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ABSTRACT

Previous research has indicated that the preservice teachers (PTs) with coaching orientations reinforced sexism and masculine bias while employing the sport education (SE) model. The first study examined the degree to which SE delivered by two PTs with teaching orientations combatted or reinforced sexism and masculine bias in four SE seasons. Guided by the theory of hegemonic masculinity (HM), findings revealed that sexism and masculine bias were largely combatted and that the PTs provided a relatively equitable experience for girls and smaller, less physically able boys. Key reasons for this success included PTs’ liberal views about sport, their willingness to confront the prevailing sporting culture, and the fact that they taught elementary-aged children.

With the intention to integrate the two previous studies, the theory of HM was employed in the second study examining four SE seasons taught by two experienced inservice teachers for the presence or absence of sexism and masculine bias. The inservice teachers were found able to combat the effects of HM to a greater extent than teaching-oriented PTs. Their effectiveness was attributed to their liberal beliefs about sport and gender and teaching orientations. Additionally, the teachers were able to provide a relatively equitable experience for girls and smaller, less physically able boys because they possessed good levels of curricular, pedagogical, content, and pedagogical content knowledge as well as superior knowledge of their pupils.

The HM perspective also suggests that any contradicting masculinities are discredited by the dominant form. Similar to males who do not behave in accepted masculine ways might be
marginalized as being “feminine,” homosexual traits might be marginalized relative to those considered heterosexual. Therefore, the third study examined the influence of sexual identity stereotyping (SIS) on five heterosexual female physical education (PE) PTs. Results indicated that the PTs generally had a good understanding of SIS and that four of them had encountered it although only one had been sexually stereotyped herself. Grounded theory, in the form of five hypotheses, was developed to explain the influence of SIS on heterosexual female PE PTs and neophyte female PE teachers.
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CHAPTER I

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN SPORT EDUCATION: CASE STUDIES OF PRESERVICE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WITH TEACHING ORIENTATIONS

Abstract

Previous research had indicated the preservice teachers (PTs) with coaching orientations reinforced sexism and masculine bias while employing the sport education (SE) model. The purpose of the current study was to examine the degree to which SE delivered by PTs with teaching orientations served to combat or reinforce sexism and masculine bias. Participants were two PTs who taught four SE seasons during their culminating internship. The theory of hegemonic masculinity (HM) guided data collection and analysis. Data were collected through formal, informal and stimulated recall interviews, passive participant observation, and document analysis. Analytic induction and constant comparison were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that sexism and masculine bias were largely combatted and rejected during the SE seasons and that the PTs provided a relatively equitable experience for girls and smaller, less physically able boys. Key reasons for the PTs’ success included their liberal views about sport, their willingness to confront the prevailing sporting culture, and the fact that they taught elementary-aged children.

*Keywords: sport education, physical education, hegemonic masculinity*
Hegemonic Masculinity in Sport Education: Case Studies of Preservice Physical Education Teachers with Teaching Orientations

The relatively new curriculum model known as sport education (SE) (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011) was developed from “play theory” by Siedentop (1968) and draws its pedagogies from a combination of the best practices witnessed in sport and the research on management from the teacher effectiveness literature (Siedentop, 2002). Its primary goals are to promote technical and tactical competency, sporting literacy (i.e., the ability to discriminate between good and poor sporting practice and a commitment to support the former), and enthusiasm (i.e., participating with the correct sporting spirit) (Siedentop et al., 2011).

These goals are realized through children and youth engaging in authentic and relatively lengthy sport seasons in which significant record keeping takes place and that lead to a culminating event such as a cup final or championship game. Seasons are centered on formal competition (e.g., leagues and round-robin tournaments) and are often tailored to the participants’ levels of experience and ability through modifying rules, playing areas, equipment, and the number of players within teams. Moreover, teachers employing the model attempt to cultivate a festive atmosphere within lessons and a sense of affiliation among members of each team. Further, teachers focus on promoting ethical and fair participation and attempt to give pupils more responsibility and freedom to make decisions as a season progresses by asking them to take on a multitude of sporting roles (e.g., captain, coach, official) and shifting from the use of direct to indirect teaching styles.

There has been considerable support for SE in terms of it potential to resurrect physical education (PE) (e.g., Locke, 1992) due to its theoretical and structural advantages over traditional models for teaching sport in schools (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Alexander,
Taggart, & Thorpe, 1996; Ennis, 1999; Hastie & Siedentop, 1999; Kirk & Almond, 1999). These include the model’s greater appeal to pupils due to its incorporation of their social system and its relevance and connection with sport outside school. They also include the model’s greater appeal to teachers because they are no longer the primary drivers of instruction and since their pupils’ motivation to negotiate content and pedagogy is considerably weakened.

Reviews of the SE research completed by different scholars suggested that the theoretical and structural advantages of the model have, in the main, been translated into practical advantages (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Hastie, de Ojeda, & Luquin, 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O’Sullivan, 2005). One area to which SE still seems susceptible to criticism, however, is its ability to combat sexism and masculine bias (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press). Such criticism is indirectly fueled by a limited amount of research suggesting that the model is not necessarily inclusive of all pupils (Brock, 2002; Curnow & Macdonald, 1995; Hastie, 1998; Penney, Clarke, Quill, & Kinchin, 2002). It is also given indirect credence by those who note that the version of SE delivered in schools is generally conservative and that this type of delivery is likely to teach pupils undesirable values and practices because it is a reflection of the current sporting culture (Kirk & Macdonald, 1998; Penney, Clarke, & Kinchin, 2002; Penney & Waring, 2000). To-date, however, only one study has directly attempted to ascertain the degree to which SE rejects or promotes sexism and masculine bias. In this study, Parker and Curtner-Smith described how the SE delivered by two preservice teachers (PTs) reinforced sexism and masculine bias. Specifically, male pupils were shown to dominate proceedings (e.g., taking most of the leadership roles), females conformed to this state of affairs (e.g., by accepting more feminine and peripheral roles), and the beliefs and actions of the PTs served to promote values and roles traditionally associated with males and females. In line with the warning of Penney and
Clarke (2005), then, simply employing the “full version” (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008) of the SE curricular model was not enough to offset inequalities between the girls and boys in the PTs’ classes.

Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press) suggested that a key reason for the PTs in their study delivering a version of SE that reinforced masculine bias and sexism was their possession of moderate coaching orientations (i.e., were motivated to enter the profession primarily by the prospect of coaching extracurricular sports teams). This led to the PTs interpreting SE conservatively and, consequently, having no interest in challenging the existing sporting culture and the norms concerning gender associated with it. In congruence with the thinking of Parker and Curtner-Smith, therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the degree to which SE delivered by PTs with strong teaching orientations (i.e., motivated primarily by the prospect of teaching curricular PE) served to combat or reinforce sexism and masculine bias. The hypothesis was that PTs with teaching orientations were more likely to have relatively liberal beliefs about sport and be more inclined to use SE as a vehicle for social change than those with coaching orientations.

**Theoretical Perspective**

This study aimed to replicate the original research conducted by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press) except for the recruitment of PTs with teaching orientations. Therefore, and as in that original study, the collection and interpretation of data were guided by the theoretical perspective known as hegemonic masculinity (HM) (Connell, 2005, 2008; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Central to this perspective is that both females and males are socialized into accepting a traditional and dominant form of masculinity. This is achieved through individuals (e.g., PE teachers and coaches), social groups (e.g., sportsmen and women) and
institutions (e.g., schools and the media) reinforcing, championing, and supporting traits of this dominant form of masculinity including firmness, mesomorphy, an absence of sensitivity, and “reasonable” levels of aggression and violence (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press).

As noted by Bramham (2003) and illustrated by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), socioeconomic status and race can interact to produce slightly different versions of this dominant form of masculinity. Context can also produce differing exemplars of the same theme. For example, “exclusive masculinity” (Wellard, 2006) emphasizes physical performance of the body in general and displays of skill, strength, and aggression in particular.

The HM perspective also suggests that any contradicting masculinities are discredited by or incorporated within the dominant form. For example, males who do not behave in accepted masculine ways might be marginalized in a similar fashion to females by being categorized as “feminine.” Similarly, homosexual traits are marginalized relative to those considered to be heterosexual (Clarke, 1996, 1998, 2006; Sykes, 2007).

Critics have largely argued about the mechanics or inadequacies of HM rather than its overarching concept. Demetriou (2001), for example, believed that dominant forms of masculinity were more likely to adapt to or assimilate other masculinities rather than subordinate them. Greig, Kimmel, and Lang (2000) were of the opinion that the impact of age, race, sexuality, class, and social status needed further study in order to make progress with what was a promising but relatively simple theory. Finally, Beasley and Elias (2006) argued that HM was limited in that it did not take into account cultures outside the West.
Method

Participants

Two PTs from within one physical education teacher education (PETE) program at a research university in the southeastern United States were purposefully selected to participate in this study based on their possession of strong teaching orientations and relatively liberal views about sport. They completed consent forms prior to the study’s commencement (Appendix A), thus satisfying university institutional review board policy.

Wayne, a 22-year-old Caucasian male, was born and raised in suburban Illinois. His mother was an elementary school principal and four other relatives were teachers. Wayne recalled that his elementary PE teacher “absolutely loved his job and went out of his way to make his class better for us.” Lessons were “beneficial,” “developmental,” “fantastic,” and “a lot of fun” because the teacher taught skill themes and health-related fitness, and employed appropriate “game-forms.” This meant that “not only did [Wayne] learn skills necessary to play sports, but [he] also learned the mindset of good sportsmanship” which “definitely made [him] a better athlete in [his] sports career.” In contrast, Wayne’s secondary school PE was a “frustrating” and “rough” experience. By this time, he had developed a “neurological movement disorder” and undergone several surgeries which meant he now had to spend much of his time in a wheelchair. It also led to him being placed in a “special” PE class which Wayne recalled as being “a waste of time . . . because they didn’t do anything.” Outside of his PE experience, Wayne remembered having three secondary teachers who were particularly influential on his choice of profession due to their expertise and skill. Specifically, these teachers “made the content come alive,” “always went out of their way to help (him) out,” and “really taught (him) how to study, how to prepare, and how to plan and organize.” The combined impact of these

1 The names of the PTs and pupils in this study are fictitious.
three secondary teachers and his elementary PE teacher led to Wayne deciding that he wanted to be a “gym teacher” in his second year of high school. After graduating, he moved south to enroll in the aforementioned PETE program and to play wheelchair basketball for the university.

Mackenzie, a 21-year-old Caucasian female, had spent her whole life in urban Alabama. Her mother taught elementary PE and her older sister was a 6th-grade history teacher. She did not recall her elementary PE fondly because lessons consisted mainly of “kickball” and “basketball” and there was “a huge emphasis on (the differences between) girls and boys.” For example, she remembered that “there was a huge field where all the guys would be and they would play football and there was this little peripheral area where all girls would go and they would be the little cheerleaders.” Middle school PE was an even worse experience for Mackenzie and she did not “remember doing much learning.” Rather, she recalled that she could opt for one of two roles during middle school PE. As in elementary school, she could either take on the role of cheerleader while the boys “played” “flag football” or “kickball” or she could “just sit around and hang out with [her] friends.” Mackenzie’s high school PE was a vast improvement over her earlier experiences of the subject. The main curricular focus at this stage of her schooling was health-related fitness and she “learned how to workout” and “do Zumba.” As most of her own PE teachers had been so poor, Mackenzie’s main inspiration for enrolling in the PETE program was her mother and the positive experiences she had when teaching water safety skills and swimming to young children and their mothers and Zumba to adult group exercise classes once she gained the certification to do so.

The varying experiences and acculturation of Wayne and Mackenzie plus the coursework they had completed prior to the study ensured that both had strong teaching orientations. For example, both PTs valued skill “processes” over “products,” were interested in employing a
variety of curricular models on graduating, and expressed the desire to realize affective goals such as their pupils gaining “valuable lessons about life” through their instruction. In addition, both PTs regarded themselves as “progressive” and fiercely defended the legitimacy of curricular PE:

I believe that physical education [is] absolutely just as much an actual class as a subject area as math and science and reading and all that stuff, and I can’t stand people that say, “Oh, you are a gym teacher and that’s a joke. You just let kids play games all day long.” That irritates me. I believe [that] teaching kids the necessary tools and skills so that they can be active for the rest of their lives is huge. (Wayne, formal interview 1)

The purpose [of PE] is progressive. . . . Just like [in] Math [class], in elementary, it’s learning skills for sure, [and] starting to get coordinated. . . . In middle school, it’s when you start figuring out, “Oh, I need physical activity for the rest of my life.” And in high school, you find your niche in physical activity whether it’d be sports, working out, or running. . . . I think they (i.e., pupils) should know it’s super important that [PE] is not just a thing they do for 45 minutes at school. It’s something that they need to continue [for the rest of their lives]. (Mackenzie, formal interview 1)

Finally, the PTs’ prior socialization led to them possessing and expressing relatively liberal views about sport, gender, masculinity, and femininity. Examples of this kind of thinking are illustrated in the following data extracts:

I remember in elementary school, there was a huge field where all the guys would be and they would play football, and there was this little peripheral area where all girls would go and they would be the little cheerleaders . . . I wanted to play football or kickball, but I couldn’t. I mean, there was no way I was going over there . . . I don’t want my students to feel this kind of peer pressure in PE. (Mackenzie, formal interview 1)

I want my students to learn physical activity, but I don’t want them to be exactly what society accepts. . . . If you are a boy and you love Zumba, go for it. I can be your personal trainer and help you get certified (laughs). I mean, personally, for me, they should have a choice to be physically active and it doesn’t have to be football for boys or cheerleading for girls. (Mackenzie, formal interview 1)

When I teach fitness stations, a lot of times they (i.e., girls) say something like, “I don’t want to do the barbell station” or “I don’t want to have muscles on my arms.” . . . That allows an opening for me to say, “Okay, these stations won’t boot up your muscles like a Hulk. Those exercises will help you stay fit later in life and having a little bit of muscle tone will actually make you look better than just being pretty and skinny.” They probably
see that (i.e., females being pretty and skinny) on TV, but that’s not true. Well, not in my opinion. (Wayne, formal interview 1)

PTs’ Prior Training in SE

Before the study commenced, the PTs had undergone a four-stage SE training program designed using the guidelines outlined by Curtner-Smith et al. (2008). During stage 1, within their secondary methods course, they had read the sport education textbook (Siedentop et al., 2011), examined example season and lesson plans, discussed the model in class sessions, and written their own season and lesson plans. During stage 2, they had team-taught a 12-lesson SE mini-season on soccer to middle school pupils within an early field experience (EFE). Within this EFE, they had been required to write individual lesson plans from a season plan provided by the course instructor. Stage 3 had involved the PTs team-teaching an additional three SE seasons at two schools. The duration of these seasons had been 16 (volleyball), 16 (track and field), and 16 (speedball) lessons, respectively. During stage 4, within their advanced methods and EFE, the PTs had revisited the model during classroom discussions and assigned reading and, depending on their placement, taught an 18-lesson season on a given sport/activity to upper elementary or middle school pupils. During stages 3 and 4, the PTs had, again, planned lessons from course instructor-supplied season plans. Finally, the three course instructors responsible for the SE training had emphasized the need for PTs to provide equal opportunities to children of different abilities, genders, and races as well as the possibilities for teaching more than just content through SE.

Setting

The study took place during Wayne and Mackenzie’s secondary student teaching practice during their final semester in the PETE program. Wayne taught two 21-lesson speedball SE seasons to 4th and 5th grade pupils in a local elementary school. The PE program at the school
was, in the estimation of the university’s PETE faculty, of high quality and taught by two experienced PE teachers. Both of these teachers had obtained masters’ degrees from the same university PETE program and employed the SE model regularly when PTs were not present at their school. The school’s facilities included a large gymnasium, plentiful equipment, and a large playing field. The 4th grade class consisted of 55 pupils (25 Caucasians, 29 African Americans, 1 Hispanic) of whom 33 were girls and 22 were boys. The 5th grade class included 61 pupils (27 Caucasians, 33 African Americans, 1 Asian) of which 35 were girls and 26 were boys. Pupils attending Wayne’s school were primarily from middle income families.

Mackenzie taught two 18-lesson soccer seasons to 4th and 5th grade pupils attending a different local elementary school that catered to children from primarily low-income families. The school’s building had recently been reduced to rubble during a natural disaster and, therefore, all instruction was taking place on the premises of the school in which Wayne was student teaching. However, while Mackenzie had access to the host school’s playing field, she did not have access to its equipment and when faced with inclement weather was forced to use a multi-purpose room measuring 27 by 45 feet. Moreover, although Mackenzie’s cooperating teacher was also well thought of by the PETE faculty, she, her pupils, and her two aides had not employed or been exposed to the SE model prior to the study. Mackenzie’s 4th grade season was taught to 49 pupils (46 African Americans, 3 Caucasians), 20 of which were girls and 29 of which were boys. Her 5th grade season was taught to 43 pupils (42 African Americans, 1 Caucasian), 20 of which were girls and 23 of which were boys.

Data Collection

Five qualitative techniques were used to collect data which revealed the degree to which HM was combatted or reinforced within the PTs’ SE seasons. Two semi-structured formal
interviews (Patton, 1990) with each PT were completed at the beginning and end of their internship. These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. The first formal interview was focused on collecting demographic data, and data explaining the PTs’ occupational socialization and their views of gender, masculinity, and femininity (Appendix B). The second focused on their reflections about the SE seasons they had just taught (Appendix C). Document analysis involved an examination of PTs’ teaching portfolios which included teaching schedules, season and lesson plans, and pupil assessments. Passive participant observation involved observing both PTs and significant note-taking as they taught their SE seasons. At every opportunity, the PTs were also informally interviewed during field work. The contents of these interviews were recorded as soon after they had been completed as possible. Finally, the protocol for each of two stimulated recall interviews the PTs completed required them to observe film of their teaching and to describe the thinking behind actions observed when the film was periodically paused. Again, these interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

Analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) were used to code and categorize the data. During phase 1, data revealing the degree to which sexism and masculine bias were observed within the PTs’ teaching and the forms this sexism and bias took were identified. Within phase 2, data revealing the degree to which PTs’ pedagogies served to reinforce or combat HM were identified. Credibility and trustworthiness were based on results triangulation, a thorough search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) and member checking.
Results and Discussion

Data collected throughout the study indicated that HM was largely combatted and rejected during the course of the PTs’ four SE seasons. This combatting and rejection was revealed within four themes: *female nonconformity, opposition to male dominance, racial and class-related differences, and construction of pedagogical barriers.*

Female Nonconformity

In contrast to most of the middle school girls observed by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), the vast majority of elementary girls in the present study did not exhibit or conform to stereotypical feminine behaviors promoted by HM. To the contrary, many of the girls in both schools were as physically competent, aggressive, and competitive as the boys:

Darell, the goalkeeper, has been putting pressure on Connie, the team captain, to let him play as an outfield player. Connie ignores his request. Later, Octavia asks Connie if she can come into the game. Connie immediately substitutes Octavia for Darell. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

Andrew dribbles the ball from midfield and approaches the goal. Jessica comes out from her goal to narrow the angle and makes a great save. Otis, following up, also shoots for goal. Jessica makes another great save. Andrew takes another shot, but Jessica, for the third time, blocks it with her left ankle. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

Soon after Sheree receives the ball from Jada, she is accidentally tripped by Lamar. Sheree gets up quickly and chases after Lamar as he dribbles toward her team’s goal. Her great effort pays off as she is able to make the tackle before Lamar has the chance to shoot. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Again, unlike most of the girls in the classes observed by Parker and Curtner-Smith, the majority of girls in the present study were keen to and did, indeed, take on central and more physical roles which had a major impact on shaping the SE seasons in which they were engaged. Moreover, within these roles, they were confident, assertive, and often employed a democratic leadership style:
During the warm-up, Emily, the team coach, explains the game strategies she wants her teammates to execute by referring to material she has on her clipboard. Tom gives Emily suggestions for improvement. Emily, not minding, asks, “Any other suggestions?” before the game begins. (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

Samuel, playing for the Cheetahs, kicks the ball out. Kenya, the referee, shouts “Elephant’s ball.” Sarah, a Cheetah, argues, “But Luke (an Elephant) touched it.” At first, Kenya stays with her original decision. Then Keisha (the Elephant’s coach) confirms that Luke had, indeed, touched the ball before it went out. Kenya changes her decision and Keisha, organizing her team’s defense for the coming throw-in, barks, “You go there and you go there,” indicating who she want her teammates to mark. (Mackenzie, field notes 4th grade soccer)

Even though it is Tisha’s first time to officiate, she is confident, keeps up with play, and makes calls such as, “Out on Tennessee, Colorado’s ball” (points in the direction of the throw-in), and, “That’s hand ball, free-kick right here” (points to the spot where the free-kick is to be taken). . . . Despite frequent challenges from Davina, Tisha is able to keep the game under control by making clear and prompt calls. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Another indication that girls, in general, fared well in these SE seasons was the fact that many of those girls who were not considered well-skilled by their classmates made a significant impact during games by being assertive, outgoing, and taking on leadership roles:

After Mackenzie explains the responsibilities of each role, Davina grabs the coaching contract, indicating she will be the coach. She then assigns other roles to her teammates. One girl and three boys take the contracts and sign their names without question. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Before the goal-kick, Perry pushes Paige, her team’s goalkeeper, to the side and says, “I got it.” Vance then indicates that he wants to take the goal-kick. Perry repeats, “I got it.” (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Lindsay is trying to get other pupils, on both sides, to listen to her throughout the game even though she is not the coach today and just one of the players. At one point, Baron scores and Jamila, the referee, yells, “Goal!” Lindsay approaches Jamila and argues the decision forcefully. Jamila, feeling the pressure, tells Elton, the scorekeeper, “No goal.” Elton scratches the tally on the score sheet. (Mackenzie, field notes, 4th grade soccer)

Also noteworthy were the fairly regular occasions on which boys were either supportive of and complimentary about girls’ playing performance or, however reluctantly, followed the directions of assertive girls in leadership roles:
While waiting for lesson closure, Isaiah is talking to Robert who is sitting next to him. Evaluating some of the female players on his team he says, “Shekeia is a very good goalie, Akira can run really fast. Lisa can dribble, and Karen, well, she is just okay. . . . They work well together.” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

Sheree specifically tells her teammates to write exactly neatly on the team poster. She points to a spot on the poster where she wants Rufus to write his name. Rufus, annoyed, says, “I know where to write it.” Sheree, still unhappy with his handwriting, takes the crayon from his hand and writes his name on the poster for him. Rufus does not complain. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Further, girls appeared to be as involved as boys in making key decisions about their classes’ SE seasons:

On team practice day before the regular season begins, Brendon, the team coach, decides to have a scrimmage within the team. Holly, the team captain, however, suggests working on passing skills instead. The rest of the team agrees with Holly and they do some drills before they scrimmage. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

Mackenzie asks pupils for suggestions on how to provide fair and equitable games between teams with differing numbers of players. Daniel suggests sitting people out. Davina suggests setting up smaller goals for the teams that have less [sic] players, and Rufus suggests giving extra points to the teams that have less [sic] players. Then the entire class votes and agrees to go with Davina’s idea. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Finally, and importantly, there was still a minority of girls who did conform to female stereotypes, and, much as the majority of girls had done in the seasons observed by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), were content to take on peripheral and less physical roles (especially cheerleading), generally subservient to more assertive boys and girls, and fairly anonymous during game play:

Before the game begins, Mackenzie announces that, “There will be no one sitting out. Everybody will be playing or officiating.” During the entire 35 minutes of gameplay, however, Zola and Destiny spend most of their time walking and only take any real interest in the ball when it is in close proximity. They are not off-task, but they are not terribly interested either. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Kiona and Tia are singing and dancing on the sideline when the ball is on the other side of the field. Tom steals the ball, dribbles toward the goal, and scores. Kiona and Tia are
jumping up and down and shout, “Good job!” When play is restarted, Kiona and Tia go back to their singing and dancing. (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

During the warm-up, Amanda and Julie hold their clipboards and walk to field 3 and 4. Amanda asks Julie, “Didn’t we just keep score on Wednesday?” Julie replies, “I think the schedule is messed up, but I don’t care, this is more fun anyways.” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

In addition, some conforming girls attempted to avoid participation in game play altogether due to various minor “illnesses” (“My stomach started hurting a minute ago” [Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball]), and the weather (“It’s too hot and I’m wearing long sleeves” [Mackenzie, field notes, 4th grade soccer]). Others annoyed their peers immensely by worrying about their appearance more than their performance and used lessons almost exclusively as an opportunity to socialize with their friends:

Katrina has her hair down and it looks like she had it straightened recently. She is running up and down the field and fighting for the ball. Two minutes into the game, she gets hot, so she asks Dakota to “sub in for me really quick.” After pulling her hair up, Katrina asks Dakota to come back out because “I’m ready to play now.” Dakota hesitates for a few seconds and says, “Whatever!” Then she walks off of the field. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

It is two boys against two girls on this particular field. Dondrea is wearing a pair of flat (“feminine”) shoes without laces. Every time she tries to kick the ball, her shoe comes off. When this happens, the referee has to call timeout and let her put her shoe back on. Half-way through the game, the two boys have finally had enough. Marcus says, “Can you please wear your tennis shoes tomorrow? You’re wasting our playing time.” (Mackenzie, field notes, 4th grade soccer)

After the warm-up, Katrina and Amber walk to Rebecca who is the scorekeeper for their game and start chatting with her. All three girls stand on the corner of the field and pay minimal attention to the game. When Katrina or Amber enter the game, Rebecca walks along the sideline so that they can keep their conversation going. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

**Opposition to Male Dominance**

Although comparatively rare, there were still attempts by some more physically skilled and/or aggressive boys to dominate the SE seasons by controlling game play and practice
sessions, wrestling control of the leadership roles from the girls they were assigned to, belittling girls’ playing ability, and taking the best spaces and time slots in which to practice and play. The majority of these situations were met with a level of resistance ranging from mild to fierce by “nonconforming” girls:

Some of the boys in one class suggest that the girls in one team can’t possibly execute the chip pass effectively. Amy, one of the girls being ridiculed says, “You don’t think we can do it (i.e., chip pass)? Oh yeah, we can!” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

Guyton, Omar, and Amanda are on the field and Ashley sets up as their goalkeeper. Before the game starts, Guyton walks over to Amanda and says, “Coach Wayne told us when we play inside, it’s 3-on-3 (as opposed to 4-on-4 outside). Can you sit out first?” Amanda then walks away and joins Julie on the sideline. Amanda says to Julie, “They (i.e., the boys) always want us to be the goalie or sit us out for most of the game.” A little later, Omar substitutes Amanda for Guyton. . . . Guyton keeps irritating Amanda by asking her if he can re-enter the game instead of her. Amanda responds by telling him, “I just got in!” Guyton hesitates for a while and says, “Oh, okay.”(Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

Benjamin, playing for the Wolves, scores on Olivia (a Panther). Walter (also a Panther) blames Olivia for her incompetent goalkeeping. Martha immediately says, “Hey, Walter, stop yelling at your teammate. We’ve talked about this. Olivia is doing her best. Just watch your man (i.e., Benjamin), okay?” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

At the beginning of the class, Daniel (playing for New York) and Davina (playing for Tennessee) run to the best field with their soccer balls. Neither of them is willing to leave. Davina shouts to her team, “Come on, y’all. Hurry up!” When all Davina’s teammates get to the field, she says to Daniel, “Alright, my team is here. I think you can use that field (points to another field in poor condition).” Daniel walks away reluctantly. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

In a minority of cases, however, “conforming” girls appeared quite happy to go along with whatever the boys wanted them to do and were passive when faced with insult and insinuation:

During game play, Grace, Natalie, and Olivia are sitting down and playing with the dirt on the sideline. When Wayne approaches them, Olivia, who is actually the team captain, says, “I was out the entire first half. They (i.e., the boys on the team) subbed me in for a while but now I’m out again.” She then goes back to playing the dirt. (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade, speedball)
After a goal, Umar, a boy who has so far failed to grasp the basic rules of soccer, is mistakenly about to take a corner-kick. Lavon, his teammate, yells, “Here, here” at Llysha, the girl who is supposed to be refereeing, and points to the center spot where the kick-off should be taken. Llysha does not react and Lavon says, “Give me the ball.” Next, he picks up the ball, puts it down on the center spot, and says, “I’m gonna kick off.” (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Andrew, Yang, and Chloe are on the field. Otis is their goalkeeper. While the ball is out of bounds, Andrew tells Otis that “Chloe is not a good player.” Otis agrees. . . . When play resumes, Chloe is positioned unmarked right in front of Otis. Otis, however, attempts a very difficult long pass across the field to Andrew. Andrew does not even touch the ball and it goes out of bounds. (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

In congruence with the findings of Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), there were also sporadic examples of boy-on-boy “exclusive masculinity” (Wellard, 2006) in which larger, more able, and aggressive boys attempted to dominate their peers through displays of their physicality. Following Drummond (2003), these displays appeared to be aimed at securing position within the group:

As soon as Daniel arrives on the field, he grabs two soccer balls, runs to the practice area, and begins stretching on his own. When his teammates (three boys and one girl) arrive, Daniel leads the warm-up exercises. He then “coaches” the team throughout the entire gameplay time. (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)

Carlos, a high-skilled boy, takes a shot from midfield and scores for the sixth time in the game he is dominating. Wayne approaches Carlos and asks him to “take it easy.” After making another goal, Carlos runs by Wayne and says, “I’m not taking easy on them,” with a big smile. (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

During the championship game, David is taking most shots as an outfield player and blocking most shots as the goalkeeper. When he scores, he runs to the bleachers and does consecutive high-fives with the “fans.” When he successfully blocks a goal, he flips his hair back to look “cool.” (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

**Racial and Class-Related Differences**

As in the study conducted by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), and following Bramham (2003), there were differences in the way the two main races (African American and Caucasian) observed in the current study behaved in relation to HM. In contrast to the results of
the earlier study, Caucasian girls led the way in terms of nonconforming female behavior and resisting male dominance, whereas African American girls were more likely to conform to female stereotypes and engage in off-task behaviors:

The ball goes out of bounds. Paula, the African American referee, does not know what to do. The players (5 girls and 5 boys) are standing around Paula and pressure her to “say something.” Amy, a Caucasian girl, finally steps in and says, “Just give it to Theresa.” The play resumes without further argument. (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

Robin and Sheila, two African American girls, are chatting on the sideline when the ball is on the other side of the field. When the ball is played to their side of the field, they take a partial interest in the game cheer “Let’s go Ninjas, let’s go.” . . . (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

These differences may well have been a function of or interaction with class and skill level as Caucasian girls in the study tended to be from more affluent families and be more skilled than African American girls and there were more conforming and off-task behaviors observed during Mackenzie’s classes.

Conversely, and in line with the findings of Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), physically skilled and powerful African American boys in the study were more likely to engage in attempts at boy-on-boy dominance than Caucasians. In congruence with the earlier study, this included verbal and physical abuse of smaller boys and “gendered performance” (Robinson, 2005) in which displays of their sexuality were aimed at impressing the girls:

After Jenell (African American) scores, he runs around the field and does chest bumps with three other African American male teammates. He also mocks Jarell (African American boy), shouting, “You can’t score with a bunch of girls on your team, can you?” (Mackenzie, field notes, 4th grade soccer)

While the two team coaches are doing rock-paper-scissors to decide who will take the kick-off, Lamar gets Adel and Bailey’s attention and then jumps over the 3-foot-tall field sign without touching it. Adel and Bailey look amazed and ask him to “do it again.” (Mackenzie, field notes, 5th grade soccer)
Again, these differences in male behavior may have been the result of or interaction with class differences as Caucasian boys were also more likely to come from more affluent homes than African American boys and there were more examples of boy-on-boy dominance and gendered performance in Mackenzie’s SE seasons.

**Construction of Pedagogical Barriers**

Wayne and Mackenzie appeared to do much to counter any sexism or masculine bias they observed within their classes by constructing pedagogical barriers to HM. This they achieved both by using the structure of the SE model and through their general pedagogy.

Both PTs clearly recognized the advantages of SE over other more traditional curriculum models in terms of promoting equality and affective development for all pupils:

We had one team that had a couple good athletes and a lot of “unskilled” ones on their team, but they got almost all the sportsmanship points . . . and they were in the championship game. . . . You’ll always have those kids that winning is the most important thing . . . but the sportsmanship aspect in sport ed has the potential to turn that (i.e., competitive nature) down. (Wayne, formal interview 2)

For these kids and [their] first try [at SE], this is a huge success in my opinion. . . . One thing I’ve learned from teaching this sport ed unit is that they started to take on responsibilities and have [good] sportsmanship. Well, most of them did (laughs). . . . There wasn’t as much fighting and arguing towards the end, so it was good. (Mackenzie, formal interview 2)

Key elements of the SE model that the PTs used to counter HM included the fair play points system, the equity board, and competitive play:

I used the point system in sport ed to motivate them to act right. I wanted to make a difference. Maybe not [in] PE, but change these kids’ attitude. . . . I constantly said to them, “You can’t just argue with people. You can’t just scream and yell at people. That’s not gonna get you far in life” . . . . Those kids had never seen anything like this (i.e., the SE model), so [it] kind of made me proud that I actually stuck with it and it worked. I think in situations, like Sheree, really encourage me . . . . I’m sure there are other situations that I couldn’t really think about right now, but yeah, it was good. (Mackenzie, formal interview 2)
We had an equity board meeting once a week. Russell, Andrew, Tyrus, and some other kids, [that] I can’t think of right now, their names have been brought to the equity board numerous times for being in the game too long, for not subbing players equally. . . . The equity board members decided to give them a warning or game suspension. They all wanted to play so I think it (i.e., the penalty) helped. (Wayne, formal interview 2)

The biggest challenge was to tell them (i.e., the more able and competitive boys) it’s not all about winning. . . . I tried to tell them, as much as possible, “Use your teammates.” . . . It’s just hard for some of them to pass the ball to the girls even though they might have a better chance to score. (Wayne, formal interview 2)

General pedagogical strategies employed by the PTs to counter masculine bias and sexism included providing prompt behavioral feedback, guidance, and intervention. For example, when they observed girls conforming to female stereotypes, they were quick to intervene and attempt to change attitudes and behavior for the better:

Rachel walks over to Wayne and says, “I can’t do it.” She then covers her face with her arms, looking frustrated. Wayne replies, “Well, you know why you can’t kick really well right now? Look at your shoes.” Rachel looks down and says, “Yeah, I know.” Wayne says, “You’re wearing UGG boots, [which are] not too good for kicking. Please bring your gym shoes, because A. you don’t have to worry about ruining your expensive shoes and B. you will be better off because you are gonna break your toe from kicking the soccer ball with the pair of UGG boots.” (Wayne, field notes, 5th grade speedball)

Ethan and Sean are in the game for the entire first half. During half-time, Wayne talks to Chemier, the team captain, and says, “Make sure you sub Ethan and Sean out and let the other girls on the team play in the second half.” Chemier says, “Okay.” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

During the warm-up, Melcia tells Mackenzie: “I don’t want to play, ’cause it’s too hot.” Mackenzie replies, “Roll up your long sleeves and go play. You’ll be fine.” Melcia then runs to the field and participates in the “sheepdog” drill with her teammates. (Mackenzie, field notes, 4th grade soccer)

Both Wayne and Mackenzie also attempted to counter situations in which they came across males attempting to dominate other males through aggressive acts or displays of their physical prowess:

Seth is making fun of Stan for scoring fewer goals than he did. Seth starts telling nearby pupils that, “Hey, I made six goals today. Guess how many Stan scored today? One.
What do y’all think about that?” Mackenzie approaches the boys and says, “Seth, please let him alone. Stan, just stay away from Seth.” (Wayne, field notes, 4th grade speedball)

On the way back to the gym, Randy and Dell are arguing about which one of them is stronger. Dell doesn’t believe Randy is stronger so Randy lifts Paul (a small, less able boy) up and throws him, upside-down, to the ground. Mackenzie immediately sends Randy to the cooperating teacher who, in turn, sends Randy to the principal’s office. (Mackenzie, field note, 5th grade soccer)

The attempts by Wayne and Mackenzie to improve the lot of girls within their classes primarily appeared to be the result of their firm belief that there were no differences between the sexes in terms of sporting potential and aptitude. Illustrative of this belief was their enthusiasm about displays of high skill by female pupils:

Julia had a one-on-two break-away. She made a really sharp cut. The defender was playing her to the outside . . . so she made a really hard cut off her inside foot and caught the ball back to the inside . . . and she completely made it from a one-on-two to a one-on-one with the goalie. She made a very aggressive, hard, bam-bam-bam move, and it was great . . . . She executed that to perfection. (Wayne, stimulated recall interview 1)

I don’t think many of them (i.e., the girls) have played soccer before . . . . The skills were not gonna come overnight, obviously, but there was more passing and goals scored. Some of them did surprise me with their improvements . . . . I saw Kenya dribbling the ball across the field and using a sole-trap between the cones the other day. I know it sounds nothing to you, but seeing her go from never saw a soccer ball to did [sic] something like that, it means a lot. (Mackenzie, formal interview 1)

The PTs’ attempts to help and support less able and assertive boys, however, stemmed mainly from their view that PE teachers had a duty to provide an equitable experience within their lessons. The following data extracts are examples of such thinking in action:

Dell (a low-skilled less able boy) has lots of behavior problems and kids don’t necessarily like to be around him. But I knew that, with him, I wouldn’t have problems when it came to this (i.e., officiating a game) because he knew how to play the game, he knew what to do. He actually, I think, did a pretty good job, just because he was in control [and)] the attention was on him. So the behavior [problem] was actually down. In certain situations, they (i.e., players) were still screaming and yelling with each other and at him, but in most situations, they were fine. (Mackenzie, stimulated recall interview 2)

That’s Aaron and Tony. They prefer sitting around and talking about who-knows-what. And I think their teammates know [that] they don’t like to play in the game anyways, so
they just let them be. But when I see that, I’ll go over there and talk about random stuff, just to warm up to them a little bit, you know, and I’ll encourage them to play. (Wayne, stimulated recall interview 1)

Wayne and Mackenzie dealt quickly and, on most occasions, successfully with more overt and obvious forms of sexism and masculine bias in their classes. There were, however, occasions when they failed to recognize relatively subtle and covert forms of these issues and thus made no attempt at intervention:

The CD showed Charles (a large able boy) moving towards the goal and intentionally pushing Kenya down because she was in his way. When Charles failed to score, he kicked the ball away and then ordered Edward (a smaller less able boy) to pick it up. Mackenzie watching this scene claimed, “I totally did not see that. . . . When I’m around, he (i.e., Charles) is an angel. I bet he wasn’t doing anything, but when I walked away, he . . . I like this (i.e., reviewing the film) because I can see what’s going on behind my back” (laughs). (Mackenzie, stimulated recall interview 1)

The CD showed Myron (a large able boy) stopping Brendon (a smaller less able boy) from getting into the game by grabbing his arm and saying, “It’s my turn to get in.” Watching this scene, Wayne noted, “Yeah. That’s Myron. He will do everything to get into the game. I’m not sure where I was, but if I was there, I would tell him (i.e., Myron) to follow the captain’s direction. (Wayne, stimulated recall interview 1)

Although the PTs did all they could to stamp out and counter specific examples of sexism and masculine bias, they stopped short of and even avoided discussing the topic with their pupils. This was because they believed doing so could be counterproductive in that it had the potential to promote HM. Instead, Wayne and Mackenzie tended to couch their interventions in terms of “good behavior,” equality, and “sportsmanship:”

Coming from a girl’s perspective, I would not want to make that (i.e., sexism and masculine bias) an issue with everybody in class, because some guys don’t do that (i.e., believe in male dominance and female conformity) and I wouldn’t want to make that aware to everybody. . . . So I would just address that on a circumstance. Like, if that was happening, I would get them together, but I’d never say, “You were yelling at this referee because she is a girl.” I would just be, like, “You are not supposed to be arguing with her because she is an official. I would never address that [directly] as a gender difference. (Mackenzie, stimulated recall interview 2)
I try to get kids [to] understand that it’s more about sportsmanship than it’s about winning. . . . You have super competitive kids that play sports outside of school where the emphasis is on winning, and they don’t care about the feelings of the other team and they don’t care about fair play or let the other less-skilled kids have the opportunity to play. You put them in a setting where you try to get everybody involved and let everyone participate. They’d have a hard time taking the competitive nature down a few notches. . . . That’s why we tell them that they can get 10 points for sportsmanship, but only 3 points for a win. (Wayne, formal interview 2)

I try to make them realize that, “You are on your own” and “You are responsible for getting these games going and have good sportsmanship, not arguing [with others].” I try to get them to act right. Athletic kids shouldn’t disrespect kids who haven’t even seen a soccer ball. They need to be able to understand that. (Mackenzie, formal interview 2)

Conclusions

The key finding of this study was that HM was found to be largely combatted and rejected during the four SE seasons taught by the two PTs who were participants. This led to a relatively equitable experience for girls and smaller, less physically able boys. The main reasons for this kind of success appeared to be that these PTs possessed teaching orientations and relatively liberal views concerning sport. Consequently, they were prepared to take on the prevailing sporting culture and made a conscious effort to take advantage of the potential for SE to combat masculine bias and sexism. Moreover, following Penney and Clarke (2005), they valued learning in the psychomotor, cognitive, and affective domains for all of their pupils and attempted to give them similar “learning opportunities.” This finding, then, was in direct contrast to the earlier study of PTs with coaching orientations and comparatively conservative views about sport (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press). Recall that, in this study, HM had largely been supported and reinforced, despite the PTs’ employment of the “full version” of the model (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

At this juncture, it is important to emphasize that the PTs in the original study (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press) taught middle school pupils during their SE seasons, while those in the
current study taught elementary-aged children and acknowledged the difference this may have made to the issues faced by the two sets of PTs in terms of HM. Logic suggests that, if left unchecked, masculine bias and sexism are likely to be more prevalent and deeply ingrained in classes taught to older pupils than those taught to younger children due to the increased time that older pupils have been socialized into “normal” ways of thinking and acting. In short, the PTs in the current study probably encountered more favorable conditions than those in the original study. Future research examining the degree to which PTs with teaching orientations and liberal beliefs about sport fare with older children when attempting to combat HM would, therefore, be useful.

Finally, it is also important to acknowledge and emphasize that the PTs in the current study were not totally successful in stamping out masculine bias and sexism because they were not skilled enough to recognize more subtle forms of HM. Moreover, these PTs were not prepared to discuss issues related to HM directly with the children in their classes, a stance that may well have negated their effectiveness. In addition, the PTs in the current study used relatively few of the SE model’s structures in order to combat HM, instead relying mainly on their general pedagogies. Future studies of experienced inservice teachers with teaching orientations and liberal beliefs about sport, not as focused on the technical aspects of the SE model as the PTs in the current study, may yield different results.
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SUBJECT CONSENT FORM FOR
PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

“HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN SPORT EDUCATION: CASE STUDIES OF
PRESERVICE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS WITH
TEACHING ORIENTATIONS”

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a doctoral student, YuChun Chen,
and her faulty advisor, Dr. Matt Curtner-Smith, from the Department of Kinesiology at the
University of Alabama. We hope to learn whether orientations to teaching and views of sport
education affect how preservice teachers teach and how their teaching combats or reinforces
gender differences in physical education.

You are selected to participate in this study because you will be enrolled in your secondary
student teaching internship during the 2011-2012 academic year and have been identified as a
preservice teacher with a strong teaching orientation and liberal views about sport.

As part of your internship, you are required to teach two full sport education seasons. We would
like to observe your teaching and video-tape two of your lessons during the internship. You will
be asked to participate in two stimulated recall interviews each lasting 30-45 minutes. You will
also be asked to participate in two formal interviews at the beginning and end of your internship
each lasting 30-45 minutes. We would like to audio-tape the interviews. If you do not want to be
audio-recorded, we will take handwritten notes. In addition, you will be asked to share your
lesson plans and other curriculum materials. We would like your permission to use all of this
data in the research project described above.

The information provided will be confidential. All data will be retained by the principal
investigator for a period of three years. The data will be kept locked in the principal
investigator’s home office during that time. After three years from completion of this study, all
data will be destroyed. The principal investigator will be the only person with access to the data.

Only the researchers will know your identity. In the event that the information collected is
published in a professional journal, your confidentiality will be protected by referring to you
only by pseudonym. On completion of the study, the results will be made available and
explained to you.

The nature of the data collection ensures that there is no physical or psychological risk of any
kind to you. The data-collection techniques may improve your teaching performance and help
you learn how to create an inclusive learning environment for all students. The data that could be
gained from such a study would provide a valuable addition to the teacher education literature
and facilitate the enhancement of the physical education teacher education undergraduate
program at The University of Alabama.
Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the Department of Kinesiology or the University of Alabama. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions about this research, contact YuChun Chen at (562) 676-7966 or ychen58@crimson.ua.edu or Dr. Matthew Curtner-Smith at (205) 348-9209 or msmith@bamaed.ua.edu. Finally, if you have any questions about research participants’ rights, you may contact Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461.

AUTHORIZATION: I have read the above and understand the nature of this study and agree to participate. I understand that by agreeing to participate in this study, I have not waived any legal or human rights. I also understand that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice. Finally, I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

☐ Yes, I give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

☐ No, I do not give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

☐ Yes, I give my permission for the investigator to video-tape two of my lessons.

☐ No, I do not give my permission for the investigator to video-tape two of my lessons.

Participant signature: __________________________ Date: ________________

Researcher as witness: __________________________ Date: ________________
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FIRST FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The purpose of this study is to examine the degree to which the sport education model delivered by preservice physical education teachers with strong teaching orientations serves to combat or reinforce sexism and masculine bias. The first interview focuses on collecting demographic data, and data explaining your occupational socialization and your views of gender, masculinity, and femininity.

Interview Questions

Background Information (multiple prompts allowed)
- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- What is your race?
- What is your gender?
- What is your ethnic origin?
* No need to ask questions in this section when answers are obvious.

History in Physical Education (multiple prompts allowed)
- Was your experience in physical education beneficial in grade school?
- What type of curriculum model did your physical education teachers use?
- What experience stood out the most about your physical education class, positive and negative?
- Did you feel successful in physical education?
- Are there any teachers that you would like to model when you become a teacher?
- Are there any teachers that you would strive to be unlike when you become a teacher?
- Is there anyone in your family that is a teacher? If so, what subject?

Knowledge about Sport Education (multiple prompts allowed)
- Where did you get/learn the knowledge(s) you have about teaching sport education?
- What types of knowledge do you think are crucial for teaching good sport education?
- What do you think teachers should know about sport education?
- What are the most challenging and most difficult aspects of teaching sport education?

Value Orientations (multiple prompts allowed)
- What are your beliefs about teaching and learning physical education?
- What do you think is the purpose of physical education?
- What are your goals for physical education?
- What do you think a physically educated student should do and know?
- What do you most want students to learn from you?
- How important is it to you that your students learn activities they can do for a lifetime (fitness, individual sports, etc)? How do you teach them these?
- Do you value process or product more? Please explain.
- Do you teach students responsibility? If so, how? Why is it important to you? If not, why not?
- How much emphasis do you place on skill development? Why?
- How much freedom do your students have to adjust tasks or find tasks appropriate for their development?
- Do you encourage your students to work with students different than themselves? If so, what strategies do you use to make this successful? If not, why not?

**Other** (multiple prompts allowed)
- Is there anything else you want to tell me about Sport Education and your teaching physical education?
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SECOND FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The purpose of this study is to examine the degree to which the Sport Education model delivered by preservice physical education teachers with strong teaching orientations serves to combat or reinforce sexism and masculine bias. The second interview focuses on your reflections about the sport education seasons you have just taught.

Interview Questions

Teaching Sport Education (multiple prompts allowed)
- How did you prepare for teaching sport education?
- What information was useful? What information was not useful?
- What support did you have when preparing to implement sport education?
- What difficulties/challenges arose when preparing to implement sport education?
- What support did you have when implementing sport education?
- What difficulties/challenges arose when implementing sport education?
- What support did you have after teaching sport education?
- What difficulties/challenges arose after teaching sport education?

Other (multiple prompts allowed)
- Is there anything else you want to tell me about sport education and your teaching in physical education?
August 18, 2011

Yu-Chun Chen
Department of Kinesiology
College of Education
The University of Alabama

Re: IRB# 11-OR-257: “Hegemonic Masculinity in Sport Education: Case Studies of Pre-service Physical Education Teachers with Teaching Orientations”
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CHAPTER II

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN SPORT EDUCATION: CASE STUDIES OF EXPERIENCED INSERVICE TEACHERS WITH TEACHING ORIENTATIONS

Abstract

Prior research revealed that while preservice teachers (PTs) with coaching orientations reinforced sexism and masculine bias, those with teaching orientations combatted and rejected it. The purpose of this study was to examine four sport education (SE) seasons taught by two experienced inservice teachers for the presence or absence of sexism and masculine bias. The theory of hegemonic masculinity (HM) served as the theoretical framework. Data were collected through non-participant observations; formal, informal, and stimulated recall interviews; document analysis; and electronic journals. They were analyzed with the techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison. Findings revealed that the inservice teachers were able to combat and reject the effects of HM to a greater extent than teaching-oriented preservice teachers had been shown to do in previous work. The foundations of the teachers’ effectiveness were their liberal beliefs about sport and gender and teaching orientations. In addition, the teachers were able to provide a relatively equitable experience for girls and smaller, less physically able boys because they possessed good levels of curricular, pedagogical, content, and pedagogical content knowledge as well as superior knowledge of their pupils.
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Hegemonic Masculinity in Sport Education: Case Studies of Experienced Inservice Teachers with Teaching Orientations

A small number of sport pedagogy scholars interested in exploring sexism in sport and physical education (PE) have employed Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity (HM) (Connell, 2005, 2008; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) as the guiding framework for their research (e.g., Brown, 1999; Skelton, 1993; Wellard, 2006). Connell (2005) explained that HM is “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (p. 77). The core of this theory is the notion that individuals (e.g., coaches and PE teachers), institutions (e.g., the media and schools), and social groups (e.g., participants in sport and physical activity) perpetuate dominant versions of masculinity by favoring, treating as superior, and reacting positively to traditional masculine behaviors and characteristics such as aggression, mesomorphy, toughness, and, within reason, violence. Moreover, these same individuals, institutions, and groups strengthen the dominant version of masculinity by treating as inferior and reacting negatively to the characteristics and behaviors associated with femininity and competing masculinities. In general, this process serves to privilege the dominant form of masculinity over other masculinities and femininity. It also socializes both males and females into the same mode of thought and facilitates the absorption of alternative and threatening forms of masculinity. Consequently, females who are perceived as “feminine” and males who do not conform to the dominant version of masculinity are marginalized (Connell, 1987; Frosh, Phoenix, & Pattman, 2002). Moreover, a side effect of HM is to marginalize homosexuality while privileging heterosexuality (Clarke, 1996, 1998, 2006; Sykes, 2007).
Importantly, the dominant form of masculinity consists of variants of the same theme which depend on context. A variant salient for physical educators, for example, is Wellard’s (2006) “exclusive masculinity” which prioritizes and elevates skilled, aggressive, and strong physical performance. Other variants are produced by an interaction of social class and race (Bramham, 2003; Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press).

A number of different lines of research have revealed the influence of HM within traditional models of PE and sport. Work on sport categorization, for example, has indicated that competitive sports and physical activities are often considered to be superior and masculine while those that are aesthetic are labeled as inferior and feminine (Klomsten, Marsh, & Skaalvik, 2005). Studies of children’s folklore related to PE and sport have highlighted the degree to which skill level influences boys’ standing within their peer group (Drummond, 2003; Pugsley, Coffey, & Delamont, 1996; Woodruff & Curtner-Smith, 2007). In addition, several of the studies examining participation styles within PE have revealed the extent to which boys can dominate girls in mixed classes, if left relatively unchecked or completely to their own devices, and the hierarchies that can exist among boys and girls (Griffin, 1984, 1985; Parker, 1996; Pope & O’Sullivan, 2003). Finally, others have documented how boys and girls move in ways that conform to gender stereotypes (Paechter, 2003) and how girls’ participation in sport and physical activity is curtailed by a belief in and conformity with these gender stereotypes (Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006; Wright, 1996).

Interventions aimed at negating HM within traditional forms of PE have largely failed (Gard, 2003; Hickey & Fitzclarence, 1999). This has mainly been due to the inability of researchers to counter the socialization that has instilled in teachers the beliefs and practices that serve to perpetuate the status quo (Brown, 1999; Skelton, 1993).
More recently, however, there has been some discussion of the extent to which the relatively new curriculum model of sport education (SE) (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011) might provide a medium through which teachers could make more of an impact in countering HM (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press). The model’s goals of producing literate (i.e., valuing sport and differentiating between good and bad sporting practice) and enthusiastic (i.e., taking part in sport with a prosocial attitude) sports persons, as well as those who are technically and tactically competent, are certainly compatible with this goal. So are the shift from more- to less-direct teaching styles during the course of a SE season, the incorporation of the student social system within the instructional system (Hastie & Siedentop, 1999), and the fact that the teacher is no longer central in the instructional process (Alexander, Taggart, & Thorpe, 1996). Moreover, the increased relevance of sport taught through the SE model due to its proximity to sporting forms engaged in outside schools (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Kirk & Almond, 1999) should strengthen its social and cultural impact as should the increase in pupils’ enthusiasm for PE taught in this way (Ennis, 1999; Grant, 1992; Kinchin, 2001). Furthermore, requiring pupils to make more decisions about their own learning, take on a number of additional roles other than player, and participate as members of a team for a lengthy period of time provides teachers with the tools and conditions that should enable them to produce a relatively equitable environment free of sexism and masculine bias. Finally, its compatibility with teachers’ socialization (Curtner-Smith, 2012; Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press) and the resulting enthusiasm among teachers for SE (Alexander & Luckman, 2001) should ensure that the model is actually employed by those trained to use it.

There is also a good deal of research suggesting that those who have employed the SE model have indeed provided a more equitable and inclusive experience for pupils (Alexander et
al., 1996; Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Carlson, 1995; Hastie & Sharpe, 1999). Conversely, some research suggests that in other contexts this has not been the case (Brock, 2002; Curnow & Macdonald, 1995; Hastie, 1998; Penney, Clarke, Quill, & Kinchin, 2002). This may be because some teachers deliver a conservative version of the model that reflects current problems and issues in sport including the promotion of HM (Kirk & Macdonald, 1998; Penney, Clarke, & Kinchin, 2002; Penney & Waring, 2000).

Two previous studies have directly attempted to discover the impact of SE on HM. The first study examined the SE taught by two preservice teachers (PTs) with coaching orientations2 to middle school pupils (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press). Results of the study mainly verified the contention that the delivery of a conservative version of the model supports sexism and masculine bias. The boys in this study dominated the four SE seasons observed. Specifically, they took most of the central and leadership roles (e.g., coach and captain), made the majority of decisions, and took control of competitive games. In addition, boys took the best time slots and spaces for practice and competition and worked hard to undermine those girls who did manage to get leadership roles. Bigger, stronger, and more physically skilled boys also dominated smaller, less-skilled boys.

The girls in the study mostly conformed to the boys’ wishes and were content to take on more feminine and peripheral roles (e.g., keeping statistics or score, newspaper reporting). They tended to avoid participation either subtly, in the manner of Tousignant and Siedentop’s (1983) “competent bystanders,” or overtly by socializing with friends when they should have been practicing or playing. These girls were only motivated to take on dominant boys when roles and spaces they felt were earmarked for them were also under threat. A few more physical and

---

2 Teachers with coaching orientations are mainly motivated to become PE teachers because of the opportunity to coach extracurricular sport (Curtner-Smith, 2009).
well-skilled girls, (i.e., those who possessed more “masculine” characteristics) fought for equality and did well in leadership roles when they got the chance to try them.

Parker and Curtner-Smith’s (in press) study also revealed an interaction between race and gender. Caucasian girls were less inclined to resist dominant boys but also less likely to engage in off-task behaviors than African American girls. Further, while Caucasian boys mainly treated each other and African American boys and girls with respect, more physical African American boys often abused smaller, less-gifted boys of the same race and gave “gendered performances” (Robinson, 2005)—sexualized behavior which emphasized their maleness to girls of both races in whom they were interested.

Finally, the PTs in the Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press) study believed that the pattern of participation in their classes was “inevitable” and “natural.” Consequently, they made no attempt to intervene in order to promote equality. To the contrary, they were often observed reinforcing the HM that existed in their classes.

Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press) echoed the sentiments of Penney and Clarke (2005) by concluding that simply employing the SE model does not guarantee less sexism and masculine bias and more equality. Both sets of authors, however, continued to argue that the “curricular scaffolding” (Ennis, 1999) of SE, together with its pedagogies, could assist thoughtful teachers who were prepared to take deliberate action to this end. Parker and Curtner-Smith also concluded that expecting well-trained but inexperienced PTs to both deliver the SE model accurately and tackle gender inequality might be too much. Borrowing from teacher concerns theory (Fuller & Brown, 1975), their hypothesis was that teachers training to use the SE model may learn in two distinct phases. In phase 1, they focus on the model’s technical
components, while in phase 2 they can consider how they can teach through the model in such a way as to promote equality.

The second study examined the SE taught by two PTs with teaching orientations\(^3\) (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012). Findings revealed that the comparatively liberal version of the model delivered by these PTs primarily served to combat sexism and masculine bias. Specifically, girls and smaller, less-skilled boys enjoyed a relatively equitable PE experience. This appeared to be due to the PTs’ liberal views concerning sport and their readiness to defy aspects of the sporting culture that were damaging. Providing a more equitable PE within SE seasons was also thought to be facilitated by teaching at the elementary school level as pupils were not yet socialized as deeply as older secondary pupils into conventional thinking about gender.

On a more negative note, this second study also revealed an interaction between gender and race that was both similar to and different from that observed by Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press). While Caucasian boys and African American boys displayed similar patterns of behavior to those described in the original study, in contrast to the original study’s results, Caucasian girls were more likely to resist male attempts at dominance than African American girls. The authors also hypothesized that social class may have been a factor determining the differences in the behaviors of boys and girls given that the Caucasian children in the study were more likely to come from relatively affluent homes than the African American children.

Moreover, findings of Chen and Curtner-Smith’s (2012) study indicated that the PTs failed to detect and combat more subtle forms of sexism in their seasons and were not prepared to engage in conversations specifically about HM with their pupils. Further, they relied mostly

---

\(^3\) Teachers with teaching orientations and primarily motivated to become PE teachers because of the opportunity to teach curricular PE (Curtner-Smith, 2009).
on their own pedagogies to combat the overt forms of sexism they did recognize, and employed few of the structures of the SE model in this effort.

Given the superiority of the performance of PTs with teaching orientations and liberal views about sport over that of PTs with coaching orientations and conservative views about sport, Chen and Curtner-Smith (2012) hypothesized that experienced inservice teachers with teaching orientations and liberal views regarding sport would be even more successful in terms of combatting sexism and masculine bias during SE seasons. The purpose of the current study, therefore, was to test this hypothesis by examining SE seasons taught by two such experienced inservice teachers for the presence or absence of HM.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were two inservice teachers with considerable experience of using the SE model and relatively liberal orientations toward PE teaching and sport. Prior to taking part in the study, both teachers had signed consent forms in congruence with the university’s policy on human subjects in research (Appendix E).

Dennis, a 34-year-old male Caucasian, was born in urban Florida and moved to rural New York when he was in the seventh grade. His parents, sister, and brother-in-law were all teachers. During his elementary and middle school PE, Dennis was taught “a lot of different activities” within traditional “multi-activity” units and learned “all the skills to play sports in [his] later years.” Dennis had also played volleyball and run track in middle school, and been on the football, basketball, and lacrosse teams in high school. Despite his positive experiences of PE and school sport, Dennis did not “look up to” any of his PE teachers for their pedagogical prowess and so one motivation for entering a university physical education teacher education

4 The names of the teachers and pupils in this study are fictitious.
(PETE) program on graduating was to become a teacher who “taught proper PE.” During his PETE, Dennis had been trained how to teach SE through classroom lectures within methods courses, teaching five mini-seasons of SE during early field experiences, and teaching two full seasons of SE during his secondary student teaching placement. On graduating, he spent 6 years teaching at a school located in a moderately sized southeastern city that catered to children with special needs aged 12 to 21 years where he employed the SE model with his higher-functioning pupils. During this time, he also completed his master’s degree in sport pedagogy. Dennis then moved to the school district’s new magnet school where he taught PE to elementary and middle school children for 3 years prior to the study’s commencement.

Mary, a 28-year-old female Caucasian, was born and grew up in suburban Alabama. She was “destined to be a teacher” as her parents, grandparents, and several aunts and uncles were all in the profession. Mary was “exempt” from high school PE because she played on the school volleyball, softball, and basketball teams and was a cheerleader. Her elementary PE was “traditional and teacher-directed” and included “dance, gymnastics, and lots of . . . cooperative games.” Her middle school program consisted of “a broad range of competitive sports” and “square dancing” but did not include much in the way of “health-related fitness stuff” which Mary felt detracted from her experience. Nevertheless, PE was Mary’s “favorite part of the day” and her elementary and middle school PE teachers inspired her to become a teacher. During her undergraduate PETE, Mary learned basic pedagogies based on the effectiveness literature (see Silverman, 1991) and Mosston and Ashworth’s (2008) spectrum of teaching styles. She also learned a good deal about elementary content for younger pupils and teaching traditional multi-activity units and health-related fitness to secondary pupils. It was not until she enrolled in the same master’s degree program as Dennis that she learned about SE. Her experiences of the
model at this stage, however, were restricted to reading about and discussing it within class sessions. On graduating from her master’s program, Mary was hired as the second PE teacher at the same magnet school as Dennis. At the time data collection commenced, she had worked at the school for 3 years and had also just started working on a doctorate in sport pedagogy part-time. It was here that her second phase of learning to teach SE occurred as she began by team-teaching SE seasons alongside Dennis.

Both Dennis and Mary’s acculturation and professional socialization had led to them developing strong teaching orientations. For example, they emphasized “processes” over “products,” wanted to develop “positive characteristics for life and sportsmanship,” and stressed that they were interested in achieving much more than teaching the “skills and knowledge necessary to play sports.” In addition, they were staunch supporters of high-quality curricular PE and recognized the potential for SE to “rescue” the subject. The following data extracts are examples of their thinking and beliefs about and commitment to both PE and SE:

It (i.e., PE) should be educational, I mean, it’s called “physical education.” . . . I know people that are PE teachers that don’t teach. That gets on my nerves. I don’t like those people; they give PE a bad name. . . . The kids should take stuff home with them . . . What we teach them here, with health-related fitness, they can take it home and they can do it on their own. (Mary, formal interview 1)

Yes, I do [think PE teachers should know about SE]. That’s why we (i.e., Dennis and Mary) have done two presentations and everything about it [at regional PE conferences]. . . . I think a lot of teachers around here try to teach the really basic aspects of sport ed but I don’t think it’s enough. . . . You have to not only have the knowledge of sport ed but be a risk-taker and be motivated and work hard enough to take on the curriculum model, and I think that’s what a lot of PE teachers are lacking. (Dennis, formal interview 1)

While neither of the teachers believed that issues related to gender were a “big issue” in their classes, as illustrated by the following interview extracts, they held relatively liberal views on this topic:
Choose whatever you want to play. You just need to find your niche. I cheered in high school and people say it’s not a sport, but it is. . . . The dancer who comes here to teach our kids is a guy. He is good at what he does and he is great with kids. Whatever floats your boat, do it. . . . I think it’s our job to, I don’t want to say “change their (i.e., pupils’) perceptions,” but to broaden their ideas. (Mary, formal interview 1)

When you think of baseball and football, you think of men. When you think of softball and cheerleading, you think of girls. Kids think of that and the society thinks of that. They think if you play softball, you must look butchy. Or the other way around; if you don’t look like a girly girl, you must play softball. Well, I don’t think so. I’ve played softball my whole life and I can dress up like a girly girl too. (Mary, formal interview 1)

Here, every boy wants to play football or basketball. When I let my middle school boys choose a sport [for the SE season] last year, it’s either flag football or basketball. I ended up letting them play basketball but it’s not my best season. They all thought they knew everything about basketball, so they didn’t listen to my instructions as much. That’s why we like to teach our kids sports [that] they are not familiar with. Like volleyball, boys outside of Alabama play volleyball, and it doesn’t make you less masculine if you play volleyball. (Dennis, formal interview 1)

**Setting**

The study took place at the magnet school at which Dennis and Mary taught. As alluded to in the preceding section, Dennis and Mary had been the first PE teachers hired at the school when it had opened 3 years before the study commenced. The school catered to pupils from a range of social backgrounds who were selected from other elementary and middle schools in the school district based on their academic ability. A key cross-curricular theme at the school was the use of project-based learning and indirect pedagogies.

The curriculum fashioned by Dennis and Mary involved them teaching skill themes to children in kindergarten through third grade and health-related fitness and sport education to grades four through eight. PE facilities included a large gymnasium, a concrete playground, and large playing field with a 476-meter running/walking track surrounding it. PE equipment was plentiful. As well as teaching curricular PE, Dennis organized a lacrosse club with the help of the parent-teacher association and Mary established an extracurricular fitness program for teachers.
and staff at the school. Mary was a member of the state PE board. Neither teacher coached extracurricular sport. Their program was regarded as one of the best in the state by local university PETE faculty and other teachers.

During the course of the study, Dennis was observed teaching a 20-lesson season of team handball and a 21-lesson season of softball to the same class of fifth grade pupils. This class consisted of 61 pupils (35 girls, 26 boys, 27 Caucasians, 33 African Americans, 1 Asian). Mary was also observed teaching a 20-lesson season of team handball and a 21-lesson season of softball to the same class of fourth grade pupils. This class comprised 55 pupils (33 girls, 22 boys, 25 Caucasians, 29 African Americans, 1 Hispanic).

Data Collection

Data that revealed the extent to which HM was rejected or reinforced within the teachers’ SE seasons were collected using six qualitative techniques. Non-participant observation in which the focus of written notes was on the teachers’ pedagogies, the pupils’ reactions to these pedagogies, interactions between teachers and pupils, and interactions between pupils was a key source of data. Semi-structured formal interviews (Patton, 1990) of the teachers before they began and after they had completed teaching their SE seasons were also conducted. These interviews were focused on gathering demographic data; data providing an insight into the teachers’ conceptions of gender, sexuality, femininity, and masculinity; and data describing how the teachers were trained to employ SE as well as their perceptions of the SE model (Appendix F). These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Both teachers were required to complete two stimulated recall interviews in which they viewed filmed footage of their teaching and explained the thinking that led to specific actions selected by the researcher. Stimulated recall interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. The teachers were
also asked to allow the researcher access to all materials related to their SE seasons for the purpose of document analysis and to complete at least two entries per week in an electronic journal in which they described any aspect of their SE seasons that was salient at the time. Finally, the teachers were informally interviewed at every opportunity with notes being made as soon after the conclusion of each interview as possible.

**Data Analysis**

The first task in the analysis process was to identify data which revealed the extent to which HM was present or absent in the teachers’ SE seasons. The second task was to identify data that indicated the degree to which the teachers’ pedagogies promoted gender equity or masculine bias and sexism. By employing the standard techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), these subsets of data were reduced to a series of codes and categories and collapsed into themes. Credibility and trustworthiness were achieved though exhaustive member checking, the search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), and triangulation through the use of the six data collection techniques.

**Results and Discussion**

Data gathered during the course of the study indicated that the SE seasons taught by both teachers helped to combat and reject sexism and masculine bias. These actions were revealed within four themes: rejection of female stereotypes, countering male attempts to establish supremacy, racial distinctions, and teachers’ beliefs and pedagogic tactics.

**Rejection of Female Stereotypes**

The vast majority of elementary girls in the current study followed a similar pattern of behavior to those in the SE seasons taught by PTs with teaching orientations (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012). That is, they did not conform to stereotypical female behaviors shaped by HM.
This pattern of behavior, however, was in direct contrast to that of the middle school girls taught by PTs with coaching orientations (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press).

Many of girls in the current study, for example, took a full and active part in the SE seasons displaying interest, tolerance for pain, competitive spirit, and skill that were on the same level as the most-skilled and aggressive boys in their classes:

The second and third bases are loaded. Sophia hits the ball towards Luke, the pitcher, and sprints to the first base. Genesis stays on third base and looks at Luke. Meanwhile, Connor is running to the third so Luke throws the ball to Kim, at second base. Genesis takes the opportunity to run home and scores a run. Both Sophia and Connor are safe on the first and third bases. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

Abigail is frustrated because Ashley, the referee, says “It’s not a goal.” Abigail runs to Dennis and asks, “Can I lie on the floor and shoot?” Dennis replies, “Yes, you can, but you can’t slide.” Abigail says, “I didn’t slide. I was on my knee.” Ashley hears it and says, “It’s a goal. Let’s go back and play.” (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

Bruce takes a shot and hits Joanna, the goalkeeper, in the stomach. Joanna picks up the ball immediately and passes it to Natalie. Natalie dribbles across the court and passes it to Michael who scores. Joanna is spinning in front of the goal. Natalie runs to Joanna and asks, “Are you okay?” Joanna replies, “Oh, my stomach? I’m fine.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Moreover, they had the motivation and confidence to take on and perform central decision-making roles within the four SE seasons and often used these positions to enhance the SE experience of other girls:

Taylor, the team captain, substitutes Max and Isaiah for Cynthia and Trinity. Max and Isaiah refuse to leave the court. Taylor says, “Come on, guys. Y’all have played for the last five minutes. Let the girls play for a while.” When Max and Isaiah finally walk out off the court, Taylor pats them on the back and says, “Y’all need to cool down a little bit. I’ll put you in in a minute.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Caleb is standing next to Madison, the team coach, while she fills out the batting order form. After Madison writes her name as the 4th batter, Caleb says, “Me next. Me next.” Madison ignores Caleb and has him as the 7th batter. Caleb says, “Well, I don’t mind batting last. I mean, everyone on our team can bat.” Madison says, “Yeah, we had the guys batting first last week, so we (i.e., girls) will bat first this week. I’m thinking to mix girls and boys up next week.” (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)
Trinity says, “I wanted to be in charge. But, I’m just a board member this time.” Olivia
replies enthusiastically, “That’s okay. Coach [Mary] said board members can change
rules during the season. That’s pretty cool. I’m a board member so I can decide penalties
when the boys don’t listen to us (i.e., girls).” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

A large proportion of girls with comparatively little skill also engaged wholeheartedly in
the SE seasons, particularly in game play segments. These girls had the confidence to take on
central roles, when the opportunity arose, and made the most of situations in which they were
asked to take on more peripheral roles:

While waiting for their turns to bat, Addison asks Julia, “What do you like better—playing
or scorekeeping?” Julia replies, “I like them both. I mean, with scorekeeping, I make sure
people are doing the right thing, but. . .” Addison cuts Julia off and says, “I like playing
better, cos I’m already good at scorekeeping, but not so good at hitting the ball.” Julia
says, “Yeah, me too. We need to practice. That’s why I like playing [games] too.” (Mary,
field notes, 4th grade softball)

Nina, the referee, makes a call with which Samuel doesn’t agree. Samuel asks Nina to
“come over here” and shows her what happened inside the goalkeeper’s box. Nina
doesn’t change her mind after Samuel’s explanation and says firmly, “I’m the ref, and I
say it’s not a goal.” Samuel doesn’t argue with Nina any further. (Dennis, field notes, 5th
grade handball)

Max is batting. Soon after the first pitch, Taylor, the scorekeeper, discovers that Carson is
the first on the batting order. Taylor stops the game and says, “It (i.e., batting order) says
Carson is the first batter.” Max says, “No, it doesn’t.” Taylor shows Max the sheet and
says, “I told you.” Max says, “So what now?” Taylor says, “First time is a warning.
Second time, you are out.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

While most boys appeared perfectly content for girls to be in positions of relative power
and were quite happy to follow their directions, a few were irritated by this state of affairs and
did all they could to undermine the girls’ authority. Girls, however, were rarely observed backing
down when faced with these kinds of challenges:

During practice, Andrea and Cori, the team coach and captain, are deciding on the batting
order. Jordan, the pitcher, says, “Are y’all ready yet?” John, on third base, adds, “Yeah,
seriously. Let’s get this going.” Just when the girls are ready to play, Mary blows the
whistle and says, “Managers, get all the equipment and come over here.” John says, “Oh,
come on, time to go in now? You girls are wasting our [playing] time.” (Mary, field
notes, 4th grade softball)
Chase is disputing the decision made by Isaiah, the referee, to disallow a goal. Lucy, the team captain, yells from the sideline, “Chase, that’s not a goal. Let it go. It’s bad sportsmanship. We don’t want that. We need all our [sportsmanship] points, remember?” Chase walks away from Isaiah without further arguments. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Natalie, the assistant coach, says, “Bruce, stand right here (points a plastic spot marking the practice area). Ella, take three steps back. There you go. Jeremiah, do you want to practice with us?” Jeremiah nods. After adjusting the size of their practice area again, the pupils begin the fielding practice. All three of them listen carefully and do what Natalie says when she shows them the right form for throwing and catching. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

More negatively, in line with the majority of middle school girls taught within a conservative version of SE (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press) and some of the elementary girls taught by teaching-oriented PTs (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012), a small minority of the girls in the present study were content to take little part in game play and practice sessions and with being allocated more peripheral, less-physical, and less-powerful roles:

Joanna looks upset at being handed the clipboard. Madeline asks, “What’s the matter?” Joanna replies, “I don’t want to be the scorekeeper. It’s boring.” Madeline immediately responds, “Oh really? Scorekeeping is my favorite. I don’t need to do anything. I mean, I still need to pay attention and everything, but it’s a lot easier than playing the game.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

There are two opponents guarding Jacob. This leaves Ashley uncovered in front of the goal. Instead of passing the ball to Ashley who is in the best position to score, Marshall takes an awkward shot and misses the goal. Ashley jogs to the other side of the court, getting ready to defend without complaining about Marshall’s poor decision-making. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

Erin volunteers to be the assistant referee on court 3 with Victoria. Instead of moving with play and paying attention to the game, she dances in one spot on the edge of the court. When the ball goes out of bounds close to Erin, Cooper (an Iguana) and Carson (a Kangaroo) ask her, “Whose ball is it?” Erin looks to Victoria, situated on the other side of the court, for help. Victoria shrugs. Erin hesitates for a while and says, “I don’t know.” Cooper says, “Come on. What were you doing? You were right next to it.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Reasons for this minority of girls avoiding participation were also similar to those discovered in the previous two studies of PTs (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012; Parker & Curtner-
Smith, in press) and included the wish to socialize to a greater extent than the structure of SE allowed, a total disinterest in the competitive nature of softball or handball, and fear of physical contact:

Julia asks Madeline to help her keep score. Madeline says, “My stomach started hurting a minute ago and I think I’m running a fever. I’m just gonna sit here for a while.” Within a few minutes, however, Madeline is chatting enthusiastically with Jeremiah and continues to do so for the remainder of the class period. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

When Dennis is not looking, Autumn abandons her team and walks with Leah and Audrey to a location behind the wall next to the gym entrance. They come out to the side and cheer for their teams when Dennis walks by. As soon as Dennis moves on to the next court, they go back to gossiping behind the wall. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

Addison, the goalkeeper, closes her eyes and dodges the ball every time a member of the other team attempts to score. She is so scared of the ball that Chase, the opposition goalkeeper, makes a direct attempt to score from just in front of his goal and scores. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

**Countering Male Attempts to Establish Supremacy**

Attempts by boys to establish supremacy within classes based on their gender were rare. When they did occur, in line with Wellard’s (2006) concept of exclusive masculinity, they were often perpetrated by larger, relatively skilled, more aggressive boys and designed to display their physical prowess:

Connor gestures toward the goal indicating that Leah should take up the position of goalkeeper. Leah protests, “But I just got out.” Connor ignores Leah and walks away from her. . . . During the game, Connor constantly talks over and ignores Diego and Audrey, the officials, and attempts to officiate while he is playing. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

Daniel dominates the game. He rarely passes the ball to his female teammates. He only trusts Cooper to whom he passes the ball occasionally. . . . Michael’s playing style is similar to that of Daniel. His main strategy is to dribble across the court and shoot. Once in a while, he passes the ball to Natalie, a high-skilled girl. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Most male attempts at establishing supremacy, however, were met with significant resistance by the majority of girls:
Sarah says to Mary, “They (i.e., Isaiah and Nevaeh) both want to be the coach. It’s two votes to three votes, but the boys say it’s not fair because we have more girls (i.e., votes) on the team, so they are doing rock-paper-scissors now.” Nevaeh wins and Isaiah looks upset. Meanwhile, Victoria is trying to get everyone’s attention by yelling, “Listen up, people! Who hasn’t been a captain?” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

Logan, the scorekeeper, and Diego, the assistant scorekeeper, are calling foul balls during the game. Half-way through the game, Kim, the referee, finally says, “Enough, you guys. Stop making calls. I’m the ref and your job is to keep score.” Logan and Diego look shocked and don’t say anything afterwards. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

There were, however, occasions when relatively small, timid, unskilled, or disinterested girls went along with boys’ attempts to dominate without any kind of resistance:

Jayden is frustrated with Layla’s weak performance as goalkeeper. He starts yelling at her from the sideline. Madison gets irritated as well and substitutes herself for Layla. Madison lets in several goals, gives up, and substitutes Jayden for herself. After Jayden makes a few saves, Layla says to Madison, “I guess he is really better than us.” (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

During a within-team practice game, John, Lucas, and Addison are playing against Jason, Elijah, and Allison. The boys keep possession of the ball for most of the game. The girls are energetic at the start of the game but, starved of possession, lose interest and are reduced to “walking on-field spectators.” They appear to accept this role without question. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Audrey’s pitch accidentally hits Faith’s bat and the ball rolls towards Audrey. Gavin, the catcher, runs to pick up the ball and says, “That doesn’t count. Redo.” Cheryl, the official, says, “But it’s not a foul ball.” Gavin replies, “Too late now. I’ve already picked it up.” Cheryl responds, “Oh, okay. Never mind.” (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

Racial Distinctions

In line with previous work (Bramham, 2003; Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012; Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press), interactions between race and gender were also observed in the current study. Specifically, and as also noted by Chen and Curtner-Smith, African American girls were more likely to conform to female stereotypes and engage in off-task behavior, whereas Caucasian girls were more likely to resist boys’ attempts to dominate them:

Taylor, the Caucasian team captain, sends Trinity, an African American, to help Luis keep score on court 4. Trinity, however, dances on her own by the bleachers... before
joining Cynthia, another African American, who is supposed to be keeping score on court 1, for a conversation that does not appear to be lesson-related. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade handball)

Kim (Caucasian) realizes that her pitching is not so good today so she walks off the pitcher’s cone. Luke asks, “Can I pitch? Can I pitch?” Kim replies, “No.” Kim hands the ball to Leah (African American), but she says, “I can’t pitch.” Lily (Caucasian) quickly says, “I can!” Lily then grabs the ball from Kim’s hand and runs to the pitcher’s cone. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

Caucasian and African American boys behaved in similar ways to the boys observed in both the earlier studies examining HM in SE (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012; Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press). Specifically, Caucasian boys were more likely to be supportive of girls and weaker, less-physical boys of either race:

After Bella lets in several goals, Aiden (African American) tells Allen (Caucasian), “Let me be the goalie. Bella sucks!” Allen ignores Aiden and teaches Bella how to better block shots with her limbs and how to approach opponents to narrow the angle. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

The ball rolls through between Nick’s (Caucasian) legs as he tries to pick up the ball by bending down. After throwing the ball to the pitcher, James (Caucasian) tells Nick, “You need to squat down or even take one knee to catch the ball with both hands like this (demonstrates), so the ball won’t roll through your legs. Try this next time, okay?” (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

Conversely, larger and more skilled African American boys were more likely to attempt to dominate other boys of either race:

Nick (Caucasian), the team captain, is trying to decide who is playing in the second half of the game. Liam (African American) says, “Y’all can’t handle the whole game. I’m in.” And then Liam walks on to the court. None of his teammates responds to Liam’s comment or stands up to him. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

The ball is hit and stops around home plate. Both Lucas (African American), playing third base, and Carson (African American), the shortstop, run to get it. Carson gets the ball, turns around, and sees Jeremy, a runner, is safe on third base. Carson blames Lucas for this state of affairs and yells, “What are you doing? Why aren’t you covering for third?” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)
In contrast to the findings in the previous two studies of HM in SE (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012; Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press), however, in the current study both African American and Caucasian boys were observed engaging in gendered performances (Robinson, 2005) aimed at impressing female classmates:

Emily walks over to Lily and says, “Everyone is telling James (Caucasian) that you like him. He did a hand-stand in the middle of the game and his shirt came off just blushing everybody up. He didn’t need to do that.” Lily looks embarrassed and quietly walks to sit down on the teacher’s line. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

Luis (African American) is on second base. Isaiah (African American) . . . hits the ball to the outfield and both of them run home. When they step on the home plate, Max (African American) does a chest bump with each of them. (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

**Teachers’ Beliefs and Pedagogic Tactics**

Unlike the coaching-oriented PTs previously studied (Parker & Curtner-Smith, in press), the inservice teachers in the current study did not believe that there was anything natural or inevitable about the behaviors of the boys and girls in their classes:

You can’t have the perception [that the behaviors of boys and girls are natural and inevitable]; otherwise, you limit their potential. I mean, I’ve seen some boys who are great artists and some girls who are better athletes than their male peers. . . . What I’m trying to say is that I’ve had some girls who enjoy keeping score and are good at it, and some boys who like playing and officiating [games], but I’ve seen it the other way around, too. I think it’s good because you get to put something different in their mind other than “girls are good at reading and writing and boys are good at sports,” you know. (Dennis, formal interview 1)

I personally have that experience. I’m really good at math, I was in math education to begin with. I’ve played sports my whole life, and I believe we girls can be as good as, or even better than the guys. You’ve seen my handwriting. It’s horrible. I know [laughs]. I mean, I have those things that people consider “guys’ characteristics,” so I think there are always exceptions. I have the girls who are great athletes and some guys who can’t throw a ball. It’s just the way it is. (Mary, formal interview 1)

In addition, and in congruence with the teaching-oriented PTs observed by Chen and Curtner-Smith (2012), Dennis and Mary believed that part of their job was countering any sexism and masculine bias resulting from HM:
Like a said, my job is to help kids explore things; something they don’t see at home, something they don’t see on TV, or something their parents never tell them about. Something like, men don’t cry because we always have to be tough, to take care of the family, you know? I want them to shift up their mindset and try to make them think from the opposite side. (Dennis, formal interview 1)

I know there are PE teachers who think guys will always be football players and girls will always be cheerleaders. I don’t think so. Well, I cheered in high school, but I also played softball, a sport that is associated with guys. . . . I don’t want my kids to do “what they’re supposed to do” just because their teachers or parents think they should. (Mary, formal interview 1)

Methods by which Dennis and Mary went about countering sexism and masculine bias in their SE seasons were more sophisticated and developed than those employed by the PTs observed by Chen and Curtner-Smith (2012). Like those teaching-oriented PTs, both Dennis and Mary used their general pedagogies to this end, frequently providing behavioral guidance, intervention, and feedback:

During team practice, Sophia volunteers to be the goalkeeper. . . . When the practice is over, Audrey, Lily, and Sophia walk to the side, sit on the bleachers. Sophia says, “The game of course starts with the boys.” Dennis hears the comment and steps in to remind Caleb, the team captain, “Make sure you don’t use the same starters every game and remember to sub people in and out fairly. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

The ball is hit toward Desmond, the shortstop. Desmond picks up the ball, looks at Olivia, who is playing second base, hesitates for a while, and then throws the ball to Luis at first base. Both runners are safe on first and second. After the inning is over, Mary asks Desmond, “Why didn’t you throw the ball to Olivia earlier? She was much closer than Luis. Kevin might have been out if you threw the ball to her.” Desmond replies, “Because Olivia can’t catch the ball.” Mary says, “Are you sure about that? I’ve seen Olivia doing some good plays. You have to trust your teammates.” Desmond replies, “Okay.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

In addition, both teachers made a conscious effort to provide more performance and motivational feedback to girls and boys who were less skilled and assertive:

I told Elijah (low-skilled, less able boy) to throw the ball to the pitcher because Carlos was already on first base. What happened was Elijah overthrew the ball to the first baseman so Carlos got to third as opposed to staying at first. If Elijah had thrown to the pitcher, Carlos would have just stayed at first. So I was making him think about a smarter play. (Mary, stimulated recall interview 2)
After Brianna (low-skilled girl) lets in a goal, Dennis says, “Hey, Brianna, you know what you could do to block that goal?” Brianna shakes her head. Dennis says, “If you’d approached Yang when he was about to take the shot here, that narrowed down the angle. And you could do this (demonstrates) to block the goal. Can you do that next time?” Brianna nods her head and smiles. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

There were also times when both teachers observed inequities in their lessons but deliberately chose not to intervene for pedagogical reasons:

The CD showed Logan constantly asking Jocelyn to “pass the ball” to him even though she was in a better position to score. Dennis was monitoring the game but didn’t comment. Dennis recalled, “That’s in the beginning of the game. Logan saw Jocelyn using the wrong foot to shoot so he wanted to make sure he got the ball and did the shooting. If you keep playing [the CD], you’ll see Logan showing Jocelyn how to use the opposite foot and he actually let her shoot later in the game. You’re supposed to have the kids to guide each other in sport education, so I try to tell the coaches little tips that they can pass on to their teammates. When it comes to strategies, I try to teach them myself, because it’s hard to explain to the coaches without showing them. But skills, I try to leave that more on the coaches because kids listen better when they’re hearing from their peers on this kind of things. (Dennis, stimulated recall interview 1)

The CD showed the Panthers getting frustrated with their coach, Isaiah (a less able boy), because he couldn’t throw a strike. Robert, Jeremy, and Victoria all tried to grab the ball from Isaiah but he refused to give it up. Mary was standing next to the field but did not intervene. Mary recalled, “In that situation, I don’t step in, they have to work it out. That’s the whole point of sport ed—they have to work through it. I’ve talked to the whole class. . . . If there is any issue, they have to come together as a group and talk to each other. It’s not the first time. They have to learn.” (Mary, stimulated recall interview 2)

Neither teacher believed it was usually necessary to make changes to game structures or rules for the purposes of improving equity:

We never have an issue that girls don’t get to play. . . . I think they (i.e., girls and boys) have the same share of playing time. . . . We have very athletic girls and not-so-athletic boys, so that evens out. In our sixth grade class, the first time we played lacrosse, we did tell the boys to pass the ball to the girls before taking a shot, but that was it. I mean, I only see them as a person, not a girl or a boy. Same as black and white, I don’t see them that way. I see them based on their skill levels more. (Mary, informal interview)

I don’t do something like that (i.e., modifications for girls). Well, at least not in my fifth grade class because the girls are just as good athletes as the boys, and I think the boys realize that too (laughs). I mean, it’s a possibility if I start the sixth grade [SE season] and see the girls don’t get as much time to play. But I seriously don’t see that here. If I gave bonus points for the girls, that would decrease the chances for the boys to play. I think
that’s not fair to the boys. That’s why we put emphasis on “play as a team,” not on individual players. (Dennis, informal interview)

Both Dennis and Mary, however, believed it important that they provided pupils of both genders with equal access to the best spaces and times to play and practice:

The first two weeks of the team handball unit have been fairly stressful for me. . . . I am still running into many of the same problems that we have had in the past two sports—captains not playing teammates fairly [i.e., equally], certain students’ unsportsmanlike conduct, and a few individuals who are unconcerned with classmates’ safety. . . . I’ll have to keep reminding the captains to provide each teammate with adequate amounts of time for actual gameplay, especially girls who don’t mind sitting out. I’ll also have to rotate the practice areas, so the girls won’t always stay on the stage and the boys get the floor and goals to practice shooting. (Dennis, electronic journal)

There have been problems with certain students playing too much or not enough during the preseason games. . . . As always, captains need to be reminded to play their teammates evenly. No matter how often I bring kids in and emphasize the importance of fair playing time, some still “forgot.” . . . We don’t have enough goals for ten teams to practice, so we have to use pads on the stage. I assign them to different practice areas each time they have sport ed, so I haven’t had any complaint about that. (Mary, electronic journal)

While the teaching-oriented PTs previously observed (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012) had used three of the SE model’s structures (fair play points system, equity board, and competitive game play) sparingly in attempts to provide a more equitable experience for their pupils, the practicing teachers in the current study relied primarily and frequently on one of the model’s key components in this endeavor. Specifically, they provided a more equitable experience for pupils through the allocation of roles. When they first implemented the SE model with a new group of pupils, Dennis and Mary made sure that roles more central to a season (e.g., coach and captain) were allocated equally to boys and girls (and pupils of all races) by providing a “set of guidelines” for teams to follow during their role “elections” or by selecting pupils to perform some of the key roles themselves:

Dennis asks pupils to “raise your hand if you haven’t been a coach.” He selects four African American girls, three African American boys, one Caucasian girl, and two
Caucasian boys. . . . Following team selection, Dennis assigns the ten coaches to a team with the goal of balancing out gender, race, and skill level. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade handball)

As pupils became more familiar with SE and socialized into this sense of fairness, the guidelines were withdrawn, the teachers ceased to intervene in the selection process, and the pupils continued, by and large, to elect pupils from a variety of backgrounds for key roles:

The pupils are sitting in the gym in their teams. Mary says, “This is the team that you’ll stay on for the rest of the semester. Now, I want y’all to decide who is gonna be the coach, captain, manager and all that good stuff (other roles with which the pupils are familiar). I know y’all all want to be the coach, but try to take the job (i.e., role) that you haven’t been before, so everyone can get the chance to take different responsibilities.” (Mary, field notes, 4th grade softball)

Dennis and Mary also increased the opportunity for pupils of both genders (and different races) to engage in roles the pupils considered important by increasing both the number of roles and the responsibilities that went along with them. For example, equity officers were required to “determine consequences as a result of unsportsmanlike conduct or forceful contacts,” board members had the authority to “determine preseason rankings and changes to game rules if needed,” league members had to “make game schedules and update points on the poster on a daily basis”, and managers were required to “get all equipment needed for gameplay or practice, distribute whistles or score cards when officiating or scorekeeping, and put all equipment away after class” (class SE roles poster). As illustrated by the following extracts, Mary was particularly pleased with the effect of increasing the responsibilities given to board and league members:

The board members, I try to incorporate as much as possible, because they really didn’t do a whole lot but [now] they can change or modify the rules. So instead me making that decision, I’m gonna let the board members decide what they should do. . . . It’s supposed to be their system. And really, the rules I’m using for this class is [sic] what my middle schoolers made up. (Mary, stimulated recall interview 1)
My biggest and greatest encouragement was the league members. They surprised me so much and really did a great job on keeping up with points. I was amazed! It was a new task and they took it and ran with it. It definitely helped me out too because the points were posted immediately. I loved that! I think the kids really enjoyed posting their own points. To me, this was the best part! (Mary, electronic journal)

The teachers also increased pupils’ perceptions that certain roles were important by providing substantive feedback on the way they had been implemented. For example, in the two extracts below the teachers provided feedback about pupils’ officiating:

During lesson closure, Mary says, “Why did I see Ian get knocked out and nobody called it? I heard Lily keep saying, “That's a travel. That's a travel,” but the ref didn't call it. One, if you have problems, talk to the ref during half-time. Don't call it out. Two, if you are a ref, you need to make calls right away; otherwise, the other team will think you are playing favorites.” (Mary, field notes. 4th grade handball)

During lesson closure, Dennis says, “If they (i.e., referees) make a call, it's final, and I'd like to see those calls to be final. . . . When they make the call that you are out, you stay off the field. You do not hold the game up by running in and arguing with the referee. Referees, if the person is arguing with you, call it unsportsmanlike conduct. They get two [unsportsmanlike conducts], then they get kicked out. Easy as that, and you don't have to deal with the arguing any more. (Dennis, field notes, 5th grade softball)

Importantly, and unlike the previously studied teaching-oriented PTs (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2012), Mary and Dennis were also able to detect and counter more subtle forms of sexism and masculine bias including the view that officiating is a male occupation and boys only like to play games as opposed to performing other roles:

Many people think officials are guys. Like in Little League, many of the umpires are guys. But I tell my students that everyone gets to be the ref, whether you like it or not, and you can be a really good one. That’s why I assigned Avery to be the umpire for the championship game because I knew she was good, she knew the rules, and she made confident calls. (Mary, formal interview 2)

When Diego and Nick are together, both of them are distracted. They are buddies and they like to talk, just like Nina and Abigail. You can’t put them together as referee and scorekeeper; otherwise, the game is totally out of control. I always make sure they are not on the same court unless their teams play against each other. You think girls like to socialize, but I have boys who like to talk more than play [games] too. (Dennis, informal interview)
Finally, in congruence with the teaching-oriented PTs observed by Chen and Curtner-Smith (2012), both Dennis and Mary believed that engaging in direct conversation with pupils about issues related to HM and concerning sexism and masculine bias was counterproductive. Their rationale was that taking such action would invariably involve making comparisons between males and females, draw attention to the issue, and have the potential to exacerbate the problem:

I think if I address the issue [of sexism and masculine bias], then it’s gonna alert the kids that, “Yeah, we’re looking at gender, and boys should be better and stronger.” If I consistently compare boys and girls, that’s going against education. I believe, as a teacher, I shouldn’t do that. (Mary, formal interview 2)

I don’t talk about it (i.e., the issue of sexism and masculine bias), at least not in front of the kids. If I did, I would be giving them the same values my PE teachers gave me, which I don’t agree with. I mean, it’s a pretty level playing field here. We have the high-skilled people and that’s boys and girls and ethnicities and everything. And we have the low-skilled ones and that’s the same thing. I’d rather look at them (i.e., pupils) in terms of their skill levels than paying attention on their genders. (Dennis, formal interview 2)

Conclusions

The key finding of this study was that HM, and any associated sexism and masculine bias, was largely rejected and combatted during the four SE seasons observed. Moreover, in line with our original hypothesis, the teaching-oriented inservice teachers in the study were more effective in dealing with the actual and potential effects of HM in their SE units than the teaching-oriented PTs observed by Chen and Curtner-Smith (2012).

The foundations of Dennis and Mary’s effectiveness in this context were their relatively liberal views and beliefs about sport and gender and the fact that they were teaching oriented. Following Shulman (1987), however, their enhanced degree of success, when compared to PTs with the same traits, appeared to be due to their having greater levels of curricular, pedagogical, content, and pedagogical content knowledge, as well as superior knowledge about their pupils.
Specifically, Dennis and Mary were extremely comfortable with and confident about their use of the SE model. Moreover, they were already pedagogically skilled and so not fixated on mastering technical aspects of teaching. Similarly, they had taught several units of handball and softball previously and so had developed good levels of content and pedagogical content knowledge. Finally, Dennis and Mary knew and understood the children in their classes exceptionally well as they had been employed at their school since its opening and had taught most of the pupils in their 4th and 5th grade classes for the majority of their schooling. In congruence with teacher concerns theory (Fuller & Brown, 1975) and Parker and Curtner-Smith (in press), collectively, this level of knowledge and expertise was what allowed Dennis and Mary to move beyond a focus on themselves and technical aspects of teaching, and to a focus on their pupils’ experiences and learning. Specifically, their enhanced levels of knowledge gave them greater “pedagogical room” to attend to aspects of instruction not usually considered central to PE, including countering sexism and masculine bias. Practically, then, the study suggests that those responsible for training both PTs and inservice teachers to employ the SE model focus on their charges’ acquisition of the knowledge types alluded to in this paragraph.

One component of Dennis and Mary’s instruction that we should at least examine as potentially problematic was their unwillingness to engage in any kind of direct discussion about issues of gender and equity with their pupils. Their judgment that this strategy would have been counterproductive, in that it would have drawn attention to a problem to which they believed their children were oblivious, may well have been correct. We are not so sure that it was, however, and would certainly question the use of such a strategy with children being taught in other relatively conservative contexts.
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APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
SUBJECT CONSENT FORM FOR
PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

“HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN SPORT EDUCATION: CASE STUDIES OF
EXPERIENCED INSERVICE TEACHERS WITH TEACHING ORIENATIONS”

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a doctoral student, YuChun Chen,
and her faulty advisor, Dr. Matt Curtner-Smith, from the Department of Kinesiology at the
University of Alabama. We hope to learn what experienced inservice teachers do to implement
the sport education model in the most accurate way and how they create opportunities to address
issues and concerns about equity in physical education.

You are selected to participate in this study because you have been identified as an inservice
teacher with considerable experience of using the sport education model and relatively liberal
views towards teaching physical education and sport.

You will be asked to teach two full sport education seasons over the semester, to be observed
daily and video-taped twice, to participate in two formal interviews at the beginning and end of
the semester each lasting 30-45 minutes, to participate in two stimulated recall interviews during
the semester each lasting 30-45 minutes, and to complete at least two electronic journals per
week. We would like to audio-tape the interviews. If you do not want to be audio-recorded, we
will take handwritten notes. In addition, you will be asked to share your lesson plans and other
curriculum materials. We would like your permission to use all of this data in the research
project described above.

The information provided will be confidential. All data will be retained by the principal
investigator for a period of three years. The data will be kept locked in the principal
investigator’s home office during that time. After three years from completion of this study, all
data will be destroyed. The principal investigator will be the only person with access to the data.

Only the researchers will know your identity. In the event that the information collected is
published in a professional journal, your confidentiality will be protected by referring to you
only by pseudonym. On completion of the study, the results will be made available and
explained to you.

The nature of the data collection ensures that there is no physical or psychological risk of any
kind to you. The results of this study may allow teacher educators to understand how
experienced inservice teachers perceive the process of implementing the sport education model
in physical education. This understanding may help create better training for preservice teachers
as well as inservice teachers as their professional development.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your
relationship with the Department of Kinesiology or the University of Alabama. If you decide to
participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time
without penalty.
If you have any questions about this research, contact YuChun Chen at (562) 676-7966 or ychen58@crimson.ua.edu or Dr. Matthew Curtner-Smith at (205) 348-9209 or msmith@bamaed.ua.edu. Finally, if you have any questions about research participants’ rights, you may contact Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461.

AUTHORIZATION: I have read the above and understand the nature of this study and agree to participate. I understand that by agreeing to participate in this study I have not waived any legal or human rights. I also understand that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice. Finally, I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

☐ Yes, I give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

☐ No, I do not give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

☐ Yes, I give my permission for the investigator to video-tape two of my lessons.

☐ No, I do not give my permission for the investigator to video-tape two of my lessons.

Participant signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________

Researcher as witness: ___________________________ Date: _________________
APPENDIX F

FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The purpose of this study is to examine sport education seasons taught by two experienced inservice teachers for the presence or absence of hegemonic masculinity. The first interview focuses on collecting demographic data, and data explaining your occupational socialization and your views of gender, masculinity, and femininity. The second interview focuses on your reflections about the sport education seasons your have just taught.

Interview Questions

Background Information (multiple prompts allowed)
- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- What is your race?
- What is your gender?
- What is your ethnic origin?
* No need to ask questions in this section when answers are obvious.

History in Physical Education (multiple prompts allowed)
- Was your experience in physical education beneficial in grade school?
- What type of curriculum model did your physical education teachers use?
- What experience stood out the most about your physical education class, positive and negative?
- Did you feel successful in physical education?
- Are there any teachers that you would like to model when you become a teacher?
- Are there any teachers that you would strive to be unlike when you become a teacher?
- Is there anyone in your family that is a teacher? If so, what subject?

Knowledge about Sport Education (multiple prompts allowed)
- Where did you get/learn the knowledge(s) you have about teaching sport education?
- What types of knowledge do you think are crucial for teaching good sport education?
- What do you think teachers should know about sport education?
- What are the most challenging and most difficult aspects of teaching sport education?

Value Orientations (multiple prompts allowed)
- What are your beliefs about teaching and learning physical education?
- What do you think is the purpose of physical education?
- What are your goals for physical education?
- What do you think a physically educated student should do and know?
- What do you most want students to learn from you?
- How important is it to you that your students learn activities they can do for a lifetime (fitness, individual sports, etc)? How do you teach them these?
- Do you value process or product more? Please explain.
- Do you teach students responsibility? If so, how? Why is it important to you? If not, why not?
• How much emphasis do you place on skill development? Why?
• How much freedom do your students have to adjust tasks or find tasks appropriate for their development?
• Do you encourage your students to work with students different than themselves? If so, what strategies do you use to make this successful? If not, why not?

Teaching Sport Education (multiple prompts allowed)
• How did you prepare for teaching sport education?
• What information was useful? What information was not useful?
• What support did you have when preparing to implement sport education?
• What difficulties/challenges arose when preparing to implement sport education?
• What support did you have when implementing sport education?
• What difficulties/challenges arose when implementing sport education?
• What support did you have after teaching sport education?
• What difficulties/challenges arose after teaching sport education?

Other (multiple prompts allowed)
• Is there anything else you want to tell me about sport education and your teaching in physical education?
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CHAPTER III

INFLUENCE OF SEXUAL IDENTITY STEREOTYPING ON HETEROSEXUAL FEMALE PRESERVICE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of sexual identity stereotyping (SIS) on heterosexual female physical education (PE) preservice teachers (PTs). The four specific questions that the study attempted to answer were (a) to what degree did PTs understand the term SIS, (b) to what extent had PTs encountered SIS, (c) how had PTs reacted to and coped with any SIS that they had encountered, and (d) how did PTs perceive SIS would impact their careers as PE teachers and athletic coaches? Participants were 5 PTs. Data were collected by formally interviewing each PT and analyzed by employing analytic induction and constant comparison. Results indicated that the PTs generally had a good understanding of SIS and that four of them had encountered it. Only one of the PTs, however, had been sexually stereotyped herself. Grounded theory, in the form of five hypotheses, was developed to explain the influence of SIS on heterosexual female PE PTs and neophyte female PE teachers.

Keywords: preservice teachers, physical education, sexual identity
Influence of Sexual Identity Stereotyping on Heterosexual Female Preservice Physical Education Teachers

Despite almost unanimous agreement among medical professionals and behavioral and social scientists that homosexuality is a “normal” disposition, many individuals, institutions, and social, political, and religious groups still believe it to be abnormal, dysfunctional, and sinful (Rubin, 1993). The resulting homophobia was defined by Hemphill and Symons (2009) as “prejudice, discrimination, harassment or acts of violence that are based on fear, distrust, dislike, or hatred of sexual minorities” (p. 398). The main goal of this action is to isolate, subordinate, and discredit homosexuals (Greendorfer & Rubinson, 1997).

Four main types of homophobia were identified by Gilbert (2000). Institutional homophobia, which emanates from various forms of government, business, religion, and other social institutions, often leads to more overt forms of discrimination (e.g., lack of employment opportunities and health care options). Cultural homophobia is more subtle and comes in the form of messages disseminated by the media in which heterosexuality is portrayed as normal and acceptable behavior and homosexuality is branded as deviant and dangerous. Interpersonal homophobia occurs when homophobes reveal their dislike and fear of homosexuals through humor, harassment, and violence (Mason & Tomsen, 1997). Finally, internalized homophobia cultivates a personal ideology in which homosexuals are viewed as immoral and inferior to heterosexuals. This type of homophobia often leads to homosexuals accepting marginalization and avoiding “coming out.”

Homophobia has a long history in sport (Anderson, 2011). Further, as women have participated in more competitive and physical forms of higher quality sport, homophobic reactions to them in some quarters have strengthened (Veri, 1999). At its most extreme, this homophobia has suggested that heterosexual women should not participate in physical and
competitive sporting forms (Griffin, 1992, 1993; Hall, 1996; Lenskyj, 1986) because doing so is a threat to patriarchy (Connell, 1987; Whitson, 1994), not feminine (Smith-Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1987; Vertinsky, 1987), and displays of physical skill and power are designed to reveal the extent of a man’s masculinity (Lenskyj, 1986; Wellard, 2006). Consequently, women who do not conform to traditional feminine traits and participate in sport are assumed to be and often labeled as lesbians (Blinde & Taub, 1992). Interestingly, as a result of this persecution, both lesbian and “straight” female athletes have described their use of coping strategies including concealment (i.e., hiding their homosexuality), deflection (i.e., downplaying their athletic roles and accentuating their non-sporting roles), and normalization (i.e., attempting to redefine homosexuality for the public by emphasizing the positive characteristics and contributions of female athletes) (Blinde & Taub, 1992).

A limited amount of research indicates that female physical education (PE) teachers suffer in similar ways to female athletes because they are also working within the masculine domain of sport (Bredemeier, Carlton, Hills, & Oglesby, 1999; Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996). The evidence is that both institutional (Gilbert, 2000) and interpersonal (Squires & Sparkes, 1996) forms of homophobia are common in school settings although the latter is unlikely to manifest itself in overt harassment or violence. Key concerns for lesbian PE teachers include protecting their lesbian identity from students, colleagues and parents; finding a sense of belonging in the heterosexual world; and securing their teaching positions (Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996). For these reasons, lesbian PE teachers, particularly those who are younger and inexperienced (Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996), also engage in a number of coping strategies. These include concealing their lesbianism by leading a “double life” through the careful fabrication of what appears to be “normal” heterosexual behavior (Lenskyj,
1997; Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996; Woods & Harbeck, 1992). They also include silence, tolerance, denial and resignation (Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996) or coming out with a complete identity and attempting to re-educate the public by displaying high moral standards and values that have implications for PE and beyond (Bredemeier et al., 1999).

**Purpose**

The catalyst for the present study came from two sources. First, a group of heterosexual female graduate students in our department read Squires and Sparkes’ (1996) life histories of several lesbian PE teachers working in British schools and relayed that it was often assumed that they were lesbians based on their career choice. This stereotyping of their sexual identity (Marcia, 1966; Worthington, Navarro, Savoy & Hampton, 2008) meant that they faced some of the same prejudices and marginalization encountered by their lesbian colleagues. Second, although the balance had improved in recent years, our department’s undergraduate physical education teacher education (PETE) program was still mainly populated by male preservice teachers (PTs). We hypothesized, therefore, that some straight female students interested in a career in PE might be dissuaded from doing so by the prospect of having their sexual identity stereotyped, particularly as our university was located in a socially conservative state. The purpose of the study described in this paper, therefore, was to examine the influence of sexual identity stereotyping (SIS) on heterosexual female PTs. The four specific questions that the study attempted to answer were (a) to what degree did PTs understand the term SIS, (b) to what extent had PTs encountered SIS, (c) how had PTs reacted to and coped with any SIS that they had encountered, and (d) how did PTs perceive SIS would impact their careers as PE teachers and athletic coaches?
Method

Participants

Participants in this study were five heterosexual female PTs from one PETE program situated within a large research university in the southeastern United States. Prior to the study, they signed a consent form in congruence with University policy on human subjects (Appendix H).

All five of the PTs were Caucasian and born and raised in the “Deep South.” Sally (aged 21 years) and Ashley (aged 21 years) were in their first semester; and Lauren (aged 28 years), Jane (aged 21 years), and Elizabeth (aged 22 years) were in their third semester of the PETE program.

Sally, Elizabeth, and Ashley’s primary sport had been cheerleading. While Sally and Elizabeth had ceased to participate once entering college; Ashley was still cheering for the university when the study was conducted. Being a college cheerleader meant that Ashley practiced with her peers twice a week and “worked out” by herself by weight training on a daily basis and running, swimming, and biking every other day. Besides cheerleading, Sally had also participated in competitive basketball and gymnastics during her school years. At the time data were collected, she was running fairly seriously and competing in local road races. As well as cheerleading during her school days, Elizabeth had also played softball. During her college years, she remained active by running in local road races, playing a little tennis, weight training, and participating in intramural softball. Similarly, during her schooling, Jane’s primary form of physical activity had been softball. Although not as competitive as she once was, she continued to play this sport at a recreational level during her college career as well as swimming and weight training and regularly taking part in a variety of group exercise classes. Finally, Lauren

5 The names of the PTs in this chapter are fictitious.
had competed as a gymnast and dancer prior to college. By the time the study was conducted, however, her preferred modes of activity were also swimming, weight training, and group exercise classes, particularly zumba, yoga, and kick-boxing.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Each PT was formally interviewed. The interview script (Appendix I) was drawn from the earlier work of Blinde and Taub (1992) with female athletes. It included questions aimed at gaining demographic data and an insight into preservice teachers’ general understanding of sexual identity stereotyping. It also included questions aimed at discovering (a) the degree to which PTs understood the term SIS, (b) the extent to which PTs had encountered SIS, (c) how PTs had reacted to and coped with any SIS that they had encountered, and (d) how PTs perceived SIS would impact their careers as PE teachers and athletic coaches.

The protocol for the interviews was semi-structured (Patton, 1990) in that all PTs were asked the same lead questions but multiple prompts and follow-up questions based on their initial answers were permitted. Interview duration was approximately 60 minutes. Each interview was audio-taped and transcribed verbatim.

The main goal of the analysis was to develop a “grounded theory” (Charmaz, 2006) which explained the influence of SIS on heterosexual female PTs. Separate analyses were completed on each section of interview questions by using the techniques of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) to code and categorize the raw data. Emerging categories were merged or subdivided so as to form meaningful themes which answered the main questions driving the study. Trustworthiness and credibility were established by member checking following interviews, a thorough search for discrepant and negative cases.
(Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), and requesting feedback from all participants on the final manuscript in which the study was described.

Results and Discussion

Understanding of SIS

SIS of female athletes. As illustrated in the following data extract, one PT (Sally) had never conceived of female athletes or PE teachers having their sexual identities stereotyped:

It just never occurred to me that they (i.e., female athletes and PE teachers) might be [stereotyped as lesbians]. And I don’t know if that’s because I am young and naïve and went to a really small school and lived in a really small town. (Sally)

The other four PTs were clearly well aware that females who participated heavily in sport ran the risk of being stereotyped as lesbians regardless of their actual sexual orientation:

They (i.e., female athletes and PE teachers) play sports a lot throughout their lives and still stay in shape even after they stop playing competitively. . . . Maybe it’s their bigger bones and their bigger clothing. . . . They fix their hair differently, they don’t wear as much makeup. . . . All that factors in [to them being stereotyped as lesbians]. (Elizabeth)

In congruence with previous observations and research (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Lenskyj, 1986; Smith-Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1987; Vertinsky, 1987; Wellard, 2006), these PTs, however, qualified their responses by pointing out that those female athletes who participated in “manly” and “competitive” sports such as “softball,” “basketball,” “soccer,” and “golf” and who were more “manly” in appearance (i.e., mesomorphic) were much more likely to be stereotyped in this way than those who participated in “girly” sports such as “cheerleading,” “dance,” and gymnastics” and had “more feminine” physiques:

A lot of times, it depends on the sport. . . . You know, people do think, “Well, if you are in a certain sports, then . . .” Softball is a big one, basketball can be sometimes. They think everyone is lesbian. . . . Of course, I don’t feel that way, but, you know, I have heard some other people believe that. I mean, when you think of softball, baseball, basketball, you think of men. . . . I think the main thing is when you have those sports that used to be mainly man-sport, you get that kind of, well, stereotyping. (Lauren)
My understanding is that a lot of people that play certain sports like softball or basketball for females, that a lot of them, like, they have a short haircut, that they look “butch,” that’s the term, then they’re gonna be [perceived as] lesbians. (Jane)

A lot of girls that are really into athletics are very athletic. Athletes, a lot of times, are thought to maybe be more butch, more masculine. . . . Butchness is related to being gay. . . . like some . . . people would say a lot of the girls on the US soccer team, sometimes they are not feminine, maybe they are gay. (Ashley)

When I was in school, basketball and softball [players would be perceived as lesbians], mainly. Really demanding sports, not necessarily individual sports, but team sports, but sometimes maybe with golf. I know that came up some when I was in high school. . . . In other sports, like with cheerleading and things like that, you know, they might see you as being too girly, but I guess it depends on what sport it is. (Elizabeth)

Interestingly, and in congruence with previous research (Anderson, 2011; Wellard, 2006), the PTs also noted that males who participated in “girly” or sports classified “feminine” were also likely to be have their sexual identities stereotyped:

Guys look at the guys that do gymnastics as being “different,” and [think men who participate in] cheerleading can be [gay]. . . . They think, “Oh, they are a little feminine.” Well, they are not. I mean, if you’ve see some of the stuff that guys have to do, you will be, like, “No, they are not.” . . . Automatically, gymnastics is thought of as a girl sport, so I think it depends on what the sport is . . . ‘cuz people kind of . . . stereotype [sports] as a man and woman kind of thing. (Lauren)

A lot of guy cheerleaders are assumed to be gay, but in all reality, the majority of our team is extremely straight. I’ve been on the team for a couple of years where there is not a single gay [man]. Right now, we only have one gay boy but he is out about it. (Ashley)

**SIS of female PE teachers.** Ashley, Lauren, Jane, and Elizabeth also saw a natural “connection” between female athletes and PE teachers which explained why they were sexually stereotyped in similar ways:

Being a PE teacher, a lot of the females are gonna be interested in sports; so they just have a connection: when they like sports, they have short hair, and they are female PE teachers . . . they must be lesbians, kind of thing. They wear longer shorts, longer khaki shorts, like guy shorts, never dress up, or [when] they dress up, they wear pants; they don’t wear like a dress or anything like that. (Jane)

[Female PE teachers] are more muscular, they take care of their bodies so they have more muscle on them, so they aren’t the skinny . . . body type. They have muscles. They don’t
wear much make-up. They usually, since they are outside, just kind of have their mascara, just enough to make them presentable. Their hair is normally up rather than down and curly-fixed. They are in sweatpants a lot, and a lot of female teachers have nice pants and dresses whereas female PE teachers, wear like a sport bra and like a looser fitting shirt and sweatpants. (Ashley)

Again, however, the PTs stressed that female teachers who taught sports that were generally categorized as feminine and who were “more feminine” in appearance were less likely to be sexually stereotyped as lesbian:

I definitely do think that people look at [female PE] teachers differently, depending on what their sports would be. . . . I can definitely see where some people would look at someone that was maybe teaching softball or whatever. Maybe they are a little different than those who teach cheerleading; you know. . . . “girlier,” and they might get that [i.e., be sexually stereotyped as lesbian]. (Lauren)

**Prevalence of SIS.** In general, Lauren, Ashley, Jane, and Elizabeth believed SIS of serious female athletes and PE teachers was fairly common but varied based on location:

There are certain places that certain sports are kind of bigger in. So I think when you’re kind of going to that, it could maybe go to a point that it can [be more prevalent to label female athletes as lesbians]. Say, places where softball or basketball is the big sport that everybody plays. People might associate that more with men, you know, that kind of thing. So, when a woman steps in, [people might think], “Oh well (laughs), she must be different (laughs).” (Lauren)

I grew up in Kentucky. [In that state] people are more accepted for just who [they] are. They don’t judge how they [i.e., female athletes and PE teachers] look like as much, as they are closer to the Bible-belt. So, when you see some of them [i.e., female PE teachers] that look different [in Kentucky], that’s just the way they are. (Ashley)

In addition, when students were the source of SIS, the PTs noted that the degree to which they engaged in this kind of thinking was age-related:

As far as labeling female PE teachers as lesbians, I would say late-middle school and high school [students are more likely to do so]. I think it does happen, but the younger kids, I don’t really see anything. . . . I think it’s mainly in the upper grades, and I think a lot of that just has to do with the fact that it’s just something to talk about among kids. I mean, the truth is a lot of it is just gossip. (Elizabeth)
More positively, however, the sentiment was that as it became more accepted by society that women participate in sports and physical activities, and sports and physical activities became less gendered, then the problem of female physical educators having their sexual identities stereotyped would eventually decrease and eventually die out:

I think it’s (i.e., sexual identity stereotyping of female PE teachers) going away. I don’t think it’s as prevalent as it used to be. I think it used to be a lot more people judging the female PE teachers. But now it’s more and more common [for women to participate in physical activity and sport], so people are trying to accept it more and realize that women do workout too and do enjoy athletic competition. . . . In the past, kind of like how culture itself progresses, it started out women did very low [amounts of] physical activity, like controlling, like gymnastics. Now the women’s [soccer] world cup is on national TV. I think the culture is progressing and realizing that women can do the same thing [as men]. (Ashley)

Impact of SIS on women considering a career in PE. PTs’ beliefs about the impact of SIS on both straight and lesbian women contemplating a career in PE depended on whether or not this stereotyping was perceived as threatening. Those who were not threatened, they suggested, would not be influenced by SIS at all:

I don’t really think it’ll (i.e., SIS) have much impact as long as they (i.e., women considering a career in PE) love their job and love what they do. I don’t think that would really make them decide that they don’t want to be a PE teacher or anything like that. (Sally)

I don’t think they should [be threatened by SIS] because people, unfortunately, would think what they want. They’ll eventually leave it alone and let it go. . . . It (i.e., the issue of SIS) shouldn’t stop a woman from becoming a great PE teacher. (Lauren)

Conversely, those who were threatened by SIS, they suggested, may avoid a career in PE:

When you sign up to teach PE, you are not gonna be wearing a skirt and heels. I mean, you wear what’s comfortable and some running shoes. I think it’s kind of known already. If you are not willing to do that, then you probably shouldn’t be teaching PE. (Elizabeth)

For women who are not lesbians, they could get pissed, so they may treat their students differently because they are mad. They may be [thinking], “Why do they think I’m a lesbian? Why would they think that?” From the students’ aspect, I don’t think it’s fair. If you can’t take it [or have the attitude of] “Well, I don’t care what they think, they are just kids”, maybe you shouldn’t teach PE. (Jane)
Impact of SIS on women already embarked on a career in PE. The PTs were also keen to discuss the issues faced by heterosexual women who had already chosen to pursue a career in PE. Again, they suggested that those who were not threatened by SIS would be largely unaffected. Conversely, those who were threatened by SIS would have to respond to three types of homophobia emanating from five key sources. Specifically, these were institutional, interpersonal, and internalized homophobia (Gilbert, 2000) and the sources of stereotyping were children and youth in PE classes, parents, other teachers, administrators, and staff in schools:

Students, nowadays, in the democratic society we have in teaching . . . can go to the principal and, I mean, they (i.e., PE teachers) could get fired. I mean, they are not supposed to get fired [due to] discrimination against sexual identity; but, you know, they (i.e., administrators) can come up with different reasons to be, like, “Hey, you know, she didn’t turn this in on time” or something, “so we’re gonna write her up.” Like, the students or parents . . . could turn around and [say] . . . “My PE teacher is in the locker room and she is gay. I don’t want her in my locker room [because] she is gay.” The students could go to the principal and get her in trouble. (Jane)

We had a really athletic PE teacher and everybody just kind of thought of her as [a lesbian]. There is always that question tossing around, “Well, I wonder, you know, if she [is a lesbian]; which way does she go?” . . . There is gonna be that circling of gossip, no matter what, whether it’s the students or the parents or the teachers. This was just one incident that I know of. . . . That [kind of thinking] does put a lot pressure on [female PE] teachers. (Elizabeth)

They (i.e., female PE teachers) are not traditional female teachers. A lot of female teachers are teaching in the classroom. They (i.e., classroom teachers) are not very physical hands-on, whereas the [female] PE teachers [are] out there with the boys and working and running around and they are not as feminine per se, which may put them on the spot [of being stereotyped as lesbians]. (Ashley)

Interestingly, there was no allusion to cultural homophobia (Gilbert, 2000) or other sources of stereotyping such as government, religion, or the media.

Again, in congruence with previous research (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Bredemeier et al., 1999; Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996) and in line with some of their own experiences, the PTs also believed female PE teachers who were particularly threatened by being labeled
lesbian, regardless of whether or not they actually were, would adopt one or more of several coping strategies. These were normalization, coming out, and deflection:

I feel like maybe [my junior high school PE teacher] was kind of overloaded with comments and calls [about being gay] and I think there were some issues with parents complaining and some of the kids were getting pulled out of the sport. I think she just felt like, “Well, maybe if I take a step back it may not be the kids’ fault, it’s the parents that pulled them out, so I step back, then, they can still play the sport and succeed.” I think she just didn’t want to step on any more toes. . . . I think that was her way out of the gossip and everything, just lay everything out there, and being like, “Okay, yes, I am [lesbian], but I’m still your PE teacher and, you know, you need to respect me either way.” (Elizabeth)

Being in PE, a lot of us would wonder, “Hey, is our PE teacher gay?” Just because . . . she was a female. . . . We never asked the teacher, we just talked about it. [But,] like in a month or so, she found out [that students were curious about her sexuality], so she started mentioning her husband and kids during softball practice. (Jane)

As well as alluding to coping strategies unearthed by prior research, the PTs also described one further coping strategy that they had observed teachers employing but that had not appeared in the previous literature. This was building closer relationships with students while at the same time erecting clear boundaries for them:

I knew my PE teachers well. . . . Even with that (i.e., close relationship), honestly, I can barely remember her coming down to the locker room and it could’ve been that reason (i.e., issue of SIS). She’d come in and say, “Hey, everybody, get ready. Everybody needs to get out.” She kind of gave us a warning. She might do a walk-through, just to make sure everybody [was] going and getting ready or whatever, but she didn’t come down there and hang out while everybody was getting ready and all that, you know. (Lauren)

Finally, rather than adopting any type of coping strategy, the PTs suggested that perhaps the best action that could be taken by teachers when confronted with SIS was to ignore it completely:

I know in my high school, a lot of the female PE teachers were just looking at their achievement in whatever sports [they were coaching]. They didn’t necessarily do anything with [the issue of SIS]. They still wore that (i.e., non-feminine dress) to school . . . every day. (Ashley)
Encountering and Reacting to SIS

General stereotyping of female PE teachers as lesbians. Prior to enrolling in the PETE program all of the PTs except Sally had encountered situations in which female PE teachers were stereotyped as lesbians. Typical of their comments on this issue were the following: “I know parents probably talk (i.e., about female PE teachers being lesbians) and . . . even some other [classroom] teachers talk about it too” (Elizabeth).

We had two female [PE teachers]. One [female PE teacher] was stockier. She’d played softball her whole life. She had short hair. She didn’t really fix up or anything. And then we had another [female] PE coach that, you know, had long hair, didn’t wear loose-fitting clothes. They looked more like workout clothes. And I think the kids were just kind of put off by the [stockier] teacher because she didn’t look like the other one (i.e., the feminine one). (Elizabeth)

In addition, these PTs relayed that they had themselves stereotyped some female PE teachers as lesbians. Specifically, while attending middle school, they reported “wondering if my female PE teachers were lesbian” (Jane) and recalled them and their female classmates discussing the sexual identities of those teachers who were “butch,” “coached softball,” or were heavily “into athletics:”

In high school, there was one teacher. She coached softball and when she first came, for the first two or three weeks, the guys were kind of, you know, “She looked . . . I wondered if she was gay.” But then, after the first month, everybody kind of figured it out, you know. She was married and she was just a really good softball coach and won [the] State [Championship] that year. So they just kind of forgot about it. (Ashley)

While the PTs obviously thought little about the labeling of female PE teachers’ sexuality in general prior to enrolling in PETE, as illustrated by the following data snippets, after enrolling in the program they thought even less about the issue:

I don’t question that (i.e., SIS), not now. In middle school, yes, like, when I talked to my friends. . . . We were not trying to be mean or anything, you know, just like kids, we were just wondering. But now, it just doesn’t cross my mind. (Jane)
Now? Not necessarily. There are two women that I worked around and they were highly respected. I wonder why the kids never said anything bad about them. As far as I could see, the kids really looked up to them. So, I don’t really have whole lot of thoughts [on the issue of SIS] any more. (Elizabeth)

Stereotyping of the PTs as lesbians. Prior to and following their enrollment in the PETE program, Elizabeth, Lauren, and Ashley relayed that they had not been stereotyped as lesbians and believed this to be because their main sports were “dance and gymnastics and that kind of thing so we don’t get [labeled like] that” (Lauren). Only Jane recalled having her sexual identity stereotyped as lesbian. This, she perceived, was not because of her career choice but because of her love for and heavy participation in the sport of softball:

I have played softball my whole life, so I’ve been asked out front, “Hey, are you gay?” I remember, my freshman year in high school, the team captain, a senior, [when] we were in the locker room, [said], “Hey, we just think this person, this person, and this person is gay, are you?” They just called you out, just asked you, so it’s just that kind of thing. And the other thing was if you became a really good friend with somebody [on the team], there was [the question], “I wonder if they are together?” [They] just automatically thought that. And also . . . from playing softball, I have a lot of good friends that are gay, so I’ve always been asked, “Are you gay”, and I’m, like, “No, I just have friends that are gay.”

Jane also explained that her reaction to having her sexual identity stereotyped as lesbian had changed as she had got more used to it. Initially, her reaction was one of fury. More recently, she had found it humorous:

I know the first time I got asked, I got mad. I was like, “Why would you think that? . . . Do I look gay?” I mean,” Hello, I . . . no, I do not. Why would you ask that?” And now, my best friend, she is gay, so we hang out, like, all the time, so now when people ask . . . we’ll make jokes. Like, people ask if we are together, I’m like, “Oh yeah, we’ve been together like five years.” They were like, “Really?” I was, like, “No, just kidding. (laughs).” (Jane)

Perceived Impact of SIS on PTs’ Careers

Lack of threat. None of the five PTs in the study felt personally threatened by SIS and did not appear to have given the topic much thought prior to the study:
Yeah, we’ve been out [to the public schools] a couple times, but it (i.e., the issue of SIS) hasn’t influenced me at all. I know [that for] the students that I teach, one of my main rules is that you can’t bully, no calling people names. So . . . I would expect them to respect people by not calling them names. (Ashley)

I don’t think it (i.e., SIS) would [influence my future plan], honestly. It really doesn’t affect [my decision to be a PE teacher]. I don’t think it would affect me in the long run just because if you know who you are, you just have to pull straight up to your students as hard as you can. (Elizabeth)

Indeed, they were adamant that, even if they were stereotyped, they would not employ any of the personal coping strategies to which they thought other women in their profession might turn. For example, they noted that they would not conceal or deflect (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Bredemeier et al., 1999; Sparkes, 1994; Squires & Sparkes, 1996):

You can’t wear flip flops and shorts and a shirt, a nice outfit, and run around with little kids all day and teach them how to do the things that, you know, if you are teaching them . . . how to run and jump over, like, a hurdle. You can’t be wearing anything nice, you have to be wearing like comfortable clothes. (Sally)

I don’t need to dress up and I’m very comfortable with who I am. . . . I think there is a time and place I need to look really nice. But if I’m planning on running around, getting dirty, or doing sports, I don’t think I need to be all pretty. I can wear sweatpants and gym shorts. (Ashley)

**Normalizing and defiance.** The one partial and positive exception to the non-use of coping strategies came from Jane who suggested that, although she was straight, she would attempt to “normalize” (Blinde & Taub, 1992) homosexuality by openly discussing SIS with her pupils:

I could just do the opposite aspect. It makes me wanna teach them more, to teach kids not to stereotype, like, even I have gay best friends. No sense to stereotyping other people. I’ll turn it into a teaching moment. I don’t think it’ll influence me at all. Just because, like I told you, I have a lot of friends that are gay and play softball. This is what I want to teach the kids. So if they have any questions or the whole lesbian thing comes up as me being a PE teacher, I’ll turn around, making it into a teaching moment, to teach them not to stereotype. (Jane)
In addition, the PTs were somewhat defiant about the prospect of having their sexual identities stereotyped:

If they want to stereotype me, go ahead. They’ll eventually figure it out on their own (i.e., that I am not a lesbian). It’s one of those things where I just don’t bother myself with things like that. . . . I’d rather have a lesbian, [who is] a really great teacher teaching my kid. . . . The way you treat other people and the way you act means more to me. (Lauren)

I think sometimes you just kind of look past what kids say because they don’t think before they say things. . . . You have to build up to that. You have to come out strong. You’ve gotta start strong and then they see that, “Okay, she is serious, we are in PE, let’s get this done.” (Elizabeth)

I think I’ll continue to teach. I know [that there might be] the rumor spread among the kids, “Oh she’s gotta be gay, she’s gotta be gay”, I mean, someday I’m planning to have a wedding ring on my finger; I mean, I like boys and I’m comfortable with it. If one class decided to spread the rumor, I’ll be gone in a year or two anyways, so I just kind of dismiss it. They can think what they want. (Ashley)

**Legitimacy of PE.** Finally, the PTs made it clear that they were more concerned about doing their jobs well and convincing others that PE was an important and legitimate subject taught by “real teachers” than having their sexual identities stereotyped:

I’m content with who I am and what I’m there to do. I’m not there to, you know, to impress a lot of people. I’m just there to get the kids active, so that’s what my job is gonna be, so just trying to do my job. (Elizabeth)

There is this kind of stereotype on PE itself . . . that, we are not really teaching. . . . There might have been people that came into the field thinking, “Oh, this will be easy,” you know. And then [they] realize, “No, we are teaching.” So I think that kind of thing is a big deal. (Lauren)

**Grounded Theory**

The results of this study and extrapolations from the previous literature led to the development of a number of hypotheses about the influence of SIS on heterosexual female PE PTs and neophyte female PE teachers. These hypotheses, we hope, will help and guide others interested in conducting research on SIS in PE. The hypotheses are as follows:
**Hypothesis 1.** The majority of heterosexual female PTs will be aware that they and heterosexual female PE teachers can be sexually stereotyped as lesbian.

**Hypothesis 2.** The degree to which heterosexual female PTs and teachers’ sexual identities are stereotyped will be strongly related to the sports and physical activities in which they participate and their physical appearance:

- PTs and teachers with more mesomorphic physiques who participate in “masculine” sports and physical activities will be more likely to be stereotyped as lesbians.
- PTs with more “feminine” physiques who participate in “feminine” sports and physical activities will be less likely to be stereotyped as lesbians.

**Hypothesis 3.** Stereotyping of heterosexual female PE PTs and teachers is currently fairly common:

- The extent to which female PE PTs and teachers are stereotyped as lesbians will vary by location.
- The extent to which women participating in sport and physical activity become acceptable in society will influence the degree to which PTs and teachers will be stereotyped as lesbians.
- The extent to which sports and physical activities are classified as gendered or gender-neutral will influence the degree to which PTs and teachers will be stereotyped as lesbians.

**Hypothesis 4.** The extent to which heterosexual women contemplating a career in PE are threatened by SIS will influence whether or not they choose to enter PETE:

- Potential PTs who are more likely to be stereotyped as lesbians (see Hypothesis 2) will be more threatened and likely to avoid a career in PE.
• Potential PTs who are less likely to be stereotyped as lesbians (see Hypothesis 2) will be less threatened and likely to pursue a career in PE.

**Hypothesis 5.** Once heterosexual female PTs graduate and obtain employment as PE teachers in schools, the extent to which they are influenced by SIS will depend on the degree to which they are threatened by it:

• Neophyte PE teachers not threatened by SIS will be largely unaffected but may attempt to “normalize” (Blinde & Taub, 1992) homosexuality or fight back against the stereotype.

• Neophyte PE teachers threatened by SIS will employ one or more of several coping strategies.

• Sources of SIS will include students, parents, other teachers, administrators, and school staff.

• Types of homophobia encountered will primarily be institutional, interpersonal, and internalized (Gilbert, 2000).

• Unthreatened neophyte PE teachers will see the legitimacy of their subject as a more important issue than SIS.
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APPENDIX H

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
SUBJECT CONSENT FORM FOR
PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

“INFLUENCE OF SEXUAL IDENTITY STEREOTYPING ON
HETEROSEXUAL FEMALE PRESERVICE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS”

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a doctoral student, YuChun Chen, and her faculty advisor, Dr. Matt Curtner-Smith, from the Department of Kinesiology at the University of Alabama. We hope to explore heterosexual female preservice physical education teachers’ awareness of sexual identity stereotyping, their experiences with it, and their views of how such stereotyping may affect their careers as teachers or coaches.

You are selected to participate in this study because you are a female undergraduate student majoring in physical education. If you do not wish to be in this study, the investigators will not conclude that you must be homosexual/lesbian as there are many reasons why people do not participate in a study.

You will be asked to participate in one formal interview aimed at discovering (1) the degree you understand the term sexual identity stereotyping, (2) the extent you have encountered sexual identity stereotyping, (3) how you have reacted to and coped with any sexual identity stereotyping that you have encountered, and (4) how you perceive sexual identity stereotyping would impact your careers as physical education teachers and athletic coaches. The interview will last 60-90 minutes. We would like to audio-tape the interview. If you do not want to be audio-recorded, we will take handwritten notes.

The information provided will be confidential. All data will be retained by the principal investigator for a period of three years. The data will be kept locked in the principal investigator’s home office during that time. After three years from completion of this study, all data will be destroyed. The principal investigator will be the only person with access to the data.

Only the researchers will know your identity. In the event that the information collected is published in a professional journal, your confidentiality will be protected by referring to you only by pseudonym. On completion of the study, the results will be made available and explained to you.

The data collection process in this particular study may elicit some adverse psychological responses. If certain adverse reactions occur, the principal investigator will stop the discussion by prompting to another question or ending the interview immediately when the adverse reactions become too severe of a situation. If you become visibly upset, the principal investigator will refer you to the University counseling service.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with the Department of Kinesiology or the University of Alabama. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
If you have any questions about this research, contact YuChun Chen at (562) 676-7966 or ychen58@crimson.ua.edu or Dr. Matthew Curtner-Smith at (205) 348-9209 or msmith@bamaed.ua.edu. Finally, if you have any questions about research participants’ rights, you may contact Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461.

AUTHORIZATION: I have read the above and understand the nature of this study and agree to participate. I understand that by agreeing to participate in this study I have not waived any legal or human rights. I also understand that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice. Finally, I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

☐ Yes, I give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

☐ No, I do not give my permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

Participant signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Researcher as witness: ____________________________ Date: ________________
APPENDIX I

FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
FORMAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of sexual identity stereotyping on heterosexual female preservice physical education teachers. The four specific questions the study attempts to answer are: (1) to what degree did preservice teachers understand the term sexual identity stereotyping, (2) to what extent had preservice teachers encountered sexual identity stereotyping, (3) how had preservice teachers reacted to and coped with any sexual identity stereotyping that they had encountered, and (4) how did preservice teachers perceive sexual identity stereotyping would impact their careers as physical education teachers and athletic coaches?

Interview Questions

**Demographic Information** (multiple prompts allowed)
- How old are you?
- Where were you born?
- What is your race?
- What is your ethnic origin?

**General Understanding of Sexual Identity Stereotyping** (multiple prompts allowed)
- What do you understand by the term “sexual identity stereotyping” in relation to female participation in sport?
- What do you understand by the term “sexual identity stereotyping” in relation to women taking on the role of physical education teacher?
- Are there any differences between the sexual identity stereotyping of women in sports and physical education? If yes, please describe.
- Why do you think female physical education teachers are labeled as lesbians?
- How prevalent is the labeling of female physical education teachers as lesbians?
- What are the characteristics of female physical teachers who are more likely to be labeled as lesbians?
- What impact do you think the threat of having one’s sexual identity stereotyped (i.e., being labeled a lesbian) has on women considering a career as a physical education teacher?

**Encountering Sexual Identity Stereotyping** (multiple prompts allowed)
- Prior to enrolling in the PETE program did you encounter any general stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians? If yes, please describe.
- During your time in the PETE program, have you encountered any general stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians? If yes, please describe.
- Prior to enrolling in the PETE program, did you encounter any sexual identity stereotyping, in terms of being labeled as a lesbian, yourself? If yes, please describe.
- During your time in the PETE program, have you encountered any sexual identity stereotyping, in terms of being labeled as a lesbian, yourself? If yes, please describe.
Reactions to and Coping with Sexual Identity Stereotyping (multiple prompts allowed)
- How did you react to and cope with any general stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians prior to enrolling in the PETE program?
- How have you reacted to and coped with any general stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians during your time in the PETE program?
- How did you react to and cope with having your sexual identity stereotyped, in terms of being labeled a lesbian, prior to enrolling in the PETE program?
- How have you reacted and coped with having your sexual identity stereotyped, in terms of being labeled a lesbian, during your time in the PETE program?
- Has the stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbian had any influence on your teaching in the schools?

Perceptions of how Sexual Identity Stereotyping will Impact Future Career (multiple prompts allowed)
- To what extent has the stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians influenced your future career plan?
- In what ways, if any, do you think the stereotyping of female physical education teachers as lesbians will influence your teaching and behavior in schools once you gain employment?

Other (multiple prompts allowed)
- Is there anything else you want to tell me about the stereotyping of female physical education teachers’ sexual identity?
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