Coaching Identity and Social Exclusion

Eric Anderson
University of Bath

This article is published in *Coaching Knowledges: Understanding the Dynamics of Sport Performance.* London: AC Blackwell. Pages 24-50. This is an unedited version.

Sport and Social Outcomes

There is a persistent myth—a near-hegemonic belief—concerning sport and society. It is a myth which purports sport to be a socio-positive, inclusive, and egalitarian meritocracy. The cultural strength of this myth is so strong, parents, players, coaches, scholars and fans tend to overlook the large number of problems associated with the culture of sports and the way we structure and run them. When the utility of sport and its ability to produce socio-positive outcomes is examined, there is often a negation of the socio-negative aspects though a 'they do more good than harm' framework. Yet, there is no 'first do no harm' creed in sport. Rather, the mantra is generally 'win at all costs' despite the breadth and intensity of those costs. Thus few people intricately involved with sport question whether sport—or at least the we play and value them—is worth the toll they have on our bodies, minds and society.

Paradoxically, social thinking on sports commonly attributes most sporting activities as desirable vessels for the building of self-esteem, the teaching of teamwork, and for delivering improved health to the individual and community, despite this paradigm's failure to prove this under empirical scrutiny. Miracle & Reese (1994), for example, show that only a few kids seem to have their self-esteems raised in sport, and those who do largely do so at the expense of others. Similarly, rather than sports teaching kids to work together, they more often pit people against one another for social promotion, creating social division instead of cohesion. Finally, the health benefits attributed to most sports may easily be maintained by a walking or jogging program, which generally incurs less risk of injuries, social marginalisation or potentially being subject to a coach's physical and verbal abuse.

Specific to the focus of this article however, sports and those who coach them have traditionally, although often unknowingly, promoted misogyny, racism, homophobia, violence, and ability status discrimination among its participants. This is particularly true among boys and men, but also applies to girls and women. Thus, rather than sports serving as an institution to benefit the whole of a society I maintain that organised teamsports largely serve a limited number of athletically talented, able-bodied, white, heterosexual males.

In this chapter I focus on just one aspect of the complicated social milieu that helps sport reproduce itself as a socially exculsionary terrain. Namely, I illustrate how individual coaches are structured to shape their coaching identity and are influenced to utilise their agency in order to maintain, instead of challenge, the status quo. Thus, in explaining the socialization process of coaches into their profession, I illustrate the structural and cultural influences that frequently direct them to utilise their agency for the reproduction of sport as a socially exclusive territory.

First, I highlight how sport structures and cultures operate. I next describe how these influence sport's socio-negative outcomes, listing the specifics of discrimination against various groups of people. I then move onto a discussion of the role coaches play in this: how they are socialised and what they can do to make sport more inclusive.

The Mechanisms that Produce Sport's Social Outcomes

Before we can understand the role of the coach in reproducing inequality, we must first understand the system of socialisation from which coaches emerge. The development of coaches whom reproduce sport as a socially exclusive environment is influenced by a number of variables, but the most salient are: 1) the social structure of sport; 2) the culture of sport.

The *social structure* of sport refers to the manner in which the game is physically structured and played, the manner in which athletes are promoted, divided and rewarded. For example, one structure (of almost all sports) is that they are performed in order to determine a sole winning individual or winning team over other losing individuals or teams. Yet, this is not the only structure upon which one can play sport. One could, for example, follow the historical tradition of many

Native American tribes and begin a sporting competition with two teams of unequal ability (Anderson 2005b; Oxendine 1988) adding or subtracting players until all teams achieve equal parity.

This is the way kids naturally play games. That is to say, before adults socialise them into what adults maintain to be 'fair' rules, and how one 'properly' plays sport from an adult perspective. Yet, before an adult socialisation into sport, kids tend to balance teams out to equal ability, even if it means one side has considerably more players than the other. Kids seem to believe that equal ability is what is 'fair,' not equal team size. Also, kids seem to feel that a close competition is what is fun and fair about sport, and they create structures to assure this. Thus kids of lesser ability might be given more tries, or allowed more room for error. Alternatively, one could play a sporting game without keeping score at all. Onc *can* enjoy sport for the sake of movement alone. Competition is not necessary to enjoy sport. A final example of the influence of structure upon sport comes from the near total segregation that occurs in sport. Sport is quite unique in that it near totally segregates women away from men—something more akin to orthodox religions than state-sponsored social welfare programmes.

The *culture of sport* simply refers to the values and norms associated with any given sport. The collective value of all sports can also be generalised into that of a sporting ethos for our society as a whole. You have heard the mantras before; sport is supposed to teach the value of 'hard work' and sport certainly esteems 'giving it one's all.' But there are other creeds within our sporting culture. We value a hyper-masculine disposition in sport. There is after all 'no crying in baseball;' there is no room 'for a sore loser;' and 'there is no 'I' in team.' Dropping out of sport is frowned upon, as is 'throwing like a girl;' challenging a coach's intelligence or authority, or giving less than one-hundred percent.

Finally, and of primary concern to this article, the socially exclusive nature of sport is influenced by the coach who came up through this system, and may therefore utilise his or her individual agency to reproduce a system he/she believes worked for them. But the coach does maintain a great deal of power in socialising individuals into a particular belief system and, to a

lesser extent, the coach also maintains the ability to alter certain sport structures. Thus, as gatekeepers, coaches maintain a great deal of sway in determining the social outcomes of sport.

There are several reasons why coaches maintain such power in shaping the norms of their teams. First, social psychologists frequently refer to five basic categorical types of power (French & Raven 1959), of which coaches often possess all five. And while it is not absolutely necessary to understand exactly what and how each of these powers operates, it is important to understand that few other occupations/professions offer individuals the ability to associate with all five types of power (Jones, Armour & Potrac 2004). These powers are described as: 1) *Legitimate*, defined as power given by one's elected or appointed status; 2) *Coercive*, defined as power because of one's ability to take something away; 3) *Reward*, defined as power derived from the ability to give something desired; 4) *Expert*, defined as power accorded individuals who have undergone formal training; 5) *Referent*, defined as power given because of the respect the coach might have as an inspiration or mentor.

Clearly coaches use reward power by offering players social promotions, more playing time, or public praise, and they use coercive power in punishing athletes with the opposite. Coaches establish their legitimacy in the eyes of their athletes primarily through having 'come up' through the system, often as a successful player first and then by producing quality athletes. This legitimacy, coupled with the title 'coach,' is then thought (often erroneously) to make one an expert, as coaches are assumed to possess the technical knowledge beneficial to advancing athletes. Finally, coaches sometimes gain the respect of their athletes through referent power because athletes desire to accomplish the same feats, times, or levels of play, or because they look to the coach as a mentor or parental figure.

The Socio-Negative Outcomes of these Mechanisms

Sport and Misogyny

The reproduction of anti-feminine attitudes among men in sport is achieved by both structural and cultural methods. First, few other institutions naturalize the structural segregation of

men and women so near perfectly as do teamsports (Messner 2002). While occupational sex segregation is declining in other institutions (Cotter, et. al. 1995; Johnson 1998; Rotolo & Wharton 2004), institutionalized, competitive teamsports remain segregated through formal and social reasoning (Messner 2002). This segregation has many historical sources including the belief that women were not physically or emotionally capable of playing sport and the overriding belief that women were not naturally inclined to participate in such activity (Crosset 1990; Hargreaves 1993; Kidd 1990; Whitson 1990). Although women have made many gains in playing teamsports in the past several decades, as the number of women who play sport increases, the proportion of women who coach has gone down (Stangl & Kane 1991).

And while we may no longer believe that sporting participation is physically incompatible with womanhood, a still salient cultural variable in men's sports is that masculinity remains predicated in not associating with femininity (Anderson 2005). The reasons for this are multiple and complex but the equation of predicating masculinity in opposition to femininity is one of sociology's most durable findings (Kimmel 1994). Accordingly, the social world created around men's teamsports is one of subversion for the respect of women, who are not viewed as worthy participants in the sporting terrain. Instead of valuing the athleticism of women, their social location in relationship to men is one that frequently posits them as bodies to be pursued and conquered by the 'rightful' participants of the sporting terrain. This has even been theorized to lead to elevated rates of sexual violence against women by members of certain teamsports (Crosset 1990, 2000; Crosset, Benedict & MacDonald 1995).

Sport and Homophobia

While there are few structural mechanisms keeping gay and lesbian athletes from equal sporting participation, there is however an extraordinarily strong cultural determinant: indeed sport has been described as one of the last bastions of institutionalized homophobia (Anderson 2005). This is evidenced by the near-total absence of openly gay or lesbian athletes in the professional, collegiate, and lower ranks of sporting systems. This, however,

does not mean that gay and lesbian athletes avoid sport altogether. Rather, it is to suggest that they are simply too afraid to come out (in any real numbers) in what they perceive to be a socially hostile environment.

Yet it shouldn't be a surprise to learn that closeted or selectively closeted gay and lesbian athletes *do* exist (at even the highest levels of sport). This is because nearly all kids (regardless of their sexual orientation) are socialized into sport through networks of friends and through compulsory participation in physical education courses. Furthermore, although it may seem that gay men might be repelled by the homophobia within sport, my research suggest that many are drawn to sport precisely because they seek the masculinising and heterosexualising veneer it provides (Anderson 2005).

Sport and Ableism

Disabled people face both structural and cultural obstacles to equal sporting participation. Perhaps the structural conditions of many organised sporting practices are the most salient obstacle to full-inclusion. Many sports simply remain inaccessible to people with various types of disabilities. Consequently, adaptations to these sports (such as wheelchair basketball) have helped promote athletic participation among the disabled, but such advances are often subject to class discrimination. A running prosthetic for below-the-knee amputees costs about 15,000 U.S. dollars, and a light framed runner who uses it just 40 miles a week needs to replace it once a year.

But there is also a degree of cultural influence over the barriers to equal athletic participation among disabled people. Much of the focus on disabilities seems to remain what people *can't* do, rather than what they *can*. It was for these purposes that, in 1989, the International Paralympics Committee (IPC) was organised to mobilise a number of individual organisations and heighten the public profile of disabled athletes. Yet the IPC remains extraordinarily exclusive as to what type of athletes, from what sports, and of what events are included in the Paralympics. Rather than adopting a gay games model of total inclusivity and encouraging the development of a community of Paralympics athletes, the games have modelled themselves after the hyper-

competitive and exclusive nature of the Olympics. Thus, the Paralympics severely restricts the number of athletes that may participate: leaving only the elite to play.

While separate sporting leagues and organisations have helped promote athleticism among the disabled, much of this participation remains segregated from mainstream sport, and few coaches are trained to understand the special needs of athletes with disabilities. So rather than the rules of basketball changing to adapt disabled athletes who might desire to play in a given school or community league, disabled athletes are instead segregated away from 'able-bodied' athletes.

Sport and Racism

Although there are many racial and ethnic minorities, black athletes are examined as the example in this chapter because they have taken a long and difficult road to gain what little space they maintain in sport. Blacks have been particularly oppressed in the United States, where they have had to struggle against centuries of slavery and another century of legalized segregation. Remarkably, some observers maintain that sports are no longer racist. These critically ill-informed thinkers show that in American sports, blacks are well represented in basketball, football, and to a lesser extent baseball. However, it is important to note that black athletes, in any real numbers, are limited to *just* these three sports. Coakley (1998) says:

> Since the 1950's, the sport participation of blacks has been concentrated in just a handful of sports. Even in the 1990s, the 34 million African Americans are underrepresented or nonexistent in most sports at most levels of competition…there is a virtual absence of black athletes in archery, auto racing, badminton, bowling, canoeing/kayaking, cycling, diving, equestrian events, field hockey, figure skating, golf, gymnastics, hockey, motorcross, rodeo, rowing, sailing, shooting, alpine and Nordic skiing, soccer, softball, swimming, table tennis, team handball, tennis, volleyball, water polo, yachting, and many field events in track and field.

Also, when black athletes are represented in sport they tend to come from positions that are less central to the outcome of the game. Thus, in baseball they are much more likely to play

a field position than pitcher, and in American football they are much more likely to be a wide-receiver than a quarterback.

Sport and Violence

The violent nature of sport (particularly as one matriculates up the sporting hierarchy) promotes the social exclusion of many types of people. First, the physical violence that is intended or unintended in sports prohibits those without enough muscle mass from effectively participating. More significantly, the violence associated with playing through pain, taking risks, and giving it all means that a large number of athletes are excluded through participation do to injury. Finally, the intra-personal violence associated with fighting and intimidation influences some parents (perhaps rightfully) to withhold their children from these types of sports, preventing many individuals from voluntarily playing them.

Much of the violence (against self and others) found in sport can be attributed to the structure of sport. This is particularly made clear in contact sports. But much of the violence in sport also comes from the way we play them, requiring a winner, which necessitates success be achieved only by another's loss. In this manner Lester Thurow (1985) describes sports are a zero-sum game. Sport is a social situation in which one person's success must come at the expense of others. Exemplifying this, coaches and athletes frequently express ill feelings toward one's competitor as they have been socialized into an in-group/out-group perspective that is predicated upon establishing the other team as the enemy. Rather than viewing competitors as agents in cooperation to bring out one's best, others (often even members from the same teams) are viewed as obstacles in the path of obtaining cultural and economic power. 'In order for me to win, you must lose.' Violence (conscious or not, intentional or unintentional) becomes an acceptable tool in achieving this victory. Hence, the structure of the sport produces the culture of the sport.

A Coach's Role in Social Exclusion

As gatekeepers to sport, coaches play a vital role in the reproduction of this socially exclusive terrain. Individual coaches utilize their agency (willingly or not) in order to help reproduce sport as a socially exclusive institution, or to challenge these tenets and help open sport to inclusivity. How coaches use their agency in shaping sport to be inclusive or exclusive of gay men and women and/or feminine-acting heterosexual men is in some ways obvious. For example, the use of homophobic, femphobic and misogynistic discourse clearly creates a culture of hate and discourages many people from coming out to play, or coming out whilst playing. But how coaches use their agency to reproduce ableism, racism and violence is a bit less obvious.

Ableism

Because the structure of most sports places most types of athletes with disabilities (or lesser abilities) at a disadvantage; and because the culture of sport influences coaches to overly-value winning (the measure by which most judge a coach's success) athletes with disabilities are often thought not desirable for a team's 'success.' This has two meanings for the social-exclusion of abled athletes in sport. First, coaches are less likely to intentionally seek out disabled athletes for participation on their teams. Drawing upon my own experience as a high school distance running coach, the common practice for coaches to identify and recruit potential teammembers was to request the PE teacher have their students run a mile. The coach would then talk to the fastest members of a PE class and attempt to recruit them to their sport. It is not likely, however, that a disabled runner is to place in the top of this event and he/she is therefore overlooked.

More insidious, able-bodied coaches concerned with their win-loss record are more likely to outright reject disabled athletes than coaches whom are concerned with the quality of character they develop among their charges as the measure of success. Again drawing upon my experience is the case of CJ. CJ was a top-notch college runner at the University of California Irvine, where he was diagnosed with bone cancer—necessitating the removal of a foot. After chemotherapy and amputation CJ desired to return to his team, where his coach denied him! Sadly, this is not the only

time I have heard of such a story. Highlighting the opportunity his coach missed, as a lecturer at the same university I learned of CJ's situation and volunteered to coach him: within a year he broke three world records for his amputee division of distance running.

Racism

The elimination of overt racism in sport has been a longstanding project among sport scholars, and we have certainly made gains in eradicating racist discourse within sport. But racism persists in many, mostly covert, ways within the institution, and coaches may even unwillingly contribute to this. For example, once on teams, black athletes are often asked to tryout for or are assigned playing positions that require speed and power; and they are less likely to be asked to tryout for or assigned positions that are more central to the outcome of a game—like pitching, catching, or quarterbacking. Complicating this, the reproduction of black athletes as being valuable in certain positions/sports is also reproduced through black athletes themselves. Athletes from minority communities may be inspired to play certain sports or positions by existing role models in those positions. Here, a coach might help introduce them to alternative sports, or to encourage them to try out for other positions.

Also, a coach's beliefs about the athletic talents and weakness of players from certain races may inadvertently influence the manner upon which they treat athletes. If a coach believes, that white men can't jump as high as black men, or that Asian women can't swim as well as white women, these beliefs might influence a coach's training practices, or motivational techniques.

Finally, racism might occur because of a coach's desire to include black athletes amongst his/her team. For example, in many predominantly white areas black students are viewed as potential assets to an institution's sporting teams. Conversely, they are less likely to be seen as potential assets to debate teams, drama clubs, or other intellectual or cultural pursuits. And while the focus of this chapter is on the social exclusion from sport, we must also question what disservice we may do by encouraging them into sport and not other pursuits.

Violence

Coaches often exploit their athletes' fears of social rejection, of being de-selected for playing time, or not making the team the following season. 'Sacrifice' (defined here as violence against the self) becomes part of the game as athletes (particularly those with low self-esteem or poor social support networks) are willing to risk their health because they are eager to be accepted by their coach and peers. Thus, coaches frequently push athletes too far and sometimes knowingly have them play with injuries. In fact, research shows that over 80 percent of the men and women in top-level intercollegiate sports (in the United States) sustain at least one serious injury while playing their sport, and nearly 70 percent are disabled for two or more weeks (Edward 2004).

Socializing Coaches into the Social Exclusion Model

None of this is to suggest that the coach is solely responsible for all of the socio-negative outcomes of sport, but it does suggest that coaches may unwillingly reproduce these outcomes. Much of this comes from the manner in which our coaches are developed and retained. Here coaches are rewarded and promoted for winning, not for improving the quality of character of their athletes. As Calerro (1994) suggests, and Jones, Armour & Potrac (2004) stress, coaches need to become aware of the socialisation process acting upon them so that they might utilise their agency to become role-makers, instead of just role-players. This section examines how a coach's identity is formed, and what structural forces act upon the development of that identity.

If we desire to understand how a 'coach's' identity is formed, we must first understand that almost all coaches have evolved from that of a player. The pattern holds that certain athletes find their experience in sports so thrilling they desire to participate in them as long as possible. Coakley (1998: 155) says, "…they love their sports and will do most anything to stay involved." Part of this is because of the sheer glory that a good athlete may experience, but part of this is also because of the prestige allotted top-notch athletes in peer culture. Athletes (particularly in men's teams) are publicly lauded as heroes: honoured by their institutions and celebrated by fans (Bissinger 1990). It is therefore understandable that from *their perception* sport is a socially positive vessel. Thus,

athletes who are both sufficiently gifted *and* who exhibit the desire to follow the strict norms associated with sport are influenced to remain within them. The longer they do, and the better they are, the more likely they are influenced to foreground their identity as that of *an athlete* (Anderson 2005; Messner 1987).

The process of developing one's master identity as an athlete is a product of both individual and social influences. Individually, an athlete's success might raise his or her sense of self-efficacy and or self-esteem. This, of course, is likely to further a narrowing of one's devotion onto sport and centres one's identity on sport. In discussing the concept of a socially perceived athletic identity with one of my university students he said, "When I come home from Uni, people ask me how rugby is going, not how my classes are going.' Similarly, when I asked another student what she might say to describe herself to someone she's just met she answered, 'I would tell them I was a tennis player at the Uni.' The generalisation to be made here is simple, the more successful we become at sport, the more likely we (and others) are to centre our identity on being an athlete.

But centering one's identity on athleticism carries with it a measurable risk. Sport is a volatile field where careers end on poor plays or miss-steps, and athletes can be cut from a team on a moments notice. In fact, as an athlete, the only thing that one can be assured of is that his or her career will end; and relative to other occupations, it will do so early. Thus, whether an athlete suddenly loses his or her association with their athletic identity, or whether their body ages out of competitive form, all athletes are eventually forced to disengage with competitive sport. When this happens, they are no longer valued in the sport setting (Messner 1987).

Athletes who drop out, are forced out, or otherwise do not make the next level of sport often find themselves detached from the cultural prestige they once enjoyed—this is something sport psychologists call the disengagement effect (Greendorfer 1992). It makes sense that athletes who rode atop the athletic hierarchy would also feel the greatest loss upon disengaging from it. Thus, for those with no further opportunity to play competitive sports, coaching becomes one of the few avenues for getting back into the game (Lyle 2002). Indeed, sport almost always draws leaders from those who ascribed to the previous cohort's ideals. As coaches, these ex-athletes reproduce hero-

athlete narratives and promote their individual experience to inspire a new generation of athletes in the same ethos that they were once socialized into and profited from (Anderson 2005; Hughes & Coakley 1991).

But for every athlete who has been highly merited by sport, there are many more (perhaps thousands) that did not make the cut; often those who had horrifying experiences in sport. Yet, those who were marginalized or publicly humiliated by sports are rarely represented in coaching positions; their stories are not told in popular culture. Books are rarely published, sponsorships are not given, and movies are not produced about those who did not achieve success in sport. Even when stories of marginalised athletes are told, they normally depict a heroic underdog. In this manner, only highly selective stories are being told about sport, stories that glamorize the struggle and romance of the sporting hero genre (Stangle 2001). These stories, fictional or real, make for great entertainment, but they may also falsely bestow upon sport the qualities that may only exist for a few. Conversely, when marginalized athletes drop out, are pushed out, or otherwise leave the sporting arena, their perceptions of how sport ought to operate are silenced. Those who were marginalized by sport, or too intimidated to play them in the first place, do not go on to coach. Their stories and their ideas about how sport ought to operate go unheard. It is for these reasons that I call sport a *closed-loop* system. Sport is essentially closed to voices of dissent.

Structural and Cultural Influences in Creating Coaches

Playing a specific sport before coaching certainly authenticates a coach; and the more successful one's abilities as an athlete, there more he or she is assumed to be a good coach (Lyle 2002). In other words, athletes tend to think that a world champion athlete would make a better coach than a second-string athlete. This is because it is assumed that the journey one takes to become the worlds' greatest necessitates having as much intellectual mastery over the sport as physical. Highlighting the flaw with this way of thinking, in a discussion with one of my students, Dan reported truly liking his coach until learning that his coach did not actually play football. 'I mean I really liked the guy, he had studied the sport and knew what he was doing; but once we [the

team] found out he had not played, he got no respect. . . It's like if you haven't bled for the sport, you can't know it.' This, 'I did it so you can too' narrative serves several functions. First, it prevents those not weaned on the sport from entering the coaching profession and it also influences the system to forgo a more rigorous manner for judging the abilities of a coach. Finally, this system limits the awareness, observations, or formally learned ways of thinking others might bring to the field (like Dan's coach). If a coach learns to coach via how he or she was coached, does this not make the system ripe for reproducing errors?

Making the transmission of poor coaching practices easier, coaching positions, public or private, almost all levels requires no university degree in coaching pedagogy, sport psychology, or physical education. Certainly, one needs a Bachelor's degree in physical education in order to teach physical education courses, but one does not need a Bachelor's in physical education in order to coach. While many organisations and institutions may require coaching certification courses, they are generally not substantive of good coaching practices (most tend to be focused on the basics motor skills and tactics of the sport). Coaching, as a profession, stands out as odd in this matter. One cannot counsel patients without an MA or PhD, one cannot practice medicine without an M.D, and one cannot cut hair without a state-certified license. Without a similar institutionalised system of training, measurement and accreditation there is little opportunity to evaluate or reform coaching practices outside of team victories, and little reason for a coach to alter his or her coaching style if he/she thinks it will not yield more wins.

Modelling Inclusive Coaching

This final section is designed to help theory meet practice. Below I give a few concrete examples of how a coach might best utilise his or her agency in order to help move sport into a more inclusive direction.

Choose your words wisely

The attitude that any given individual holds toward any social matter is not simply a matter of rational choice or individual agency. The attitudes one maintains toward other people, groups, or cultures are heavily influenced by a variety of factors. These include large, macro-level variables, like institutional outlooks; the organisational attitude of any given team; the influence of key team members and/or the influence of the coach. Thus, the coach maintains at least some degree of power in shaping social attitudes among his or her athletes.

Actively recruit marginalised people

It is likely a generalisable truth that most coaches seek to recruit athletes that they perceive as being capable of contributing to a team's ability to beat other teams. This is increasingly the case the further one matriculates up the ranks of sport. However, if coaches are interested in using sport in attempt to teach something other than just the value of winning, coaches might also be advised to intentionally seek individuals who represent diversity to their teams. If, for example, we believe that sport can help reduce racism by enabling white and black athletes to compete together, we must have black athletes on the team to do such. This is not, of course, to suggest hanging a poster announcing that members of a certain race or sexuality or ability status are desired; it is however to suggest establishing relationships with people of these categories first, and then extend to them an invitation to join the team. As an example, as a high school teacher with a top-notch team, I once invited a deaf student to run on my team. Whilst this individual may never have thought of running on his own, the invitation thrilled him into participation, and his participation socialised my athletes

into a new way of understanding diversity in relationship to ability-status. Several of the athletes even learned sign language.

Challenge structures that promote social exclusion

Quite simply, coaches ought to be champions of policies and practices that influence other coaches. Nowhere is this better illustrated than through the lack of coaching-influenced policies in terms of the treatment of gay and lesbian athletes. Rather than waiting for one's athletes to demand the inclusion of sexual minorities in official policies, coaches should champion this effort and mandate non-discriminatory language amongst his/her athletes. Coaches whom organise large meets should similarly be cognitive of factors that may include or exclude people of disability. Simple changes often make a difference in the ability for inclusive.

Educate others

Although it may be difficult to revolutionise the way we coach without changing the structural methods upon which coaches are promoted and rewarded, it is still possible to make change through the education of one's peers. For the most part coaches are people with good intentions whom (often) get caught up in the orthodox fervour of sport. Educating them as to the overt and covert ways that they may be producing a socially exclusive environment will help mould the hwole of sport in a more progressive direction. One can, for example, give them a copy of this chapter to read. Remember, great coaches are great teachers first.

References

Albert, Edward. 2004. “Normalizing Risk in the Sport of Cycling.” In Kevin Young, *Sporting Bodies, Damaged Selves: Sociological studies of sports-related injury*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Anderson, Eric. 2005. *In the game: Gay athletes and the cult of masculinity*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Bissinger, H. G. 1990. *Friday night lights.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Coakley, Jay. 1998. *Sport in Society: Issues and controversies.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cotter, David A., Joann M. DeFiore, Joan D. Hermsen, Brenda Marsteller Kowaleski, & Reeve Vanneman. 1995. “Occupational Gender Desegregation in the 1980s.” *Work & Occupations* (22)3-21.

Crosset, Todd. 2000. “Athletic Affiliation and Violence Against Women: Toward a structural prevention project.” P. 147-161 In McKay, Jim; Messner, Michael; Sabo, Donald (Eds.) *Masculinities, Gender Relations, and Sport*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

———. 1990. “Masculinity, Sexuality, and the Development of Early Modern Sport.” P. 55 In Messner, Michael & Sabo, Donald (Eds.) *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.

Crosset, Todd; Benedict, Jeffrey; & MacDonald, Mark. 1995. “Male Student Athletes Reported for Sexual Assault: A survey of campus police departments and judicial affairs offices.” *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* (19) 126-140.

Callero, P. 1994. From Role-Playing to Role-Using: Understanding Role as a Resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57(3) 228-243.

French, J.R.P. & Raven, B. 1959. “The Bases of Social Power.” In Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Studies in Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Univesity of Michigan Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1964. *Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Goldsmith, P. 2004. Schools' Role in Shaping Race Relations: Evidence on friendliness and conflict. *Social Problems* (51)587-612.

Greendorfer, Susan. 1992. “A critical analysis of knowledge construction in sport psychology.”

P. 201-215 In Horn, Thelma (Ed.) *Advances in Sport Psychology*. IL: Human Kinetics.

Hallinan, M., & Williams, R. (1989). Interracial friendship choices in secondary schools. *American Sociological Review* (54)67-78.

Hargreaves, Jennifer. 1993. “The Victorian Cult of the Family and the Early Years of Female Sport.” In Dunning, Eric; Joseph Maguire and Robert E. Pearson (Eds.) *The Sports Process: A comparative and developmental approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Howe, David P. & Carwyn Jones. 2006. Classification of Disabled Athletes: (Dis)Empowering the Paralympics Practice Community. Sociology of Sport Journal 23(1) 29-46.

Hughes, Robert & Coakley, Jay. 1991. Positive Deviance among Athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 8(4): 307-325.

Johnson, Robert. 1998. *Destined for Equality: The inevitable rise of women’s status*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jones, Robyn; Armour, Kathleeen & Potrac, Paul. 2005. Sports Coaching Cultures: From Practice to Theory London: Routledge.

Kidd, Bruce. 1990. “The Men’s Cultural Center: Sports and the Dynamic of Women’s Oppression/Men’s Repression.” P. 31-45 In Messner, Michael & Sabo, Donald (Eds.) *Sport, Men and the Gender Order*. Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.

Kimmel, Michael. 1994. “Homophobia as Masculinity: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity.” P. 119–41 In Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. (Eds.) *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lyele, J. 2002. Sports Coaching Concepts: A framework for coaches’ behaviour. London: Routledge.

Messner, Michael 2002. *Taking the Field: Women, men and sports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1987. “The Meaning of Success: The athletic experience and the development of identity.” P. 193–209 In Brod, Harry (Ed.) *The Making of Masculinities: The new men’s studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Miracle, Andrew W. & Rees, Roger C. 1994. Lessons of the Locker Room: The myth of school sports. New York: Prometheus Books.

Moody, J. 2001. Race, School Integration, and Friendship Segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology* (107): 679-716.

Oxendine, Joseph (1988). *American Indian Sport Heritage*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Rotolo, Thomas & Wharton, Amy. 2004. Living Across Institutions: Exploring sex-based homophily in occupations and voluntary groups. *Sociological Perspectives* 46(1): 59-82.

Stangl, J. M. & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural Variables that offer Explanatory Power for the Under Representation of Women Coaches Since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal* (8): 47-60.

Thurow, Lester. 1985. *The Zero-Sum Solution: Building a world-class American economy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.