conduct an extended, formalized evaluation of the Speak Out! program. This process would include two components: a policy review and a program assessment.
A neutral, third party, who has experience in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data, and who is able to understand the organizational culture of the CHA network, should conduct this research (Adams, 1994).

In reviewing the integrated abuse and harassment policies, it is recommended that they be considered separately but equally and that two review levels be conducted. The first level, called a Bench Review, should be completed to determine whether the policies communicate logistically consistent and appropriate standards to reflect the diversity of the CHA network. The second level must examine how Speak Out! policies operate within the network, as to how and when the policies are used and whether the policies are current and relevant to all organizational incongruities. Adams (1994) states, "...the benefits of policies are difficult to quantify, as are the costs of poorly written and poorly implemented ones" (p. 15). Conducting a review of the Speak Out! policies is highly recommended for enhanced policy effectiveness.

Further to this process, it is recommended that a comprehensive assessment be conducted to determine the Speak Out! program's impact on CHA network individuals and organizations. In ensuring network-wide representation, data could be collected from all constituent levels of the CHA across Canada, (i.e., players, parents, volunteers, and staff) through individual and focus group interviews, quantitative surveys, and online feedback via website technology. A goal of this assessment would be to identify trends and common concerns pertaining to Speak Out! implementation and would assist in developing salient recommendations and solutions for more effective program implementation (McIntyre, 2000).
An additional recommendation requires all network constituents to focus efforts on future Speak Out! planning in order to heighten implementation effectiveness. In so doing, the CHA should develop and communicate realistic, reasonable, and measurable Speak Out! objectives, at all levels of implementation. Executive administrators at all network levels need also to assume and convey ownership of the Speak Out! program to constituents by becoming certified facilitation trainers, conducting workshops, and attending important Speak Out! functions. Failure of senior management to assume ownership may indicate a lack of program credibility among CHA staff and volunteers. Several recommended strategies to plan effectively are described further.

Cost-effective program materials should continually be developed with the needs of various constituents (players, parents, volunteers, and staff) as a continual focus. Directives to this recommendation include: developing, and modifying policies which consider network structural, cultural, and geographic inconsistencies, and provide alternatives to accommodate and/or alleviate these inconsistencies; producing user-friendly materials with a simple format focusing on a unifying theme of harassment and abuse prevention; producing age-appropriate materials in French and English languages that are appropriate for both sexes; clarifying ambiguous terms in abuse and harassment areas through use of checklists and/or question and answer sections; providing additional support resources; and continually devising alternative methods to distribute materials to grassroot association levels.

Educational programs that continue to be interactive should be designed, tailored to volunteer requirements and constraints. This provides ongoing communication of the CHA’s commitment to the Speak Out! program. It is recommended that those designing
educational programs continue integrating key Speak Out! concepts into other training programs. In planning these educational processes, network administrators should be attentive to the future, especially in planning around the proposed mandate of September 2002. Continual involvement from network constituents is needed in further Speak Out! program planning. Martens & Day (1999) recognize, "...when a program has been shaped by the employees who will benefit from it, they are more likely to respect and observe it" (p. 170). Thus, planning for, and incorporating network-wide participation in Speak Out! program development and implementation is recommended.

Finally, the current study has added to the non-existent body of knowledge on implementation effectiveness of a sport abuse and harassment program, however additional research of the Speak Out! program is recommended. Rose's (1981) Eclectic Model, as a research framework, has merit, and could be utilized in the future to extend the current findings, in the CHA, or in other sport networks. While the current findings cannot be generalized to other populations, network analyses should be conducted to determine the implementation effectiveness of existing prevention programs within other sport cultures.

Quantification and qualification of CHA actors' perceptions of, and attitude change towards, abuse and harassment as a result of retaining action of the Speak Out! program should be measured. As well, research to determine the level of interdependence between CHA network organizations in Speak Out! program evolution and program delivery should be conducted to determine how interdependence aids or hinders network program effectiveness. Continued research is also recommended to
determine the influence of the current perceived power base within the CHA network, factors mitigating this power base, and its effect on Speak Out! program effectiveness.

Further research with CHA players, parents, volunteers, and staff should be conducted to determine the current knowledge and use of the Speak Out! program. As well, research should be conducted to determine quantitatively the effect of the Speak Out! program on the level of disclosure rates in network organizations. Because the mitigating incident providing impetus for program development was male on male sexual abuse, it is recommended that future research be conducted to determine the level of Speak Out! effectiveness for additional heterosexual abuse within the OWHA, as this type of abuse is more predominant in the literature and should, therefore, command attention. Conducting future research on the Speak Out! program will aid in enhancement of implementation effectiveness, which will ultimately affect the safety of the CHA’s most valued participants, the players.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy

This policy sets out the principles and practices of the Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) with regard to abusive behaviour towards participants. Each Branch and Affiliate Association is responsible for adopting a similar policy and adapting it to provincial, regional or local requirements as appropriate.

A. RELATIONSHIP TO HARASSMENT POLICY
Some behaviours which are defined as abuse when directed towards a child or youth may constitute harassment when directed towards a peer or when perpetrated between adults. The Canadian Hockey Association's Harassment Policy covers such behaviours. Together, the two policies address the entire spectrum of abusive and harassing behaviours.

B. CANADIAN HOCKEY ASSOCIATION'S MISSION
The mission of the CHA is to ensure its participants are provided meaningful opportunities and enjoyable experiences in a safe, sportsmanlike environment. This includes, among other things, a shared responsibility with parents to nurture the physical and emotional well-being of all participants. The CHA's primary interest is the well being of its participants.

C. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
The CHA is part of the sporting community in our country that is committed to seeking better ways to keep our youth safe. Protecting participants from all forms of abuse and neglect, whether emotional, physical or sexual, is an important element of safety. The CHA considers any form of abuse or neglect to be unacceptable and will do all it can to prevent this intolerable social problem. To this end, the CHA will promote awareness of all forms of abuse and neglect by providing educational materials and programs for participants, parents, volunteers and staff members. Through the use of these strategies, we will send a clear message to all potential abusers and sexual predators that hockey participants are not easy targets. The CHA is committed to the highest possible standards of care for its participants.

D. POLICY
It is the policy of the CHA that there shall be no abuse and neglect, whether physical, emotional or sexual of any participant in any of its programs. The CHA expects every parent, volunteer and staff member to take all reasonable steps to safeguard the welfare of its participants and protect them from any form of maltreatment.

1. DEFINITIONS OF ABUSE
Child abuse is any form of physical, emotional and/or sexual mistreatment or lack of care which causes physical injury or emotional damage to a child. A common characteristic of all forms of abuse against children and youth is an abuse of power or authority and/or breach of trust. Across Canada a person is considered a child up to the age of 16 to 19 years depending on provincial legislation.

Note: The following are the basic definitions of a child for Canada's various jurisdictions. Those marked with * also use regulations which modify the definition. For complete information, consult "Speak Out! Act Now! A Guide for preventing and responding to Abuse and Harassment for Sports Clubs and Associations", pp. 52-79

British Columbia - any person under 19 years of age
Alberta - any person under 18 years of age  
*Saskatchewan - any unmarried person under 16 years of age.  
Manitoba - any person under 18 years of age  
*Ontario - any person under 18 years of age  
Quebec - any person under 18 years of age  
*New Brunswick - any person under 19 years of age.  
Nova Scotia - any person under 16 years of age  
P.E.I. - any person under 18 years of age  
*Newfoundland - any unmarried person under 16 years of age  
*Northwest Territories - any person under 18 years of age  
*Yukon - any person under 18 years of age  

2. EMOTIONAL ABUSE  
Emotional abuse is a chronic attack on a child's self-esteem; it is psychologically  
destructive behaviour by a person in a position of power, authority or trust. It can take the  
form of name-calling, threatening, ridiculing, berating, intimidating, isolating, hazing or  
eglecting the child's needs.

3. PHYSICAL ABUSE  
Physical abuse is when a person in a position of power or trust purposefully injures or  
threatens to injure a child or youth. This may take the form of slapping, hitting, shaking,  
kicking, pulling hair or ears, throwing, shoving, grabbing, hazing or excessive exercise as  
a form of punishment.

4. NEGLECT  
Neglect is chronic inattention to the basic necessities of life such as clothing, shelter,  
nutritious diets, education, good hygiene, supervision, medical and dental care, adequate  
rest, safe environment, moral guidance and discipline, exercise and fresh air. This may  
 occur in hockey when injuries are not adequately treated or players are made to play with  
injuries, equipment is inadequate or unsafe, no-one intervenes when team members are  
persistently harassing another player, or road trips are not properly supervised.

5. SEXUAL ABUSE  
Sexual abuse is when a young person is used by an older child, adolescent or adult for his  
or her own sexual stimulation or gratification. There are two categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>NON-CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>touched or fondled in sexual areas</td>
<td>obscene remarks on phone/computer or in notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced to touch another person's sexual areas</td>
<td>voyeurism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kissed or held in a sexual manner</td>
<td>shown pornography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced to perform oral sex</td>
<td>forced to watch sexual acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaginal or anal intercourse</td>
<td>sexually intrusive questions and comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaginal or anal penetration with an object or finger</td>
<td>forced to pose for sexual photographs or videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexually oriented hazing</td>
<td>forced to self-masturbate or forced to watch others masturbate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. HARASSMENT AND ABUSE - DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABUSE</th>
<th>HARASSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Emotional, physical, sexual</td>
<td>Emotional, physical, sexual; may be motivated by racial or other forms Of prejudice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of care</td>
<td>Person of any age; may be male or female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Any person under age of Majority as determined by Provincial and Territorial Child Protection Acts; may be male or Female</td>
<td>May be peer or person with power or authority over adult victim; may be male or female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Any person who has power or Authority over victim and/or Breeches trust; may be male or Female</td>
<td>Most often internal unless referred to police in cases of suspected physical Or sexual assault or criminal harass-ment (stalking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>External to organization; referred To child welfare or police</td>
<td>Determined by organization’s harassment policies, Criminal Code, labour tribunals, civil action and/or Provincial Human Rights Tribunals; may be used concurrently or alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Determined by Provincial and Territorial Child Protection Acts and Criminal Code; civil suits may also occur</td>
<td>The victim is not to blame; offenders are responsible for their behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The victim is not to blame; Offenders are responsible for Their behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. DUTY TO REPORT

Abuse and neglect are community problems requiring urgent attention. The CHA is committed to help reduce and prevent the abuse and neglect of participants. The CHA realizes that persons working closely with children and youth have a special awareness of abusive situations. Therefore these people have a particular reporting responsibility to ensure the safety of Canada’s young, by knowing their provincial protection acts and following through as required.

Every province and territory in Canada, except the Yukon, has mandatory reporting laws regarding the abuse and neglect of children and youth; the Yukon requests that concerns be reported. Consequently, it is the policy of the Canadian Hockey Association that any CHA personnel (part-time and full-time staff, volunteer, participant, team official, on ice official) or CHA partner (parent, guardian) who, has reasonable grounds to suspect that a participant is or may be suffering or may have suffered from emotional, physical abuse and neglect and/or sexual abuse shall immediately report the suspicion and the information on which it is based to the local child protection agency and/or the local police detachment. Across Canada a person is considered a child up to the age of 16 to 19 years depending on provincial legislation.
Those involved with the CHA in providing hockey opportunities for participants understand and agree that abuse or neglect, as defined above, may be the subject of a criminal investigation and/or disciplinary procedures. Failure to report an offence and thereby, failure to provide safety for participants may render the adult who keeps silent legally liable for conviction under the provincial child protection acts.

By educating our National body, Branch Representatives and local hockey association personnel, the CHA is weaving a tighter safety web around our most precious resources... the players!
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Appendix B

Canadian Hockey Association Harassment Policy

This Policy sets out the principles and practices of the Canadian Hockey Association regarding harassment. Each branch is responsible for adopting a similar policy, adapting it to provincial, regional and local requirements as appropriate.

A. RELATIONSHIP TO RECOGNITION AND PREVENTION OF ABUSE POLICY

Some behaviours which might be described as harassment when directed towards an adult, may constitute abuse when directed towards a child or youth by any person with power or authority over the person harassed. The Canadian Hockey Association’s Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy covers such behaviours. Together, the two policies address the entire spectrum of abusive and harassing behaviours.

B. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Canadian Hockey Association is committed to providing a sport and work environment which promotes equal opportunities and prohibits discriminatory practices. Harassment is a form of discrimination which is prohibited by human rights legislation in Canada. The CHA supports the right of all its members, whether athletes, volunteers or employees, to participate in all CHA activities free from any form of harassment. Further, the CHA emphasizes the importance of eliminating harassment in hockey as a key element in ensuring the safety of young participants. A sports environment which actively discourages harassment and builds relationships based on trust and mutual respect, is an environment which discourages the abuse of children and youth, and encourages the overall development of the individual.

In order to further these aims, the CHA will make every reasonable effort to promote awareness of the problem of harassment among all its members, and to respond swiftly and effectively to complaints or disclosures of harassment.

C. POLICY

It is the policy of the Canadian Hockey Association that harassment in all its forms will not be tolerated during the course of any CHA activity or program. Accordingly, all CHA personnel (staff, volunteers, team or on-ice officials) and partners (parents, guardians) are responsible for making every reasonable effort to uphold this commitment. Specifically, this includes refraining from harassing behaviour, responding promptly and informally to minor incidents of harassment and following local or national policy guidelines for reporting or responding to more serious complaints of harassment. Players and other participants are expected to refrain from harassing behaviour and are encouraged to report incidents of harassment.

1. DEFINITION OF HARASSMENT

Harassment is defined as conduct, gestures or comments which are insulting, intimidating, humiliating, hurtful, malicious, degrading or otherwise offensive to an individual or group of individuals, and which create a hostile or intimidating environment for work or sports activities, or which negatively affect performance or work conditions. Any of the different forms of harassment may be based on the grounds prohibited in human rights legislation, such as race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation and religion. Harassment may occur between peers (eg: player to player of the same age group, parent to official, coach to coach) or between someone in a position of power or authority and an adult in a subordinate position (eg: coach to player, sports administrator to employee).
The following is a non-exhaustive list of examples of harassment:
1. unwelcome jokes, innuendo or teasing about a person's body, looks, race, sexual orientation etc.
2. condescending, patronizing, threatening or punishing actions which undermine self-esteem
3. practical jokes which cause awkwardness or embarrassment, or may endanger a person's safety
4. any form of hazing
5. unwanted or unnecessary physical contact including touching, patting, pinching
6. unwanted conduct, comments, gestures or invitations of a sexual nature which are likely to cause offence or humiliation, or which might on reasonable grounds be perceived as placing a condition of a sexual nature on employment or on any opportunity for training or advancement
7. sexual assault or physical assault

It is important to note that the behaviours described in items 5 to 7, when directed towards a child or youth, constitute abuse under child protection legislation. This may also be true of other behaviours, for example, certain hazing practices. In such cases, the duty to report provisions of the Recognition and Prevention of Abuse Policy come into effect.

2. HARASSMENT AND ABUSE - DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HARASSMENT</th>
<th>ABUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>Emotional, physical, sexual; may be motivated by racial or other forms of prejudice</td>
<td>Emotional, physical, sexual, lack of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Person of any age; maybe male or female</td>
<td>Any person under age of Majority as determined by Provincial and Territorial Child Protection Acts; maybe male or Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Maybe peer or person with power or authority over adult victim; may be male or female</td>
<td>Any person who has power or Authority over victim and/or breeches trust; maybe male or female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Most often internal unless referred to police in cases of suspected physical or sexual assault or criminal harassment (stalking)</td>
<td>External to organization; referred To child welfare or police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Actions</td>
<td>Determined by organization’s harassment policies, Criminal Code, labour tribunals, civil action and/or Provincial Human Rights Tribunals; maybe used concurrently or alone</td>
<td>Determined by Provincial and Territorial Child Protection Acts and Criminal Code; civil suits may also occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>The victim is not to blame; offenders are responsible for their behaviour</td>
<td>The victim is not to blame; offenders are responsible for their behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. RESPONSE AND REMEDIES

Harassment of all kinds has been tolerated for too long in hockey, being tacitly accepted as a part of the culture of the game and used by individuals who would not condone such conduct out of the hockey environment. It is the position of the Canadian Hockey Association that harassment can be tolerated no longer. Harassment is unacceptable and harmful. The CHA recognises the serious negative impact of all types of harassment on personal dignity, individual and group development and performance, enjoyment of the game and in some cases, personal safety.

At the same time, the CHA recognises that not all incidents of harassment are equally serious in their consequences. Harassment covers a wide spectrum of behaviours, and the response to harassment must be equally broad in range, appropriate to the behaviour in question and capable of providing a constructive remedy. There must be no summary justice or hasty punishment. The process of investigation and settlement of any complaint of harassment must be fair to all parties, allowing adequate opportunity for the presentation of a defence to the charges.

Minor incidents of harassment (eg: inappropriate jokes) should be corrected promptly and informally, taking a constructive approach and with the aim of bringing about a change in negative attitudes and behaviour. More serious incidents (eg: a course of repeated taunting, any form of sexual or physical assault) should be dealt with according to the relevant association, branch or national policy guidelines. Complaints should be handled in a timely, sensitive, responsible and confidential manner. There should be no tolerance of reprisals taken against any party to a complaint. The names of parties and the circumstances of the complaint should be kept confidential except where disclosure is necessary for the purposes of investigation or taking disciplinary measures.

Anyone making a complaint which is found to be clearly unfounded, false, malicious or frivolous will be subject to discipline.

Procedures for the handling of complaints brought against national employees or volunteers of the Canadian Hockey Association are detailed in the document entitled "CHA Harassment Complaint Procedures."
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Appendix D

Semi-Directed Focussed Interview Adapted

Modified from Brannagan, 1986

Introduction

I would like to start by asking for permission to tape this interview, as I will need a transcription for further analysis. No one will have access to the tape except for me and if you wish to not be recorded during the interview, you just have to indicate and I will turn off the recorder. May we start?

The purpose of this interview is to obtain information that will help me conduct a network analysis of the Canadian Hockey Association. As someone who has been instrumental at the organizational level, you are in a unique position to describe the organization that you work for, in terms of organizational and personal ties, perceived influence and certain decisional analysis factors, as they relate to the bigger network of the CHA. That’s what the interview essentially is about: your experiences with the organization and your thoughts about the organization.

The answers from all the people I interview, and that will approximate 20 – 25 people, will be combined for my thesis report. Nothing you say will ever be identified with you personally. As we go through the interview, if you have any questions about why I’m asking something, please feel free to ask. Or if there’s anything you don’t want to answer, just say so. The purpose of the interview is to hear your insights about how the organization operates, and how it is tied to the CHA network. Any questions before we begin?

Demographic Information

We’ll start off with some basic demographic information:

Name:
Association/Organization:
Position held within organization:
Length of time within organization:
Previous positions held:
Length of time in previous position:

Decision Making and Organizing Processes Analyses

This first set of questions pertains to key issues that were identified some time ago by the CHA. The purpose of these questions is to help me analyze certain decisions made by the CHA.

1a. The CHA has identified three items as important issues with respect to sport harassment and abuse that they have dealt with in the recent past.
   - The implementation of the Speak Out! harassment and abuse policies within the CHA
   - The implementation of 12 Speak Out! program initiatives within the CHA
   - The ongoing development and dissemination of educational material pertaining to harassment within the CHA, vis a vis the Speak Out! Program
Select the issue that is most important for the hockey organizational body at this time and in your opinion, why you have made this selection.

1.b. Please comment on the importance of the other two issues as they relate to organizational ties within the CHA.

2. Here are three descriptions of how networks of organizations might deal with such issues:
   - Vigorous conflicts between the same leaders or groups appear again and again in discussions of National issues, so that the same persons or groups are always found together in coalition.
   - There are constantly changing coalitions between various groups or persons, so that the coalitions are different depending on the specific issue being considered.
   - Relatively little argument takes place because there is a high concensus among the various leaders and groups about what needs to be done.

In general, how would you characterize the situation among the Canadian Hockey Association during the past few years? Does it fit closer to the first, second, or third description?

I would now like to discuss these three issues identified at the National level over the last few years.

3. First, I would like to discuss the development and implementation of the Speak Out! policies:
   a. How did you participate in the decision making process of the development and implementation of the harassment and abuse policies?
      How?
      If Not, Why Not?
   b. What was your original position toward the development and implementation of an abuse and harassment policy?
      For It (Why?)
      Against It (Why?)
   c. How has your position toward the development and implementation of the policies changed over time?
      How?
      If Not, Why Not?
   d. What change has been needed to the Speak Out! policies since its inception in 1997 in order to accommodate your association’s requirements?
      What Changes?
      If None, Why None?
   e. What influence did the NHL exert with regard to the development and implementation of the Speak Out! Harassment and abuse policies?
      What Influence?
      If None, Why None?
   f. What influence did the CHL exert with regard to the development and implementation of the Speak Out! Harassment and abuse policies?
      What Influence?
If None, Why None?

In your opinion, has the development and implementation of the Speak Out! policies been a successful endeavour for your association?
Yes (How So?)
No (Why Not?)

4. Second, I would like you to consider the following list of the 12 Speak Out! Program initiatives.

a. In what way did you participate in the decision making process of the development and implementation of various Speak Out! program initiatives?
   In what way?  .
   If Not, Why Not?

b. What was your original position toward the need for screening and the other initiatives?
   For It (Why?)
   Against It (Why?)

c. How has your position toward the implementation of initiatives changed over time?
   How?
   If not, Why not?

d. What have you needed to change or modify in terms of the initiatives in order to accommodate your association's requirements?
   What Changes Have Been Made?
   Why No Changes?

e. What influence did the NHL exert with regard to the development and implementation of the Speak Out! Program initiatives?
   What Influence?
   If None, Why None?

f. What influence did the CHL exert with regard to the development and implementation of the Speak Out! Program initiatives?
   What Influence?
   If None, Why None?

g. In your opinion, has the development and implementation of the Speak Out! initiatives been a successful endeavour for your association?
   Why?
   Why Not?

5. Third, I would like you to consider the ongoing development and dissemination of educational material pertaining to harassment and abuse within the CHA, vis a vis the Speak Out! program.

a. In what way did you participate in the decision making process of the ongoing development and dissemination of educational material pertaining to harassment and abuse within the CHA, vis a vis the Speak Out! program?
   In what way?
   Why No Participation?

b. What was your original position toward this ongoing educational process?
For It (Why?)
Against It (Why?)
c. How has your original position changed over time with regard to this ongoing educational process?
   How?
   Why No Change?
d. How have you need to change or modify any of the educational processes or resources over time in order to accommodate your association's requirements?
   How So?
   Why No Changes?
e. What influence did the NHL exert with regard to the ongoing development and dissemination of education materials pertaining to abuse and harassment in the CHA?
   What Influence?
   If None, Why None?
f. What influence did the CHL exert with regard to the ongoing development and dissemination of education materials pertaining to abuse and harassment in the CHA?
   What Influence?
   If None, Why None?
g. In your opinion, has the ongoing development and dissemination of educational material pertaining to abuse and harassment in the CHA been a successful endeavour for your association?
   Yes (Why?)
   No (Why not?)

**Structural Analysis**
This next set of questions is about personal and professional ties within the hockey organizational community. This part of the interview is aimed at determining how close the ties are within the hockey organization and how that affects certain organizational variables within the CHA.

6. Would you please indicate the names or positions of three other National/Provincial members or executives with whom you most frequently meet socially or formally.
7. When you think of your best friends within the larger hockey community, would you include the above named person(s)?
8. With whom of the three other National/Provincial members do you have the most frequent formal contact?
   Why is this the case?
9. With whom of the three other National/Provincial members do you most frequently discuss long-range hockey concerns?
10. With whom of the three other National/Provincial members did you most frequently discuss:
    - The implementation of the Speak Out harassment and abuse policies within the CHA
    - The implementation of 12 Speak Out! Program initiatives within the CHA
The ongoing development and dissemination of educational material pertaining to harassment within the CHA, vis a vis the Speak Out! Program

**Exchange Analysis**

We're about half-way through the interview at this point and I think a lot of really important things are being said about the CHA network organization. This next set of questions is about perceived influence within the hockey organizational community. Here is a list of hockey organizations/associations, directly or indirectly active at the National level:

- Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) - Ontario Office
- Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) - Calgary Office
- British Columbia Amateur Hockey Association (BCAHA)
- Hockey Alberta
- Saskatchewan Hockey Association (SHA)
- Hockey Manitoba
- Hockey Northwestern Ontario (HNO)
- Ontario Hockey Federation (OHF)
- Ottawa District Hockey Association (ODHA)
- Hockey Quebec
- New Brunswick Amateur Hockey Association (NBAHA)
- P.E.I. Hockey Association (PEIHA)
- Nova Scotia Hockey Association (NSHA)
- Newfoundland and Labrador Hockey Association (NLHA)
- Hockey North
- Canadian Hockey League (CHL)
- Ontario Hockey League (OHL)
- Western Hockey League (WHL)
- Quebec Minor Junior Hockey League (QMJHL)
- Greater Toronto Hockey League (GTHL)
- Northern Ontario Hockey Association (NOHA)
- Ontario Hockey Association (OHA)
- Ontario Women's Hockey Association (OWHA)
- Ontario Minor Hockey Association (OMHA)
- Minor Hockey Alliance of Ontario (Alliance)

**Sport Canada**

11. Which one(s) would you say are generally influential at the National level?

12. Of the groups listed in question 11, which do you see as most influential?
   Why?

13. Are there other influential hockey organizations I may have missed?
   Yes (which)?
   No

14. Which organizations should be influential?
   Why?
   Why aren’t they?

15. Which organizations could be influential?
   Why?
   Why aren’t they?
Lastly, I would like to ask you about some of the ties your organization has with other National/Provincial organizations. Please remember, I am interested in organizational ties, not personal relations among individuals.

16. Upon which three of the other National/Provincial organizations does your Association most rely for information regarding hockey matters that might affect them?
   Why is this the case for each specific organization?

17. To which three other National/Provincial organizations would your association be most likely to pass on important information regarding hockey in Canada or matters that might affect them?
   Why is this the case for each specific organization?

18. To which three other National/Provincial organizations does your association give the most substantial funds as payments for goods or services received, or as dues or grants, or as loans or investments?
   Why is this the case for each specific organization?

19. From which three National/Provincial organizations does yours receive the most substantial funds as payments for services rendered or goods received, or as loans, grants, dues or investments?
   Why is this the case for each specific organization?

20. To which three National/Provincial organization do you feel your association would be most likely to offer the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?
   Why is this the case?

21. From which three National/Provincial organizations would you feel your Association be most likely to receive the greatest moral support if facing a difficult issue or challenge?
   Why is this the case with each specific organization?

22. Here again is a list of hockey organizations. Would you please indicate those with which you are associated at this time as a:
   Director, Board Member, Member, Official, Coach, Athlete
   Please indicate those with which you have previously served as a:
   Director, Board Member, Member , Official, Coach , Athlete

- Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) – Ontario Office
- Canadian Hockey Association (CHA) – Calgary Office
- British Columbia Amateur Hockey Association (BCAHA)
- Hockey Alberta
- Saskatchewan Hockey Association (SHA)
- Hockey Manitoba
- Hockey Northwestern Ontario (HNO)
- Ontario Hockey Federation (OHF)
- Ottawa District Hockey Association (ODHA)
- Hockey Quebec
- New Brunswick Amateur Hockey Association (NBAHA)
- P.E.I. Hockey Association (PEIHA)
- Nova Scotia Hockey Association (NSHA)
- Newfoundland and Labrador Hockey Association (NLHA)
Hockey North
Canadian Hockey League (CHL)
Ontario Hockey League (OHL)
Western Hockey League (WHL)
Quebec Minor Junior Hockey League (QMJHL)
Greater Toronto Hockey League (GTHL)
Northern Ontario Hockey Association (NOHA)
Ontario Hockey Association (OHA)
Ontario Women’s Hockey Association (OWHA)
Ontario Minor Hockey Association (OMHA)
Minor Hockey Alliance of Ontario (Alliance)
Sport Canada

23. Do you have any other questions at this time?
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