Professional sport stadiums in the United States are funded either through public-private partnerships or through the local, regional and state governments (Baade & Dye, 1988, 1990; Seigfried & Zimbalist, 2000). Starting with Camden Yards in 1992, facilities constructed in this modern era were built primarily in downtown areas and serve as a central location through which significant city revitalization can occur. Although the success of revitalization through the public stadium can be debated, facility managers and operators are faced with a more prominent issue: violence toward spectators. Whether from an act of terrorism or an inebriated group of individuals, violence at sporting events has become a consistent concern among facility operators since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (Fosdick, 1995; Piccarello, 2005). Following the recent attacks in Paris on the Stade de France in late 2015, facility managers saw the potential nightmare occur, thankfully with limited success. While Stade de France was designed with terrorism in mind (e.g., significant distance between the stadium and the rest of the city), what ethical responsibilities do government agencies have to fund and finance security at venues managed for the benefit of a private organization?

As municipalities such as Boston and Los Angeles ban the use of smokeless tobacco in sport venues, Major League Baseball (MLB) has agreed to follow local laws and ban its use in dugouts in those cities. Smokeless tobacco has already been banned in minor league dugouts. Many players, such as Chicago pitcher John Lackey, have spoken out against the bans, saying, “We’re grown men. I don’t know about all that.” And further, Lackey’s manager Joe Maddon says, “If someone else is going to make up his mind for me, I’m going to have a hard time with that.” Cleveland Manager Terry Francona says he “wrap[s] gum around it because I don’t want kids seeing me with it,” but it is less clear that others feel that way. This presentation will examine both the laws regarding smokeless tobacco use and professional baseball policy, and then, consider whether MLB and its players owe a duty to fans, and children in particular, to set an example regarding behavior.

In this presentation we examine two questions: i) if elite female distance runners feel supported by athletic governing bodies and/or corporate sponsors during and post pregnancy; ii) if they do not feel supported, how do they cope with this reported lack of support? We begin by providing an overview of women’s participation in sport, specifically elite athletics, pregnancy, corporate sponsorship, and athletic governing bodies’ policies that impact women. We then present four main themes identified through poststructural feminist theory and thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with 14 elite female distance runners: 1) they do not feel supported by corporate sponsors and/or athletic governing bodies during pregnancy or postpartum; 2) some participants “accept/rationalize” reduction/loss of contracts during and post pregnancy; 3) they strategize their pregnancies around competitions, contracts, and spousal support; 4) they face stress/uncertainty that their male counterparts do not. Finally, we draw on solutions from the participants, while concomitantly arguing that athletic governing bodies and corporate
sponsors must be more transparent in their practices and improve policies to create more equitable sporting environments particularly during pregnancy and postpartum.
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This paper will present a comparative content analysis of the harassment policies and ethical guidelines of the Ontario Volleyball Association (OVA) through the lens of two ethical frameworks: the Ethics of Care (EoC) and the Ethics of Justice (EoJ). The EoC prioritizes relations between persons along with context-sensitive reasoning while the EoJ stresses the use of abstract moral principles. Both frameworks provide a unique perspective on the ethical issue of athlete harassment in sport. And while steps have been taken at the policy level towards minimizing and eliminating harms, these efforts often do not extend into practical application (Donnelly et al, 2014). The difficulty lies in the structure of sport itself; specifically, its primary aims taking precedence over the experience of athletes and the inherent relativity embedded in the concept of care and caring. Thus, a comparative analysis of the OVA governing documents through the EoC and the EoJ will show how care and justice for athletes are presented at the structural level. It will also examine the philosophical principles underlying the value structure of sport and further our understanding of how athlete rights and mistreatment have been conceptualized at the structural level.