

traditional and state discourses on the gendered citizen and by resistance to such discourses. For example, several of the memoirs indicate the authors' refusal to identify with the state's construction of the word "woman," *funü*, in favor of the more gender-neutral "youth," or *qing-nian*. Some of the memoirs reflect on the privileged status of the authors as educated urban youth and how their situations were different from those of less educated, poorer women. Here it would be nice to read memoirs of rural women, or less educated women, for a more diverse picture of this era. A few of the memoirs offer an articulate self-reflexivity on the process of reconstructing one's past subjectivity and on how the authors' past and present situations assist in the construction of their memory. Several of the authors seem less certain about how gender and its social stereotypes shaped their identity. Their memoirs reflect an uneven understanding of the subject's relationship to the past, of how the past is remembered and retold, as well as of how gender informs such a discussion. It is difficult to expect all the memoirs to address the multifaceted concerns outlined in the introduction. Nevertheless, these stories provide primary material for anyone studying the Cultural Revolution and its testimonial literature. Several of the memoirs provide rich material for the discussion of sexuality, subject formation, and the state in modern China. In addition, they provoke the reader to consider the Cultural Revolution in a different light. While both *Masculinity Besieged?* and *Some of Us* constitute essential reading for courses on modern Chinese gender and sexuality, the latter should be used with caution due to its irregular approach to the question of gender. ■

Taking the Field: Women, Men, and Sports. By Michael A. Messner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Spoilsports: Understanding and Preventing Sexual Exploitation in Sport. By Celia H. Brackenridge. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Ann Chisholm, California State University, Northridge

Michael A. Messner's *Taking the Field: Women, Men, and Sports* and Celia H. Brackenridge's *Spoilsports: Understanding and Preventing Sexual Exploitation in Sport* investigate matters of crucial import with regard to Western sport and gender, sexual discrimination, sexual

harassment, sexual abuse, and sexual violence—both on and off the field. As a consequence, these very different yet consanguine texts are wary of pursuing liberal accommodation absent institutional change. These books, moreover, were written with students in mind. Accordingly, both works seek to commission those readers, in particular, as agents of social transformation who might meet the challenges posed both by feminist theory and practice as well as by cultural studies' mandates for intervention.

Assessing the progress that has been made by women in U.S. sport since the advent of Title IX, Messner's *Taking the Field* makes the case that although conditions have improved in some ways, the fundamental attitudes and inequities engendered by sporting institutions and by the matrix of social apparatuses with which they are enmeshed (i.e., the U.S. media, corporations, colleges and high schools, local parks and recreation services, etc.) remain rather firmly entrenched. Thus, Messner critically interrogates the "center" of U.S. sport: "the sport-media-commercial complex" that is linked inextricably to male-dominated sports such as football, basketball, baseball, and hockey (xx, 128). He develops these claims by applying a tripartite critical framework designed to explain sports-related gendered performances while simultaneously illuminating the mutually constitutive character of social interactions (gendered performances), structural contexts, and cultural codes.

Messner compellingly describes performances of masculinity by athletes at the interactional level in the second chapter of his book, "Playing Center: The Triad of Male Violence in Sports." Arguing that the athletes who are most likely to perpetrate sexual violence are not only participants in revenue-producing contact sports but are also high-status members of their peer groups, he maps peer collaboration in such performances according to in-group and out-group hierarchies. In these circumstances, Messner submits, increasing and decreasing status, respectively, are synonymous with perceptions of either greater or lesser fidelity to a particular code of heterosexual masculinity: a "manhood formula" that he later distills from U.S. media coverage and portrays as a script that is rehearsed, (re)activated, and (re)invigorated by gendered performances in and of themselves (123–24). He further posits that in such cases, as well as in more commonplace instances of misogyny and homophobia, performances of masculinity constitute pleasurable, erotic bonds: bonds reinforced by sporting imperatives requiring the suppression of empathy, bonds strengthened by the specter of a lack of complicity that might call one's group membership (masculinity and heterosexuality) into question, bonds that ultimately limit relationships among men (via homophobia),

and bonds that therefore accrue their affective force from the very alienation they fuel.

Taking the Field often laces together the various levels of analysis suggested by Messner's model quite nicely. Thus, for example, the book charts correspondences among male athletes, beer drinking, bonding, and violence on an interactional level and, subsequently, connects them with both the beer industry as an institutional nexus (among colleges, sporting competitions, and corporate advertising) and with the cultural codes comprised by the "manhood formula." In the process, while frequently attending to matters of race and class, Messner deploys well-selected anecdotes and examples gleaned from his personal experience and from striking sports-related media events. In the end, he concludes that although some media representations may be transgressive, the center still holds: the manhood formula essentially remains untouched, and women continue to be (under)represented in a marginalized, if not frivolous and sexualized, fashion.

Messner's text converges neatly with his prior work and with pertinent literature in sociology, cultural studies, and sports studies. Yet, regrettably, although Messner does discuss gendered performance in relation to symbolic interactionism and Erving Goffman's dramaturgy, he refers to Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* and to associated work in gender studies and performance studies only in passing.¹ As a result, *Taking the Field's* account and utilization of performativity may fall a bit short for some readers. Likewise, the book's analytical framework makes a good deal of sense at an intuitive level but nonetheless poses a problem—that of audience effects. Indeed, as Messner acknowledges, "it is not possible, merely on the basis of my (or anyone else's) textual analysis of sports programs, to explicate precisely what kind of impact broadcast sports . . . have on their audiences" (132). Therefore, his suppositions regarding connections between gendered cultural codes mobilized in media representations and events that occur at the interactional level are necessarily "tentative" (127).

Messner's ultimate goal, however, is not to build the perfect explanatory model; it is to generate the impetus for reform. Thus, the final chapter of *Taking the Field* recommends an agenda for fundamentally transforming U.S. sporting institutions, which the exegeses throughout his text describe as both harmful to all athletes and increasingly unstable. Messner's proposals along these lines are keyed to his three contextual foci, which he examines more or less discretely in three consecutive chap-

¹ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

ters that appear earlier in his text. These materials are complemented effectively by Messner's authorial persona: one of knowing chagrin, of regret, and of empathy; one that enacts his thesis that significant intervention in U.S. sport must "provide a context in which the 'silent majority' of men move affirmatively away from being quietly complicit with misogyny, homophobia, and violence at the center of men's sport culture" (30).

For her part, Celia H. Brackenridge positions *Spoilsports* within a context defined by two countervailing exigencies: the embryonic condition of research pertaining to sexual exploitation in sport, which she sees spanning a continuum from discrimination to harassment to abuse, and the moral panic that has sensationalized this issue by identifying it almost exclusively with pedophilia. *Spoilsports*, in turn, offers an introduction to social scientific research related to sexual exploitation in sports while also proffering a guide for policies and prevention (6–7). Before proceeding, however, readers should heed well the author's introductory warning that "we are still chronically short of data on the issues of sexual harassment and abuse in sport and, thus, lack what we need for developing and testing social scientific theories" (3). Accordingly, those readers searching for definitive answers to a number of vital questions regarding sexual exploitation in sport (how prevalent is sexual abuse in sport? what characteristics, if any, distinguish sexual harassment and abuse in sport from sexual harassment and abuse occurring in other circumstances?) may well be disappointed.

The fourth chapter, "Knowing Our Limits: Stakeholder Research," is one of the stronger sections in *Spoilsports*. There Brackenridge not only reviews existing empirical studies of sexual exploitation in sport—studies conducted in the United Kingdom, six other Western nations, and Australia—but also provides detailed direction both with respect to addressing the particular dilemmas that inevitably attend such research and with respect to research design. In the process, she recommends rigorous qualitative research as the best means for formulating the bases for prevention policies. Moreover, while demonstrating her command of the literature specific to these issues, Brackenridge highlights some interesting, although frequently inconclusive, research results.

Throughout her text, Brackenridge often builds on her own research program and marshals literature drawn from an array of disciplines, including sociology, psychology, criminology, and feminist studies. Thus, she ultimately advances a theoretical model of exploitative encounters that essentially fuses David Canter's notion of the criminal career with two models of abuse drawn from therapeutic and clinical literature in psychi-

atry.² She describes her contribution as “a work in progress,” as “a very crude attempt to capture three dimensionally the multi-dimensional complexities of sexual exploitation in sport” (145). Her specific purposes in this respect are to account for coach/abuser motivations, for athlete susceptibilities, and for opportunities created by the norms that emerge in specific sporting contexts, while charting the increasing risks of and the decreasing resistance to exploitation. Concomitantly, by proposing to examine the autobiographical narratives of (male) abusers as well, Brackenridge hopes to yoke analyses of the interpersonal power dynamics occurring in those sporting contexts to broader social codes of gendered power, particularly heterosexual masculinity as articulated in relation to (quasi-)familial structures.

Given the yawning gaps that Brackenridge identifies in the extant research concerning sexual exploitation in sport—such as the dearth of information pertaining to race and class—*Spoilsports* will spark in some readers a keen desire for additional information regarding the design of those available studies that she uses to map the terrain. In a similar vein, such readers may note as well that the text occasionally generalizes from one or two studies that rely on very small samples and that its characterizations of existing data at times appear to be somewhat arbitrary.

Brackenridge, consequently, is at her best when she is working closely both with and between the studies she deploys. Her book also functions effectively on the microlevel when she shares the moving testimony conveyed by athletes she has interviewed. Equally important, *Spoilsports* identifies numerous unanswered questions, discerns practicable lines of inquiry, and implicitly raises crucial issues that merit further exploration. Among them, the following are distinguished: How might scholarly work pertaining to the relationship between pedagogy and seduction usefully inform research regarding sexual harassment and abuse in sport? How will theorizing male power in sport via the family romance, as defined by patriarchal and heterosexual imperatives, both enhance future inquiries regarding sexual exploitation in sport and potentially affect research regarding race, class, and those instances of sexual exploitation that are not perpetrated by heterosexual males?³

² David Canter, *Criminal Shadows: Inside the Mind of the Serial Killer* (London: HarperCollins, 1994).

³ Consider, for example, the stakes of the important exchange pertaining to pedagogy, seduction, sexual harassment, and feminism in reply to Jane Gallop’s “Resisting Reasonableness,” *Critical Inquiry* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1999): 599–609; James R. Kincaid’s “Pouvoir, Félicité, Jane, et moi,” *Critical Inquiry* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1999): 610–16; and Ann Pellegrini’s “Pedagogy’s Turn: Observations on Students, Teachers, and Transference-Love,” *Critical*

Overall, *Taking the Field* and *Spoilsports* are informative and sometimes insightful books that are particularly well suited for classroom use insofar as they aim to delineate the ways that instances of sexual discrimination, harassment, violence, and abuse in sport might be correlated with specific institutional structures as well as with broader cultural environs. Although neither of the models they tender offers a definitive account in this respect, both books assert the necessity of decoding narratives of masculinity as a precursor to meaningful reform. In doing so, they obliquely ruminate over the (im)possibility of parsing the erotics of sport in such a way as to acknowledge pleasure and power in athletics without necessarily fore-ordaining the potential for sexual exploitation.⁴ Still more important, both texts tacitly underscore the import of research that conceptualizes heterosexual masculinity in some Western sports not only through Butler's notion of performativity but also through her theories of incorporation and melancholia. ■

Inquiry 25, no. 3 (Spring 1999): 617–25. Numbered among the subsequent critical responses were Tania Modleski's "Fight the Power: A Response to Jane Gallop, James Kincaid, and Ann Pellegrini," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2000): 591–600; Lisa Ruddick's "Professional Harassment," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2000): 601–9; Terry Caesar's "Response," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2000): 610–14; James Kincaid's "Response," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2000): 615–18; and Ann Pellegrini's "Interested Third Parties: A Response to Tania Modleski," *Critical Inquiry* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2000): 619–26.

⁴ The following authors have articulated a range of attitudes in this regard: Patricia Vertinsky, "Gender Relations, Women's History and Sport History: A Decade of Changing Enquiry, 1983–1993," *Journal of Sport History* 21, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 16–17; Allen Guttman, *The Erotic in Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 168–69; Toby Miller, *Sportsex* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); and Leslie Heywood and Shari L. Dworkin, *Built to Win: The Female Athlete as Cultural Icon* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 76–99.

Copyright of Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society is the property of University of Chicago Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.