

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND

THE CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER IDENTITY IN ELITE SPORT: A MIXED
METHODS EXPLORATION

A Dissertation submitted by Andrea Lamont-Mills BA (Hons)

For the award of Doctor of Philosophy

2001

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own efforts, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

Andrea Lamont-Mills

Date

ENDORSEMENT

Grace Pretty (Supervisor)

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION	i
LIST OF TABLES	x
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xvi
ABSTRACT	xviii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Setting the Scene.....	2
1.2 Overview of the Dissertation.....	3
1.3 Background to the Research.....	7
1.4 Definitions.....	10
1.4.1 Gender and Gender Identity.....	10
1.4.2 Elite Sport.....	11
1.4.3 Discourse and Language.....	12
1.5 The Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	13
1.6 Justification for the Research.....	15
1.7 Justification of the Methodology.....	18
1.8 Justification of the Discursive Psychological Framework.....	20
1.9 Contributions.....	22
1.10 Outline of the Dissertation.....	23
1.11 Delimitations of Scope.....	24
1.12 My Framework.....	25
1.13 Conclusion.....	26

CHAPTER TWO:	GENDER AND SPORT: CRITICISMS AND CONCERNS	27
2.1	Introduction	28
2.2	A Historical Look at Women in Sport and Exercise	28
2.3	Gender in Sport and Exercise Psychology: A Brief Overview	30
2.4	Unifactorial and Two Factor Models of Gender	32
2.5	The Doing of Gender: Gender as a Social Category in Language	41
2.6	Where to Now? Gender Identity and Constructionist Approaches	44
2.7	Conclusion	49
CHAPTER THREE:	DISCURSIVE PSYCHOLOGY	51
3.1	Introduction	52
3.2	What is Discursive Psychology?	53
3.3	Meta-theoretical Aspects	59
	3.3.1 Rhetorical Psychology	59
	3.3.2 Conversation Analysis	60
	3.3.3 Ethnomethodology	63
3.4	Interpretative Repertoires	65
3.5	Positioning: A Discursive Representation of the Self	68
3.6	Gender and Discourse	71
	3.6.1 Reconsidering Gender and Gender Identity in Talk	71
	3.6.2 Why Consider Gender as Discursively Constructed?	73
3.7	Discursive Psychology and Gender Research	75
3.8	Conclusion	80
CHAPTER FOUR:	METHOD	81
4.1	Participants	82
4.2	Sampling	84
4.3	Response Rate	85
4.4	Apparatus	85
4.5	Measures	85

4.5.1	24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire.....	86
4.5.2	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	89
4.6	Design and Development of Interview Format and Guide.....	91
4.7	Data Coding and Analysis: NUD*IST 4, An Overview.....	95
4.7.1	Data Coding and Analysis: A-Priori Content Analysis.....	95
4.7.2	Unit of Analysis: Text Unit as a Line and Text Unit as a Response.....	96
4.7.3	Data Analysis: Discourse Analysis.....	97
4.8	Sampling for the Inductive Analysis.....	99
4.9	Issues of Rigour.....	100
4.10	Procedure.....	103
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS: GENDER PERSONALITY		
TRAITS AND SOCIAL DESIRABILITY.....		
106		
5.1	Demographic Data.....	107
5.1.1	Data Screening and Re-coding.....	107
5.1.2	Statistical Differences.....	107
5.2	The Influence of Social Desirability: Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	109
5.3	Personal Attributes Questionnaire: Quantitative Results.....	110
5.4	Conclusion.....	114
CHAPTER SIX: THE A-PRIORI CONTENT ANALYSIS.....		
116		
6.1	The Imposition of the 24 Item Personal Attributes Questionnaire.....	117
6.2	Data Included for Analysis.....	118
6.3	Data Analysis.....	118
6.4	The Idiosyncratic Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis.....	119
6.4.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	119
6.4.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale.....	123
6.4.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale.....	127
6.4.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales.....	128

6.4.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences.....	130
6.4.6	Conclusion: Idiosyncratic Identity.....	131
6.5	Gender Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis.....	132
6.5.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	132
6.5.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale.....	136
6.5.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale.....	140
6.5.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales.....	141
6.5.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences.....	144
6.5.6	Conclusion: Gender Identity.....	144
6.6	Gender Identity in Sport and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis.....	145
6.6.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	145
6.6.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale.....	150
6.6.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale.....	153
6.6.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales.....	155
6.6.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences.....	158
6.6.6	Conclusion: Gender Identity in Sport.....	158
6.7	Conclusion.....	159

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONSTITUTING IDENTITIES: THE FEMALE		
COACHES, FIONA AND KAREN.....		164
7.1	Introduction.....	165
7.2	Fiona.....	166
7.2.1	Idiosyncratic Identity: Talking the Talk of Androgyny But Walking a Masculine Walk.....	167
7.2.2	Gender Identity: Masculine Talking and Atypical Walking.....	173
7.2.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis.....	181
7.2.4	Gender Identity in Elite Sport: Being Positioned as a Woman in Elite Sport.....	182

7.2.5	Fiona’s Story So Far: Being Positioned as an Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Woman, and Then as a Woman in Elite Sport.....	188
7.3	Karen.....	190
7.3.1	An Idiosyncratic Individual: Talking the Talk of Masculinity and Interpersonality and Walking a Masculine Walk.....	191
7.3.2	Now as a Woman: Equality Talking and Opposites Walking.....	195
7.3.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and the A-Priori Content Analysis: Karen.....	199
7.3.4	I’ve Never Thought of Myself as a Woman Coaching: Talking the Talk of the Female Coach But Walking the Walk of the Non-Issue.....	200
7.3.5	Karen’s Story So Far.....	204
CHAPTER EIGHT: THE MALE COACHES: MARK AND RALPH.....		208
8.1	Introduction.....	209
8.2	Mark.....	209
8.2.1	Idiosyncratic Identity: Coach Talking Whilst Directive Democrat Walking.....	209
8.2.2	I’m a Man’s Man: Androgyny and Hegemonic Masculinity.....	216
8.2.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: Mark.....	223
8.2.4	A Man in Elite Sport: Back to the Effective Coach But With An Athlete Manager.....	224
8.2.5	Mark’s Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Man, and a Man in Elite Sport.....	230

8.3	Ralph.....	233
8.3.1	Trait and Masculinity Talking But Structured Walking.....	233
8.3.2	Being Positioned as a Man: Talking the Talk of Traits But Walking an Atypical Walk.....	237
8.3.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: Ralph.....	241
8.3.4	A Man in Elite Sport: Innovation in Sport With Egalitarianism.....	242
8.3.5	Ralph and the Story So Far.....	248
8.4	Comparing Across the Coaches.....	251
CHAPTER NINE: THE ATHLETES: MARSHA AND SUSAN.....		256
9.1	Introduction.....	257
9.2	Marsha.....	257
9.2.1	The Idiosyncratic Identity: Androgyny Talking and Good Person Walking.....	257
9.2.2	A Woman: Talking the Talk of Femininity But Walking an Opposite to Men Walk.....	262
9.2.3	Marsha: Comparing the Discourse Analysis with the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis.....	267
9.2.4	A Woman in Elite Sport: A Tough Walk Within a Lack of Recognition Talk.....	267
9.2.5	Marsha's Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Woman, and a Woman in Elite Sport.....	276
9.3	Susan.....	278
9.3.1	The Idiosyncratic Identity: Trait Talking and Walking.....	278
9.3.2	I am a Woman: Talking Traits But Walking Atypically.....	280
9.3.3	Susan: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis.....	284
9.3.4	As a Woman in Elite Sport.....	284

9.3.5	Susan's Story Thus Far	289
CHAPTER TEN: FINALLY THE MALE ATHLETES: DANIEL AND ADAM		
		291
10.1	Introduction	292
10.2	Daniel	292
10.2.1	As an Idiosyncratic Individual	292
10.2.2	Gender Identity, Trait Talking and Trait Walking	294
10.2.3	Daniel: Comparing the Discourse Analysis with the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	296
10.2.4	As a Man in Elite Sport	296
10.2.5	Daniel's Story: As an Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Man and then as a Man in Elite Sport	299
10.3	Adam	301
10.3.1	Ok as a Person	301
10.3.2	An Old-Fashioned Man	304
10.3.3	Adam: Comparing the Discourse Analysis with the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	307
10.3.4	I Have No Idea	308
10.3.5	Adam's Story So Far	311
10.4	Comparing the Athletes	313
10.5	Comparison Across All Participants	315
CHAPTER ELEVEN: PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER		
		320
11.1	Introduction	321
11.2	Alternative Ways of Understanding Gender	322
11.2.1	Gender as a Social Construction	323
11.2.3	Many Masculinities and Many Femininities	328
11.2.4	Gender as an Ideological Practice	332
11.2.5	Summary	335
11.3	Methodological Implications	338

11.4	Limitations and Future Directions	340
11.5	Conclusion	346
GLOSSARY		348
REFERENCES		354
APPENDICES		
APPENDIX A		376
A.1	Personal Attributes Questionnaire	377
A.2.	Personal Attributes Questionnaire – Scoring Sheet	379
A.3	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	381
A.4	Personal Reaction Inventory – Scoring Sheet	383
A.5	Semi-structured Interview Guide	385
A.6	PAQ Imposed Items Across Identities	390
A.7	A-priori Coding	393
A.8	Recruitment Letter	394
A.9	Document Header Information	399
APPENDIX B		401
B.1	Demographic Data	402
B.2	Assumption Testing – Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	404
B.3	Assumption Testing – Personal Attributes Questionnaire	405
APPENDIX C		407
C.1	Linguistic Markers, Idiosyncratic Identity	408
C.2	Linguistic Markers, Gender Identity	409
C.3	Linguistic Markers, Gender Identity in Sport	410

LIST OF TABLES

Table

4.1	Demographic Characteristics for Participants: Means and Standard Deviations.....	82
4.2	Demographic Characteristics for Participants: Frequencies.....	83
5.1	PAQ Mean scores and Standard Deviations as a Function of Sex and Occupation.....	112
5.2	PAQ Split-Method Classification as a Function of Sex and Occupation: Frequencies.....	113
6.1	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	121
6.2	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	122
6.3	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	122
6.4	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	123
6.5	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	125
6.6	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	126
6.7	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	126

6.8	Idiosyncratic Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	127
6.9	Idiosyncratic Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	128
6.10	Idiosyncratic Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	129
6.11	Idiosyncratic Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	129
6.12	Idiosyncratic Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	130
6.13	Gender Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	134
6.14	Gender Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	135
6.15	Gender Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	135
6.16	Gender Identity, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	136
6.17	Gender Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	138

6.18	Gender Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	139
6.19	Gender Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	139
6.20	Gender Identity, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	140
6.21	Gender Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	142
6.22	Gender Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	142
6.23	Gender Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	143
6.24	Gender Identity, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	143
6.25	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	147
6.26	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	148
6.27	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	148

6.28	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	149
6.29	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	151
6.30	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	152
6.31	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	152
6.32	Gender Identity in Sport, PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	153
6.33	Gender Identity in Sport, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data.....	156
6.34	Gender Identity in Sport, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data.....	156
6.35	Gender Identity in Sport, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data.....	157
6.36	Gender Identity in Sport, Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data.....	157
6.37	Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Idiosyncratic Identity.....	160
6.38	Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Gender Identity.....	161

6.39	Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Gender Identity in Sport.....	162
7.1	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Fiona Across Identities.....	189
7.2	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Karen Across Identities.....	204
8.1	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Mark Across Identities.....	231
8.2	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Ralph Across Identities.....	249
8.3	Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Male and Female Coaches Across Identities.....	252
8.4	Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Male and Female Coaches Across Identities.....	254
9.1	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Marsha Across Identities.....	277
9.2	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Susan Across Identities.....	289
10.1	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Daniel Across Identities.....	300
10.2	Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Adam Across Identities.....	312
10.3	Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Male and Female Athletes Across Identities.....	313
10.4	Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Male and Female Athletes Across Identities.....	314
10.5	Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes: Idiosyncratic Identity.....	316
10.6	Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes: Gender Identity.....	316

10.7	Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes:	
	Gender in Sport Identity.....	316
10.8	Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes:	
	Idiosyncratic Identity.....	317
10.9	Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes:	
	Gender Identity.....	317
10.10	Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes:	
	Gender in Sport Identity.....	317

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Five years ago I began this quest. Through this time I have thought, despaired, argued, accepted, and lamented over this dissertation. Throughout this a number of people have stood quietly by, always ready to assist with words of encouragement, questions for consideration, and shoulders to lean on. First and foremost, I give my most deepest thanks to my supervisor Grace Pretty. Grace took me on as a student knowing that I didn't have a background in the psychology of gender, knowing that I had no experience in qualitative analysis, but also knowing that I had a passion for learning. Grace for your tireless energy, commitment, belief in me, friendship, patience, encouragement, humour, and guidance I am most sincerely thankful. It has been a privilege to have worked with you.

To my Associate Supervisor Eric Marx, thank-you for stepping in at the last moment and giving me your thoughts and comments on my work. I hope that this is the first of many collaborative efforts.

Steven Christensen, my husband and colleague, thank you for instilling in me that good is good but better is best. Even if in these last few days I wish I had never heard you say that! You have been unfailing in your support, encouragement, love, patience, enthusiasm, and belief in what I set out to achieve. Your critical questioning and intellectual challenges may not have always been welcome, but know that I appreciated having that bar set high. You are a true inspiration as a colleague and friend. You have always been there when I have needed you. Thank-you.

To my son, Jens Christensen. For most of your life I have been doing my PhD. You have grown accustomed to Mummy going to work on Sundays and working late into the evening. Yet you have always greeted me with love and joy. Your excitement in me finishing this dissertation has kept me going during these last few days. Sweetheart we can now go on our holiday!!

To my fellow postgraduates, the support that you have provided has been invaluable, as has been the wine that you have bought, and that we have shared. To my academic colleagues, administrative, and technical staff I extend my appreciation.

I also thank those State Institutes of Sport, athletes, and coaches who gave so freely of their time and energy. Without your support I would never have been able to achieve what I have in this dissertation. I thank the sport psychologists at those institutes who were invaluable in gaining me entry into these organisations. The drinks are on me in Adelaide! To those professionals who have spent time with me at National and International Conferences. Your comments and thoughts have inspired me to look at my work in a multitude of different ways.

The financial support given to me by the University of Southern Queensland has been invaluable and has made possible the completion of this dissertation. The three and a half years that were conducted under the University of Southern Queensland Postgraduate Scholarship, along with the marking, tutorial, lecturing, and travel funding assistance that I have gained from the USQ Department of Psychology, have allowed me concentrate my efforts on this dissertation without too many unnecessary distractions. My deepest gratitude to you.

Finally to my parents, to whom I dedicate this dissertation. Whose love, support, and understanding has been the main driving force behind my academic pursuits. Your faith and trust in my abilities and your indulgence of my wishes have allowed me to be where I am today. To my father, I thank-you for encouraging me to challenge male-female binaries, to not only think but act in ways that challenge this. I thank you also for encouraging me to be whatever I wanted to be. To my mother, whose own academic aspirations were never realised, this is for you. I thank-you for instilling in me the passion to go out and be whoever I wanted to be. Thank-you both so very much.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explored how gender identity is constructed in elite sport. I argued that sport is a unique socio-cultural context where gender category membership, may be enacted both the same and differently than in other contexts. Historically, most gender stereotyping, gender trait, and gender identity research in sport (e.g., Andre & Holland, 1995; Csizma, Wittig, & Schurr, 1988; Harris & Griffin, 1997) has employed researcher-generated constructions of masculinity and femininity, or non-sporting constructions of masculinity and femininity. By failing to define and construct gender from the participants' perspective, researchers have imposed their own preconceived cultural standards of gender upon participants (Doyle & Paludi, 1995). To generalise these preconceptions to other groups is to do so without consideration of cultural diversity and possible difference (Doyle & Paludi). Therefore, previous sport gender studies that have used these methodologies are tenuous as contemporary and future models upon which to base gender work.

Further, gender identity research that has utilised a discursive psychological theoretical and methodological framework has produced findings that question the empirical validity of current models of gender in sport and exercise psychology (see Wetherell & Edley, 1999). These discursive results suggest that gender is a multifaceted, multidimensional, multifactorial, negotiated, dynamic, and variable concept (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Therefore, two research questions were addressed by this dissertation: 1) How do participants perceive themselves in terms of gender-related characteristics?; and 2) How do elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of idiosyncratic, gender, and gender identity in sport categories?

In order to address these research questions two self-report measures were utilised, the 24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and a semi-structured interview concerning identity prescription. Thirty-eight elite level coaches (19 women, 19 men) and 37 elite level athletes (19 women, 18 men) voluntarily participated in this study. The interview data were analysed using two divergent theoretical and analytical frameworks, an a-priori content analysis (imposition of the PAQ items on interview responses) and a discursive psychological framework.

The results of the PAQ analysis suggest that sportswomen and sportsmen perceive themselves differently in relation to gender-related characteristics. Differences which did not reach statistical significance, were found between male and female responses on the PAQ Masculine (M), Feminine (F), and Masculine-Feminine (M-F) sub-scales. Statistically significant differences were found with reference to PAQ classification, with women more likely to be classified as Androgynous and men as Masculine. There were no statistically significant occupational differences on either PAQ sub-scale responding or PAQ classification. The above results call into question the underlying assumptions and theoretical foundations of the PAQ.

The a-priori content analysis also revealed a number of contradictory findings with reference to the assumptions and foundations of the PAQ scale. For example, women were more likely to utilise the PAQ M item Self-confident to describe themselves as gendered individuals than men. Whereas men were more likely to use the PAQ F item Gentle than women in the same identity category. Further, Feminine classified people were more likely to use the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant when describing themselves as women/men in elite sport. Therefore, the PAQ and a priori results cast doubt on the empirical utility of two factor models of gender to understand gender as a complex and dynamic construct. The results suggest that elite sport might be a context where gender is distinctively enacted and constituted.

In order to determine how gender identity is enacted and negotiated in competitive sport, the interview data were analysed using a discursive psychological approach. Discursive psychology focuses upon how representations are constructed within, and constitutive of, the social practices that are found in language. In this respect, gender is conceptualised as being negotiated within the local interactive context where culture, history, and social contexts are reflected within discursive practices. In Research Question Two, interest centred on the interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that participants used to prescribe themselves as idiosyncratic, gendered, and gendered individuals in sport.

Interpretative repertoires are recurrent, culturally familiar global discursive patterns that individuals use to make sense of themselves in conversations (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). Reflexive positions are offered as an alternative

discursive notion to the social psychological concept of role (Davies & Harré, 1990). A person is not considered as an individual free agent, but rather as the subject of the interaction, where the individual takes up or is placed in various subject positions depending upon the discourse and the particular social context in which the individual interacts. Thus we make sense of ourselves, or position ourselves, within social interactions through the cultural and personal resources (interpretative repertoires) that are made available to us in our discourse.

Overall, the results of the discursive analysis suggest that participants enacted something gender scholars would call Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny when prescribing themselves across the three identity categories. That is, participants used gendered, culturally familiar discursive patterns (interpretative repertoires) to make sense of themselves across identity categories. However, participants were also able to draw upon non gender-related discourses during this process. Thus, identity work was characterised by variability, inconsistency, and contradiction. Different interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions were used by participants both within and across identity categories.

Therefore, the use of gender-related interpretative repertoires differed according to the identity that was being scripted up. Thus participants were able to be Masculine, Androgynous, and Feminine, and position themselves differently depending upon the identity that was being prescribed and the local interaction context. That is, participants used interpretative repertoires to talk one way, but walk another (e.g., Androgynous interpretative repertoire, Hegemonic Masculine reflexive position) that was specific to the social, historical, and cultural context, and the local interactional context. The above results call into question Spence and Helmreich's (1978) postulation that there is one Masculine and one Feminine identity. Indeed the results are suggestive of many Masculinities and many Femininities.

Participants also deployed specific discursive strategies that incorporated the action and epistemological orientation of their talk when constituting their identities. That is, they worked to increase the facticity of their talk and worked to align themselves with certain positions (e.g., Hegemonic Masculine man) and not others (Feminine man) through their discourse. Thus gendered talk carried with it gendered

ideological practices that participants used to reproduce, reinforce, and challenge the current gender order.

The above results, combined with the disparity between the PAQ results and the a-priori content analysis, suggest that earlier and current models of gender that conceptualise gender as a multifaceted, multidimensional, bi-directional but static concept are probably not representative of how people do gender in everyday talk. The results support extant theory that gender identities might exist rather than a single gender identity. Overall, the results of this dissertation -suggest that elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of identity categories that is specific to the local interactional context, as well as the cultural, social (i.e., sport), and historical context. I infer, therefore, that current static gender models in sport and exercise psychology may not fully capture the complexity of gender in everyday talk and that alternative ways of understanding gender in sport are needed.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1	Setting the Scene	2
1.2	Overview of the Dissertation.....	3
1.3	Background to the Research.....	7
1.4	Definitions	10
1.4.1	Gender and Gender Identity	10
1.4.2	Elite Sport.....	11
1.4.3	Discourse and Language.....	12
1.5	The Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	12
1.6	Justification for the Research	14
1.7	Justification of the Methodology.....	18
1.8	Justification of the Discursive Psychological Framework	20
1.9	Contributions	22
1.10	Outline of the Dissertation	23
1.11	Delimitations of Scope	24
1.12	My Framework	25
1.13	Conclusion.....	26

1.1 Setting the Scene

At the 1998 World Swimming championships two Australian swimmers did not perform in accordance with their world rankings. Scott Goodman, ranked world number one in the 200m men's butterfly before the championships, was judged to have deliberately false started in the final of this event. Officials subsequently disqualified Goodman from competing in the final. Samantha Riley, ranked in the World top three for the 200m women's breaststroke before the championships, finished out of the top four in the final of this event.

Don Talbot, the Australian head swimming coach, made the following comments to the media concerning these athletes' unexpected performances and their subsequent reactions. Referring to Goodman who threw a pool side chair as he left the pool deck after his disqualification, Talbot commented: "he (Goodman) was shattered ... you've got to understand, six or seven years' preparation, No.1 in the world, gets DQ-ed (disqualified). Of course he doesn't feel good ... I bleed for him" ("Fun", 1998, p.151). Scott Volkens, Samantha Riley's coach, and Riley herself, suggested that Riley's unexpected performances were due to her suffering from severe tonsillitis before and during the swim meet. Talbot remarks concerning these explanations were as follows, "her (Riley's) performances (have been) ho-hum" (Magnay, 1998, p. 21), "She got about as sick as I am ... that it's I've got a headache, wrong time of the month or something. ... These kids are highly strung" ("Fun", p.151).

Through his comments Talbot attributes Samantha Riley's post race reactions to her sex and thus gender through his use of "wrong time of the month" and "highly strung" ("Fun", 1998, p.151). Conversely, Talbot attributes Goodman's reaction as the disappointment of having missed a chance at sporting glory, a chance that Goodman had trained for a number of years. This is evidenced by "you've got to understand" and "of course he doesn't feel good" ("Fun", p.151). Therefore, gendered attributions were offered for Samantha Riley's performance and her reactions whereas situational attributions were offered for Scott Goodman's reaction, different attributions for different genders. Therefore, the language that Talbot used to describe his reactions to

each athlete's performance and each athlete's subsequent behaviour can be read as conveying two contrasting images.

1.2 Overview of the Dissertation

I originally began this dissertation by exploring how elite sportswomen and sportsmen saw themselves as gendered individuals. This was done using traditional research methodologies. In this instance, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and a semi-structured interview were employed to examine how women and men perceived, and subscribed to, feminine and masculine ways of being. However, upon closer examination of the interview data, it became apparent that participants were using more complex and dynamic discourses to describe their gendered selves than originally expected. Therefore, alternative ways of understanding the data were sought.

The interview data were subsequently subjected to a discursive psychological analysis. Hence, how gender identity is enacted and negotiated in everyday talk was added to this dissertation's agenda. The discursive analysis concentrated upon the discursive resources and discursive strategies that women and men in elite sport employ when negotiating their gender identities. Further, the implications of taking up these identities in everyday talk were explored.

I essentially argued that competitive sport¹ is a unique socio-cultural context where gender, as a social category, may be enacted differently than in other contexts (Gill, 1999a). Thus, what it means to be a woman or a man, to be feminine or masculine, may be similar and different in sporting contexts than in non-sporting contexts. Historically, most research in sport that has focused on gender stereotyping, gender traits, and gender identity has employed researcher generated constructions of masculinity and femininity, or non-sporting constructions of masculinity and femininity (e.g., Andre & Holland, 1995; Csizma, Wittig, & Schurr, 1988; Harris & Griffin, 1997).

¹ Hereafter sport will be used to infer competitive sport.

By failing to define and construct gender from the participants' perspectives, researchers have imposed their own preconceived cultural expectations of gender upon participants (Doyle & Paludi, 1995). To generalise these gendered preconceptions to different groups is to do so without consideration of cultural diversity and possible differences (Doyle & Paludi). Therefore, findings and conclusions from previous sport gender studies that have used such methodological frameworks become tenuous as contemporary and future models upon which to base gender work.

Gender identity research that has utilised a discursive psychological theoretical and methodological framework has produced findings that question the empirical validity of current models of gender in sport and exercise psychology (see Wetherell & Edley, 1999). These discursive results suggest that gender is a multifaceted, multidimensional, multifactorial, negotiated, dynamic, and variable concept. Two research questions were therefore addressed in this dissertation: 1) How do participants perceive themselves in terms of gender-related characteristics?; and 2) How do elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of idiosyncratic, gender, and gender identity in sport categories?

As indicated above, three identity categories were explored in this dissertation, the idiosyncratic self (i.e. self as a unique person), the gendered self (i.e., self as a woman or man), and the gendered self in sport (i.e., self as a woman or man in elite sport). The decision to consider these three identity categories was in response to the Davies and Harré (1990) notion of positioning. Firstly, they consider a discursive interaction as the telling of a story that has within it multiple storylines that may be offered during an interaction. Davies and Harré postulate that the storylines that we offer people determine the discourses that are made available in interactions, discourses from which identities will be worked up. Accordingly, the offering of a gender storyline brings with it a particular understanding of how women and men are expected to be (Davies & Harré). The offering, therefore, implicitly invites the hearer to take up this shared understanding in order to maintain the storyline that has been set. In order for the storyline to continue, the individual positions self in relation to this offering. Henceforth, in this dissertation, research interest focused on how the offering of particular identity categories influenced the gender-related characteristics that

participants offered to describe themselves, and their gender identity enactment and negotiation process.

As mentioned previously, two self-report measures were utilised to address the original research focus, the 24-item PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and a semi-structured interview that contained questions relating to identity prescription. Thirty-eight elite level coaches (19 women, 19 men) and 37 elite level athletes (19 women, 18 men) voluntarily participated in this study. As a result of the expanding research agenda, the interview data were analysed using two divergent theoretical and analytical frameworks. These frameworks were the a-priori content analysis (i.e., the imposition of PAQ items on interview responses) and a discursive psychological analytical framework.

In order to address the first research question, the PAQ was utilised as a measure of gender-related characteristics. Sex differences which did not reach significance were reported on the PAQ Masculine (M), Feminine (F), and Masculine-Feminine (M-F) sub-scales. However, significant differences were found with reference to PAQ classification. Women were more likely to be classified as Androgynous and men as Masculine. There were no statistically significant occupational differences on either PAQ sub-scale responding or PAQ classification. Thus, the above PAQ results are contrary to the underlying foundations of the PAQ concerning women's and men's responses to the PAQ.

The a-priori content analysis also revealed a number of contradictory findings with reference to the underlying foundations of the PAQ scale. For example, women were more likely to utilise the PAQ M item Self-confident to describe themselves as gendered individuals than men. Whereas, men were more likely to use the PAQ F item Gentle in the same identity category. Further, Feminine classified people were more likely to use the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant when describing themselves as women or men in elite sport. Therefore, the PAQ and a priori results suggest that women and men in elite sport may perceive themselves differently in terms of gender-related characteristics than previous research had suggested (e.g., Spence & Buckner, 2000).

In order to determine how gender identity is enacted and negotiated in sport, the interview data were analysed using a discursive psychological approach. Discursive

psychology focuses upon how representations are constructed within, and constitutive of, the social practices that are found in language. In this respect, gender is conceptualised as being negotiated within the local interactive context where culture, history, and social contexts are reflected within discursive practices. Research interest, therefore, centred on the interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that participants used to prescribe themselves as idiosyncratic, gendered, and gendered individuals in sport.

Interpretative repertoires are recurrent, culturally familiar, global discursive patterns that individuals use to make sense of themselves in conversations (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). Reflexive positions are offered as an alternative discursive notion to the social psychological concept of role (Davies & Harré, 1990). A person is not considered as an individual free agent, but rather as the subject of the interaction, wherein the individual takes up, or is placed, in various subject positions depending upon the discourse and the particular social context of the interaction. Thus, we make sense of ourselves, or position ourselves, within social interactions through the cultural and personal resources (i.e., interpretative repertoires) that are made available to us in our discourse.

Overall, the results of this analysis suggest that participants enacted something gender scholars would call Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny when prescribing themselves across the three identity categories. That is, participants used gendered, culturally familiar, discursive patterns to make sense of themselves as individuals, as gendered individuals, and as gendered individuals in sport. However, they were also able to draw upon non gender-related discourses during this process. Further, the use of gender-related interpretative repertoires differed according to the identity that was being scripted up. Thus, the same participant was able to be Masculine, Androgynous, and Feminine, and position self differently depending upon the identity that was being prescribed and the local interaction context. Participants, therefore, used interpretative repertoires to talk one way, but walk another (e.g., Androgynous interpretative repertoire, Hegemonic Masculine reflexive position). Participants also deployed specific discursive strategies that incorporated the action and epistemological orientation of their talk when constituting their identities. That is, they worked to

increase the facticity of their talk and worked to align themselves with certain positions (e.g., Hegemonic Masculine man) but not others (e.g., Feminine man) through their discourse. When discourse is considered for its ideological functions, participants were able to dexterously deploy particular discursive practices that both supported and challenged the current gender order. These findings are consistent with previous feminist research (e.g., Oglesby, 1978) that sought to place women in sport as a legitimate and important site of hegemonic resistance.

The above results suggest that current static models of gender in sport are probably not representative of how sportswomen and sportsmen perceive themselves as women and men. Gender as a multifaceted, multidimensional, bi-directional, but static concept, might not best capture how sportswomen and sportsmen do gender in everyday talk. Indeed, the results propose that gender identities might exist rather than a single gender identity. Overall, the results suggest that elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of identity categories that are specific to the local interactional context, as well as the cultural (i.e., Australian), social (i.e., sport), and historical (i.e., 1990's) context. I infer, therefore, that current static gender models in sport and exercise psychology may not fully capture the complexity of the gender concept and that alternative ways of understanding gender in sport are needed.

1.3 Background to the Research

Sport is argued to be a powerful cultural site within which gender identity is constructed (Connell, 1987; Dufur, 1999; Hargreaves, 1994; Oglesby & Hill, 1993). It is a site that, in particular, constructs hegemonic masculinity as a highly prized and rewarded way of being for men. In this respect “sport is seen as the masculine embodied” (Oglesby & Hill, p.722.). Hegemonic masculinity is defined as the “configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or takes for granted) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (Connell, 1995, p. 77). The hegemonic masculine ideal is one where masculinity is seen as natural or as given. It is the heroic male epitomised in films such as *Crocodile Dundee* and *Mad Max*, and in

male sporting events such as the iron man series² (Donaldson, 1993). Thus, sport appears through its hegemonic masculine climate, to overtly value the masculine. Here, maleness is valued whereas the feminine and femaleness are overtly devalued (Hall, 1993).

Research that has examined gender and sport can broadly be characterised as focusing mainly upon difference research (Oglesby & Hill, 1993). Difference scholars have predominately considered gender in sport from a gender personality trait perspective (e.g., Andre & Holland, 1995; Colker & Widom, 1980; Helmreich & Spence, 1977). The basic premise of this approach is that participation in sport socialises women to be more instrumental. However, such socialisation is not seen to develop at the expense of women's expressive characteristics. Thus, female athletes are more likely to be classified as Androgynous³ than non-athletes. However, criticisms of reinforcement and reproduction of gender biases and stereotypes have been levelled at this research (Plaisted, 1995). For example, conceptually the theoretical construct of Androgyny may be interpreted as covertly valuing instrumental patterns of behaviour over expressive patterns, thus unintentionally reifying the very gender biases that it seeks to measure (Doyle & Paludi, 1995). This coupled with methodological criticisms concerning the predicative power of gender personality questionnaires (e.g., PAQ), questions these scales as global indicators of masculinity and femininity (Deaux, 1985).

The difference perspective further conceptualises gender as a stable, unitary, universal, and cognitively represented construct (Billig et al., 1988). An alternative to this is a conceptualisation of gender as having many culturally, historically, and socially dependent understandings and meanings, where we base our expectations and perceptions of women and men upon these understandings and meanings (Deaux,

² Here I have adapted Donaldson's (1993) description of hegemonic masculinity to Australian films and sporting events to be consistent with discursive psychology that views gender as culturally, socially, and historically situated.

³ Androgynous classified people display high levels of masculine and feminine characteristics (Bem, 1974).

1999). Gender in this sense is conceived as a dynamic, flexible, variable, and multidimensional concept that is “deeply contextualised, both by location and history” (Deaux, p.22). Indeed, numerous researchers such as Oglesby and Hill (1993), Hargreaves (1993), Birrell (1987), and Hall (1988; 1993) have argued against unidirectional and two factor notions of gender. They propose more constructionist views of gender and sport. However, scant sport and exercise psychology research (for an exception see Bredemeier et al, 1991) has actively explored gender from this perspective or considered how gender is conceptualised in sport, with the more favoured perspective being the two-factor model of gender (Plaisted, 1995). Moreover, as discussed in the previous section, most sport psychology gender researchers have imposed non-sporting or researcher generated conceptualisations of gender upon athletes and coaches. As will be discussed in Chapter Two, the above points disregard gender as being culturally, socially, and historically located.

Plaisted (1995), therefore, asserts that gender personality research conceptually limits the ability of sport and exercise psychology to enhance understandings of gender and gender relations in sport. As such she argues that alternative ways of understanding may be needed to extend our knowledge of gender in sport. Discursive psychology is offered in this dissertation as one such alternative way of understanding.

1.4 Definitions

1.4.1 Gender and Gender Identity

At this juncture it is pertinent to define the key research concepts that are to be used in this dissertation. Definitions and abbreviations of terms used throughout this dissertation are found in the glossary attached at the beginning of this dissertation. The reader is encouraged to use it as a reference sheet during reading.

Numerous definitions of gender exist that reflect differing underlying theoretical epistemologies (Marecek, 1995), and the complexity inherent in this construct (Trew, 1998). As will be outlined in other sections, this dissertation is constructed upon a view of gender in sport as a social category that is socially, historically, and culturally constructed (Deaux, 1998a; 1999). In this respect, gender encompasses the shared meanings that we hold about the prescribed culturally appropriate characteristics of maleness and femaleness, and the behaviours, attitudes, and feelings associated with these characteristics (Oglesby & Hill, 1993). Such a definition does not implicitly assume that sex is a biological entity and that gender is a socio-cultural entity. Rather it illustrates a context in which biological sex contributes to our gender orientation, just as our social and cultural notions contribute to our sex (Gill, 1995). Hence, there exists a complex interaction between biological and socio-cultural factors.

The above perspective views gender as in a constant state of flux, as a construct that is multiple, fragmented, and local (particular to the immediate interactional situational context). It contradicts the notion of gender having a single, universal, and fixed meaning with the same salience from culture to culture, context to context, social group to social group, and from one point in time to another (Marecek, 1995). This notion of gender allows sport to be treated as a unique social context that may produce views of gender that differ from other social contexts.

Gender shapes not only what we bring to a situation in terms of attitudes, beliefs, expectations, and values but also our experiences, behaviour, and perceptions within the situation (Cogan & Petrie, 1997; Murray, 1996; Unger, 1979). Gender, when conceived as a set of culturally, historically, and socially constructed relationships,

assumes that these relationships are produced and reproduced through people's actions and reactions (Deaux, 1984; Gerson & Peiss, 1985). Therefore, when confronted with a situation, people bring (and are met) with these constructed relationships and behave according to these relationships.

Moving to gender identity, gender identity is viewed in this dissertation as a "fundamental and existential sense of (our) maleness or femaleness, an acceptance of one's gender on a psychological level" (Spence, 1984, p.79). Therefore, it is our subscription to socio-cultural stereotypes or prescriptions related to being male or female. It is the psychological sense we have of being male or female (Deaux, 1998b; Oglesby & Hill, 1993). In this way gender identity can be seen to be interconnected with gender role orientation. Gender identity encompasses an individual's self definition as masculine or feminine (Deaux, 1998a). This Paludi (1998) asserts to be gender role orientation, which she argues is part of an individual's gender identity. Trew (1998) points out that this sense of ourselves as women and men, is paramount to how we see ourselves as individuals. As such, gender identity influences how we feel, think, and act. Thus, gender identity is a key element of our self-concept (Spence, 1984; Trew).

The above does not suggest that gender identity is a homogeneous representation that always drives our behaviour. On the contrary, Deaux (1998a) argues that we differ individually in the salience that we ascribe to our gender identity and our gender conceptualisation. Further, Spence (1984) asserts that the contribution that our gender identity makes to our behaviour, once our gender identity is well established, also differs between individuals.

1.4.2 Elite Sport

Elite sport, in this dissertation, is defined as international or national level athletic or coaching performances. It includes those sportswomen and sportsmen who are competing and coaching at the national level, thereby representing an Australian state or territory. Thus, they are the best within their state or territory and compete primarily against athletes and coaches from other Australian states and territories (e.g.,

Australian Netball National Titles). International level performance is representation for Australia. These athletes and coaches are, therefore, the best in Australia and compete against athletes and coaches from other countries (e.g., Netball World Championships). International level athletes will also be national level athletes.

1.4.3 Discourse and Language

There is some disagreement surrounding what should be considered as discourse and how this may differ from the term text. This disagreement reflects the different academic disciplines that consider discourse as a unit of analysis (Nunan, 1993). I have adopted the meaning given to discourse by Potter and Wetherell (1987), in which a discourse analysis approach is applied to the study of social psychological phenomena. In this instance, discourse is seen to encompass both formal and informal verbal communication and interactions (e.g., election speeches and discussions with friends over dinner), as well as formal and informal written text (e.g., email chat group messages and scholarly text respectively). As discourse conveys messages, discourse may also encompass sign language (Forman & McCormick, 1995). Thus, any communication event that conveys meaning is open to analysis using a discursive psychological approach.

The approach to language and the understanding of language that I have espoused differs from a more linguistic approach to language in a number of ways. Linguists see language in terms of an abstract system of rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, semantics, and syntax) that go together in certain ways (Wetherell & Maybin, 1996). The types of research questions posited in linguistic research may concern correct ways of speaking or ordered patterns that make speech recognisable. The discursive psychological approach posits language as not only an abstract system of rules but also as a practical activity. Language is seen as a social action in its own right, as an interactive activity, and as a process of communication (Wetherell & Maybin; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 1995).

1.5 The Research Questions and Hypotheses

The overall theme of this dissertation focused on how gender identity in elite sport in Australia is constructed through discourse. Two research questions were explored in this dissertation:

- 1) How do participants perceive themselves as idiosyncratic individuals, gendered individuals, and gendered individuals in elite sport in terms of gender-related characteristics? and
- 2) How do elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of idiosyncratic identity categories, gender identity categories, and gender identity in elite sport categories in everyday talk?

In order to address the above research questions, a mixture of inductive and hypothetico-deductive methods (i.e., semi-structured interviews & PAQ responses) and analytical approaches (i.e., discursive psychological & an a-priori content analysis) were employed in this dissertation.

In order to address Research Question One, the PAQ was utilised as a measure of how sportswomen and sportsmen perceive themselves in terms of gender-related characteristics. According to previous research (e.g., Belansky & Boggiano, 1994; Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981; Spence & Buckner, 2000; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; 1980), men score higher on the PAQ M and M-F sub-scales and women score higher on the PAQ F sub-scale. Further, women are more likely to be classified as Feminine on the basis of their PAQ sub-scale scores and men are more likely to be classified as Masculine. The decision to base the following hypotheses on non-sporting research was due to the lack of sporting studies that have compared women's and men's responses to the PAQ within the same study. Therefore, it was unclear how sportswomen and sportsmen will differ with respect to PAQ responding.

Four hypotheses were, therefore, associated with Research Question One:

- 1) Men will score higher on the PAQ M and M-F sub-scales than women;
- 2) Women will score higher on the PAQ F sub-scale than men;
- 3) Men will be more likely to be classified as Masculine than women; and
- 4) Women will be more likely to be classified as Feminine than men.

In order to address Research Question Two, how elite athletes and coaches talk about themselves across different identity categories was explored. Two divergent theoretical and analytical approaches were utilised to do this, an a-priori content analysis and a discursive psychological approach. Given the qualitative nature of this data, the hypotheses presented below were consistent with the conceptualisation of hypotheses within a qualitative research approach (see Bryman, 1988).

Three research hypotheses were associated with the a-priori content analysis:

- 1) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as idiosyncratic individuals? If so, are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?;
- 2) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as women or men? If so, are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?; and
- 3) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as women or men in the elite sporting context? If so are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?

Finally four research questions were affiliated with the discursive psychological analysis:

- 1) What are the reflexive positions that participants use to position themselves when interactively positioned as idiosyncratic, gendered, and gendered individuals in sport?;
- 2) What are the interpretative repertoires that participants use when doing this?;
- 3) Do participants draw upon gender related interpretative repertoires when positioning themselves, and if so what are they?; and
- 4) What are the discursive strategies that participants use to position themselves and how are these strategies used?

1.6 Justification for the Research

The approach taken by this research and the problem under investigation is justified on theoretical, methodological, and practical grounds. Theoretically, Gill

(1999a) proposes that sport is a unique socio-cultural context where gender as a social category, may be enacted differently than in other contexts. This proposition considers gender as a social category that is socially constructed (Deaux, 1998a; 1999; Gerson & Peiss, 1985). Further, it recognises gender as a multifaceted and interactive social construct and encourages the examination of the processes by which the construction of gender occurs.

As such, gender will vary according to the social, cultural, and historical context (Crawford & Unger, 2000; Deaux, 1998a; 1999; Gill, 1999). According to this position, social (e.g., sport), cultural (e.g., Australian), and historical (e.g., 1990's) contexts shape our reality and identity, which in turn influence our behaviour, attitudes, and feelings. Different contexts (e.g., university, American, 1970's) will in turn shape realities and identities differently, and influence behaviour, attitudes, and feelings differently. Therefore, gender as conceived in one context may not have the same meanings and influences in a different context.

In recent years psychology has been replete with cross-cultural research that has examined differences in gender-role beliefs and gender-related traits (Gibbons, Hamby, & Dennis, 1997). Gibbons et al. argue that such cross cultural examinations are fraught with methodological problems stemming from the meanings associated with gender and the meaningfulness of gender per se as used across different cultures. That is, conceptual equivalence and meaningfulness are culturally specific, and henceforth meanings and instruments developed in one culture may not be culturally appropriate in others. Researchers who have undertaken cross cultural research and who have not fully appreciated that research measures may be culturally sensitive, may have distorted findings by either masking differences or over emphasising differences. Research that has not considered the cultural meaning of gender, therefore, risks producing tenuous findings (Gibbons et al.).

My review of the sport and exercise psychology literature indicates there is scant research that has considered gender from this socially constructed perspective. Most sport psychology studies that have examined gender within the sporting context have tended to use researcher generated constructions of gender or non-sporting generated constructions in their research (e.g., Csizma et al., 1988; Harris & Griffin,

1997). That is, researchers themselves have defined and constructed the representations of gender in their measures for use by research participants, or have used definitions and constructions developed from specific groups of participants (e.g., North American, white, middle class, college students) and then used these with different groups (e.g., Australian, sport institute, athletes). Doyle and Paludi (1995) are critical of researchers who fail to define and construct gender from the participants' perspective. As previously argued, researchers who engage in this practice impose their own preconceived cultural expectations of gender upon participants. These standards are often associated with the dominant or majority culture. Researchers who generalise these preconceptions to other groups, do so without consideration of cultural diversity and possible differences. Therefore, previous sport gender studies that have used these methodologies are questionable as contemporary and future models upon which to base gender work.

Another concern is that gender in sport has traditionally been considered from a two-factor model perspective. This perspective represents femininity and masculinity as two independent dimensions where an individual can be both Feminine and Masculine to varying degrees. Such conceptualisation underlies the PAQ. However this model also considers gender as a relatively universal, concrete, pre-existing, and stable construct that resides, and is therefore initiated, within the individual. As such, it is somewhat inconsistent with more current social psychological conceptualisations of gender as discussed above. As such, sport gender research findings that are based on the two factor model may be conceptually limited in their ability to advance understandings of gender relations in the sporting context (Plaisted, 1995).

In summary, findings and conclusions based on previous sport gender studies that have used the above theoretical and methodological approaches are questionable as models upon which to base future research, and may not best reflect gender relations in Australian sport. How gender is constructed in sport, how it shapes sporting realities and sporting identities, and how it influences sporting behaviours, attitudes, and performances is thus unclear. By not understanding gender as a social relational process in sport, the ability of research outcomes to enrich the sporting lives of both women and men becomes limited.

Methodologically the use of discourse or language as a legitimate site of psychological inquiry is relatively new, emerging in the early to mid eighties (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Discourse as a research site has not been widely embraced by the sport and exercise psychology research community. Historically, sport and exercise psychology has tended to rely upon positivistic based models of theory, research, and practice (Dewar & Horn, 1992). These perspectives situate language as a reflective medium for inner mental processes and not as a research activity or site in its own right. When considered from these perspectives, how is language used, why is language used, and what does language do, does not appear to have been the focal point of research endeavours in sport and exercise psychology.

Discursive psychology however re-conceptualises the way language and gender identity are viewed within psychology. It allows for the possibility of multiple gendered selves or identities that speak with multiple voices, that perceive a world in multiple ways. The focus on gendered behaviour in interaction is on what we say and how we say it. As complexity is inextricably fused with context when gender is considered (Deaux, 1999), such a complex concept may require a complex methodological and theoretical approach. Discursive psychology is able to encompass this complexity and thus the theoretical premises of discursive psychology are consistent with current gender conceptualisations (Deaux).

Gender is of research interest in sport and exercise psychology because gender matters in sport. It is argued that gender matters because being a woman influences (Bryson, 1994), moderates, and directs sport and exercise behaviour, performance, and interactions (Gill, 1994b; Plaisted, 1995). Gender matters because “gender-related processes influence behaviour, thoughts, and feelings in individuals; they affect interactions among individuals; and they help determine the social structure” (Crawford & Unger, 2000, p. 22). Thus perceived differences between women and men are shaped by societal differences which are maintained through social relations (Crawford & Unger). For example, sportswomen in Australia are more likely to have fewer competitive opportunities, less access to monetary rewards, fewer sport and exercise choices, fewer career opportunities, and less access to sport and exercise facilities than men (Australian Sports Commission, 1998). A more comprehensive understanding of

the gendered sporting world may enable sport and exercise scholars to further challenge and refute gender practices that can be oppressive to both women and men.

1.7 Justification of the Methodology

As mentioned previously, a mixture of inductive and traditional scientific hypothetico-deductive approaches are employed in this dissertation. Conventional views of gender (e.g., Constantinople, 1973) regard gender as being bipolar and unidimensional. However more current perspectives consider gender as multifaceted (e.g., Spence, 1984). Thus this mixed methods approach seeks to explore the relationship between two divergent procedures for investigating our self-conception of our gender. As discussed in previous sections, gender research has been criticised for failing to define and construct gender from the participants' perspectives (Doyle & Paludi, 1995). Hence in this dissertation, consideration is given to how participants give meaning to themselves as women and men using self-descriptions, and how they give meaning to themselves in relation to researcher imposed constructions of gender using the PAQ.

The PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) has been used to determine participants' possession of instrumental and expressive personality traits. Further, it has been used to classify participants as Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated based on their PAQ responses. The most practical investigative approach taken in sport and exercise psychology is research that has examined psychological differences between men and women (Gill, 1999a; Oglesby & Hill, 1993; Plaisted, 1995). Within this, research on gender personality traits have predominated (Plaisted). Whilst the lack of validity concerning this approach has already been noted, the decision to use the PAQ is based on its prominence in the gender literature (Spence & Buckner, 2000) and its conceptualisation of gender as a dualistic construct (Spence, 1984). Whilst the scale itself is over 20 years old, its utility as a contemporary conception of gender identity has been substantiated by Spence and Buckner. Spence and Buckner found that men still scored significantly higher than women on the PAQ M sub-scale items Self-confident, Feels Superior, Never Gives Up, Competitive, and Decisive. Further, women still

scored significantly higher than men on all eight PAQ F sub-scale items. In addition, as a measure of an individual's self definition as masculine and feminine, it is a commonly used scale in sport and exercise psychology and has been used with Australian athletes (Jackson & Marsh, 1986).

Continuing with the PAQ approach, an a-priori content analysis of the semi-structured interview responses has also been conducted. This was to determine if participants in their talk define themselves with reference to gender-related characteristics or traits. Responses to the semi-structured interview questions were analysed by imposing the 24 items from the PAQ upon the data.

In order to determine how gender is negotiated and enacted in the everyday talk of athletes and coaches, a discursive psychological theoretical and methodological framework has been utilised with the semi-structured interview responses. In this instance eight randomly selected participant transcripts (2 female athletes, 2 female coaches, 2 male athletes, 2 male coaches) have been analysed. The decision to analyse only eight participants is outlined in Chapter Four. In order to measure the possibility of social desirability impacting on the interview data, the Marlowe- Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) has been utilised. Further, a comparison has been made using triangulation methodology (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) utilising the above participants' PAQ responses, the a-priori content analysis, and the discursive analysis.

1.8 Justification of the Discursive Psychological Framework

Discursive psychology attempts through the examination of discourse, to understand how interactions occur within the social sphere (Potter, 1996b; Potter, Edwards, & Wetherell, 1993; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus the main concern of discursive psychology is what people do with their talk. Analysis within a discursive psychology framework focuses on discourse as a social practice, and on the discursive resources and strategies that are used to construct those practices (Potter). Thus analysis is not confined to just the discourse or the words themselves. Rather it is the interpretation of discourse within a particular social context (Nunan, 1993).

Gender identity can, therefore, be conceptualised from a linguistically based, social psychological perspective (Davies & Harré, 1990). First and foremost, a discursive psychology perspective sees gender identity as being constituted through discourse. How we perceive ourselves as women and men is constituted through the use of particular discursive resources such as subject positions and interpretative repertoires. Here gender identity is not constructed on the basis of some inner mental process or representation such as gender schemata. Rather gender identity is conceptualised as being dynamically constituted through language. From this perspective, gender identity is viewed as being dynamic, multifaceted, multidimensional, bi-directional, multidetermined, and in a constant state of flux. These different identities are the result of the discursive demands of the local interactional context. A focus on discourse places language at the centre of the research process, where the language that we use to talk about ourselves as women and men becomes the research site in and of itself (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

There are two main premises that are used to justify why discourse as a site of research interest has been utilised in this dissertation. These are a de-emphasis on positivistic research methods and the search for emic psychological processes. The most common epistemological approach used in sport and exercise psychology is positivism (Dewar & Horn, 1992). Sport and exercise psychology gender researchers (e.g., Dewar & Horn; Oglesby & Hill, 1993) have been critical of research that uses traditional positivist research methodologies. They argue that such research subconsciously

endorses policies and practices of gender exclusion and segregation. To illustrate, male researchers conduct the majority of sport and exercise psychology research on white, middle class, male, college level athletes. These findings are often generalised across sporting contexts without consideration of possible gender, race, cultural, social, and ethnic diversity. Thus when difference is found, this difference is often equated with abnormality (Bredemeier et al., 1991; Gill, 1995; Krane, 1994).

Therefore, sport and exercise psychology research approaches that utilise this positivistic stance may not best capture the contextual, cultural, historical, and social understandings and meanings of gender. A positivistic stance assumes that there is one truth that is waiting to be discovered. In reference to gender, there is one gender identity that is awaiting discovery. Such a stance is epistemologically incompatible with more current conceptualisations of gender as a set of socially constructed practices (Deaux, 1998a; 1999).

Where language has been considered in psychology, emphasis has been upon language as a channel that communicates underlying psychological processes. That is, the identification of underlying intrapsychic processes and structures has been paramount, with language as a secondary outcome of this process. Focus upon how mental processes (representations) may transform perceptions and understandings of the world and how these may in turn influence behaviour is paramount to this argument.

Discursive psychology, therefore, focuses upon how representations are constructed within, and constitutive of, the social practices that are found in language. The discursive analyst considers discursive strategies and discursive resources rather than cognitive processes (Potter, 1996a). Discursive psychology, therefore, considers the epistemological (factual constructions properties of language) and action (language does things) orientation of language. It considers that gender is negotiated within the local interactive context, where culture, history, and social contexts are reflected within the discursive resources and strategies that are used within the local context. Thus discursive psychology is more consistent with current conceptualisations of gender and gender relations.

Further, the cognitive model of the self emphasises identity or personality (e.g., defining features and roles), the mind (e.g., cognitive processes), and reality (e.g., other

people, environment, situation, and context) (Potter et al., 1993). The focus in cognitivism is on the personality and mind and their interdependence, with reality being portrayed as a relatively simple and neutral arena or criterion against which behaviour is measured. In discursive psychology the notion of reality being simple and neutral is actively questioned, as is the notion of researcher superiority. Kuhn (1970) and Popper (1959) argue that it is impossible to make scientific inferences without these inferences being reflective of the scientist's values, interests, and perspectives. Thus researchers using a discursive psychology perspective believe that participants construct their own reality out of their own social practices, as they do with their personality and their mind.

1.9 Contributions

In this dissertation I essentially argue that the negotiation and enactment of one's personal and social identities in discourse is a multidetermined construction that is both context free and context sensitive. That is, we are able to use culturally familiar discourses (e.g., Masculine discourses) to negotiate context sensitive meanings (e.g., Atypical) that reflect the local interactional context. Identities are not only negotiated and enacted according to the local interactional context, but also with consideration of the ideological implications inherent in taking up certain identities. I propose that a focus on the discursive resources and strategies that are used in identity negotiation allows for a re-conceptualisation of gender that encompasses multidimensionality, bi-directionality, multi-determinism, and contextual variability (Deaux, 1999).

Understanding how someone does being a woman or man in everyday talk allows us to move beyond dualistic notions of gender that difference research finds difficult to do. Unger (1983) argues that a focus on differences reinforces the notion of women and men as opposite, where men are the norm and women the deviation. Further, difference research infers an essentialist model of gender (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1998). It locates gender as residing within the individual as a stable, unitary, universal, and cognitively represented construct (Billig et al., 1988). Whilst more contemporary difference research encompasses social context (Eagly, 1998), difference research finds it difficult to conceive how gender is situated and constructed in situ or

within social relations. Discursive psychology is able to conceive of gender in multiple ways with multiple meanings within the specific social interactions that sustain it. By focusing on how gender is borne out in our social interactions, discursive psychology attempts to produce a more appropriate account of gender.

Therefore the contribution that this research makes is threefold. Firstly, it will add to the existing but limited theoretical base concerning gender and gender identity within the sporting context. Specifically, this research will enhance our understanding of how gender identity is constructed within the elite sporting context. Current gender research and practice in sport and exercise psychology has tended to rely upon gender constructions that are not specific to the sporting context. Thus the knowledge gained in this dissertation will be used to develop a sport specific, gender sensitive framework for sport and exercise psychology research and practice. Further, this knowledge will be used to develop research and practice that is specific to an Australia sporting context.

Secondly, knowledge of how gender norms and gender relations are enacted in everyday talk, and how women and men discursively conform to gender ideals will benefit sport and exercise psychology scholars by demonstrating how gender relations can be reproduced and reinforced in everyday talk. Understanding the discursive resources and strategies used by coaches and athletes to maintain gender relations allows researchers to develop specific strategies aimed at challenging and changing these relations. Finally, this research will offer an alternative mode of studying gender that is more consistent with current conceptualisations of gender (Deaux, 1999).

1.10 Outline of the Dissertation

The outline of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter Two is a critical review of the sport and exercise psychology research as it pertains to gender identity. The focus of this chapter is not a historical journey through the sport and exercise literature. Rather I focus on the key elements of this literature. Chapter Three is a brief overview of discursive psychology. Incorporated in this chapter is a critical review of the gender and discursive psychology literature that has focused on gender identity negotiation. Chapter Four is the method chapter, with Chapter Five and Chapter Six describing the

quantitative results from the PAQ and MC-SDS analysis and qualitative results from the a-priori content analysis respectively. Chapters Seven through to Ten contain the discursive psychology analysis. I have kept the presentation and grammatical style consistent and somewhat repetitive across these four discursive psychology chapters for ease of reading and to aid the reader in tracking identity negotiation across the three identity positionings. I conclude with Chapter Eleven, where a discussion of the findings and implications for the discipline are considered. The reader will note that the grammatical style and spelling presented in this dissertation is reflective of Australian standards.

1.11 Delimitations of Scope

Like any other research endeavour this dissertation cannot be all things to all people. There are several delimitations of this research. First and foremost, this is a study within the elite Australian sporting context. Thus the findings of this dissertation pertain to this context. What is said may not be generalisable to other contexts, however the discursive resources and strategies may transcend contextual boundaries. That is, how they are said may be etic properties.

The second is that the work in this dissertation does not go beyond what is said. The discursive psychology approach does not rely upon cognitive explanations of what is being said in order to understand what is occurring in interactions, thus going beyond the text is not the aim of discursive psychology. This is not to suggest that nothing is going on cognitively during everyday talk nor does it negate the importance of looking at cognition. Rather it does not place at the forefront of analysis the need to explicate all behaviour as having a cognitive association.

The third delimitation of this dissertation is that the interview is a specific kind of everyday talk. Interview talk brings with it its own contextual framework. As such, the questions I use in the research interview will impact upon participants' responses. Thus the questions posed in this dissertation need to be considered within the framework or positioning in which they were asked.

Related to the above point is that this dissertation will not reveal universal gender interpretative repertoires or laws. The search for etic laws may be a common goal of cognitive based social psychological theories of gender, however, it is not the goal of discursive psychology. Here, what is said is considered to be specific to the historical, social, cultural, and local context. In this respect, the approach that I have taken is consistent with discursive psychology. Therefore, I am concerned with the discourse of a particular group of people, of a particular socio-economic class, at a particular point in time. I am concerned with the subtle and complex nature of human discourse and discursive practices.

1.12 My Framework

As a researcher's frame of reference can impact significantly upon how a topic is approached, how data are analysed, and what inferences are made (Oglesby & Hill, 1993), it is paramount that the reader have an understanding of the frame of reference that was sought to bear upon this dissertation. The framework of this dissertation reflects my psychological training and thus discussion is limited to the psychology domain. Within this knowledge domain I take a social psychological perspective on gender and gender relations in sport. I believe that empirically, similarities between women and men are much greater than the differences. However I think that women and men are generally perceived as more different than similar. Thus I do not believe that all women and all men are the same, but that intragender differences are greater than intergender differences.

Further, I see women and men as being neither better nor worse than the other. I feel that women can act in ways that are just as oppressive, powerful, and inequitable as men. I believe that language matters, that what we do with language can have a profound effect on our everyday interactions. I also think that we are not always conscious of this effect.

I believe strongly that sport is a legitimate site of study for feminist research and psychology of women research. Sport can be as potentially empowering as it is potentially disempowering for some women. The same is true for men. I do not believe

that all men are automatically given dominant status in sport or in other contexts. I do not see women in sport who act in ways that society may consider masculine (e.g., aggressive) as merely mirroring masculine ways of being. Rather I see sport as a site that may legitimise certain ways of being for women. Finally, I enjoy sport as both a competitor and spectator. I take pleasure in the power, the aggression, and the dominance that is required to be competitive.

1.13 Conclusion

This chapter has laid the foundations for my dissertation. It has served as an introduction for the following ten chapters. It introduced the research problem and research issues. The research problem was delineated, definitions were presented, and the methodological approach utilised in my dissertation was justified. The various chapters were also briefly described and the limitations given. On these foundations I now proceed with a detailed critique of the gender in sport and exercise psychology literature.

CHAPTER TWO

GENDER AND SPORT: CRITICISMS AND CONCERNS

2.1	Introduction	28
2.2	A Historical Look at Women in Sport and Exercise	28
2.3	Gender in Sport and Exercise Psychology: A Brief Overview	30
2.4	Unifactorial and Two Factor Models of Gender	32
2.5	The Doing of Gender: Gender as a Social Category in Language	41
2.6	Where to Now? Gender Identity and Constructionist Approaches	43
2.7	Conclusion	48

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is twofold. First, it provides the reader who is unfamiliar with sport and exercise psychology, an understanding of how gender has been conceptualised within this context. I propose that sport is a unique socio-cultural context where gender, as a social category, is enacted differently than in other contexts (Gill, 1999a). This proposal is based on the argument presented in Chapter One, where gender, like other cultural or social categories, varies according to social context (e.g., Crawford & Unger, 2000; Deaux, 1998a; 1999; Gill).

This chapter is not an extensive overview or historical description of the sport and exercise psychology gender literature, as this is not necessary to the thesis of this dissertation. For this the reader is directed to reviews by Gill (1995), Plaisted (1995), and Oglesby and Hill (1993). Foremost, this chapter is a critical review and examination of the research approaches that have been adopted by sport and exercise psychology researchers in examining the psychological dimensions of gender in sport and exercise domains. In this respect, it does not encompass the sport sociology literature, as this is beyond the bounds of this dissertation. However I do acknowledge this body of literature as significantly informing some of the work that I have drawn upon in this dissertation. This chapter will begin with a brief background to gender research in sport and exercise psychology, followed by a critical examination of research pertaining to the areas most pertinent to this dissertation (i.e., gender personality, gender identity, and gendered language).

2.2 A Historical Look at Women in Sport and Exercise

Whilst history attests that both women and men in Western cultures have been active participants in sport and physical activity for a number of centuries, overall numbers of women actively participating in sport and physical activities have been small compared to the numbers of men (Spears, 1978). Historically, women were more likely to be passive consumers of sport and physical activities, or the watchers of sport

and exercise rather than the doers (Hargreaves, 1986; 1994). Further, women who wished to participate in physical activities and sport were often constrained and limited in their choice of activities because of societal beliefs about the physical and emotional capabilities of women. To illustrate, women in the Victorian era were perceived to be the weaker sex both physically and mentally due to their smaller physiques and supposed smaller brain sizes (McKay, 1991). Such beliefs were often used to justify women's exclusion from certain physical activities and sport (Hargreaves).

Women were not the only group excluded from participating in sport and physical activities. Some men were also excluded in their choice of recreative pursuits (Dufur, 1999). However the reason for their exclusion was because of socio-economic access rather than inherent personal traits and attributes. Hence, not all men had equal access to sport and physical activity as these were predominantly the domains of the middle to upper classes (Hargreaves, 1994). Further, athleticism equated with manliness, fair play, courage, loyalty, anglocentrism, obedience, discipline, and respect (McKay, 1991), and this did not actively encourage the development of alternative masculine pursuits and masculinities.

The emergence of large numbers of women in the sporting arena did not occur until the 1970's in the United States of America (USA) and early 1980's in Australia. Due to government legislation (e.g., Australian anti-discrimination laws, USA Title IX respectively) and related social changes, more women began to participate in a wider range of sports and physical activities (Gill, 1999a). However in Australia, women's participation levels in 1999 to 2000 in a variety of sporting arenas did not meet those of men, where 55% of sport participants were men compared with 45% who were women (Active Australia, 2000). In the USA where Title IX was introduced as a gain for women in sport, the participation of women in some sporting positions appears to have decreased. To illustrate, head coaches of women's teams pre Title IX (1972) were predominantly women (approximately 90%) whilst the post Title IX percentage stands at 16% (Gill). Women now compete in a variety of non-traditional sports at elite and non-elite levels (e.g., women competed for the first time in weightlifting at the Sydney 2000 Olympics), however the number of women involved in organised sport and

physical activity overall in Australia has increased only 2.1% in the past 5 years from 23% in 1993 (McLennan, 1995) to 25.1% in 1998¹ (Women's Sport Unit, 1999). Thus, Australian women in the new millennium still face inequity with respect to participatory numbers, access to physical and sporting pursuits, financial rewards from sport, and access to key decision making positions (Active Australia).

At this point it is perhaps pertinent to stop and reflect on why we should consider gender as a concept of interest in sport and exercise. Gender is important because it is argued that being a woman influences (Bryson, 1994), moderates, and directs particular sport and exercise behaviour, performance, and interactions (Gill, 1994b; Oglesby & Hill, 1993; Plaisted, 1995). Despite this importance, Hall (1993) posits that there is an absence of conceptual frameworks for understanding gender in sport, thus limiting the ability of sport researchers to comprehend gender as a multifaceted, multidimensional, and dynamic psychological construct.

2.3 Gender in Sport and Exercise Psychology: A Brief Overview

During the 1970's sport and exercise psychology began to emerge as a distinctive and legitimate scientific discipline (Anshel, 1997). It was also during this period that a greater number of books and journal articles in sport and exercise emerged, paralleling developments in the broader psychology of women research field (Gill, 1999b). Hence, many of the gender related criticisms that had been levelled at the psychology of gender research were applied to sport and exercise psychology. For example, the predominance of white, middle class, American college men as research participants in sport and exercise psychology research (Dewar & Horn, 1992) reflected a similar practice in the wider psychology domain (Anselmi & Law, 1998; Lerman, 1986), as did the generalisation of such findings to both men and women (Anselmi & Law; Dewar & Horn; Lerman). This research orientation belied the ideology that male

¹ These were the most current figures that I could locate at the time of writing.

research participants are generic humans and served to exclude women from the research process. Such generalisations assume that men are a homogeneous group and fail to consider that the general male population is heterogeneous (Coltrane, 1998).

Further, the sport and exercise gender area has been dominated by research that has examined differences (e.g., personality traits, competitive orientation, achievement motivation) between men and women (Gill, 1999a; Oglesby & Hill, 1993; Plaisted, 1995). Deaux's (1999) thematic review of gender research in psychology defines difference based gender research as that which focuses primarily on identifying psychological differences between men and women. Gender is used in this research as the organising principal central to understanding and explaining sport and exercise behaviour and/or performance differences. Any differences are theorised to be the result of biological, socialisation, and/or cultural differences (Unger & Crawford, 1998). Research that has explored gender practices in sport and exercise has tended to adopt this approach. Indeed, Plaisted suggests that gender researchers in sport and exercise psychology have not moved far beyond this difference approach.

Not all difference based gender research has considered gender as the central organising principal by which sport and exercise behaviour and/or performance differences can be understood and explained. Nor has all of this research sought to explain differences between women and men in terms of biology, socialisation, and/or culture. Some so called 'gender' studies (e.g., Kishton & Dixon, 1995) have treated gender as a subject or independent variable rather than as a stimulus variable (Shields, 1998). Gender has been used to divide the participant population into two groups or categories with no intent of understanding and explaining differences. Hence, the treatment of gender as a variable for analysis is a recent occurrence in sport and exercise psychology (e.g., Halbert, 1997; Harris & Griffin, 1997). The emergence of gender as a variable for study is not unique to sport and exercise research and is again reflective of psychology's historical treatment of gender (Lerman, 1986).

In conclusion, women have been excluded not only from the research but also the practice of sport and exercise psychology. An androcentric bias exists in sport and exercise psychology where developments in the field have been shaped by men who are

well-educated, white, privileged, and academic psychologists (Dewar & Horn, 1992). Therefore, the topics of research, choice of methods, definitions of variables, interpretation of data, and development of theory have evolved in a discipline where women have traditionally been given an exclusionary status. Therefore, whilst increasing as a research domain, gender has not been a prominent focus of sport and exercise psychology research.

2.4 Unifactorial and Two Factor Models of Gender

As mentioned previously, the most practical investigative approach to focus on gender identity in sport and exercise psychology thus far, is research that has examined psychological differences between men and women (Gill, 1999a; Plaisted, 1995). Within this research on gender and personality traits has predominated (Plaisted). Within the gender and personality trait perspective two models have prevailed, unifactorial and two factor models of gender.

Unifactorial models characterise gender on a bipolar continuum with masculinity at one end of the spectrum and femininity at the other (Spence & Buckner, 1995). Therefore our place upon the continuum is determined by our degree of femininity or masculinity. As a woman I would be expected to be somewhere near the Feminine end of the continuum, whereas a man would be expected to sit somewhere at the opposite or Masculine end. For those women and men in the middle of the continuum, it was assumed that such placement was reflective of some sort of underlying psychological or sexual dysfunction (Spence & Buckner).

Fundamental to the unifactorial model is the assumption that there is a single factor that underlies the difference between women and men. Indeed, early gender questionnaires were developed upon this presumption. As such, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) was developed along unifactorial lines (Spence & Buckner, 1995). Consistent with this gender personality perspective, psychology researchers in sport have tended to adopt a unifactorial perspective of gender as reflected in their use of the BSRI as the preferred measure of choice (e.g., Katz &

Hanegby, 1995; Koivula, 1999; Lantz & Schroeder, 1999; Martin & Martin, 1995; Wrisberg, 1988). Whilst Bem's conceptualisation of gender has been seen as a two factor model as observed in its two factor scale, Spence and Buckner argue that when considered closely it is not a two factor but instead unifactorial scale. They posit that Bem presents two inconsistent arguments when interpreting her scale as representative of two factors. First, Bem argues that Masculine and Feminine are not bipolar opposites but independent concepts and appears to interpret her scale as indicative of a two factor model of gender. However, she also presents an interpretation of those women and men who fall in the middle of the continuum and by doing so inadvertently presumes that Masculine and Feminine lie along a bipolar continuum. From this Bem seems to represent her scale as having one factor.

On this basis Spence (1984) suggests that the BSRI is not able to conceptualise gender as a multidimensional, multifactorial, and multifaceted concept given its single factor orientations. Spence argues that Bem's (1974) theoretical conceptualisation of gender presents a pseudo dualistic model of gender. Theoretically and empirically Bem relies upon a uni-dimensional model where there is one gender schema not two gender schemas. Thus unifactorial models of gender are unable to conceive of gender as a dynamic, multifaceted, and multidetermined concept. The development of alternative models of gender was the result of dissatisfaction with the unifactorial model of gender.

Spence and colleagues have offered an alternative perspective of gender using a two factor model of gender which they operationalise in the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). As one of the conceptual frameworks used in this dissertation, research based on Spence and colleagues work with the PAQ will be the focus of this remaining section.

The theoretical premise that guides the PAQ arose out of conceptual concerns with masculinity and femininity as a bipolar, unifactorial concept, and the absence of any stated theoretical basis for item selection on previous masculinity-femininity scales. Such criticisms left the validity of unifactorial models and associated scales open to

question (Spence, 1984)². At this point it should be reiterated that gender and the concepts of masculinity and femininity, as noted in Chapter One, are amongst the more ambiguous concepts in psychology. Debate still lingers (e.g., Deaux, 1998b; Gentile, 1998; Unger & Crawford, 1998) surrounding the meaning of these concepts.

The PAQ was developed as a measure of the psychological dimensions of masculinity and femininity. It encompasses socially desirable personality traits considered to define the core of masculinity and femininity (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The scale was not conceived as a global measure of masculinity or femininity per se, it was based on measures of communion or expressivity (concern for others) and instrumentality or agency (self-assertion) as core psychological dimensions that differentiate women and men. As an empirical measure of the core dimensions that differentiate women and men, Spence and Helmreich argue that the use of the more global terms masculinity and femininity is therefore legitimate. This aside, the PAQ Masculine (M) sub-scale is a measure of instrumentality (e.g., Self-confidence), the PAQ Feminine (F) sub-scale is a measure of expressivity (e.g., Gentle), and the PAQ Masculine-Feminine (M-F) sub-scale is a measure of sex-specific traits (e.g., Aggression - men).

The PAQ contains “clusters of socially desirable socioemotional trait descriptions reflecting what are typically labeled *personality* characteristics³” (Spence & Helmreich, 1979, p.1033). The basic premise of the PAQ is that these clusters are independent and essentially orthogonal dimensions, where one may be high on both dimensions (i.e., Androgynous⁴) (Helmreich et al., 1979). In this respect, it is a two factor model of gender. Thus, an individual is not Masculine or Feminine, as in

² For discussion of conceptual concerns regarding gender as a single factor the reader is directed to Spence (1984).

³ Emphasis as per original statement.

⁴ Here I note Helmreich et al. (1979) reluctance to use the word Androgyny.

unifactorial models, but can display both masculine and feminine (i.e., Androgynous) personality traits.

This does not preclude that individuals can be higher on one dimension than another (i.e., Masculine/Feminine) or low on both dimensions (i.e. Undifferentiated). Thus, instrumentality and expressivity coexist within an individual to varying degrees, where women and men predominantly display one or the other. According to Spence and Helmreich (1978), men typically display high levels of instrumentality and low levels of expressivity, conversely women typically display high levels of expressivity and low levels of instrumentality. Spence and Helmreich note that the inclusion of the PAQ M-F sub-scale, which acts as a single factor measure, precludes acceptance of instrumentality and expressivity as purely dualistic dimensions, hence their argument for a semi-dualistic conceptualisation of gender.

The instrumental and expressive trait dimensions that make up the PAQ are theoretically conceived to be “internally located response predispositions that combine with situational variables and other person variables to determine behavior but are not (by) themselves identical to behavior” (Helmreich et al., 1979, p.1632). Hence, whether an individual will exhibit instrumental and expressive behaviours is dependent upon the individual and the situation in which she/he finds herself/himself. Thus, instrumentality, expressivity, and gender, as conceived within the PAQ, are multidimensional. As psychological dimensions by themselves, instrumentality and expressivity are theorised to be weakly related to broader sex-related behaviours. It is the combination of these dimensions with other variables that result in its power as a behavioural predictor (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). In particular, Spence and Helmreich note the relationship between behaviour and the PAQ may be not strong in those settings that encourage conformity to sex-related socially acceptable behaviours, traits, and characteristics. This contextuality aside, Spence and Helmreich still argue for the stability of predispositions when considering a macroscopic perspective for differentiating between individuals.

With reference to sport and exercise domains it is not surprising that Helmreich and Spence (1977) were amongst the first researchers to consider gender and personality in this context. The aim of their sport related research was to theoretically

validate the antecedents and consequences of masculinity and femininity in populations where differences in women's and men's endorsement of traits may not be as predicted (e.g., female, intercollegiate level athletes).

In the Helmreich and Spence (1977) study, classification as Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated was made based on the median split method⁵. The largest number of female athletes was found in the category of Androgynous (39%), followed by Masculine (31%), Undifferentiated (20%), and Feminine (10%). For female non-athletes, the largest classification category was Feminine (39%), followed by Androgynous (29%), Undifferentiated (21%), and Masculine (11%). A similar pattern of results was reported by Del Ray and Sheppard (1981) with a similar population.

Regarding the above results, Helmreich and Spence (1977) assert that women who engage in contexts that are considered stereotypically masculine, display more instrumental traits than women who do not engage in these contexts. Furthermore, they do so without expense to their expressivity. It is however unclear from the reporting of this study whether a comparison was made between female and male responses. It appears that only intragender comparisons were made, thus limiting the theoretical validation of this research as differentiating between men and women. Further, it is unclear whether these differences between populations and within populations were statistically significant. Race, age, varsity level, sport played, and other basic demographic information were not reported in this study, thus restricting the generalisation of the results. Hence any conclusions based on this research are tenuous, and inferences regarding women and men in sport therefore become problematic.

Research by Colker and Widom (1980) also compared female, North American, intercollegiate level athletes to female non-athletes on PAQ responses. Here athletes were divided according to commitment level (hours per day training) and sport played (rowing, basketball, squash, & swimming). Again the central thesis of this research was

⁵ The median split method will be outlined in Chapter Four.

that the masculine context of sport would encourage female athletes to display instrumental traits, as well as expressive traits. In contrast to Helmreich and Spence (1977), Colker and Widom found that both athletes and non-athletes were just as likely to be classified as Masculine. That is, there was no statistical difference on the Masculine classification.

However, consistent with Helmreich and Spence (1977), Colker and Widom (1980) did report that athletes were significantly less likely to be classified as Feminine than non-athletes. The potentially different environmental contexts of the two universities, resulting in potentially different college and athletic experiences was proposed as a possible reason for the divergent findings regarding the Masculine classification. The Helmreich and Spence athletes were considered professional athletes (recruited for their athletic ability), whereas the Colker and Widom athletes varied in professionalism (recruited primarily for their academic ability).

The above proposition potentially supports Helmreich and Spence's (1977) and Spence and Buckner's (2000) suggestion that the psychological dimensions of gender are multifactorial and multidimensional. Differences in the professional level of the athletes may promote differences in masculinity rather than no difference. That is, perhaps the more professional the athlete, the more time they spend within the sport context, the more likely they are to be exposed to instrumental or masculine behaviours, and hence the more likely they would be classified as Masculine. It is unclear from the Colker and Widom (1980) study how the different environmental contexts may be related to self-ratings. Age, racial identity, socio-economic class, and ethnicity were not described, again limiting the generalisability of these results.

Desertrain and Weiss' (1988) research with North American, high school level female athletes also failed to replicate the findings of Helmreich and Spence (1977). They found no statistically significant difference between the classification of athletes and non-athletes into Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated categories. However, unclear sampling procedures and the lack of independence of observations, where some participants were excluded from analysis as their scores placed them in two categories, suggests caution when considering these findings.

A more recent study by Miller and Levy (1996) reported that female, North American, intercollegiate Division I athletes were significantly more instrumental than non-athletes on the PAQ M sub-scale score and were not significantly different from non-athletes on the PAQ F sub-scale score, although this was approaching significance. These results and the use of sub-scores rather than the median split classification method are consistent with Andre and Holland (1995) who reported similar results. The use of sub-scores, however, makes comparison difficult across studies. What is consistent across all the aforementioned studies is that they either do not compare female athlete scores and classifications with male athlete scores and classification, they compare but do not report statistical results, or they have looked only at female athlete responses.

Whilst there is a lack of empirical evidence to suggest that being a woman and being an athlete are incompatible (see Allison, 1991), Dufur (1999) argues that the potential for mixed messages in sport, (i.e., to be strong and aggressive and petite and attractive for women) may encourage female athletes to act in ways that are overtly socially acceptable for women (i.e. 'overfeminization' of appearance), in order to confer their status as women. Research on displays of overt femininity in sport (e.g., Blinde & Taub, 1992; Halbert, 1997) suggests that there is not only an appearance of heterosexual standards of femininity (e.g., excessive make-up and jewellery), but also a distancing of female athletes from masculine standards. Further, sports that overtly emphasize femininity such as gymnastics and figure skating, appear to actively encourage sex-related, socially acceptable behaviour through their judging systems (Dufur).

Thus, sport may become for some women, a potential site where instrumental traits are encouraged (Helmreich & Spence, 1977). But for others it may become a site where expressivity, femininity, and sex-related socially acceptable behaviours are overtly emphasised and rewarded, and masculine behaviours actively discouraged. The above may, therefore, detract from the potential utility and validity of the PAQ instrumental and expressive dimensions as potential behavioural indicators (e.g., achievement motivation, competitiveness) in sport. Hence, conclusions based on

research that has not considered the participants' sport, level of competition, or how sport may decrease masculine displays of behaviour and increase feminine displays, may be problematic. Thus, the adequacy of the PAQ as a measure of gender-related characteristics associated with sportswomen and sportsmen is unclear.

Whilst gender difference personality research may have identified some differences between athletes and non-athletes, this research has been criticised for treating gender as an objective property of the individual rather than as a principle of social organisation (Ely, 1995a). This research has also been condemned for treating gender as universal across all settings and all individuals, thus ignoring potential contextual and cultural diversity (Deaux, 1985). Spence and Buckner (2000) assert that what is considered masculine or instrumental and feminine or expressive can vary culturally, socially, contextually, developmentally, and historically. Thus, a scale developed with college students and validated primarily with college level populations may lack scientific validity when considered with diverse populations (e.g., athletes).

Whilst Spence and Helmreich (1978) do suggest contextual differences in PAQ responding, they maintain a trait perspective in terms of methodology and conceptualisation at the macro-level. By ignoring the influence of social context, gender and personality research thus ignores gender as a social construction (Hall, 1990). Hence, gender from this theoretical perspective cannot be conceived as dynamic and interchangeable (Wetherell, Stiven, & Potter, 1987). The treatment of gender as static and unvarying is in direct contrast to more current conceptualisations of gender as multifaceted, multidimensional, multidetermined, and as contextually and historically situated (Bem, 1993; Deaux, 1999). Thus, the de-contextualisation of the two factor model does not allow for gender to be considered as constructed within a situation or within the particular person-to-person context. That is, gender cannot be conceived as a socially constructed and interactionally negotiated construct that is variable not only across contexts but within contexts and within individuals.

One of the major criticisms of the gender personality research is that it stereotypes and oversimplifies masculine and feminine behaviour (Deaux, 1985). To illustrate, instrumental behaviour is often viewed as competitive and assertive whereas

expressive behaviour is often viewed as emotive and passive. This oversimplification may be problematic in sport as such delineation fails to capture the importance of expressive behaviours (e.g., in gymnastics) and supportive behaviours (e.g., in team cohesion) within the sporting context. Deaux has further argued that the PAQ is not an accurate or valid measure of behaviour, as it reveals only a weak relationship to general gender behaviour. Researchers have conceptually and methodologically criticised personality research for reinforcing misleading sex roles and perpetuating gender stereotypes (Gill, 1995; 1999a; Hall, 1990; Plaisted, 1995). This is done through the equation of the PAQ with gender role and global concepts of masculinity and femininity when conceptually these equations lack scientific merit. Further, as Spence (1984) herself acknowledges, the PAQ did not move gender understandings much further than the dichotomous continuum of stable individual predispositions that it sought to redress.

Additionally, Wetherell (1997) argues that when gender is conceptualised as a set of stable internal dispositions or traits, gender as an ideological practice is ignored. Conceptualising gender as a property of the individual makes it difficult to critically examine and refute gender difference as something that is produced to maintain the current gender order. Thus, PAQ research may inadvertently perpetuate the plus male, minus female phenomenon (Spender, 1980). Such research may reinforce male-female differences as natural, given, or universal, thereby making the analysis of the meaningfulness of such categorical difference problematic. Wetherell asserts that gender scales, such as the PAQ, reinforce a set of imaginary identities where there is one Feminine and one Masculine. She argues that such a focus impedes the analysis of gender as a human relation.

In conclusion, gender and personality research that is based on the two factor model of gender has tended to isolate the athlete from the social context. Consequently this has limited its contribution to understanding how sport and exercise behaviours are influenced by gender or how the sport context itself influences gender expression. Further, methodological and conceptual criticisms cast doubt on the scientific validity of the two factor model. Despite these criticisms, the PAQ and the model of gender

underlying it is one of the most frequently used research approaches in sport and exercise psychology. Thus, researchers have seldom moved beyond it in recent studies of gender in the sporting context (Plaisted, 1995).

2.5 The Doing of Gender: Gender as a Social Category in Language

A paradigm shift in the 1980's saw gender conceptualised as a significant social category (Sherif, 1982), a conceptualisation that has since gained wide acceptance in the psychology of gender field (Trew, 1998). Focusing upon gender as a social category enables gender to be re-conceptualised as a social practice rather than as a stable disposition. Further, it allows the researcher to hypothesise about gender as a dynamic, situationally specific, and thus variable construct. Social psychological theories of gender have embraced this framework and have moved to situate gender as an integral part of the self-concept.

There are four broad social psychological approaches that have focused on gender, and in particular gender identity, within this framework. Three of these approaches will be briefly mentioned, and the fourth, the language approach, will be discussed in greater detail. For a more detailed understanding of gender from each social psychological perspective the reader is directed to the referenced readings that follow each approach.

The first, a multifactorial approach (e.g., Spence, 1993), views gender as a self-label and is but one factor amongst many (e.g., gender self-perceptions, personality traits) that encompasses the gender construct. Research from this perspective focuses on exploring the relationship between these different gender related factors. Spence and Buckner (1995) note that essentially these factors are somewhat independent. Therefore, the factors that influence our sense of self as women or men are diverse and variable from person to person, and thereby making gender inferences across factors difficult.

Secondly, social cognition approaches consider gender as a self-categorisation schema (e.g., Sherif, 1982), or a "lens through which thought and behavior are framed"

(Crawford & Unger, 2000, p. 78). Thus, gender is a central social category that organises and manages our social and personal realities. Research from this perspective considers the gendered thoughts and behaviours of women and men. Further, this perspective allows for an exploration of how gender, power, and status are interrelated.

A social identity perspective views gender as a collective identity that is developed from group membership (e.g., Ely, 1994). The social groups (e.g., women) to which we belong form an integral part of our social identity and thus our self concept. We have many social identities and which identity is salient at any given time is partly dependent upon the social context (Vaughan & Hogg, 1995). Research from this perspective includes what are the group norms associated with the social category of women or how do women categorise themselves according to these norms.

Finally, social psychological language perspectives view gender as existing within talk. That is, gender is brought into being through everyday talk where the meaning that we give to ourselves as women or men is negotiated within the parameters of the interaction (Speer & Potter, 2000). This approach is consistent with discursive psychology, and as such, will be outlined in more detail in Chapter Three.

Returning to sport and exercise psychology research, as discussed earlier, there has not been much movement beyond the individual personality trait approach to gender (Plaisted, 1995). Whilst sport sociologists and some sport and exercise psychologists have considered gender role adoption and knowledge of sex-determined role standards from constructionist perspectives (e.g., Burroughs, Ashburn, & Seebohm, 1995; Griffin, 1992; Kolnes, 1995, Krane, 2001, Lenskyj, 1990; Pirinen, 1997; Halbert, 1997), little research has looked specifically at gender identity or gender role orientation. A search of the sport and exercise psychology literature focusing specifically upon social psychological language approaches reveals a focus on the use of gender-stereotyped language in the media. Here particular attention has been given to the influence of the media in producing and reproducing gender stereotypes. One particular study by Messner, Duncan, and Jensen (1993) analysed the televised verbal commentary of the 'final four' of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

basketball tournaments, and US Tennis Open men's, women's, and mixed doubles finals.

Messner et al. (1993) found distinct differences in the way commentators talked about female and male athletes. Firstly, female athletes were more likely to be referred to as girls or ladies whereas there were no instances where male athletes were referred to as boys. This they termed a 'hierarchy of naming'. Secondly, they found that female sports were often marked by their gender. That is, it was the women's final four compared to the final four for men, this was termed 'gender marking'. They noted that women were more likely to be referred to by their first name and men by their last. Messner et al. suggested that this might be a reflection of dominance, where dominants in society are more likely than subordinates, to be referred to by their last names. From this they concluded that media commentary constructs gender differently for women and men, where women are constructed as other, infantile, and with diminished accomplishments.

With the exception of the media, self-commentary and the construction of gender through discourse has not been an active site for research in the sport and exercise domain. In a literature review conducted for this dissertation I could not find any published study that addressed the construction of gender by focusing specifically upon athlete or coach self-descriptions. Whilst there is research that has considered how the media represents gender (e.g., Messner et al., 1993), there is little research that has considered how athletes and coaches represent themselves as women or men through their discourse. Hence, language as a site of research activity in its own right has not been a focus of sport and exercise psychology gender researchers.

2.6 Where to Now? Gender Identity and Constructionist Approaches

What is most apparent from the aforementioned discussion is that most gender sport studies have used researcher generated constructions of masculinity and femininity, or non-sporting generated constructions of masculinity and femininity, and imposed these upon participants. Researchers themselves have defined and constructed

masculinity and femininity for use by research participants or have used definitions and constructions developed from specific groups of participants (e.g., North American, white, middle class, college students) and then used these with different groups (e.g., Australian, sport institute, elite athletes).

As described in Chapter One, Doyle and Paludi (1995) are critical of researchers who fail to define and construct gender from the participants' perspectives. They argue that researchers who engage in this practice impose their own preconceived cultural standards of gender upon participants. These standards are often associated with the dominant or majority culture. Researchers who generalise these preconceptions to other groups do so without consideration of cultural diversity and possible differences. Further, the various conceptual and methodological concerns outlined previously detract from the scientific validity of such studies. By doing some or all of the above, researchers have potentially failed to question "the evidence for, the logic of, and the damaging consequence of theories" (Caplan & Caplan, 1994, p. 24). Therefore, findings and conclusions based on previous gender personality studies that have used these conceptualisations and methodologies are tenuous as frameworks upon which to base future gender research.

Given the aforementioned theoretical, methodological, and empirical concerns, it perhaps is surprising that little research has examined what it means to be female and male in sport or how gender identity manifests itself discursively in sport. As suggested in Chapter One, gender identity is defined as the existential sense and acceptance of our maleness or femaleness (Green, 1974). It is the internalisation of our sex and gender; it is the psychological sense we have of being male or female; it is our masculinity or femininity (Spence, 1984). Not all men and all women display all the characteristics and attributes associated with their sex. The gender-appropriate characteristics that we do possess are used to maintain our gender identity. We dismiss or ignore those gender appropriate characteristics that we do not possess, and ignore and dismiss those gender inappropriate characteristics that we do possess.

Spence (1984) states that our gender identity is one of the central components of who we are. Trew (1998) points out that this sense of ourselves as women and men is

paramount to how we see ourselves as individuals. It, therefore, forms the basis of our self-concept, self-esteem, and self-perception. Our gender identity influences how we think, how we feel, and how we behave. Thus we may behave, think, and feel in ways that society and our culture deem appropriate for women or men on the basis of societal and interpersonal gender influences. Should we behave in ways that are not socially or culturally acceptable for women or men, we risk social ostracism and psychological isolation (Crawford & Unger, 2000; Spence & Buckner, 1995). Whilst the influence of gender identity is considered to wane as we age, it is still central to our self-concept (Spence & Buckner). Further, our gender identity is not something that can be easily expressed or assessed via self-report measures (Spence & Buckner). It is more of an 'I'll know it when I see it' concept.

Rollins (1996) argues that it is the relationships with the reference groups (e.g., athlete, coach) to which we belong and our individual interactions, that influence our gender identity. From this view, gender identification is group and context dependent (presumably culturally and socially dependent given the group dependence). This parallels Sherif's (1982) position that it is the group norms concerning the range of appropriate behaviour for a particular group that influences individual member behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, and so forth. When conceived from this perspective, gender identity is possibly formed through group reference and individual interactions (e.g., everyday interactions).

Sport and exercise psychology gender researchers have not extensively studied the nature of gender identity, how it is constructed, and how it impacts upon sporting and exercise behaviour. Again there is some sport sociology and sport and exercise psychology research that has considered gender role adoption and knowledge of sex-determined role standards (e.g., Burroughs, Ashburn, & Seebohm, 1995; Griffin, 1992; Kolnes, 1995, Krane, 2001, Lenskyj, 1990; Pirinen, 1997; Halbert, 1997). However, there is little research has focused specifically on gender identity or gender role orientation. Oglesby and Hill (1993) assert that "inadvertently we have relegated these issues (gender identity) to the sphere of biogenetic influences" (p.388). Hence the relationship between gender identity, and sport and exercise is unclear. Vealey (1997)

asserts that our sexual identity and gender identity may impact upon our self-esteem, self-awareness, and self-perception. She argues that self-esteem, self-awareness, and self-perception are critical precursors to sport performance skills (e.g., optimal attention and optimal arousal). Furthermore, she posits that our sexual identity and gender identity can influence our sport choices and goals.

To illustrate the above points, Vealey (1997) cites research by Sheafer (1992) and Weisfeld (1986) who found young women (high school athletes and college level athletes, respectively) purposefully depressed their athletic performances to levels that were below their best. They did this to avoid appearing masculine and overtly competitive when competing against men or when being watched by men. Vealey speculates that issues surrounding our sexual identity and gender identity may act as powerful stressors that influence behaviour in sport (e.g., anxiety, burnout, attrition, avoidance of participation). Unfortunately there is little empirical research evidence to support Vealey's assertions.

The discussion so far should not be taken as an indication that sport and exercise researchers have not reflected upon the utility of more contemporary gender approaches in sport and exercise domains. For example, constructionist approaches such as a gender relations approach, where practices and identities as socially constructed, historically produced, and culturally defined (Bem, 1993), have been advocated in sport and exercise psychology and sport sociology (e.g., Gill, 1993;1994a; 1995; Hall, 1990; 1993; Hargreaves, 1986; Krane, 1994; Leahy, 1997). The gender relations approach recognises that gender will differ across cultures and needs to be defined from various cultural perspectives. Accordingly, present gender practices, identities, and relations will reflect historical gender relations, practices, and identities, hence the past actively influences the present. The gender relations approach also asserts that gender practices, relations, and identity reflect societal norms, beliefs, values, and knowledge about men and women. Here gender is a principle of social organisation and not an objective property of the individual.

Gender relation theorists recognise gender as a multifaceted, interactive, social construct, and they endeavour to examine the processes by which the social

construction of gender occurs. Further, they also argue that gender must be considered as a social category within specific contexts (Deaux & Lafance, 1998; Deaux & Major, 1987; Sherif, 1982). The gender relations approach assumes that gender relations are constructed, produced, and defined in order to serve and perpetuate the interests of the most powerful group in society (Hall, 1993; 1996).

The gender relations approach and its research merits have been profusely discussed and widely debated by sport and exercise, and sport sociology, gender researchers (e.g., Dewar & Horn, 1992; Gill, 1993; 1994b; 1995; Hall, 1990; 1993; 1996; Hargreaves, 1986; 1994; Krane, 1994; Leahy, 1997). However, few sport and exercise gender researchers who adhere to this approach have endeavoured to explore the construction of gender or gender identity within the sporting context (for exceptions see Anderson, 1999; Wheaton & Tomlinson, 1998). Cahn (1990), a sport historian, examined how gender was constructed in sport in the USA, from the early 1900's through to the 1950's. Cahn's insightful and provocative discourse analysis provides a rich and detailed historical account of gender construction in sport. However, the above exceptions aside, sport and exercise gender researchers have been slow to examine the construction of gender within the modern sporting age. Again gender role adoption and knowledge of sex-determined role standards research is beginning to increase in the sport and exercise domain (e.g., Burroughs, Ashburn, & Seebohm, 1995; Griffin, 1992; Kolnes, 1995, Krane, 2001, Lenskyj, 1990; Pirinen, 1997; Halbert, 1997). However, little sport and exercise psychology research that focuses specifically on gender identity or gender role orientation, has been undertaken.

Epstein (1988) argues that researchers risk producing biased interpretations should they ignore the social context in which psychological phenomena are produced. As a constructionist concept, gender is seen as a “dynamic construct that characterises social interaction” (Deaux & Lafance, 1998, p.817). Constructionist approaches allow for everyday interactions (e.g., conversations, discourse) to be considered as legitimate research sites. Rather than focusing on verbal communication differences, how gender is negotiated within these interactions and the reasons for these interactions becoming gendered are explored. Of interest is not the degree to which we align ourselves to our

gender per se, but rather how gender is done within interactions (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Thus, being male or female becomes an agreed upon position that occurs within the course of the interaction, where this agreed upon position may change as the interaction changes. In this manner, gender is conceived as fluid, variable, rich, and dynamic.

Although increasing calls have been made for a more theoretically informed constructionist analyses of gender within sport (e.g., Hall, 1993; 1996), few researchers have answered this call. Gender construction within the sporting context is relatively unknown. Sport and exercise psychology scholars who have tried to understand and predict human behaviour within sport have sometimes failed to acknowledge how gender constructions may impact upon affect, behaviour, cognitions, and performance. The use of researcher and non-sport gender constructions by sport psychology researchers serves to enforce selective cultural and social engendered perspectives upon participants. Such research becomes potentially invalid as the findings reflect the researcher's perspectives, not the participant's perspectives. These findings are also tenuous as they reflect non-sporting perspectives of gender. Hence, the lack of research on clarifying or delineating the gender in context relationship makes some gender research conclusions and recommendations limited.

2.7 Conclusion

Plaisted (1995) argues that the future of sport and exercise psychology gender research lies with treating gender as a context specific construct, where gender knowledge is contextualised rather than taken as universal. This chapter considered ways in which alternative ways of knowing may occur in sport and exercise psychology through considering alternative epistemological, theoretical, and methodological approaches that are more in keeping with current conceptualisations of gender. I argued that unifactorial and two factor models of gender are inadequate for considering gender as a multifaceted, multidetermined, and dynamic construct.

Deaux (1999) argues that there are many culturally, historically, and socially dependent understandings and meanings of gender. Such is the complexity inherent in the conceptualisation of gender. It is conceived as a multidimensional, and multidetermined concept. Gender is seen as “deeply contextualised, both by location and history” (Deaux, p.22). Such a complex concept may require a complex methodological approach. As complexity is inextricably fused with context when gender is considered (Deaux), a difference-based approach is limiting. One approach that may be suitable is discursive psychology as it embraces such contextuality and variability (Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Potter & Wetherell, 1995b). As a broad constructionist approach, discursive psychology would answer Plaisted’s call for a more constructionist perspective to gender in sport and exercise psychology. Thus I now turn to discursive psychology and with Chapter Three put forward an argument for considering gender through a discursive lens.

CHAPTER THREE
DISCURSIVE PSYCHOLOGY

3.1 Introduction 52

3.2 What is Discursive Psychology? 53

3.3 Meta-Theoretical Aspects..... 59

 3.3.1 Rhetorical Psychology..... 59

 3.3.2 Conversation Analysis..... 60

 3.3.3. Ethnomethodology 62

3.4 Interpretative Repertoires 64

3.5 Positioning: A Discursive Representation of the Self 68

3.6 Gender and Discourse..... 70

 3.6.1 Reconsidering Gender and Gender Identity in Talk..... 71

 3.6.2 Why Consider Gender as Discursively Constructed? 72

3.7 Discursive Psychology and Gender Research 74

3.8 Conclusion 79

3.1 Introduction

The first chapter in this dissertation opened with comments made by Don Talbot, Australian head swimming coach, concerning two elite swimmers who did not perform up to expectations at an international swim meet. The language that Talbot used to describe his reactions to each athlete's performance and each athlete's subsequent behaviour can be read as conveying two contrasting images. The reader is directed to Chapter One, page 2, for Talbot's comments.

The language that Talbot uses to describe Scott Goodman can be understood as normalising Goodman's behaviour. Talbot uses language that constructs Goodman's reactions as understandable, expected, and normal for a person who was faced with the disappointment of not being allowed to compete after years of hard training. Goodman's reaction of throwing a deck side chair after his disqualification is normalised or seen as natural, given these particular circumstances (e.g., "you've got to understand, six or seven years' preparation, No.1 in the world, gets DQ-ed (disqualified)" ("Fun", 1998, p.151).

In contrast, Talbot's language concerning Samantha Riley following her disappointing performance was quite different. Talbot's use of language can be read as trivialising Riley's performance explanations and reactions. Further, he describes Riley as a gendered individual, as a woman rather than as an athlete. That is, he interprets her behaviour through his use of typification (Davies & Harré, 1990). Talbot leads the listener to associate Riley's behaviour with the cultural stereotype of women through his reference to "wrong time of the month" and "these kids are highly strung" ("Fun", 1998, p.151). Thus, making Riley's behaviour typical of women.

This chapter will focus on how language is used by people to make sense of themselves, their worlds, and others. It will explore how a discursive psychological approach can be used to understand the gendered self within the sporting context. This chapter is not intended to be an exhaustive overview of discursive psychology as this is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Rather, this chapter is intended as a brief overview of the premises and discursive constructs that guide the theory and methodology adopted to understand the interview data in this dissertation. Particular

emphasis in this chapter has been given to understanding how the gendered self is represented in conversation regarding the sporting context, as this is the research focus of this dissertation.

3.2 What is Discursive Psychology?

Theoretically and methodologically discursive psychology is concerned with how people use language to make sense of their world. It rests upon three main principles, these being the notion that discourse, and hence the products of discourse (e.g., identities), are variable and constantly in motion (variation), that language has an action and epistemological orientation (function), and that discourse takes on a constructional role in everyday conversations (construction) (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The principal tenant of discursive psychology “is that function involves construction of versions, and is demonstrated by language variation” (Potter & Wetherell, p.33). Therefore, discursive psychology situates language as an activity in and of itself, a human practice that ‘constitutes’ the world.

‘Constitute’ encompasses how we use words, descriptions, and accounts to build or construct certain versions of our world. Objects, identities, and categories are not just described. They are brought into being, or formed, through words, descriptions, and accounts (Potter & Reicher, 1987). Thus, in constituting our world, we actively draw upon pre-existing linguistic resources (whilst at the same time ignoring others). We then use these pre-existing linguistic resources in the local interactional context to do particular things (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus, through our descriptions, words, and ‘accounts’ we actively constitute a particular version (or versions) of our social world that is particular to that interaction. The word ‘accounts’ in the above refers in particular to explanatory discourse rather than more general passages of talk. This is consistent with the usage posited by Potter and Wetherell.

Throughout this dissertation I will use the terms ‘context’ and in particular the ‘local interactional context’. The notion of context is central to discursive psychology (Nunan, 1993). It is thus imperative at this point to describe what is meant by these terms. Discourse does not occur in isolation; discourse occurs within a situation. In this

respect, discourse occurs within context. According to Nunan, there are two types of context and both are considered within this dissertation. The first is the 'linguistic context' and the second is the experiential or 'local interactional context'. 'Linguistic context' concerns the language that "surrounds or accompanies the piece of discourse under analysis" (Nunan, p.8). The 'local interactional context' is the 'real world' in which the discourse is situated. This includes the conversational sequence (e.g., greeting), topic of conversation, purpose of the conversation, physical setting in which the conversation is situated, the interlocutors and their relationship, and the social, historical, and cultural context (Nunan). This understanding of local interactional context is more consistent with the usage advocated by Speer (2000) and will be used in this dissertation. The above will be expanded upon in succeeding sections and chapters.

Discursive psychology is, at its simplest, the application of discourse analysis concepts to social psychological phenomena (Potter, 1998). It is viewed as an independent theoretical and methodological discursive research approach developed from six theoretical perspectives (Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Potter et al., 1993). As a methodology, discursive psychology differs from more conventional psychological understandings of what methodology should and ought to be. There are no standard or structured rules that the researcher must follow in discursive psychology. Hence, there are no exact or agreed upon steps that the researcher must take from data collection through to interpretation. Instead what discursive psychology provides is a broad theoretical framework from which to understand language's place in our social world. It offers suggestions about how discourse could be considered and suggestions about how findings could be made more convincing (Potter & Wetherell). Discursive psychology is an alternative approach to social psychological phenomena and it requires the researcher to re-conceptualise how social psychological constructs are conceived and how social psychological research is approached. In this sense 'difference' does not necessarily equate with being better, rather 'difference' equates with an alternative way of looking at the world.

The aim of discursive psychology is to understand social psychological phenomena through the detailed study of the operations of language (Billig, 1996). Discursive psychology attempts through the examination of social discourses, to better

understand the interactions and life that occurs within the social sphere (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). It looks at how we construct our worlds, thus the main concern of discursive psychology is what we do with our talk. Analysis within a discursive psychology framework focuses on discourse as a social practice, and on the discursive resources and strategies that are used to construct those practices (Potter, 1996b). Thus, analysis is not confined to just the discourse or the words themselves. Rather it is the interpretation of discourse within a particular context (Nunan, 1993). Analysis encompasses the interpretation of discourse in terms of its action orientation or how descriptions can be used to perform certain actions or used as part of certain actions. Further, it incorporates the epistemological orientation or how descriptions and accounts can be used to make what the interlocutor (person doing the speaking) is saying more factual (Potter). Epistemological orientation is based on the premise that descriptions, in and of themselves, may not necessarily be treated as literal or true. Rather interlocutors in some instances draw upon various discursive resources and strategies to construct what they are saying as factual. Potter suggests detailed descriptions can be deliberately “produced and worked up for (their) fact-constructive properties” (p.118).

Discursive psychology therefore encompasses methodological relativism. Methodological relativism does not start with the assumption that the aim of the researcher is to determine what is true or what is false (Collins, 1981). Rather it assumes that the aim of the researcher is to examine how the participant makes what she/he says appear true. Thus, it is not a case of uncovering what is right, what is wrong, or what is the truth. Instead, focus is on what are the discursive strategies by which the participant makes what she/he is saying appear right, wrong, or truthful. Methodological relativism stresses the facticity of discourse, where interlocutors work to make what they are saying more factual. Hence, through their use of various discursive resources and strategies, interlocutors work to increase the facticity of their accounts.

Historically, social psychology has tended to view language as a tool or medium of communication rather than as a legitimate research focal point of analysis in its own right (Wetherell & Potter, 1988). Language has been portrayed as a connecting channel

between two or more people where analytical emphasis is on intrapsychic mental states. In this view, language is seen as simple, un-intrusive, referential, and descriptive of cognitive processes that originate within the person (Wetherell & Potter). What is of interest to the researcher from this perspective is the cognitive processes which language supposedly transmits and not the process of language per se.

In contrast, discursive psychology proposes that language be viewed as an analytic site, in and of, itself (Marshall & Wetherell, 1989; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). Discursive psychologists believe that language is an essential feature of social life, where it is composed of social and psychological processes. Language as a social practice has its own characteristics and practical consequences. Language is the site where the construction and negotiation of mental states occurs. It is where identities are created and modified and social realities are produced and reproduced. In this respect, discursive psychology follows the view of social interactions espoused by Deaux and Major (1998a). That is, a social interaction is the process by which we negotiate our identities in the pursuit of goals that are specific to the particular interaction.

Marshall and Wetherell (1989) and Potter and Wetherell (1987) have argued that in any analysis of discourse the fundamentals of language practice need to be considered. The analytic focus is on the function served by language and how particular linguistic constructions can serve particular purposes. Here alternative descriptions and categorisations of discourse are actively considered and pursued. In regard to identity representation, discursive psychology focuses upon the linguistic construction of identity rather than the cognitive process of identity representation. Discursive psychology treats how we talk about our identities in social interactions not as passive reports of our beliefs, thoughts, or views about ourselves, but rather as a site where we struggle to negotiate our identities on these occasions with reference to culturally accepted narratives about appropriate and acceptable identities (Wetherell, in press).

Discursive psychology does not treat participants as informants nor does discursive psychology attempt to make inferences about the inner mental process that drive identity selection (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Rather, discursive psychologists with an interest in identity, focus on how identity is used in everyday talk, what it does, and how it is made more factual. Identity negotiation incorporates the Bakhtin (1986)

notion that we speak with the anticipation of how we will be heard and responded to by the listener. We speak with action and epistemological orientation consideration. Thus identity work, or how identity is constituted through discourse, is not a reflection of pre-conceived self-concepts but a construction that is context and content dependent.

Discursive psychologists presume, that an individual's identity is in a constant state of flux (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). People are not seen as stable, fixed, or consistent in their attitudes, behaviours, feelings, or thoughts. Rather cognition, affect, and behaviour are seen as highly variable, content and contextually dependent, inconsistent, and unstable. The discursive psychology stance does not believe that inference making is simple or that people always make clear and consistent responses. Instead the discursive social psychologist believes that inference is made difficult because of the very variability that is inherent within social interactions (Potter & Wetherell).

Variability in language accounts is conceived as natural because discursive psychology assumes that language can, and is, used for a multitude of purposes and goals. Different purposes and goals require different constructions in order for outcomes to be achieved. Furthermore, different contexts require different constructions. As a result of this, over time, discourse can be highly variable, inconsistent, and at times contradictory (Marshall & Wetherell, 1989). These constantly changing, evolving, and alternating constructions are particular to everyday discourse where change, variability, and inconsistency are inevitable features of social life. The notion of variability in traditional individual psychological research is as an unwanted construct and is viewed as error variance that is to be reduced, controlled, or eliminated. A coherent, consistent, one state of mind view of the individual is sought. Rather than control and limit these features the discursive psychology analyst sees error variance as the main analytical focal point, for variability reveals function.

From the above it may be deemed that discursive psychology is anti-cognitivist (Edwards, 1996; Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Such an assertion, whilst popular, may not be entirely accurate. As discussed previously, discursive psychology moves the analytical and explanatory focus from language and behaviour as a reflection of inner mental processes to an analytical and explanatory focus that considers how

these mental processes are constructed and used in language and interactions (Potter, 1996a; Potter, 1998). Thus, the difference between discursive psychology and cognitive psychology lies in the level of operationalisation. Discursive psychologists' do not consider cognitive questions and use an alternative methodology for answering those questions. Instead, discursive psychology asks different questions and uses a different theoretical and methodological framework for answering those questions (Potter & Wetherell, 1995a). Thus, the focus in discursive psychology is entirely upon discourse itself, the analytical and explanatory frame has moved.

The above does not suggest that mental processes do not exist or deny the importance of cognitive approaches in psychology (Potter, 1998). Instead, the focus is on how these mental processes (e.g., social categories) are 'done' in interactions. 'Doing' in discursive psychology incorporates how psychological phenomena (e.g., gender) are created and maintained in social and discursive practices (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus rather than being anti-cognitivist, cognitive psychology and discursive psychology have different analytical and explanatory focuses with discursive psychology being an alternative theoretical and methodological framework for the analysis of social psychological phenomena. Therefore, the focus of discursive psychology is on psychological phenomena in interactions, rather than the outcomes or reports of these phenomena.

Discursive psychologists, therefore, study the doing of psychological phenomena through text and talk. It considers the discursive resources that people draw upon to do this, and how these relate to broader issues in social psychology. Discursive psychology views descriptions not just as words randomly thrown together in particular situations, but rather as descriptions that are designed to be sensitive to the context and interaction, and to do specific actions. In reference to gender, it concerns how we do or how we create and maintain being female or male in interactions, and whether we orient to something that we would call Masculine, Feminine, or Androgynous, and identifying the resources and strategies that we draw upon to do this. Discursive psychology considers the implications that this type of analytical approach has on the wider discipline of psychology.

3.3 Meta-Theoretical Aspects

As mentioned previously, discursive psychology embodies different theoretical perspectives within its overall theoretical premise. As such, a discussion of the key concepts from each of these perspectives and how they have been incorporated by discursive psychology will enable the reader to better orientate herself/himself to the theoretical and methodological framework of discursive psychology. It is beyond this dissertation to examine all of the theoretical perspectives that inform discursive psychology. Thus, particular concepts from rhetorical psychology, conversational analysis, ethnomethodology, and social constructionism that form the core premises that guide the discursive psychological approach, will be reviewed briefly.

3.3.1 Rhetorical Psychology

One of the main contributors to discursive psychology has been rhetorical psychology, where a discussion of one gives rise to discussion of the other. Rhetorical psychology is a rhetorical approach to social psychology that developed around the same time as the discursive approach to social psychology. Both Potter (1998) and Billig (1996) propose that rhetorical psychology and discursive psychology have become so merged over the last decade that to see these two approaches as separate entities is difficult. Billig suggests that we commonly view rhetorical discourse as discourse that emphasises the argumentative or explicitly persuasive aspects of discourse. However the use of the word argumentation is potentially problematic in that it is often a word associated with quarrel or discourse that is conflictual. Billig, Potter and Wetherell (1987), Potter (1996b), and Edwards (1996) take a differing view of 'rhetoric' in that it encompasses not only discourse associated with conflictual situations, but also includes reasoned discourse, especially when it is produced in informal conversations. 'Rhetoric' from a discursive psychology perspective is concerned with justification, account making, and criticism, as well as negation, disagreement, and accusation.

Rhetoric from the discursive psychological stance is viewed as a “persuasive feature of the way people interact and arrive at understanding” (Potter, 1996b, p. 106). Thus, according to discursive psychology, all words have within them rhetorical affordances. The discursive psychology rhetorical perspective is one that considers how descriptions in interactions build up particular accounts as factual. These descriptions are also studied in respect to how they can counter alternative accounts that could be scripted up by the same description, and how these descriptions are themselves designed to resist being countered (Billig, 1996). This view moves beyond considering rhetoric as mere persuasion in that persuasion stops at fact construction. Persuasion does not consider the counters and the resistance to counters that are described above. Hence, in discursive psychology, analytic emphasis is given to these counters and resistance during fact construction with respect to their action and epistemological orientation or function.

3.3.2 Conversation Analysis

Whilst drawing heavily upon conversation analysis, discursive psychology has not always placed conversation analysis at the forefront of analysis and interpretation. Current discursive researchers such as Antaki (1998; 1999), Speer (2000), Speer and Potter (2000), and to a lesser degree Edwards (2000), have begun to incorporate more components of conversation analysis into their discursive psychological research. Conversation analysis is a linguistic based analysis of everyday conversations (Potter, 1998). The aspects of conversation analysis that are of most interest to discursive psychology are: the prominence that conversation analysis gives to context in understanding accounts and descriptions; the consideration of accounts and descriptions as part of conversational sequences (e.g., invitations, accusations, excuses); an emphasis on how accounts and descriptions are built within conversations; and how the above are done intentionally.

With respect to conversation sequences, the conversation analysis approach considers that all interactions occur within sequences. That is, conversations are part of greetings, requests, invitations, and so forth and these sequences are bound or

associated with likely responses from the listener. To illustrate, with reference to this dissertation process, a request (a question) from myself for a personal description is likely to lead to a personal response (an answer) from the participant. Hence, there are normative expectations that we carry within conversation sequences. For example, if we ask a question we expect an answer. However, interlocutors do not always act according to these expectations and expectation violations have conversational consequences in terms of hearer attributions, blame, and so on (Heritage, 1988). Thus, when considering the action and epistemological orientation of discourse, analysis includes consideration of “how the utterances relate to the *conversational sequences* to which they belong” (Potter, 1996b, p. 57)¹. Hence, function is considered within conversational sequences.

Conversational analysts’ also seek to understand accounts and descriptions in context where these accounts and descriptions are deployed for their ‘interactional business’. That is, they are designed to perform particular actions and can be deployed either explicitly or implicitly. When considering the function of discourse, discursive psychologists look to ground that function within the context in which the discourse occurs. Context in this sense is not just the social context. It incorporates the immediate conversational or person-to-person context where the sequential context influences how an account or description is designed. This is referred to as the local interactional context.

To illustrate, with reference to a question asked in this dissertation a female athlete replied ‘I enjoy, you know, getting, putting make up on and putting dresses on and, I really like the feminine type but I also like to be relaxed and to be able to not let that inhibit me in any way in the activities that I do, so I can sort of be a bit sort of tomboyish I guess’. A woman who ascribes to behaviour that may be considered socially unacceptable for women is at risk of psychological isolation and social ostracism (Crawford & Unger, 2000). To ascribe to being tomboyish can be perceived as a risky identity for a woman to construct. Thus, her use of feminine descriptions, on this occasion, may have been deployed to minimise the potential risk inherent in her

¹ Emphasis as per original.

tomboy description in this particular local interactional context. This notion of risk is a central component of identity work and will be drawn upon several times within this dissertation in the discursive analysis chapters. As such the theoretical foundations of this notion will be discussed in those chapters rather than here.

Conversation analysis also implies some form of intentionality or pre-planning on the part of the interlocutor. This is not to infer that all interactions are carefully and explicitly construed pieces of interaction produced for their deliberate rhetorical effect or with consideration of sequence and action. Potter (1996b) argues that as the concern of discursive psychology is the analysis of social practices, the management of such practices is not of central importance. However, Potter's own qualifier is that over our life span we become adept at using language and thus it is conceivable that we are able, without conscious planning, "to produce descriptions appropriate to particular actions" (Potter, p. 65). This ties with Bakhtin's (1986) proposition that we speak with the anticipation of how we will be heard and responded to by the listener. Thus, discursive psychology analysis incorporates the intentionality of the speaker. Whilst I have treated the above aspects of conversation analysis independently, they are intertwined or interrelated. The discursive psychologist tends to treat one with consideration of the other. In this respect, conversation analysis is sometimes understood as an in-depth application of ethnomethodological insights to conversational interactions (Potter).

3.3.3. Ethnomethodology

The two aspects of ethnomethodology that discursive psychology draws heavily upon, and that are also related to conversation analysis, are 'indexicality' and 'reflexivity'. 'Indexicality' is the understanding that the meaning we give to words (and utterances) is context specific (Potter, 1996b). Thus, without understanding the context in which a conversation or description occurs, we cannot understand the meaning inherent in the conversation or description. Context here again is taken to involve more than the physical setting of a conversation or description, it involves conversational sequences (as discussed previously) as well as the broader social context. In this way, the same words can take on different meanings depending upon the context in which they are uttered. Thus, it is the unique combination of context and words that gives a

conversation its meaning. For example, as conversationalists we gain a sense of meaning in our interactions from knowing who is talking, what is their status, what has been said before, what has gone previously, what is most likely to happen, and so on (Potter). Further, indexicality is occasioned in that we understand in terms of the here and now, hence we give meaning to the expression, on this occasion for this occasion. Thus, meaning is not only indexical, it also needs to be understood within the local interactional context, the on this occasion for this occasion. In order to best understand the function that discourse serves, discursive psychologists are sensitive to the indexical nature of the interaction.

'Reflexivity' incorporates the action aspect of discourse in that descriptions and accounts are not just describing something; they are an integral part of the description. Here descriptions and accounts do not just describe what is occurring, they also ascribe. That is, descriptions do not stand-alone from the elements they describe; they also become a constitutive part of the description (Potter, 1996b). Wieder (1974) posits that talk is both multiformative and multiconsequential. Using Potter and Wetherell's (1987) example from Wieder's ethnomethodological study of a half way house for narcotic offenders, 'you know I won't snitch', is not merely a description of a behavioural code. Potter and Wetherell argue it also "formulates the nature of the action and the situation and has a number of practical consequences within that situation" (p.21 & 22). That is, the above phrase could be used to perform a variety of different functions (e.g., behaviour as a violation of the code, behaviour in compliance with the code). Thus, in order to understand what is happening within the social world of the interlocutor, the discourse psychologist examines the function that the discourse serves, which in turn is considered within the occasioned context in which the interaction occurs. Thus we cannot consider reflexivity without giving consideration to indexicality.

At this point, the reader may be contemplating whether discursive psychology is not a broad constructionist approach. Indeed, discursive psychology is most commonly situated within this epistemological framework. Social constructionism considers how language practices and discourses influence the social creation of psychological states (Gergen, 1994). Gergen asserts that it is through everyday conversations and in particular through accounts and descriptions, argumentation or rhetoric, that social

realities are created. Potter (1996b) argues, “reality enters into human practices by way of the categories and descriptions that are part of those practices” (p. 98). Accordingly, it is through language and categorisation that we construct our world. Discursive psychology stresses the “twin sense of construction” (Potter, 1998). Accounts, descriptions, arguments, and rhetorical debates are themselves constructed, where the very discourse that we use to construct our world is itself a construction. In this respect, construction will be somewhat determined by function, and function is often varied. Thus, construction will be inconsistent across and within discursive practices.

The constructionist approach considers constructions as culturally, historically, and contextually situated, and reliant upon particular social practices (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). As outlined above, variability is embraced by social constructionism. Gergen (1985) argues that ‘what counts for what’ is continually changing and evolving. Thus, interpretations and meaning varies depending upon the social interaction in which they are placed. Discursive psychology embraces such variability by focusing on what purposes or functions are served by variable meanings. Accordingly, there is no one true self but many selves that may be located in many discursive practices that are located historically, culturally, and within the local interactional context.

3.4 Interpretative Repertoires

The reader at this point may be asking what is identified as the unit of analysis when using discursive psychology methodology. From the previous discussion regarding the variability inherent in language and discourse, identification of a unit of analysis may appear as an impractical exercise. Wetherell and Potter (1988), Mulkay and Gilbert (1981), Potter and Mulkay (1982), and Potter and Wetherell (1995a) posit that ‘interpretative repertoires’ may be a useful unit of analysis for discursive psychology.

Interpretative repertoires are recurrent, culturally familiar, habitual arguments or stable global discursive patterns that individuals use to make sense of themselves, events, actions, cognitive processes, and other phenomena in conversations (Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Potter, 1988). They consist of recognisable themes, familiar tropes (a rhetorical figure of speech), metaphors, descriptions, and a discernible but limited

range of terms and grammar that individuals use to locally manage their accounts and descriptions in interactions (Wetherell, 1998). 'Local' refers to be the immediate context in which the interaction occurs. It is the person-to-person (or persons) interactional context. The individual selects these themes, tropes, and descriptions because they "best suit the function to which the discourse is put" (Wetherell et al., 1987, p. 61). They can be used to make evaluations, constitute identities, characterise actions, construct factual versions, or perform particular actions. They reflect the function, purpose, and consequence of an individual's language, as they are the resources or 'building blocks' of action and cognitive processes (Potter & Wetherell, 1995b). The use of the terms recurrent and recognisable may appear inconsistent with earlier arguments concerning discursive variability. However, McKinlay, Potter, and Wetherell (1993) argue for regularity within variation, where at the individual level regularity may be absent, but at the collective level it may be present in interpretative repertoires.

Edley and Wetherell (1999) posit that interpretative repertoires pervade both the individual and collective or cultural levels, and are readily available for the individual to draw upon. In reference to identities, interpretative repertoires capture the identity work in which participants engage when making sense of themselves as individuals (Edley & Wetherell). Individuals justify, explain, and account for the self in particular contexts through the use of interpretative repertoires and they are worked up in response to the situation. Individuals thus ascribe or reject, avow or disavow, and display or ignore descriptions that incorporate an interpretative repertoire as a way to constitute their identity (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Therefore, as individuals negotiate their identity, they draw upon these interpretative repertoires to constitute a sense of self. This does not suggest that identities born from interpretative repertoires are fixed, permanent, or reflective of a true inner self, as this would be inconsistent with the epistemological foundations of discursive psychology. Rather the use of a particular interpretative repertoire on a particular occasion reflects the "contingencies of their accounting situation" (Wetherell, in press, p.3). That is, the use of interpretative repertoires on this occasion is for this occasion, and as such identities are seen as fluid

and variable constructions where different interpretative repertoires can be drawn upon in different contexts.

Interpretative repertoires, therefore, allow for identities to be described and defined in ways that are appropriate to the local interactional context. Speer (2000) argues that we make use “in action, of both the indexical (Garfinkle, 1967) *and* ready-made (or ‘inference rich’ (Sacks, 1995)) elements of a category” (p.29)². Words come with culturally prescribed or ready-made meanings attached to them and it is how they are used within a particular interaction (indexicality) that gives rise to similarity and difference (Speer). In this dissertation, interpretative repertoires are defined as culturally familiar, habitual arguments or stable global discursive patterns. The argument is presented that interpretative repertoires can also contain the inference rich elements of identity categories and that it is these interpretative repertoires that are drawn upon in identity negotiation. That is, interpretative repertoires may hold the culturally familiar discourses that we use when we talk about ourselves as women and men. Sacks (1992) would consider these familiar discourses membership category devices. Through discourse, we arrange our world into categories and with this come the imposition of characteristics that are culturally acceptable for the particular category. These characteristics are referred to as membership category devices. Antaki and Widdicombe’s (1998) discussion of membership category devices incorporates a wide range of behaviours including discourse, whereas the interpretative repertoire is specifically a discursive resource. Thus, the interpretative repertoire is more in keeping with the discursive approach taken in this dissertation.

Connell (1987) asserts that being male encompasses a compliance with, or resistance to, a dominant notion of masculinity (hegemonic) that is culturally and historically situated. This does not suggest that this is the only masculinity that exists per se, rather that there are multiple notions of masculinity with this being the most dominant one within the particular cultural context. The same argument can be made for women, where women may explicitly comply with, or resist, traditional notions of

² Original emphasis and references as per Speer (2000) article.

femininity that are also culturally and historically situated. Thus, interpretative repertoires may encompass stereotypical elements of feminine and masculine respectively. This is not to suggest that interpretative repertoires are simply stereotypes of women and men, as this does not take into consideration the action and epistemological orientation of discourse. Rather they are discursive resources that can be drawn upon in identity constitution (Potter, 1996b).

One of the more significant pieces of research using the concept of the interpretative repertoire was a series of studies conducted by Gilbert and Mulkay (1984). The central aim of their work was to explore the interpretative discourses that biochemists used when talking formally (e.g., peer reviewed journals) and informally (e.g., one-on-one interviews with the researchers) about their scientific work and to determine what actions were being served by their discourse. Two distinctive repertoires were identified, the empiricist repertoire and the contingent repertoire. The empiricist repertoire was most often drawn upon in formal settings and was characterised by logical and coherent data developments, the absence of researcher subjectivity, and the conventional and impersonal rule bound activities associated with the research process. The contingent repertoire was found only in the informal settings (participants also drew upon the empiricist in this setting as well) and was characterised by research developments being the product of personal insight, social interactions, and researcher characteristics, thus refuting the notion of a clear linear, logical, and coherent research process.

Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) suggest that each repertoire was used for different means when participants were describing potential conflict in the scientific world. The empiricist repertoire was drawn upon when the participant was supporting his or her own 'correct' perspective. Thus, the participants constructed a stance that reflected the logical, objective, and coherent world of the scientific experiment. When talking about an opposing researcher or theorist, the participant drew upon the contingent repertoire to construct her/his nemesis as the result of flawed logic, subjective biases, obtuse personalities, and so forth. The point here is that, when accounting for her/his own perspective, a clinical, detached view of her/his world was presented. Yet when talking

about others who opposed her/his views, this was accounted for by presenting a world of flawed, politically motivated scientists who had abandoned the rigours of science.

Thus, it can be seen how interpretative repertoires can be drawn upon to justify, explain, and account for the self in particular contexts, and how discourse through the interpretative repertoire has both an action and epistemological orientation. As a unit of analysis the interpretative repertoire is but one focus of discursive psychology and should not be taken as the only unit of analysis that concerns discursive psychology. Potter and Wetherell (1987) propose that interpretative repertoires should be considered with other discursive resources. As a resource, in and of, itself interpretative repertoires may appear as a gross analytical concept that requires further refinement.

3.5 Positioning: A Discursive Representation of the Self

Wetherell (in press) suggests subject positions (Davies & Harré, 1990) are another potential unit of analysis for discursive psychology. Whilst the Davies and Harré view of subject positions has some parallels with post-structuralist approaches to subject positions (e.g., Mouffe, 1992), Davies and Harré place the idea of subject positions within a discursive psychological framework. Here they offer position as an alternative discursive notion to the social psychological concept of role. According to this perspective, a person is not considered as an individual free agent, but rather as the subject of the interaction, wherein the individual takes up, or is placed in, various subject positions depending upon the discourse and the particular social context of the interaction. 'Positioning' is "the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines" (Davies & Harré, p.48). Davies and Harré propose that positioning as a discursive process encompasses the dynamic and multifaceted aspects of identity negotiation within conversations.

Davies and Harré (1990) theorise that we make sense of ourselves, or position ourselves, within social interactions through the cultural and personal resources that are made available to us in our discourse. They term these resources conceptual repertoires. It is through the use of these conceptual repertoires that we locate or position ourselves

in interactions. Conceptual repertoires were considered by Wetherell (in press) as interpretative repertoires in her discursive analysis of 16 British high school women and how these young women made sense of themselves in reference to their body image, eating, and dieting. Wetherell argues that interpretative repertoires can be used as resources to position and thus create identity possibilities for these women. The young women in this study appeared to use interpretative repertoires as discursive resources to constitute their identities on this occasion. Different women drew upon the same interpretative repertoire (e.g., individualism) as a resource to discursively position themselves differently within the same repertoire (i.e., being your own woman, resisting to social pressures, or the media). Thus in this study, the subject positions outlined above contained the same underlying premise of a self that is separate from society and societal forces. However differences emerged in the way in which this repertoire was used to constitute the participants' identities on this occasion. That is, the same interpretative repertoire was used by different participants to negotiate their identity, (e.g., being your own woman versus the media).

Subject positions, therefore, encompass the notion of conceptual repertoires and a location of ourselves within these repertoires, where these repertoires are seen as discursive resources by which we position or constitute ourselves. Davies and Harré (1990) assert that

“Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images metaphors, story lines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned” (p.46).

Thus, who we are as people and our view of the world is constantly changing depending upon the positions made available in our and others' discourse. Here conversations are assumed to take on aspects of narrative where the topic of conversation is often discussed as a form of story telling, implicitly or explicitly. It is during the telling of our stories about ourselves that positioning becomes evident through the types of metaphors, images, concepts, and tropes that are used within this narrative.

The process of making sense of ourselves from the positioning perspective involves an understanding that people are members of different categories (e.g., male/female, student/teacher) and that we engage in giving meaning to people within these categories through the way in which we talk about these categories. It is through this meaning making that subject positions are elaborated. We then position others and ourselves in relation to these categories, where we recognise that we and others have characteristics that allow or do not allow us membership to these categories. It is in this way that we become the subject of our discourse (Davies & Harré, 1990).

We not only position others and ourselves however. Others also position us as they position themselves in everyday conversations. Henceforth there can be two types of positioning taking place within the same conversation. One is 'interactive positioning' where what we say to and about others, either implicitly or explicitly, positions them in the conversation. Conversely 'reflexive positioning' is when what we say about ourselves, either implicitly or explicitly, positions ourselves in conversation (Davies & Harré, 1990). Hence, it is through our discourse that we invite others to take up certain story lines, and thereby interactively position other people. The response of others to these story lines is the reflexive position that they take up in the conversation. Davies and Harré postulate that it is not inevitable that each interlocutor will take up the projected story lines or positions that one gives the other. It is possible to resist or comply with positioning in a multitude of ways for a multitude of different reasons.

Therefore, within our conversations, we invite others to take up offered story lines. It is through these story lines that we give meaning to ourselves as people. Hence, the notion of subject positions and positioning allows for a way of identity making that incorporates the variability found when people talk about who they see themselves to be. It allows for identity negotiation in talk to be tracked and analysed as evolving. Subject positions and positioning captures the finer identity work that is being undertaken within interpretative repertoires, where interpretative repertoires are seen as discursive resources that are deployed for their constitutive properties.

3.6 Gender and Discourse

3.6.1 Reconsidering Gender and Gender Identity in Talk

To recapitulate, Deaux (1999) argues that there are many culturally, historically, and socially dependent understandings and meanings of gender. Such is the complexity inherent in the conceptualisation of gender that it is conceptualised as a multidimensional, bi-directional, and multidetermined concept. Further, gender is seen as “deeply contextualised, by both location and history” (Deaux, p.22). Such a complex concept may require a complex methodological approach, as complexity is inextricably fused with context when gender is considered (Deaux). One approach that may be suitable for the study of gender is discursive psychology as it embraces such contextuality, multidimensionality, bi-directionality, multideterminism, and variability (Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Potter & Wetherell, 1995b).

The gendered self or gender identity has most often been intellectualised using social learning theory (e.g., Mischel, 1970), gender schemata (e.g., Bem, 1981), gender identity theory (e.g., Spence, 1993), cognitive developmental theory (e.g., Lewis & Brooks-Gunn, 1979), social identity theory, and social categorisation theory (e.g., Ely, 1994; 1995a; 1995b). All of these differing theories and models conceptualise the gendered self as being relatively fixed and stable, as residing within and therefore being initiated by the individual, as being the personal possession of the individual, and as pre-existing within the individual. Here the meaning we attach to ourselves as women or men appears fixed across time and context. Whilst each theory or model may understand the gendered self somewhat differently, all of the models and theories subscribe to the above conceptualisations. As argued in Chapter Two, stable and fixed conceptualisations of gender are inconsistent with current conceptualisations of gender as a culturally, historically, and socially dependent concept (Deaux, 1999). The above theories and models that ascribe to stable and fixed conceptualisations may be somewhat limited in their ability to enhance our understanding of gender and gendered behaviour (Plaisted, 1995).

By focusing on language as an inner mental process, social psychology and therefore by default social psychological theories of gender, lack elaborate models of language and discourse (Marshall & Wetherell, 1989). Potter and Wetherell (1987)

further assert that the theoretical and empirical adequacy of social psychology theories is limited by their failure to accommodate how psychological phenomena are managed in everyday interactions, as it is through language that our social relations are managed (Crawford & Unger, 2000; Denmark, Rabinowitz, & Sechzer, 2000).

The gendered self can be conceptualised from a linguistically based, social psychological perspective (Davies & Harré, 1990). First and foremost as previously discussed, a discursive psychology perspective sees the gendered self as being constituted through discourse. That is, the kind of women and men we perceive ourselves to be, and others perceive us to be, are constituted through the use of particular discursive resources, such as subject positions and interpretative repertoires. Here the gendered self is dynamically constituted through language. From this perspective the gendered self is viewed as being dynamic, multifaceted, multidimensional, bi-directional, multidetermined, and in a constant state of flux, where there is no one true gender self but multiple gendered selves. These different selves are the result of the discursive demands of the interaction or the local interactional context. This way of perceiving gender is in keeping with current conceptualisations of gender (e.g., Deaux, 1999). A focus on discourse places language at the centre of the research process, where the language that we use to talk about ourselves as women and men becomes the research site in and of itself (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

3.6.2 Why Consider Gender as Discursively Constructed?

Thompson (1984) argues that language and its meaning is often taken as common sense, as a reflection of the natural state of the world and thus taken for granted. Accordingly, some language constructions can become more powerful than others. When this occurs the more powerful ideologies filter into our language thus making language a potentially powerful site for the oppression and repression of alternative discourses (Marshall & Wetherell, 1989). Thus, the most powerful group (e.g., men in Western society, Crawford & Unger, 2000; Lips, 1993) have the ability to make their constructed versions of reality the accepted world view. Hence, their meanings and their interpretations of social phenomenon become reality. That is, these

meanings, interpretations, and versions become legitimately endorsed through discourse. This may make it difficult for members of the less powerful groups (e.g., women in Western societies, Crawford; Lips) to construct their own meanings, versions, and interpretations of the same social phenomenon.

Gender in talk is often constructed by people as two binary categories, male or female, that take their meaning through their opposition to each other (Davies, 1997). Davies and Harré (1990) and Davies suggest that this construction of binaries is often done unintentionally and unconsciously through various discursive resources (e.g., interpretative repertoires, subject positions). That is, gender is most often done through 'speaking-as-usual' (Davies & Harré) where these gender binaries are inherently part of individual's discursive structures. For example, when asked to talk about being a woman, a woman may respond 'I'm not masculine' thereby implicitly inferring that by default she is feminine. Further, these binaries are arranged discursively within a hierarchical relationship where men as the ascendant group discursively position, or are positioned, through language as being valued over women (Davies). As a result, men as members of the ascendant group may find it difficult to see how their membership and resultant discursive resources and strategies maintain the binary system (Davies, 1993). Thus according to this view, individuals come to see this discursive binary as the way their world is and should be (i.e., men and women rather than women and men). Davies further argues for the powerful pervasive influence that the binary system holds for individuals as they negotiate a sense of themselves as women and men and how they may unintentionally hold the gender binary model in place through their everyday conversations. For example, when the sex of a coach is unknown, coaches are spoken of as men rather than women. Whilst men may dominate the coaching profession, to talk of all coaches as being men may reinforce a binary world.

Gender as a discursively constructed entity suggests that women and men rely on each other for their existence. That is, for men to maintain their higher status (Crawford & Unger, 2000; Lips, 1993) they need women to be positioned in a subordinate position. Deconstruction, which in this sense is the critical analysis of metaphysical assumptions and internal contradictions that underlay the male-female binary, allows for this binary to be seen by individuals as multiple and varied, thus

potentially emancipating both men and women from a dualistic gendered world. Deconstruction has the potential to significantly change the way in which gender and gender identity is construed (Davies, 1997). More than this, deconstruction may elucidate the dependence of the valued group on the subordinate group for their existence (Davies). Deconstruction of the binary model may allow for the identification of discursive practices that maintain this binary system. Identification, Davies suggests, may dissipate the power that is constructed within male dominant identities, and thus deconstruction may allow a questioning of how the gender order is maintained. Identification, therefore, may allow for the world to be differently constituted through alternative discourses where deconstruction allows for gender to be constructed in numerous ways. Davies however does not suggest how this may actually occur psychologically or discursively.

In summary, gender is constructed through various language practices and how people see themselves as men or women is constituted and reconstituted through the language that they and others use in social interactions. As discussed previously, discursive psychology enables gender to be analytically considered as multifaceted, dynamic, contextual, indexical, achieved, negotiated, and asserted. Given that descriptions about events, actions, and people are interwoven in our everyday conversations, our sense of ourselves as men and women will be constituted through these descriptions.

Hence, discursive psychology is appropriate to investigate how women and men use the notion of gender in sport and exercise contexts. It allows researchers to ask what does using gendered notions in sport and exercise discourses do (e.g., challenge or reinforce oppressive hegemonic masculine practices), and how do we make what we are saying factual (e.g., how can I make what I say appear as if I am not sexist). Discursive psychology thus takes a different epistemological, theoretical, and methodological approach to gender practices in sport and exercise compared to gender personality and gender schema research that prevails in sport and exercise psychology.

3.7 Discursive Psychology and Gender Research

Kondo (1990, cited in Martin, 1998) asserts that the way in which we discuss female or male behaviour engenders that behaviour as feminine or masculine. There is an abundance of gender research focusing on women's and men's speech styles (e.g., Eble, 1999; Labov, 1990; Lakoff, 1975; McCloskey, 1996; Tannen, 1994; Wood, 1994), however it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to review this research. What is beginning to emerge from this research that is of interest to the discursive psychology researcher, is the suggestion that the discursive context is more likely to produce particular discursive practices than the gender or sex of the interlocutor *per se* (Cameron & Coates, 1989; Coates, 1989; Freed & Greenwood, 1996). This suggests that discourse may need to be considered as a function of a particular conversational context rather than purely as a function of an interlocutor's gender or sex³. This research is not suggesting that women and men do not display or are not encouraged to use differing language styles due to differing socialisation experiences, rather that women and men are capable of using differing styles depending upon the demands of the discursive situation.

Research exploring gender from a discursive psychology approach has increased over the past decade (e.g., Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Edley & Wetherell, 1999; Marshall & Wetherell, 1989; Speer, 2000; Wetherell & Edley, 1999; Wetherell et al., 1987). As discussed in the previous section, gender from a discursive psychological perspective considers how gender is done in talk, how we do our gender identity in discursive interactions, how we negotiate our gender identity in talk, and how this in turn influences others and ourselves. Discursive psychology researchers explore how gender as an identity is negotiated in everyday interactions, how gender identity may regulate our actions, accounts, and lives, and how this occurs in a variety of different contexts. Researchers may consider within a discursive field, how gender identity accounts are mobilised to do certain things in certain situations. In discursive

³ The reader is directed to Freed and Greenwood's (1996) study that explored gender differences when the discursive context was kept constant.

psychology the focus lies on not only what is said but also how it said and why it is said.

The discursive psychology approach to gender, therefore, assumes that gender is discursively instantiated, produced, reproduced, and maintained through discourses. Further, that the self as a gendered identity can be positioned in multiple ways depending on the context (Potter, 1996b). Here the gendered self is seen as having multiple presentations and being inconsistent across contexts and interactions (Potter). Further and perhaps most poignantly, that when considered as a discursive practice, research focus is on gender as a method of description rather than as a psychological attribute (Speer, 2000).

Gender through a discursive psychology lens also allows for the notion that gender can be rhetorically constructed and deployed by participants to actively manage certain 'interactional dilemmas'. Billig (1996) argues that everyday interactions are bound with conflicting or contrary culturally valued themes that the interlocutor may take up within interactions or may shape interactions. These themes may pull and push the interlocutor in divergent ways, with the interlocutor being aware of these contrary themes and how she/he will be heard by and responded to in interaction. Bakhtin (1986) asserts that we deliberately deploy forms of talk with the anticipation of how we will be heard and acted upon by the listener. Hence, we talk with the anticipation of being heard and we actively manage our talk with the anticipation of how our discourse will be responded to by the listener.

Gender, masculine, and feminine are words or concepts that are used extensively in gender psychology research. Speer (2000) argues that conceptual confusion surrounds these concepts, in particular the notion of masculinity. This confusion is evident from recent debates by Unger and Crawford (1998), Deaux (1998b), and Gentile (1998). Speer postulates that researchers sometimes use these concepts without explicating how these terms can be applied to data, especially everyday conversational interactions. As a result, scant gender research has focused on how we find gender in talk, how we identify it, how we do our gender in talk, and what androgyny, femininity, or masculinity looks like in talk.

Discursive psychology gender research has focused primarily upon how oppressive masculinities or hegemonic masculinities (Connell, 1987) are discursively instantiated, produced, reproduced, and maintained through talk (e.g., Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Edley & Wetherell, 1999; Speer, 2000; Wetherell & Edley, 1999). This has mainly been through male talk, although there are exceptions to this (see Speer & Potter, 2000). This exception aside, few researchers have attempted to examine how women and men within the same social context negotiate their identities as women or men in interactions. Thus, there is a noticeable absence of women's voices in discursive psychology research exploring how gender and gender identity is constructed, reconstructed, and negotiated. This is even more evident in sport and exercise settings where there is no research to date⁴ that has examined gender identity from a sport and exercise psychology perspective using discursive psychology theories and methods. Thus, discursive psychology gender research has rarely explored both femininity and masculinity or maleness and femaleness, from both a male and female perspective, and has rarely explored these in sport and exercise contexts. An absence of women's voices in psychology research, and in particular sport and exercise psychology, has been criticised for promoting androcentric views of psychological phenomena and women's place as deviations from the norm (Dewar & Horn, 1992; Krane, 1994).

There are some recent explorations of gender construction through discourse in the sport setting. Speer (2000) has explored how men discursively negotiate their gendered identities in relation to their leisure and sport activities. Speer followed in principle the Wetherell and Edley (1999) discursive psychological approach to masculinity. However compared to Wetherell and Edley, she incorporated a more technical conversation analysis approach to her data. Specifically she has limited her analysis to the text and does not go beyond the participants' orientations in exploring why men attended to hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987) in their talk. Speer used interview transcripts from two British men in their mid twenties who were asked what

⁴ I could not locate any sport psychology research using PsycINFO or SPORTdiscus literature databases.

factors of their identity they thought influenced their leisure. She focused specifically on their masculine identity and how this identity was negotiated in relation to the notion of hegemonic masculinity. Speer found that participants negotiated different definitions of masculinity and meanings of masculinity across different contexts, thus suggesting that gender identity has properties of indexicality. However she found that these men were also able to use elements of a ready-made masculine category (hegemonic masculinity) to negotiate their identity where the two men used similar words to describe a male or masculine identity. This led Speer to suggest that the meaning of masculinity on this occasion was both context free and context sensitive.

Speer's (2000) paper comes from a larger project that focused on gender inequality in sport and leisure. This project has used both men and women across a wide age range (20 to 80 years of age) where pictures of men and women engaging in non-traditional sporting activities (e.g., men ballet dancers and women rugby players) were used as prompts to engage the participants in gender inequality discussions. Not all participants were active in organised sporting or exercise pursuits (e.g., members of organised sporting club) and those that were, were not participating at an elite level (e.g., national/international representation), they were club level athletes. Further, the participants were predominately British nationals. Whilst the aim of discursive psychology is not generalisation as this is epistemologically inconsistent with the foundations of discursive psychology, Potter and Wetherell (1987) argue for the possibility of discursive resources and strategies (e.g., interpretative repertoires and subject positions) being consistent across participants. As gender is conceived as a culturally, historically, and socially produced construct (Deaux, 1999), such consistency across participants is thus limited culturally, historically, and socially. Hence, it is possible that different discursive resources and strategies will be produced in different cultural, historical, and social settings such as Australia.

Further, Speer's (2000) use of an active interviewing style similar to that outlined by Holstein and Gubrium (1997) may have produced different story lines and thus gender positions than more passive interviewing styles. Active interviewing is a confrontational style of research interviewing which Speer used deliberately to garner a wider range of discursive resources and strategies in her research. Here gender positions

are actively challenged and disputed. Thus, this style would invoke different positions compared to a less confrontational style. Speer's research focus was not on gender identity per se rather on gender equity. The story lines that Speer invites the participants to take up within the research interactions would have implicitly positioned the participant in ways that being positioned explicitly as a woman or man would not have. Thus, her research captures implicit gender positioning rather than explicit positioning. Whilst gender language practices are both implicit and explicit, within the sporting domain Gill (1993; 1995; 1999a) has argued that gender is all pervading, thus making gender more explicit for women than men. Hence, implicit positioning may not fully capture gender identity negotiation as it occurs within the sporting domain.

Consequently there is little empirical research that has considered how gender identity is discursively conceived within the sport and exercise domain or how gender is discursively instantiated, produced, reproduced, and maintained through this discourse. Research that has considered gender identity (e.g., Speer, 2000) has not focused explicitly on how gender identity is done in interaction. Rather the research focus has been on other psychological concepts that are outcomes (e.g., gender inequity).

3.8 Conclusion

This dissertation is predicated on the position that if language matters as argued by Celia Kitzinger (1994), then sport and exercise scholars who maintain that sport and exercise is a site for the production and re-production of hegemonic masculinity and femininity (e.g., Birrell & Richter, 1987; Connell, 1987; Dufur, 1999; Hall, 1990; 1993; Hargreaves, 1986; Messner, 1988; Oglesby, 1984; Vealey, 1997; Wright, 1997) should be concerned with the language practices that produce and reproduce masculinity and femininity in sport. Language matters because it is a source of power that can produce and reproduce inequitable gender relations between women and men (Crawford & Unger, 2000). Language matters because our reality is constituted as we talk. It enters into our human practices (e.g., social interactions) by the way of categories and descriptions that are inherent in these practices (Potter, 1996b). Sport and exercise psychology research that does not consider how women and men in sport see

themselves as women and men in sport, risks being challenged for producing and reproducing the very oppressive hegemonic practices that it seeks to eliminate. One way in which women and men may see themselves as women and men in sport and exercise is through their language. Thus without consideration of language, current gender conclusions may be flawed and incomplete. This dissertation therefore explores how women and men in elite sport negotiate and enact membership of idiosyncratic categories, gender categories, and gender in sport categories in everyday talk.

CHAPTER FOUR
METHOD

4.1	Participants	82
4.2	Sampling.....	84
4.3	Response Rate	85
4.4	Apparatus.....	85
4.5	Measures.....	85
4.5.1	24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire	85
4.5.2	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	89
4.6	Design and Development of Interview Format and Guide.....	91
4.7	Data Coding and Analysis: NUD*IST 4, An Overview.....	95
4.7.1	Data Coding and Analysis: A-Priori Content Analysis.....	95
4.7.2	Unit of Analysis: Text Unit as a Line and Text Unit as a Response.....	96
4.7.3	Data Analysis: Discourse Analysis	97
4.8	Sampling for the Inductive Analysis.	99
4.9	Issues of Rigour.....	100
4.10	Procedure.....	103

4.1 Participants

Thirty-eight elite level coaches (19 women and 19 men, mean age = 37.29 years, SD = 7.29) and 37 elite level athletes (19 women and 18 men, mean age = 23.11, SD = 5.24) participated in this study (N = 75). Participation was voluntary with no incentives offered. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 contain a comprehensive description of participants' demographic characteristics.

Table 4.1.

Demographic Characteristics for Participants: Means and Standard Deviations

Characteristic	Coaches			Athletes		
	Men (<u>n</u> = 19)	Women (<u>n</u> = 19)	Total <u>N</u> = 38	Men (<u>n</u> = 18)	Women (<u>n</u> = 19)	Total <u>N</u> = 37
Age						
<u>M</u>	36.37	38.21	37.29	23.61	22.63	23.11
<u>SD</u>	6.30	8.23	7.29	6.25	4.19	5.24
Years as a coach or athlete						
<u>M</u>	12.63	13.79	13.21	11.94	9.84	10.86
<u>SD</u>	5.64	7.86	6.77	4.41	5.01	4.79
Years as an international						
<u>M</u>	3.37	2.74	3.05	3.83	3.89	3.86
<u>SD</u>	2.91	4.51	3.76	4.02	3.89	3.90
Years as a national						
<u>M</u>	4.21	7.63	5.92	6.39	6.47	6.43
<u>SD</u>	2.93	6.36	5.19	4.09	4.05	4.01

Note. Years as international/national reflects the number of years the participant has represented Australia and/or an Australian state respectively.

Table 4.2.

Demographic Characteristics for Participants: Frequencies

Characteristic	Coaches			Athletes		
	Men (<u>n</u> = 19)	Women (<u>n</u> = 19)	Percentage of Total	Men (<u>n</u> = 18)	Women (<u>n</u> = 19)	Percentage of Total
Education level						
Secondary	10	3	34	6	3	24
Tertiary	8	16	63	8	12	54
TAFE	1		3	4	4	22
Marital Status						
Single	4	9	33	12	15	74
Married	11	5	42	4	1	14
Divorced		1	3			
Separated	2	2	11	1		3
De Facto	2	2	11		2	6
Widowed					1	3
Nationality						
Australia	15	17	84	16	16	86
New Zealand	2	1	8	2	1	8
Other	2	1	8		2	6
NCAS						
0	3		8	13	15	76
1		3	8	5	4	24
2	6	9	39			
3	10	7	45			
Employment						
Full-time	18	13	82	4	6	27
Part-time		2	5	9	9	49
Other	1	4	13	5	4	24
Sport type						
Team	12	13	66	13	12	68
Individual & team	7	6	34	5	7	32

Note. NCAS¹.

¹ Level 0 = general principals of coaching and human performance, level 1 = sport specific coaching knowledge and skills–beginning level, level 2 = sport specific coaching knowledge and skills–intermediate level, level 3 = sport specific coaching knowledge and skills–national/international level.

4.2 Sampling

To be included in this study athletes had to have, at minimum, represented their state or territory at a National level competition run by a National Sporting Organisation in either 1997 or 1998. First selection preference was for athletes who had represented Australia in either 1997 or 1998. Coaches had to have, at minimum, coached at a National level competition run by a National Sporting Organisation in either 1997 or 1998. However due to the limited numbers of women elite level coaches in Australia, this criteria was expanded to include 1996. Both team (e.g., hockey) and team and/or individual sports (e.g., canoeing) were represented in this study. The sports represented have not been included in the reporting of the data in order to ensure the confidentiality of participants' responses.

To increase the number of women coaches in this study and to ensure that both athletes and coaches from the same sport were represented, a combination of sampling methods were employed. The majority of participants were recruited from four Australian State Institutes of Sport ($n = 69$). Thirty-four coaches from three Australian State Institutes of Sport were recruited using population sampling. That is, all the coaches from these institutes who met the selection criteria were invited to participate in this study.

Two coaches from two Australian State Institutes of Sport and one non-institute based coach were recruited using convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is where the researcher approaches the most conveniently available people to become participants, providing they meet the designated selection criteria. Convenience may be related to geographical accessibility, time availability, and so forth. The remaining coach was recruited using snowballing or network sampling, where a previous participant referred the researcher to the other suitable participant. Thirty-three athletes were randomly selected from one Australian State Institute of Sport. In the first instance the names of all athletes from each squad were obtained by the researcher. Those athletes who met the elite definition and age requirement as outlined previously in this dissertation, were then placed on a separate list. This resulted in eliminating the gymnastic squad from the selection process due to athletes not meeting the age

requirement. To ensure equal representation from each squad and equal sex representation, two athletes (one woman and one man) from each squad were then randomly selected using a random numbers table. If an athlete did not wish to participate, another athlete's name was randomly selected from the met requirements list. The remaining four non-institute based athletes were recruited using snowballing or network sampling.

4.3 Response Rate

Ninety athletes and coaches were initially invited to take part in this research project. Fifteen declined to participate leaving an overall response rate of 83%. Three did not have time to participate, five did not reply to the initial invitation, two were not interested in participating, two declined as English was their second language, and three were unable to find a mutually agreeable time to participate.

4.4 Apparatus

A Sony TCM 5000EV portable audiocassette recorder with a plug in microphone and 90-minute audiocassettes were used to record the semi-structured interviews.

4.5 Measures

Orientation to gender-related characteristics was measured using the 24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and social desirability responding (SDR) was measured using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

4.5.1 24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The 24-item PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) is a shortened version of the 55-item PAQ (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Both versions are designed to measure the degree to which an individual believes she/he possess instrumental and expressive traits. Spence and Helmreich did not intend the PAQ to be a global measure of masculinity and femininity, however some researchers believe that the sex-linked nature of instrumentality and expressivity make them global descriptions of masculinity and femininity (McCreary & Steinberg, 1992). Hence, the PAQ is most commonly referred to as a measure of 'gender role orientation' (Deaux, 1999). That is, it measures an individual's self definition as Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated.

The 24-item PAQ consists of three sub-scales, a masculine scale (PAQ M), a feminine scale (PAQ F), and a masculine-feminine scale (PAQ M-F). Each scale incorporates eight abstract trait dimensions that represent behaviours or personality attributes. The PAQ M sub-scale consists of traits and attributes that measure instrumentality or masculinity (e.g., Very Independent, Very Competitive, Stands up Well Under Pressure). The PAQ F sub-scale encompasses traits and attributes that measure expressivity or femininity (e.g., Very Emotional, Very Gentle, Very Helpful to Others). Both the PAQ M sub-scale and the PAQ F sub-scale include traits that are socially desirable in both men and women. However, men are seen to possess PAQ M sub-scale traits to a greater degree than women, and women are seen to possess PAQ F sub-scale traits to a greater degree than men (Spence, 1984; Spence & Buckner, 2000). The PAQ M-F sub-scale consists of personality trait and attribute pairs (e.g., Not at All Aggressive – Very Aggressive). One of the pair (e.g., Not at All Aggressive) is seen as more appropriate for women, and the other pair (e.g., Very Aggressive) is seen as more appropriate for men (see Appendix A.1 & A.2 for a copy of the 24 item PAQ and scoring instructions). Thus, the M-F sub-scale measures both instrumental and expressive traits and is considered a combined scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The traits associated with this sub-scale are socially desirable for one sex and not for the other (e.g., Aggression and Dominance for men, Need for Security and Feelings Easily Hurt for women). For a more detailed discussion on the development of the 55 and 24 item PAQ, the reader is referred to Spence & Helmreich (1978).

The participants task on the 24 item PAQ was to indicate where they fell on a five-point bipolar scale ranging from A (e.g., doesn't cry easily) to E (cries easily), where A = 0 and E = 4. Six items on the questionnaire were reversed scored, five from the PAQ M-F sub-scale and one from the PAQ M sub-scale. A separate score for each sub-scale was determined by adding all the item scores together, with scores for each scale ranging from 0 to 32. High scores on the M and the PAQ M-F sub-scale represented extreme instrumentality or masculinity, whilst high scores on the PAQ F sub-scale represented extreme expressivity or femininity.

Spence and Helmreich (1978) argue that an individual's score on the three PAQ sub-scales is not the only way to conceptualise an individual's possession of instrumentality and expressivity. Classification of an individual into one of four categories based on PAQ M sub-scale and PAQ F sub-scale scores also reflects an individual's possession of instrumentality or expressivity. Participants in this study were classified into one of four categories using the Spence and Helmreich median-split method. Here participant generated median scores² (PAQ M sub-scale median = 25, PAQ F sub-scale median = 23) were used to categorise participants into one of four categories: Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, and Undifferentiated. Using the Spence and Helmreich system, participants with PAQ M sub-scale scores greater than 25 and PAQ F sub-scale scores less than 23 were categorised as Masculine. Feminine participants had PAQ F sub-scale scores greater than 23 and PAQ M sub-scale scores less than 25, and Androgynous participants had PAQ M sub-scale scores greater than 25 and PAQ F sub-scale scores greater than 23. Finally, Undifferentiated participants had PAQ M sub-scale scores less than 25 and PAQ F sub-scale scores less than 23.

However, when using this system some participants were categorised into two categories not one, thus violating the assumption that the four categories are mutually exclusive (see Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Therefore, the following adjustment to the median-split method was undertaken to ensure categorisation into only one category. The Masculine category consisted of participants who scored greater than or equal to 25

² Median scores are across all participants.

on the PAQ M sub-scale and less than or equal to 23 on the PAQ F sub-scale. The Feminine category consisted of participants who scored greater than or equal to 23 on the PAQ F sub-scale and less than 25 on the PAQ M sub-scale. Androgynous participants scored greater than or equal to 25 on the PAQ M sub-scale and greater than 23 on the PAQ F sub-scale, whereas Undifferentiated participants scored less than 25 on the PAQ M sub-scale and greater than or equal to 23 on the PAQ F sub-scale.

Spence and Helmreich (1978) assert that either participant generated medians or norms from their own work can be used in the categorisation process. They suggest that the use of medians generated by a comparable sample or the sample itself is preferable, as this more clearly reveals gender orientation relationships within the given sample. This is particularly relevant when samples are small and/or derived from unique populations (Spence & Helmreich). Previous research has found that female athletes differ in their gender orientation when compared with female non-athletes (e.g., Colker & Widom, 1980; Desertrain & Weiss, 1988), and that there may be cultural differences when responding to the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich). Hence this study used participant generated medians to categorise participants into one of the four categories. By way of comparison, participants were also categorised using Spence and Helmreich's college norms.

The 24-item PAQ has been found to possess good internal reliability (Spence, 1993). For the PAQ M sub-scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficients have been reported with non-athlete populations ranging from 0.85 (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) to 0.53 (Shifren, Furnham, & Bauserman, 1998). For the PAQ F sub-scale, Cronbach Alpha's have ranged from 0.82 (Albion, 2000; Spence & Helmreich,) to 0.70 (O'Sullivan, 1995), and for the PAQ M-F sub-scale, from 0.78 (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) to 0.64 (Albion). Due to their computational absence in the sport literature, an extensive range of Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for athlete populations was unable to be located. Andre and Holland (1995) report a PAQ M sub-scale $\alpha = .77$ and a PAQ F sub-scale $\alpha = .80$, and PAQ data from Harmison (1998) elicited an $\alpha = .66$ for the PAQ M sub-scale and an $\alpha = .75$ for the PAQ F sub-scale. Due to the limited reporting of PAQ M-F sub-scale data (Lenny, 1991), no PAQ M-F sport related Cronbach Alpha's were located. In the

present study the Cronbach Alpha for the PAQ M sub-scale was $\alpha = .66$, for the PAQ F sub-scale $\alpha = .74$, and for the PAQ M-F sub-scale $\alpha = .62$.

Nunnally (1978) indicates 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient, thus within this dissertation the PAQ F sub-scale appears to possess acceptable reliability on this occasion. According to the above, the reliability of the PAQ M and M-F sub-scales is unsatisfactory. The PAQ M-F sub-scale alpha is perhaps not unexpected as it is a combined scale and low alphas are often indicative of multidimensionality (Nunnally). The PAQ M sub-scale alpha may also be indicative of a multidimensional structure, thus results and conclusions are considered within this parameter. Test-retest reliabilities for the 24-item PAQ could not be located, however test-retest reliabilities for the three sub-scales on the 55-item PAQ range from .65 to .91 (Spence et al., 1975).

Helmreich, Spence, and Wilhelm's (1981) psychometric evaluation of the 24-item PAQ reported a two-factor structure consistent with the PAQ M and F sub-scales with PAQ M-F items loading predominantly on the M or F sub-scales. As Spence and Helmreich (1978) assert, the PAQ is a measure of instrumentality and expressivity, relationships between the PAQ and non-instrumental and non-expressive gender traits, attributes, and behaviour therefore have been low or inconsistent (Spence, 1984). Convergent and discriminant validity have been established through significant positive correlations between the PAQ F sub-scale and empathy, and negative and lower correlations with the PAQ M sub-scale (Spence & Helmreich). Further, significant positive correlations between the PAQ M sub-scale and competitiveness, work, and mastery have been reported (Spence & Helmreich).

4.5.2 Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

The MC-SDS (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) is designed to measure the tendency of an individual to respond to questionnaire items in a way that makes the individual look good. Although the MC-SDS was originally designed to measure SDR, Crowne and Marlowe (1964) later believed that it measured a much wider construct, the need for approval, with Crowne (1979) extending this to avoidance of disapproval. The MC-

SDS has been used as a measure of all three constructs, however in this study it was used as a measure of SDR.

The MC-SDS consists of 33 true or false items that are either undesirable but common behaviours (e.g., I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way) or desirable but uncommon behaviours (e.g., I am always careful about my manner of dress). Participants were asked to respond to each item by circling the true or false response that was most representative of their behaviour. There are 18 true-keyed items and 15 false-keyed items. Scoring on the MC-SDS is dichotomous, with a matched response to a keyed item given a 1 (e.g., true response to a true keyed item), and a non-match given a 0 (e.g., false response to a true keyed item). Thus 1 indicates a socially desirable response. Scores on the scale range from 0 to 33, with high scores being indicative of a socially desirable response set (see Appendix A.3 & A.4 for a copy of the MC-SDS and scoring instructions). For a more detailed discussion on the development of the MC-SDS the reader is directed to Crowne & Marlowe (1960).

Internal reliability of the MC-SDS has been assessed using Cronbach Alpha coefficients and has been found to possess good reliability (Paulhus, 1991). Coefficients for non-athlete populations have been reported to range from $\alpha = .88$ (Orbach & Mikulincer, 1996), $\alpha = .82$ (Nordstrom, Huffaker, & Williams, 1998), to $\alpha = .75$ (Watson, Milliron, & Morris, 1995). Crowne and Marlowe (1960) report a K-R 20 coefficient of .88. The 33-item MC-SDS has not been widely used with athlete populations hence the researcher has been unable to locate Cronbach Alpha's for this population. Test-retest reliability over a one month period was reported to be acceptable at $r = .89$ (Crowne & Marlowe). The Cronbach Alpha for the current study was $\alpha = .77$.

Paulhus (1984) reports that the MC-SDS shows convergent validity as seen from factor analytic studies where significant correlations between MC-SDS scores and 'need for approval', and loading on 'impression management' were reported. Paulhus (1991) further asserts that the MC-SDS shows discriminant validity with low to moderate correlations with the Edwards Scale, which also measures SDR. Crowne and Marlowe (1960) examined the content validity of the MC-SDS and found this to be acceptable. They further performed item analyses on scores from a normal sample to ensure that the scale items discriminated between high and low total scores.

4.6 Design and Development of Interview Format and Guide

The same interview format and semi-structured in-depth interview guide was used across all interviews in this study (see Appendix A.5 for a copy of the interview guide). The interview format followed Patton (1980), and Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) guide for conducting research interviews. Patton recommends using an interview guide, giving careful consideration to the wording of questions so that they are open ended, neutral, singular and clear, and giving support and recognition to responses. Further Bogdan and Biklen recommend developing a trusting research relationship by getting to know each other, and by putting the participant at ease as part of the interview.

As such, a guide was used in each interview. The interview guide consisted of two sections, a background information section and an identity section. Each interview began with the background section that encompassed general information about the purpose of the study, followed by basic demographic and sporting background information questions. The identity section of the interview then followed, with the interview concluding with the completion of the 24-item PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and MC-SDS (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) questionnaires. The decision to administer the PAQ and MC-SDS after the interview was to reduce the possibility that these questionnaires would sensitise the participant to the underlying aim of this research and therefore influence her/his responses to the interview.

The identity section of the interview was designed to interactively position the participant through the asking of different self-description questions³. The participant was then asked to reflexively position self in response to these differing intentional interactive positions. These questions were therefore intentionally deployed to explore how participants reflexively position themselves in response to interactive positioning. In this dissertation, interest lay in exploring how interactive positioning influences the

³ The reader is directed to Chapter Three for a discussion of interactive and reflexive positioning.

reflexive positions that the participants script up with particular emphasis on discursive resources (e.g., Interpretative repertoires; interpretative repertoires) and discursive strategies (e.g., extreme case formulations).

The interactive positions were:

1. An idiosyncratic identity where the participant was positioned as an idiosyncratic individual. Question 1, if you were to describe yourself as a person to another person in general, how would you do this?
2. A gender identity where the participant was positioned as a man/woman. Question 2, if you were to describe yourself as a man/woman to another person, in general, how would you do this?
3. A sporting identity where the participant was positioned as an athlete/coach within the elite sporting context. Question 29, if you were to describe yourself as an elite athlete/coach to another person, how would you do this?
4. A gender identity in sport where the participant was positioned as a man/ woman within the elite sporting context. Question 6, in elite sport, if you were to describe yourself as a man/woman to another person, in elite sport, how would you do this?

5. A masculine and/or feminine identity where the participant was positioned as masculine and/or feminine. Question 16, if you were to describe yourself as a masculine, feminine or both in general to another person, how would you do this?
6. A masculine and/or feminine identity in sport where the participant was positioned as masculine and/or feminine within the elite sporting context. Question 21, if you were to describe yourself as a masculine, feminine or both in sport to another person, how would you do this?.

The interview guide was developed from the existing gender literature and reflected the original research questions under investigation. Questions 14 (importance of being a woman/man), 15 (how is being a woman/man important), 27 (importance of being masculine/feminine/both), and 28 (how is being masculine/feminine/both important) were adapted from Ely (1995a). Questions 1 (idiosyncratic identity), 2 (gender identity), 6 (gender in sport identity), and 29 (athlete/coach identity) were adapted from Marshall (1989) (the reader is referred to the interview guide in Appendix A.5 for more detail concerning these questions). The remaining questions were developed from the original research questions under investigation.

Four types of open-ended questions were asked in the identity section. These questions were loosely based upon Egan's (1998), and Hutchins and Cole's (1992) questions and probes for use in counselling type settings, and Spradley's (1979) ethnographic interviewing techniques. The majority of questions were open ended and sought self-descriptions or self-reflections (e.g., If you were to describe yourself as a man to another person in general, how would you do this?). Three different types of open-ended questions were then asked to elicit more self-reflection information, with question content being dependent upon the participant's response to the previous question. Thus intervention differed according to the responses that were elicited by the original positioning questions (idiosyncratic, gender, or gender in sport identity).

Some questions were designed to elicit information about participant feelings, emotions, and reactions toward particular identity issues, and how long these feelings lasted (e.g., How does that make you feel when they get more attention and they're portrayed differently? So how long would that feeling of annoyance last?). Other

questions were asked to elicit information concerning what the participant meant when he/she used various terms or phrases (e.g., When you said that, when you're looking at the guys that it's demoralising, what do you mean it's demoralising?). The remaining questions were designed to elicit information about how the participant acted or reacted in delicate identity situations (e.g., And how do you usually deal with these sorts of situations?).

The four types of questions outlined above helped identify issues and concepts in a detailed and in-depth way. In order to increase the rigour of the research process, the participants' agreement was sought on my understanding of the participants' comments through summarising and paraphrasing (Egan, 1998). This was to ensure that the information elicited was credible and trustworthy (e.g., Just to make sure I've got this clear, you see yourself as a women in elite sport, that whilst you're feminine you're still able to do what's required?). This allowed the participant to confirm, disconfirm, and/or add further clarifying information.

Patton's (1990) guide for conducting interviews recommends that the researcher give support and recognition to the participants' responses during the interview. Given the potentially delicate nature of identity description and self-assessment, support and recognition to the participant was given in three ways. Firstly, I emphasised throughout the interview that there were no right or wrong answers and that I was interested in the participant's thoughts and experiences, not what the participant thought were the correct answers. Secondly, I recognised the participant as the expert in the research relationship. This was done through stating in the background section of the interview that I was not and had never been an elite athlete or coach, acknowledging that the participant was the expert in elite sport, and that I was here to learn about elite sport from the participant. Thirdly, the participant was encouraged to take her/his time when answering questions through an emphasis on the participant as the primary speaker during the interview.

Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) recommendations regarding developing a trusting research relationship were also followed. A research relationship was developed from the first point of contact by carefully explaining to participants what was required in the interview and by allowing the participant to seek clarification at any point during the

research process. Time was taken at the start of the research interview to put the participant at ease and to get to know the participant through discussing with the participant her/his training program, competition results, my academic and sporting background and that of the participant.

The interview guide was piloted on two retired athletes (one male national level athlete, and one female regional level athlete) and one female elite level coach. The pilot data was not used in the main study. The pilot participants were asked for feedback and comments after the interview regarding the interview guide, content, and interviewer style. No changes were made to the content of the interview guide.

4.7 Data Coding and Analysis: NUD*IST 4, An Overview

After the interviews were transcribed verbatim, the transcripts were entered into the NUD*IST 4 (N4) qualitative data analysis computer program, for coding and analysis. N4 (Qualitative Research Solutions, 1997) is a qualitative data analysis computer program that helps qualitative researchers organise, structure, think, and theorise about their data. NUD*IST stands for Non-numerical, Unstructured, Data, Indexing, Searching, and Theorising. N4 is a code-based, theory-builder that not only retrieves-and-codes qualitative data, but also assists the researcher in developing and testing theory. Categories can be developed from the assigned codes, memos written and linked to these codes and categories, and hypotheses that have been induced from the data can be formulated and tested. For an overview of how N4 organises projects, codes, and analyses qualitative data the reader is directed to Lamont-Mills (in press).

4.7.1 Data Coding and Analysis: A-Priori Content Analysis

The transcripts from the 75 interviews were imported into N4, with analysis of the data for each question following the same procedures. Two types of data analysis were undertaken, an a-priori content analysis and discourse analysis that followed the discursive social psychological approach as espoused by Potter and Wetherell (1987), Potter et al. (1993), and Potter (1996b). Firstly, the data were subjected to an a-priori

content analysis. That is, pre-formed categories or concepts were imposed upon the data with these concepts and categories being theory driven. The concepts and categories imposed upon the data were the 24 items from the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978; see Appendix A.6 for a list of the items searched). The data were searched for the occurrence of each item from the three PAQ sub-scales. The results of each search were placed into separate item nodes, with each scale being represented by an overall organising scale node (e.g., PAQ F sub-scale - scale node, emotional - item node). Item searches included the direct item (e.g., emotional) and synonymous words (e.g., sensitive). The synonymous words were derived from The New Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus in One Volume (McLeod, 1987), The Australian Concise Oxford Dictionary (Moore, 1997), and The Cambridge Australian English Style Guide (Peters, 1995). For example, the PAQ F sub-scale item emotional search included searches on excited, emotional, emotions, demonstrative, excitable, passionate, sensitive, sentimental, tender, temperamental, affectionate. For readers unfamiliar with this analysis process and program see Appendix A.7 for an explanation of the coding method.

4.7.2 Unit of Analysis: Text Unit as a Line and Text Unit as a Response

Two units of analysis were used in the a-priori content analysis, the number of participant responses to a question and text unit. In this study a text unit was one line of the transcript. N4 is somewhat limited in its range of units of analysis, as units are defined by hard returns in the transcript. Thus for ease of typing and readability units of analysis are most often participant responses to a question, naturally occurring turns in talk, one line of data, or whole documents (Qualitative Solutions Research, 1997). In naturally occurring conversations individuals take turns in conversing. Thus naturally occurring turns in talk is the changing of conversation between interlocutors. In this study a-prior coding frequencies have been generated for the number of participant responses (e.g., 1 out of 75 participants make reference to the PAQ M-F sub-scale item Aggressive) and the number of text units (e.g., 5 out of 890 text units make reference to the PAQ M-F sub-scale item Aggressive). The presentation of only text unit data could

have potentially biased data analysis and interpretation as one or two participants may have accounted for a large percentage of the coded data.

4.7.3 Data Analysis: Discourse Analysis

The second type of analysis conducted on the data was an inductive discourse analysis. As the discourse analysis in this dissertation reflects a discursive psychology framework focus centred upon the organisation of language and the psychological consequences of this organisation within each interview question. As discussed in Chapter Three, there are multiple meanings and analytical approaches that lay claim to the mantle of discourse analysis. Hence there are also a number of ways in which discourse can be analysed using a discursive social psychological approach.

This study was influenced by the framework used by Wetherell and her colleagues (e.g., Edley & Wetherell, 1999; Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999; Wetherell et al., 1987) and grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In the initial readings the transcripts were read through utilising the method of grounded theory. Thus themes were identified, combined, and contrasted (if appropriate) and grounded in the talk of the participants. From this point, prior theoretical and personal perspectives were brought to bear on these themes, however Glaser (1992) argues that it is difficult to avoid imposition in the initial stages of the research process. In this way the interview transcripts were read and re-read numerous times for the presence of broad “recurring and collectively shared patterns in self-positioning” (Wetherell, p. 339). At this juncture four questions were asked of the text during the discourse analysis process:

1. What common themes or global patterns (interpretative repertoires) did participants draw upon in constituting their identities;
2. What images of the self (reflective positions; reflexive positions) were constituted when participants talked about themselves;

3. Did participants draw upon gender related themes and global patterns when constituting their identities, and if so what were they;
4. What discursive strategies did participants use when constituting their identities and how were these strategies used.

In order to increase the credibility and trustworthiness of the discursive practices and strategies that emerged from the data, the researcher engaged in the following process. With each reading the researcher noted possible interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that the participant appeared to be using. The rules upon which this decision was based were kept in a memo associated with the particular interpretative repertoire.

The interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions were also examined for possible alternative interpretations, themes, places, and tropes. Elimination of alternative perspectives was noted on the transcript along with decisions to reject alternative perspectives. Secondly, selected text excerpts were discussed with colleagues and their feedback, comments, and interpretations of the decision making process was elicited.

Wetherell and her colleagues do not subject the discourse to a more fine-grained analysis of rhetorical devices, trope, or metaphors when searching for interpretative repertoires in their data. Rather they focused upon the broad themes that are available to the participants as they structure and make sense of their worlds. Whilst this study focused on participants' use of interpretative repertoires as a means to understand and formulate a sense of self as people and as men and women, it also differed from the Wetherell framework. This study differed by incorporating a more fine-grained analysis of the interpretative repertoires. This fine-grain analysis focused on both the action and identity orientation of discourse (Potter, 1996b). The interpretative repertoires were examined for the way the participants reflexively positioned themselves within the interpretative repertoires and how these reflexive positions were used to create alternative identity possibilities (Davies & Harré, 1990).

People use reflexive positions to locate or position themselves within an IR⁴. As previously argued, identity negotiation takes place not only through the use of particular interpretative repertoires (Wetherell & Edley, 1999), but also through how the people position or locate themselves within these interpretative repertoires (Davies & Harré, 1990). A person may negotiate her/his identity through the use of the discursive elements of a particular interpretative repertoire (e.g, Masculine), but position themselves somewhat differently within the interpretative repertoire (e.g., Atypical). Davies and Harré posit that people view the world through the positions that they take up and through the use of various discursive practices that are made available by the interpretative repertoires. Thus the interpretative repertoires were examined for the following: 1) What image is constructed when these interpretative repertoires are being used? and 2) What is ruled out by talking about the self using the particular position (Wetherell, in press). Thus the data were subjected to both a broad focused analysis or macro level analysis, and a fine-grained, or micro level analysis.

4.8 Sampling for the Inductive Analysis

Eight participants (two female athletes, two male athletes, two female coaches, and two male coaches) were randomly selected for the discourse analysis. The decision to analyse only eight transcripts was in response to the time constraints imposed by a doctoral degree where it was decided that analysis of all participants was not reasonable, whereas eight participants was a manageable and realistic task, and could answer the research questions addressed by the interview data.

⁴ The reader is again directed to Chapter Three for a discussion of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions.

4.9 Issues of Rigour

Discussion of rigour does not pre-dominate in the discourse analysis and discursive social psychological literature as it does in the more traditional qualitative literatures. Foremost, discursive psychology follows the premise that the primary aim of the researcher is not to determine whether what the participant says is true, credible, or trustworthy (Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The discursive social psychologist does not assume the position of truth determination. What is of primary interest to the discursive social psychologist is how the participant makes what she/he says true, factual, and/or resistant to undermining or questioning (Potter). The researcher is not interested in whether what the participant says is a true reflection of her/his perceived reality. What is of interest is how what is said, is made factual through discursive practices, and thus protected from contention or undermining. Thus the focus is on how what is said, is made to appear as solid and real to the participant. This is a very contrary position to other more traditional qualitative and quantitative methodologies and frameworks and reflects the social constructionist influence on discursive psychology. Due to the somewhat controversial and radical nature of this ideological position, trustworthy and credibility checks of the data and data interpretations were made. As mentioned previously, data collection credibility and trustworthiness were checked through the use of paraphrasing and summarising within the interview itself. In addition, the credibility and trustworthiness of the data and data interpretations were established in the following ways.

Credibility was attested through the following processes. Firstly, consideration was given to the influence of prior theory on data interpretations and conclusions. Morse (1992) argues that because constructionist research is value laden the influence of prior theory on data interpretations needs to be addressed in this type of research. Guba and Lincoln (1982) therefore recommend that the researcher note her/his philosophical, epistemological, and methodological orientations and assumptions that drive her/his research questions and data interpretations in the research paper. This notification enables the reader to make her/his own judgements about the possible influence that the researcher's background may have had on conclusions and

interpretations. This was done in the introductory chapter and the reader is directed here for this.

Secondly, interdependence between participants and researcher can become problematic in qualitative research with the researcher losing her/his perspective on the data. The researcher often has more opportunities to become more aware of patterns in the data and may be influenced unconsciously by participants' explanations. This was countered by including a diverse range of participants as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984). Athletes and coaches, men and women, team and individual sport participants were included in this study. I also engaged in continual peer debriefing with my supervisor and a sport psychology colleague, and continual reflective analysis of emerging themes, patterns, suppositions, and presuppositions as seen in the memos in N4 (Miles & Huberman).

Triangulation was also used to address the credibility of data analysis. Triangulation is seen as one of the most powerful means to reduce the possibility of false interpretations and data distortion in qualitative research (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). Results are treated with more confidence when consistency is found across the different sources (Jick, 1979). Triangulation of data sources was undertaken whereby self-assessment of gender identity conceptualisation was collected through the interview and the 24-item PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Patton (1980) also suggests that triangulation of data sources include the comparison of different participants' viewpoints. Thus the inclusion of men and women, athletes and coaches, team and individual sport participants was made with consideration of triangulation. Further, the use of a modified version of Glaser and Strauss' (1967) method of constant comparison was also undertaken.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) further suggest that triangulation can be established through member checking. Lincoln and Guba assert that participants should be given the opportunity to make comment about the researchers' interpretations of their worlds. This parallels somewhat the summarising and paraphrasing that were used during the interviews themselves. Member checking was also done with participants and sport psychology peers. Participants at Institute A were given the opportunity to take part in a workshop that explored issues relating to the coaching of elite women athletes. This

workshop included findings from the study and the researcher invited participants to make comments about these findings. The data from Questions One and Two have been presented at national and international sport psychology, sport medicine, and gender psychology conferences, where peers were invited to make comments about the data interpretations. In both instances no challenges to the data interpretations were made to the researcher.

The absence of comments does not automatically increase the credibility and trustworthiness of the data interpretations. It is possible that the absence of comments may be due to peers being unfamiliar with discursive social psychology, and thus not able to make a critical evaluation of this work at this point. Further with the 2000 Olympic Games under a year away, participants may have not found the time nor interest to make detailed comments about the interpretations.

Another method of rigour, triangulation of data analysts or investigator triangulation, was not undertaken due to this study being a Doctoral thesis. Thus the use of other analysts was not permissible. Further whilst it is one way in which the trustworthiness, rigour, and credibility of qualitative research can be increased (Tindall, 1994), it was unable to be implemented due to the absence of coders trained in the specific discursive psychology theoretical and methodological approach undertaken in this dissertation. Additionally there is much disagreement in the qualitative literature on the utility of independent coders and how consensus is reached when differences in coding and interpretations emerge. For example Tindall argues against investigator triangulation through her discussion of the limitations of different views and understandings that are brought by different investigators and the possibility of consensus collusion on codes and interpretations. However in the same paragraph she extols the value of collaboration in that it allows for an extension of frameworks and understandings. However emerging themes and patterns were checked for competing hypotheses with the intention of deliberately trying to disprove the emerging themes and patterns (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).

Transferability or the representativeness of the data was addressed by describing in some detail the participant's athletic background. This enabled interpretations to be transferred to similar participants (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). However due to ethical

considerations, in-depth detail about sporting successes or failures were not included in order to ensure confidentiality. In addition, detail pertaining to the state institutes of sport was not included to again protect the confidentiality of participants' responses. This is particularly relevant in Australia given the somewhat inclusive nature of the elite sporting population. However representativeness of the data was ensured by including a diverse range of participants, a large number of participants ($N = 75$), and using random sampling with the athletes (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

4.10 Procedure

Before the research project began, the support of the four state institutes of sport was gained. This was done in differing ways depending upon the particular institute. For one state institute (Institute A), a letter outlining the study, a request for support, a research proposal, and participant information package was sent to the Director and one of the section managers (see Appendix A.8 for a copy of the letter to participants and participant information package). A meeting was then arranged between the Director, Manager, and myself, where the institute's support was given and information pertaining to contacting athletes and coaches was obtained. The Director also requested that I address a meeting of the institute coaches to outline the study and invite participation. At this coaches meeting, a brief overview of the study was given and information packages were given to interested coaches. The information package contained an information sheet, consent form, and pre-paid self-addressed envelope. Minimal information was disclosed about the hypothesis of the study during this meeting in order to minimise prospective participants rehearsing information before the interview and thus potentially prompting the participant to answer in ways that were socially acceptable.

Those coaches who returned the consent form were then contacted by phone to arrange a mutually convenient time for the interview. After a period of two weeks the coaches who had not returned the consent form were rung to check that they had received a study information package. For those coaches who had attended the meeting and had not responded to the request, a second invitation to take part in the study was

made. If the coach was willing to participate, a mutually convenient time for the interview was arranged and an offer of a second information package was made. Those coaches who had not attended the meeting were sent a study information package. The above procedures were then followed with these coaches.

The institute-based athletes who participated in this study were all from Institute A. The athletes were sent a similar study information package, where the only change made was the substitution of the word athlete for coach. After the package was sent the same follow up procedure as used with the coaches in Institute A was followed with the athletes.

At the second institute of sport (Institute B), a letter outlining the study, a request for support, a research proposal, and participant information package was sent to one of the section managers and the institute's sport psychologist. The sport psychologist was a colleague who had been briefed regarding the study. A meeting was arranged between the section manager and the sport psychologist who acted as the proxy, where Institute B's support was given and information pertaining to contacting coaches was obtained. Due to the limited number of female elite level coaches at Institute A, a request was made for only female elite level coaches' contact information. Due to the timing of the research project prior to the 1999 Commonwealth Games, only one coach was available to be interviewed.

A letter outlining the study and request for support, a research proposal, and participant information package was sent to the sport psychologist at the third institute of sport (Institute C). The sport psychologist was also a colleague and was briefed regarding the study. A meeting was arranged between the director and the sport psychologist who acted as a proxy. Institute C's support was given and information pertaining to contacting coaches was obtained. Again due to the limited number of female elite level coaches, only female elite level coaches at Institute C were contacted. The researcher sent information packages to the sport psychologist who distributed them to the female coaches. The procedure for contacting coaches differed with Institute C. The section manager was given available interview times, and the section manager then contacted the participants to invite them to participate in the study. The section manager then arranged a time mutually agreeable to undertake the interview.

The sport psychologist at the fourth institute of sport (Institute D) was also a colleague and was briefed regarding the study. This person was also one of the section managers at the institute and gave her/his support for the study. Due to the limited number of female elite level coaches available to be interviewed, only female elite level coaches were contacted at Institute D. However due to a late withdrawal of a male coach from Institute A, a male coach from Institute D was also contacted and invited to participate. The procedure for contacting coaches was the same as for Institute C.

As mentioned in the design and development of the interview format and guide, all interviews followed the same structure. Participants completed the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and MC-SDS (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) questionnaires after the interview finished. Following this participants were debriefed to the full purpose of the study and any questions that the participant had were answered. The participant was then asked whether she/he had anything to add to the interview and whether she/he were suffering from any distress that may have been elicited by the interview. The interview sessions lasted from approximately 35 minutes to two and half-hours.

Interviews were then transcribed verbatim by an experienced transcriber and entered into the N4 program for analysis. Due to time constraints, N4 text handling limitations, and budgetary constraints, transcription notation did not follow the Jefferson simplified notation method (Edley & Wetherell, 1999) that is commonly used in discursive psychology research. For examples of the simplified version the reader is directed to Edley and Wetherell (1997), Wetherell (1998), Wetherell and Edley, (1999), and Wetherell et al. (1987). The transcripts were transcribed primarily for readability with untimed pauses being represented as ... within the extract (see Appendix A.9 for extract header information).

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS: GENDER PERSONALITY TRAITS AND SOCIAL DESIRABILITY

5.1 Demographic Data..... 107

 5.1.1 Data Screening and Re-coding 107

 5.1.2 Statistical Differences..... 107

5.2 The Influence of Social Desirability: Marlowe-Crowne Social
Desirability Scale 109

5.3 Personal Attributes Questionnaire: Quantitative Results 110

5.4 Conclusion 113

5.1 Demographic Data

5.1.1 Data Screening and Re-coding

In order to identify possible confound effects, the demographic data were analysed using either a chi-squared test for independence or an independent groups t-tests. The reader will note that alpha was set at .05 for all analyses in this dissertation, unless otherwise stated. Data screening revealed violations of expected cell frequencies. In response to these violations education level was re-coded to two categories (secondary, higher education) on the basis that both tertiary and TAFE levels of education were post-secondary levels of education for the participants in this study. Marital status was re-coded to three categories (married or de-facto, single, divorced or separated or widowed). The common premise for the married or de-facto combination was individuals in a de-facto relationship in Australia, have similar legal rights as married individuals. For the divorced or separated or widowed combination, the common theme was that participants had previously been married. Nationality was re-coded to three categories (Australian, New Zealand, Others) due to the small number of participants in the Europe ($N = 3$), North America ($N = 1$), and Other ($N = 1$) categories. Cell re-coding was based on the recommendations of Siegel and Castellan (1988).

Homogeneity of variance was violated for some of the demographic variables (see Appendix B.1). For those variables, the t-values, df, and significance levels for unequal variances were used. Geographical differences were not analysed in this study due to the transient nature of the elite-sporting domain. Fifty eight percent of the coaches had coaching or athletic experiences that were not confined to the one geographical location, however all athletes came from the same state.

5.1.2 Statistical Differences

There was no statistically significant effect of sex on age $t(73) = .12, p > .05$ (women $M = 30.42, SD = 10.19$, men $M = 30.16, SD = 8.95$), on number of years as a

coach or athlete $t(73) = .35, p > .05$ (women $M = 11.82, SD = 6.80$, men $M = 12.30, SD = 5.02$), on number of years coaching or competing at the national level $t(73) = 1.7, p > .05$ (women $M = 7.05, SD = 5.29$, men $M = 5.27, SD = 3.66$), or on number of years coaching or competing at the international level $t(73) = .31, p > .05$ (women $M = 3.32, SD = 4.19$, men $M = 3.59, SD = 3.45$). Men and women did not appear to differ on National Coaching Accreditation Scheme (NCAS) levels $\chi^2(4) = 3.49, p > .05$, employment status $\chi^2(2) = .69, p > .05$, sport type $\chi^2(1) = .03, p > .05$, nationality $\chi^2(2) = .92, p > .05$, or marital status $\chi^2(2) = 4.02, p > .05$. A statistically significant difference was reported for education level $\chi^2(1) = 6.82, p < .05$, where women appeared to be more likely to have a tertiary level of education and men a secondary level.

In regard to occupation, there was a statistically significant effect of age, with athletes appearing to be younger than coaches $t(73) = 9.65, p < .05$ (coaches $M = 37.29, SD = 7.29$, athletes $M = 23.11, SD = 5.24$). There were no other statistically significant occupation differences for years as a coach or athlete $t(73) = 1.74, p > .05$ (coaches $M = 13.21, SD = 6.77$, athletes $M = 10.86, SD = 4.79$), years as an athlete or coach at the national level $t(73) = -.48, p > .05$ (coaches $M = 5.92, SD = 5.19$, athletes $M = 6.43, SD = 4.01$), or years as an athlete or coach at the international level $t(73) = -.92, p > .05$ (coaches $M = 3.05, SD = 3.76$, athletes $M = 3.86, SD = 3.90$).

Occupation appears to have no statistically significant effect on sport type $\chi^2(1) = .03, p > .05$, education $\chi^2(1) = .85, p > .05$, or nationality $\chi^2(2) = .19, p > .05$. Athletes and coaches appear to differ on NCAS level $\chi^2(4) = 62.14, p < .05$, employment status $\chi^2(2) = 24.69, p < .05$, and marital status $\chi^2(2) = 11.32, p < .05$. That is, coaches were more likely to hold a NCAS level 3 accreditation, whereas athletes were more likely to have a level 0¹. Coaches were more likely to be employed full-time in the elite-sporting domain, and athletes were more likely to be employed part-time in various occupations. Finally, coaches were more likely to be married, with athletes more likely to be single.

¹ The reader is directed to Chapter Four for a discussion of NCAS levels.

5.2 The Influence of Social Desirability: Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

The Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was used to assess if participants' responses to both the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and the interview questions were affected by social desirability responding (SDR). When used as a measure of SDR, researchers commonly use combined group MC-SDS means to determine SDR (e.g., Bannon, 1999; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; 1984; Paulhus, 1991; Vella-Brodrick & White, 1997). To ensure that combined means could be used, the MC-SDS data were first analysed for sex and occupation effects using a 2 (men/women) x 2 (athletes/coaches) ANOVA.

Prior to conducting the ANOVA, the data were screened for assumption and normality violations. No violations were reported (see Appendix B.2). There were no statistically significant main effects for sex $F(2, 70) = .14, p > .05$ or occupation $F(1, 70) = .46, p > .05$. Further, the interaction did not reach statistical significance $F(1, 70) = .25, p > .05$. Female scores ranged from 4 to 25 ($n = 37, M = 16.58, SD = 5.18$), male scores ranged from 5 to 28 ($n = 36^2, M = 16.11, SD = 5.44$), athlete scores ranged from 4 to 25 ($n = 37, M = 16.78, SD = 5.41$), and coaches scores ranged from 7 to 28 ($n = 36, M = 15.92, SD = 5.18$).

A post hoc power estimate was generated for the ANOVA. Power was found to be poor for sex ($\beta = .051$), for occupation ($\beta = .097$), and for sex by occupation ($\beta = .047$). Henceforth the non-significant ANOVA findings need to be interpreted with caution as it is possible that a Type II error has occurred. As a result, participant scores were not collapsed for comparison.

Due to the absence of sport specific normative data, the recommendations of Vella-Brodrick and White (1997) were used to determine SDR. Firstly, the means were

² There was one missing case from the male coach data.

compared to the MC-SDS midpoint (16.5). If the means exceeded the midpoint then SDR was suspected. Further, the means were compared to reported means from other studies. SDR was suspected if the means fell two or more standard deviation away from other reported means.

The means for men and coaches fell below the MC-SDS midpoint (16.5) recommendation. The means for women and athletes were slightly above the midpoint (see Table 5.4). All means fell within one standard deviation of means reported in other studies (e.g., Bannon, 1999, $\underline{M} = 18.66$, $\underline{SD} = 3.84$; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, $\underline{M} = 13.72$, $\underline{SD} = 5.78$; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964, $\underline{M} = 15.5$, $\underline{SD} = 4.4$; Paulhus, 1984, $\underline{M} = 15.5$, $\underline{SD} = 4.6$; Vella-Brodrick & White, 1997, $\underline{M} = 15.8$, $\underline{SD} = 5.8$). Further, Evans (1982) in a review of non-college normative data reported that 71% of studies evaluated reported means in excess of 16, thus the means reported in this study compare favourably to these studies. Based on the above, it was concluded that the data did not appear to be contaminated by SDR. However low power levels indicate that these results should be treated with caution.

5.3 Personal Attributes Questionnaire: Quantitative Results

In order to address Research Question One, how do participants perceive themselves in terms of gender-related characteristics, the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was used as a measure of participants' self-definition with respect to gender-related characteristics. Based on previous research (e.g., Belansky & Boggiano, 1994; Helmreich et al., 1981; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; 1980) the following hypotheses were examined:

- 1) Men will score higher on the PAQ Masculine (M) and Masculine-Feminine (M-F) sub-scales than women;
- 2) Women will score higher on the PAQ Feminine (F) sub-scale than men;
- 3) Men will be more likely to be classified as Masculine than women; and
- 4) Women will be more likely to be classified as Feminine than men.

From a perusal of the literature, the PAQ has predominately been used as a measure to differentiate between men and women's self-definition as masculine or

feminine. In the sporting domain there is an absence of PAQ research that has compared coaches and athletes responses on the PAQ. Thus the aim of the occupational analysis was to explore athlete and coach responses to the PAQ. Hence the following hypotheses were explored:

- 1) Coaches will score differently on the PAQ M, F, and M-F sub-scales than athletes; and
- 2) Coaches will be classified differently than athletes with respect to the four PAQ classification categories.

The PAQ data were analysed using a 2 (men/women) x 2 (athlete/coach) MANOVA. Three violations of univariate normality were reported. These were women's responses on the PAQ F sub-scale, Shapiro-Wilk (38) = .01, $p < .05$, women's responses on the PAQ M sub-scale, Shapiro-Wilk (38) = .02, $p < .05$, and athlete responses on the PAQ M sub-scale, Shapiro-Wilk (38) = .02, $p < .05$. Although some violations of normality were found, it was determined that data transformation was not required. As the primary aim of this dissertation was to explore gender identity construction in the elite sporting context, data transformation would have been epistemologically, theoretically, and methodologically inconsistent with the aims and objectives of this study. No other violations were reported (see Appendix B.3 for violation testing results).

The means and standard deviations for the three PAQ sub-scales as a function of sex and occupation are presented in Table 5.1. Scores ranged from 7 to 26 on the PAQ M-F sub-scale, 14 to 30 on the PAQ F sub-scale, and 14 to 31 on the PAQ M sub-scale. As can be seen in Table 5.1, there appears to be little difference between men's and women's, or coaches and athletes scores on the three PAQ sub-scales. The MANOVA statistic revealed no statistically significant effect for sex $F(1,69) = .03$, $p > .05$, or occupation $F(1,69) = .04$, $p > .05$, and an interaction effect that was not statistically significant $F(1,69) = .02$, $p > .05$.

Table 5.1

Mean scores and Standard Deviations as a Function of Sex and Occupation

PAQ sub-scales

Group	Masculine		Feminine		Masculine-Feminine	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Sex						
Men	24.51	3.15	22.47	3.12	17.03	4.42
Women	24.84	3.76	23.29	3.68	16.16	3.64
Occupation						
Athletes	24.43	3.72	22.89	2.75	15.81	3.99
Coaches	24.92	3.21	22.89	4.01	17.34	4.00

Note. Maximum sub-scale score = 32.

A post hoc power estimate found power to be poor for sex ($\beta = .20$), for occupation ($\beta = .25$), and for sex by occupation ($\beta = .12$). Henceforth the non-significant MANOVA findings need to be interpreted with caution, as it is possible that a Type II error has occurred. Increasing the number of participants involved in this dissertation was not considered as an option for increasing power on this occasion. As mentioned in Chapter Four, the population of female coaches at Australian Institutes of Sport was not sampled. Instead the whole female coach population at the four Institutes of Sport was invited to participate in this study. The time constraints of a dissertation and the upcoming Olympic Games limited the search for female coaches beyond my immediate contacts and Institutes of Sport. As consideration of the PAQ results is central to the thesis of this dissertation, this dissertation proceeds with using these results, albeit with an acknowledgement of the lower confidence in the quantitative analysis results.

The PAQ data were subjected to the Spence and Helmreich (1978) split-method classification procedure as outlined Chapter Four. Individuals were categorised into one of four categories, Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated. Table 5.2 presents the PAQ classification frequencies using both participant medians and Spence and Helmreich's college norms for comparison. As can be seen, there appears to be a difference in PAQ classification using participant generated medians and Spence and Helmreich's college norms. Therefore, both the participants' generated median classification data and the college norm data were subjected to analysis. The use of both Spence and Helmreich's college norms and participant generated split-method

procedures is common in sport related PAQ research (e.g, Colker & Widom, 1980; Del Ray, 1989; Desertrain & Weiss, 1988; Helmreich & Spence, 1977).

Table 5.2

PAQ Split-Method Classification as a Function of Sex and Occupation: Frequencies

Group	PAQ Classification			
	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Undifferentiated
Sex				
Men	15 (22)	9 (2)	4 (11)	9 (2)
Women	7 (11)	6 (2)	18 (22)	7 (3)
Occupation				
Athletes	12 (16)	8 (3)	10 (15)	7 (3)
Coaches	10 (17)	7 (1)	12 (18)	9 (2)

Note. Participants M median = 25, F median = 23.

Spence and Helmreich's (1978) college norms M median = 21, F median = 23 are in brackets for comparison.

The PAQ classification data were analysed using a chi-squared test for independence. The participant generated median data reported a statistically significant difference in PAQ classification for men and women $\chi^2(3) = 12.66, p < .05$. Women were more likely to be categorised as Androgynous and men were more likely to be categorised as Masculine. Whilst not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that more men ($n = 9$) were classified as Feminine than women ($n = 6$). There was no statistically significant difference in the PAQ classification of athletes and coaches $\chi^2(3) = .67, p > .05$. The Spence and Helmreich (1978) college norm classified data violated one of the main assumptions of the chi-squared, that of expected cell frequencies, and thus this analysis has not been reported as the categories could not be meaningfully re-coded as per the Siegel and Castellan (1988) suggestion.

5.4 Conclusion

Regarding the demographic variables, education level differences were found between men and women. Women appeared to be more likely to have a tertiary level of

education and men appeared more likely to have a secondary level. Occupation differences were also found with athletes appearing to be significantly younger than coaches. Athletes and coaches also differed on NCAS levels, employment status, and marital status. Coaches were more likely to have a NCAS level 3 accreditation whereas athletes were more likely to have a level 0. Coaches were more likely to be employed full-time in the elite-sporting domain, and athletes were more likely to be employed in a part-time capacity. Finally, coaches were more likely to be married, and athletes were more likely to be single.

SDR was determined following the recommendations of Vella-Brodrick and White (1997). All means were acceptable as they fell within one standard deviation of means reported by other researchers, with the men and coaches means falling below the median point of the MC-SDS. Thus suggesting that the PAQ and the interview data did not appear to be contaminated by SDR.

There were no statistically significant effects of sex or occupation, and no statistically significant interaction effect on PAQ sub-scale responding. Hence the first hypothesis, that men would score higher than women on the PAQ M and PAQ M-F sub-scales and that women would score higher than men on the PAQ F sub-scale, was not supported. Further the third hypothesis, that athletes and coaches would respond differently on the PAQ M, F, and M-F sub-scales, was also not supported. Inadequate power levels however suggest that the lack of statistical significance may be due to poor power, rather than a lack of difference (Stevens, 1992). Thus this dissertation proceeds with caution and an acknowledgement that the confidence in these results is lowered. When classifying participants into Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, and Undifferentiated categories, men were more likely to be classified as Masculine and women were more likely to be classified as Androgynous. This provides partial support for the second hypothesis that men would be more likely to be classified as Masculine than women. However it fails to support the notion that women would be more likely to be classified as Feminine than men. There was no statistically significant difference between athletes and coaches on the PAQ classification. Thus the final hypothesis that athletes and coaches would be classified differently in terms of the four gender

classification categories was also not supported. Due to main assumption violations, classification using Spence and Helmreich's (1978) college norms was not presented.

The results of the PAQ analysis are contrary to the assumptions that underlie the PAQ. Women and men did not respond differently on the PAQ M, F, M-F sub-scales. Further, women were not classified as Feminine. These results suggest that sport may be a context where women and men perceive themselves differently in terms of gender-related characteristics.

CHAPTER SIX - THE A-PRIORI CONTENT ANALYSIS

6.1	The Imposition of the 24 Item Personal Attributes Questionnaire.....	117
6.2	Data Included for Analysis.....	118
6.3	Data Analysis.....	118
6.4	The Idiosyncratic Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis.....	119
6.4.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	119
6.4.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale	123
6.4.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale	127
6.4.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales	128
6.4.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences	130
6.4.6	Conclusion: Idiosyncratic Identity	131
6.5	Gender Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis	132
6.5.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	132
6.5.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale	136
6.5.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale	140
6.5.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales	141
6.5.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences	144
6.5.6	Conclusion: Gender Identity	144
6.6	Gender Identity in Sport and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis	145
6.6.1	The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale.....	145
6.6.2	The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale	150
6.6.3	The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale	153
6.6.4	The Complete PAQ Sub-scales	155
6.6.5	PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences	158
6.6.6	Conclusion: Gender Identity in Sport.....	158
6.7	Conclusion.....	159

6.1 The Imposition of the 24 Item Personal Attributes Questionnaire

As outlined in Chapter Four, interview responses to the idiosyncratic identity, gender identity, and gender in sport identity questions were coded using an a-priori content analysis. That is, pre-formed categories or concepts were imposed upon the data, these being the 24 items from the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). A list of the PAQ sub-scale items and synonymous words imposed upon the identity question is presented in Appendix A.6. This list was used consistently across all three questions.

In order to answer Research Question One, the a-priori content analysis explored whether participants used PAQ Masculine (M), Feminine (F), and Masculine-Feminine (M-F) sub-scale items and their synonyms¹ to describe themselves, and whether there were any sex, occupational, or usage differences. Thus the a-priori research questions became:

- 1) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as idiosyncratic individuals? If so, are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?;
- 2) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as women or men? If so, are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?; and
- 3) Do participants use PAQ items or their synonyms when describing themselves as women or men in the elite sporting context? If so are there any sex, occupational, or usage differences?

The structure of the a-priori content section will be as follows. The a-priori content analysis will be presented accompanied by associated non-parametric statistical analyses. First, the eight individual items that comprise each PAQ sub-scale (M, F, and M-F) will be presented, followed by the complete PAQ sub-scale. For example, the analyses for each of the eight items from the PAQ M sub-scale will be presented first.

¹ Hereafter in this chapter the word items will be used to include PAQ items and their synonyms.

These eight items are then combined into the PAQ M sub-scale and the associated analyses for this sub-scale will then be presented. Idiosyncratic identity responses will be presented first, followed by gender identity and gender identity in sport responses.

6.2 Data Included for Analysis

The following semi-structured interview questions were included for the a-priori content analysis and discourse analysis; Question One (Q1) pertains to the general self or idiosyncratic identity, Question Two (Q2) pertains to the gendered self or gender identity, and Question Six (Q6) pertains to the gendered self in sport or gender identity in sport. The decision to analyse these particular questions was driven by three considerations. Firstly, these questions were best reflective of the theoretical and methodological re-conceptualisation that resulted from discovering the theoretical and methodological framework of discursive psychology. Secondly, these three questions best suited the research questions under investigation. Thirdly, given the time constraints imposed by a doctoral degree it was decided that analysis of all questions was not reasonable, whereas three questions were a manageable and realistic task.

A tape malfunction during the beginning of one participant's interview resulted in the non-recording of his responses to the first two questions. Thus 74 participants' responses were represented in the idiosyncratic identity and gender identity questions. Both text unit and participant response data will be presented for the a-priori content analysis. The reader is directed to Chapter Four for discussion regarding the use of both text unit and participant responses as units of analysis.

6.3 Data Analysis

The sex and occupation data for Questions One, Two, and Six were analysed using Mann Whitney U tests. The statistic that will be reported will be the z score. The PAQ classification data for the same questions were analysed using Kruskal Wallis H one-way between groups ANOVA's. The statistic that will be reported is the chi-squared value. The decision to use these two analyses and not a chi square was a result

of both units of analysis violating one of the primary assumptions of the chi squared analysis, that of mutually exclusive response categories. That is, some text unit hits were coded at two or more sub-scales; similarly some participants' responses were coded at two or more sub-scales. The data were analysed for sex, occupation, and PAQ classification differences. The above pertains to all a-priori PAQ sub-scale content analyses. Due to the large number of statistical analysis undertaken with the a-priori content analysis there is an increased possibility that some of the significant findings may be due to chance. Therefore in this chapter, exact significance levels have been reported.

6.4 The Idiosyncratic Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis

6.4.1 The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale

Of the 74 participants who responded to the idiosyncratic identity question², 30 participants described themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items, with 80 text units ($N = 890$) representing PAQ M sub-scale items. The actual words or items that were coded or matched in the text are presented in Appendix C³. This includes the matches from the three identity questions and the items from the three PAQ sub-scales. There were no coded matches with the PAQ M sub-scale items Feels Superior and Makes Decisions Easily. Below are six text extracts from the idiosyncratic identity question that have been coded at the PAQ M sub-scale node. The individual PAQ M sub-scale item is presented in brackets and follows the text extract. Each extract begins with a header, which presents demographic data about the participant (see Appendix A.9 for header information), followed by text unit information, the transcribed text, and finally the

² Q1 asked 'In general, if you were to describe yourself as a person to another person how would you do this?'

³ Hereafter referred to as linguistic markers.

imposed item match which is in bold. Extract presentation was held consistent across Questions One, Two, and Six.

Extract 1.

*S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/FTA/A/S/0/T/And

Text units 8-8:

8 **active**

(Active)

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/MM/11/30/12/5/0/FTC/A/S/99/T/Mas

Text units 16-17:

16 identify a direction I'm, I'm **reasonably sort of ambitious to get that**

17 **done, I'm determined to get that done.**

(Never give up easily)

Extract 3.

*S1/FA/FM/21/31/6/6/6/OTHER/A/M/0/T/And

Text units 5-5:

5 Um, ... I'd say I'm I'm **fairly confident**, I'm an optimist, definite

(Self-confident)

Extract 4.

*S1/FA/FM/25/19/6/4/1/FTS/A/0/T/And

Text units 6-6:

6 having fun, really, um, **always, like to have a, competitive element**

(Competitive)

Extract 5.

*S1/MC/FF/30/30/11/1//0/FTC/A/Sep/2/S/Mas

Text units 8-10:

8 Oh ok. I am a **relaxed person, um, everything to me is, there's a bit of**

9 **fun in everything, um, I'm not the type of person that, I don't stress, I**

10 **don't worry about things**, um, I'm not

(Stands up well under pressure)

Extract 6.

*S1/FC/FF/5/43/25/9/1/FTC/A/M/3/T/And

Text units 5-5:

5 ... **Independent**. Um ... I probably have strong opinions on things. I am

(Independent)

Tables 6.1 to 6.4 present the coded frequencies for the imposed eight PAQ M sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response ($N = 30$) and text unit ($N = 80$). Table presentation

column totals may not equal the total number of participants or text units for the associated column. This is because one or more participants or text units, can be, and are represented at different items within the same column.

Table 6.1

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content

Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 10)	Women (<u>n</u> = 20)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 14)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 16)	
Independent		1	-.97		1	-.99
Active	1	6	-1.93	4	3	-.43
Competitive	1	3	-.99	4		-2.07*
Decisive						
Never gives up easily	4	7	-.93	4	7	-.93
Self-confident	3	4	-.36	5	2	-1.22
Feels superior						
Stands pressure	4	4	-.04	4	4	-.04

Note:* = significance at .03

Table 6.2

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 21)	Women (<u>n</u> = 59)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 50)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 30)	
Independent		1	-.99		1	-.99
Active	4	16	-1.90	9	11	-.38
Competitive	3	5	-.95	8		-2.07*
Decisive						
Never gives up easily	7	13	-.94	9	11	-.78
Self-confident	4	23	-.36	25	2	-1.26
Feels superior						
Stands pressure	6	7	-.02	5	8	-.05

Note: * = significance at .03

Table 6.3

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 11)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 1)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 12)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 6)	χ^2 (3)
Independent			1		2.41
Active	1	1	3	2	1.37
Competitive	1		2	1	1.49
Decisive					
Never gives up easily	6		4	1	6.41
Self-confident	2	1	3	1	.78
Feels superior					
Stands pressure	3	1		4	6.45

Table 6.4

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 43)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 1)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 19)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 17)	
Independent			1		2.41
Active	6	1	5	8	1.28
Competitive	2		3	3	1.45
Decisive					
Never gives up easily	12		6	2	6.53
Self-confident	21	1	4	1	.81
Feels superior					
Stands pressure	4	1		8	6.79

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant sex or PAQ classification effects were reported (see Tables 6.1 to 6.4). A statistically significant occupation difference was reported (see Tables 6.1 & 6.2). When describing themselves as idiosyncratic individuals, more athletes made more references to themselves as being Competitive than coaches. There were no other statistically significant occupation effects.

6.4.2 The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale

In this analysis, 43 participants described themselves using PAQ F sub-scale items, with 96 text units (N = 890) representing PAQ F sub-scale items. Below are eight text extracts from the idiosyncratic identity question that have been coded at the PAQ F sub-scale node.

Extract 1.

*S1/MC/FMMM/10/33/6/5/0/FTC/A/Sep/3/T/Mas

Text units 5-5:

5 In general, ok, honest, **empathetic**, um, ... , **caring**, are you looking for
(Aware of feelings of others)

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/MX/13/45/15/2/0/FTC/A/Def/2/S/Fem

Text units 9-9:

9 Oh I'd describe myself as a fairly **well devoted family man** even
(Able to devote self completely to others)

Extract 3.

*S1/MC/MX/16/39/8/5/5/FTC/A/M/3/T/Mas

Text units 7-7:

7 Um, quite **affable**, I guess, um, pretty calm um, I think a fair bit, um,
(Warm in relations with others)

Extract 4.

*S1/FA/FM/21/31/6/6/6/OTHER/A/M/0/T/And

Text units 8-8:

8 **considerate**, I like being happy, ah ... that's about it.
(Understanding of others)

Extract 5.

*S1/MA/MM/22/18/13/3/2/FTA/A/S/1/TAFE/Mas

Text units 9-9:

9 think I'm **fairly kind**, um ... um, um, what else can I put in there, ah,
(Kind)

Extract 6.

*S1/FC/FXMX/24/37/9/2/1/FTC/A/S/1/T/Fem

Text units 7-8:

7 terms, I'd say I'm a **moody shit, um, and very emotional, I feel deeply**
8 **about what I'm doing**,
(Emotional)

Extract 7.

*S1/MA/MX/29/18/13/4/0/FTS/A/S/0/S/Mas

Text units 8-8:

8 you know, **helpful**, you know that's how I see myself I'd say.
(Helpful)

Extract 8.

*S1/MA/MX/36/18/4/1/1/FTS/A/S/0/T/Fem

Text units 14-14:

14 all my coaches come out with, oh the **'gentle giant'** (name)

Text units 16-17:

16 That, like sure I might be tall and like look big **but I won't hit you or**17 **anything** whereas other people like, the
(Gentle)

Tables 6.5 to 6.8 present the coded frequencies for the eight imposed PAQ F sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response ($N = 43$) and text unit ($N = 96$).

Table 6.5

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 21)	Women (<u>n</u> = 22)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 22)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 21)	
Emotional	1	5	-1.66	2	4	-.81
Devoted	5	4	-.40	3	6	-1.02
Gentle	1	2	-.56	2	1	-.61
Helpful	6	5	.71	6	5	-.37
Kind	2	1	-.61	2	1	-.61
Aware of feelings	2	4	-.81	1	5	-1.66
Understanding	3	5	-.70	3	6	-1.45
Warm with others	10	9	-.33	14	5	-2.44*

Note: * = significance at .01

Table 6.6

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis
on as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					
	Sex		Z	Occupation		Z
	Men (n = 49)	Women (n = 47)		Athletes (n = 40)	Coaches (n = 56)	
Emotional	1	10	-1.68	6	5	-.78
Devoted	10	5	-.43	4	10	-1.02
Gentle	3	2	-.53	4	1	-.62
Helpful	15	9	-.41	11	13	-.35
Kind	2	1	-.61	2	1	-.61
Aware of feelings	5	7	-.81	1	13	-1.70
Understanding	8	6	-.67	2	12	-1.48
Warm with others	14	13	-.31	20	7	-2.39*

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.7

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis
as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	PAQ classification				χ^2 (3)
	Masculine (n = 10)	Feminine (n = 12)	Androgynous (n = 12)	Undifferentiated (n = 9)	
Emotional		2	3	1	3.51
Devoted	3	2	3	1	.54
Gentle		1		2	4.97
Helpful	4	3	4		3.44
Kind	2	1			3.30
Aware of feelings		1	4	1	5.04
Understanding		2	5	1	6.52
Warm with others	6	5	2	6	4.03

Table 6.8

Idiosyncratic Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	PAQ classification				χ^2 (3)
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 17)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 21)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 41)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 17)	
Emotional		3	7	1	3.51
Devoted	3	6	4	2	.54
Gentle		4		2	4.97
Helpful	8	6	10		3.44
Kind	2	1			3.30
Aware of feelings		1	9		5.04
Understanding		2	11	12	6.52
Warm with others	7	6	5	7	4.03

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant sex or PAQ classification effects were reported (see Tables 6.5 to 6.8). Again, a statistically significant occupation difference was reported (see Tables 6.5 & 6.6). That is, more athletes made more references to themselves as being Warm in Relation to Others than coaches. There were no other statistically significant occupation effects.

6.4.3 The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale

Only one PAQ M-F item, Aggressive, was found in the data. Only one participant made references to the item, a female coach classified as Androgynous. Following is the text from the idiosyncratic identity question that has been coded at the Aggressive PAQ M-F sub-scale node.

*S1/FC/FX/64/28/3/1/0/PTC/A/S/1/T/And

Text units 6-6:

6 driven, um can be **aggressive**, especially like in play, um very stubborn

Text units 10-13:

- 10 Um, probably I've got a **winning stubbornness, like it's if you'd**
 11 **never met me and the first encounter with me on the (sporting**
 12 **arena) you'd you'd probably take a big step back, you wouldn't,**
 13 **probably not very approachable out it that way on the (arena)**

For the participant response data, no statistically significant effects of sex $\underline{U} = 684.5$, $\underline{z} = -.99$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 684.5$, $\underline{z} = -.99$, $p > .05$, or PAQ classification $\chi^2(3) = 2.41$, $p > .05$ were reported. Similarly for the text unit data, no statistically significant effects were reported for sex $\underline{U} = 684.5$, $\underline{z} = -.99$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 684.5$, $\underline{z} = -.99$, $p > .05$, or PAQ classification $\chi^2(3) = 2.41$, $p > .05$.

6.4.4 The Complete PAQ Sub-scales

The coded responses for the imposed eight items for each PAQ sub-scale were copied into one combined sub-scale for overall analysis. Tables 6.9 to 6.12 present the coded frequencies of the combined sub-scales as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response ($\underline{N} = 58$) and text unit ($\underline{N} = 174$).

Table 6.9

Idiosyncratic Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex		\underline{Z}	Occupation		\underline{Z}
	Men ($\underline{N} = 25$)	Women ($\underline{N} = 33$)		Athletes ($\underline{N} = 27$)	Coaches ($\underline{N} = 31$)	
Masculine $\underline{n} = 30$	10	20	-2.25*	14	16	-.37
Feminine $\underline{n} = 43$	21	22	-.10	21	22	-.10
Masculine -Feminine $\underline{n} = 1$		1	-.99		1	-.99

Note: * = significance at .03

Table 6.10

Idiosyncratic Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>N</u> = 66)	Women (<u>N</u> = 108)		Athletes (<u>N</u> = 88)	Coaches (<u>N</u> = 86)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 80	21	59	-2.18*	50	30	-.13
Feminine <u>n</u> = 96	49	47	-.45	40	56	-.38
Masculine -Feminine <u>n</u> = 5		5	-.99		5	-.99

Note: * = significance at .03

Table 6.11

Idiosyncratic Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				
	PAQ classification				χ^2 (3)
	Masculine (<u>N</u> = 16)	Feminine (<u>N</u> = 12)	Androgynous (<u>N</u> = 19)	Undifferentiated (<u>N</u> = 11)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 30	11	1	12	6	9.71*
Feminine <u>n</u> = 43	10	12	12	9	4.44
Masculine -Feminine <u>n</u> = 1			1		2.41

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.12

Idiosyncratic Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>N</u> = 58)	Feminine (<u>N</u> = 22)	Androgynous (<u>N</u> = 62)	Undifferentiated (<u>N</u> = 32)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 80	43	1	19	17	9.25*
Feminine <u>n</u> = 96	17	21	41	17	3.81
Masculine -Feminine <u>n</u> = 5			5		2.41

Note: * = significance at .03

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant occupation effect was reported for the three PAQ sub-scales (see Tables 6.9 & 6.10). A statistically significant sex effect was reported for the PAQ M sub-scale (see Tables 6.9 & 6.10). More women made more references to themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items than men. No other statistically significant sex effects were reported. There was also a statistically significant PAQ classification effect for the PAQ M sub-scale (see Tables 6.11 & 6.12). When describing themselves as idiosyncratic individuals, more Masculine, Androgynous, and Undifferentiated classified people described themselves using PAQ M items more often than Feminine people. No other statistically significant PAQ classification effects were reported.

6.4.5 PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences

The imposed PAQ sub-scale data were also analysed for usage differences using a Friedman two-way ANOVA. The data were analysed to see if any one sub-scale, or any one individual item from a PAQ sub-scale, had been coded more often than another. There were statistically significant usage differences between the coding frequencies of the combined three PAQ sub-scales for the participant response data, χ^2 (2) = 27.74, $p =$

.00 and the text unit data $\chi^2 (2) = 28.34, p = .00$. It appears that the PAQ M sub-scale items (participant response = 30, text units = 80) and the PAQ F sub-scale items (participant response = 43, text units = 96) were used more frequently than PAQ M-F sub-scale items (participant response = 1, text units = 5). There were no statistically significant usage differences between the individual items of the PAQ M sub-scale, participant response data, $\chi^2 (7) = 2.03, p > .05$, text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.11, p > .05$, the PAQ F sub-scale, participant response data, $\chi^2 (7) = 6.72, p > .05$, text unit data, $\chi^2 (7) = 7.01, p > .05$, or the PAQ M-F sub-scale, participant response data, $\chi^2 (7) = .203, p > .05$, text unit data, $\chi^2 (7) = .111, p > .05$.

6.4.6 Conclusion: Idiosyncratic Identity

With respect to the research questions associated with the idiosyncratic identity interview responses, the qualitative data appears to suggest that some participants did make reference to themselves using the PAQ M, F, and/or M-F sub-scale items. Further, there were some sex, occupation, and usage differences. The qualitative data presents a somewhat different picture to that found in the quantitative data in relation to sex differences. As discussed in the PAQ quantitative results section, it appears that there were no sex or occupation differences on PAQ responding. However when the PAQ items were imposed upon the qualitative data, there appears to be sex differences. More women appeared to use the PAQ M items with greater frequency than men⁴. There was some similarity between the quantitative and qualitative PAQ data sets with no occupational differences reported in either data set.

In this instance, when participants came to discursively represent themselves as idiosyncratic individuals, men and women appeared to differ in their use of PAQ items. However when the same participants came to respond to the PAQ with its pre-formed or

⁴ The reader should note that this discussion is in reference to the overall scale and not responses to individual items, as individual item analysis is not necessary for gender orientation classification (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

pre-existing descriptive traits, no statistically significant sex differences were reported. Thus there appears to be some discrepancy between what people say and how they respond to pre-existing trait descriptions. However as discussed in Chapter Five, the poor power associated with the PAQ quantitative analysis lowers the confidence of these conclusions. Possible reasons for response disparity will be discussed in Chapter Eleven.

The total text units that were represented by idiosyncratic identity responses was 890, with 74 participants responses represented. Of these 890 text units, 174 (19.6%) text units were coded at a PAQ sub-scale node, with 58 (78%) participants using PAQ sub-scale items to describe themselves. This leaves 80% of what was said unaccounted for when using the a-priori content analysis coding scheme, with 22% of participants ($n = 16$) not being represented by this coding scheme. Thus, whilst the majority of participants did make reference to themselves using PAQ items, this accounted for a minority of the content.

6.5 Gender Identity and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis

6.5.1 The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale

Of the 74 participants who responded to the gender identity question⁵, 23 participants described themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items, with 78 text units ($N = 1003$) representing PAQ M sub-scale items. There were no coded matches with the PAQ M sub-scale item, Feels Superior. Below are seven text extracts from the gender identity question that have been coded at an individual PAQ M sub-scale item node.

Extract 1.

*S1/MC/MM/15/41/23/4/8/FTC/A/3/T/Undiff

Text units 18-18:

⁵ Q2 asked 'In general, if you were to describe yourself as a man/woman to another person, how would you do this?'

18 female um, I'm, you know I love, ah, **competition, I do love competition,**
(Competitive)

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/FXMX/17/25/7/3/3FTC/NZ/S/1/T/Mas

Text units 24-25:

24 that I am male, um being fairly, I guess I'm **fairly decisive in what I do**

25 **so** that

(Makes decisions easily)

Extract 3.

*S1/FA/FX/19/22/8/8/6/FTA/A/S/1/TAFE/Fem

Text units 9-9:

9 Um ... I guess I'd say as a woman I'm fairly **confident**, um, and happy

(Self-confidence)

Extract 4.

*S1/MA/MM/20/21/12/3/2/FTA/A/DEF/1/S/Undiff

Text units 43-45:

43 forced because I'm living away from my family but, um, I'm pretty

44 **independent and, don't really like asking other people for help which**

45 **gets me into trouble a lot** but yeah, just a big

(Independent)

Extract 5.

*S1/FA/FX/41/20/12/8/2/FTS/A/S/0/TAFE/And

Text units 18-20:

18 do something really well, um, I like to achieve a lot, **like if I set myself**

19 **something you know, I'll keep going until I get there, um, things like**

20 **that.**

(Never give up easily)

Extract 6.

*S1/FA/FX/60/18/10/4/1/FTS/A/S/0/T/Mas

Text units 13-13:

13 That's a different one, um, as a woman, I would say fairly **active**,

(Active)

Extract 7.

*S1/FC/FX/8/25/10/9/2/FTC/A/S/2/T/Undiff

Text units 42-46:

42 tough when like **different problems come up in your life, whatever, in**

43 **any aspect, I think I can, cope with them, rather than getting**

44 **emotional about them this is a really** bad image I'm portraying of a

45 woman but anyway, um, yeah so, **like I don't get as emotional about**

46 **problems, I can deal with them more like realistically,** um ... I suppose

(Stands up well under pressure)

Tables 6.13 to 6.16 present the coded frequencies for the imposed eight PAQ M sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response ($N = 23$) and text unit ($N = 78$).

Table 6.13

Gender Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 7)	Women (<u>n</u> = 16)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 11)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 12)	
Independent	1	5	-1.66	3	3	-.03
Active	1	1	-.02	2		-1.44
Competitive	3		-1.78	2	1	-.61
Decisive	1	1	-.02		2	-1.41
Never gives up easily	2	4	-.81	4	2	-.88
Self-confident		5	-2.27*	2	3	-.43
Feels superior						
Stands pressure	1	2	-.56		3	-1.73

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.14

Gender Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 22)	Women (<u>n</u> = 56)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 35)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 43)	
Independent	2	16	-1.69	10	8	-.07
Active	1	1	-.02	2		-1.44
Competitive	3		-1.78	2	1	-.61
Decisive	5	2	-.02		7	-1.40
Never gives up easily	10	5	-.73	12	3	-.89
Self-confident		22	-2.27*	11	12	-.40
Feels superior						
Stands pressure	2	11	-.59		13	-1.73

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.15

Gender Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 3)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 6)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 9)	
Independent	1		2	3	4.15
Active	1			1	2.08
Competitive	1			2	4.51
Decisive	1			1	2.08
Never gives up easily	2		2	2	1.79
Self-confident	1	2	2		2.55
Feels superior					
Stands pressure		1		2	5.05

Table 6.16

Gender Identity PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 27)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 12)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 12)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 27)	
Independent	4		5	9	4.06
Active	1			1	2.08
Competitive	1			2	4.51
Decisive	5			2	2.06
Never gives up easily	9		2	3	1.78
Self-confident	8	10	4		2.51
Feels superior Stands pressure		2		4	5.13

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant occupation or PAQ classification effects were reported (see Tables 6.13 to 6.16). A statistically significant sex difference was reported (see Tables 6.13 & 6.14). Thus when describing themselves as gendered individuals, more women made more references to themselves as being Self-confident than men. There were no other statistically significant sex effects.

6.5.2 The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale

In this analysis, 19 participants described themselves using PAQ F sub-scale items, with 45 text units (N = 1003) representing PAQ F sub-scale items. There were no reported coded matches with the PAQ F sub-scale items Able to Devote Self to Completely to Others or Kind. Following are five text extracts from the gender identity question that have been coded at an individual PAQ F sub-scale item node.

Extract 1.

*S1/FC/FF/127/53/30/18/6/FTC/A/M/3/T/Mas

Text units 31-33:

31 guess it comes back from the old stereotype of **warm and soft and**
 32 **cuddly, and if you had seen me with my children I've got that element**
 33 **to me as well**, but only with my children.
 (Warm in relations with others)

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/MX/16/39/8/5/5/FTC/A/M/3/T/Mas

Text units 21-21:

21 enjoy that aspect, and working with people and **helping** them.
 (Helpful to others)

Extract 3.

*S1/MA/MX/18/21/9/8/3PTA/A/S/1/T/And

Text units 18-20:

18 quite **understanding to people** and, I think I'm fairly ah, how do you say
 19 **it, fairly sensitive to some people's needs, and I think, I like, being like**
 20 **that**,
 (Aware of feelings of others)
 (Understanding of others)

Extract 4.

*S1/MA/MX/44/22/17/5/3/FTS/A/S/0/T/Undiff

Text units 12-12:

12 most would see, I'm more um, I'm **softer than most I'd say**, so I'm not

Text units 15-15:

15 play football but to be tough and, **I never was that tough**, so

Text units 17-19:

17 Um, like I have people tell me that they they think they think I'm, like a
 18 first impression is they think I might be gay, things like that, it's just,
 19 **something that I guess I'm not really aggressive, so**.
 (Gentle)

Extract 5.

*S1/FC/FX/48/34/11/7/0/OTHER/USA/S/2/T/And

Text units 29-30:

29 **emotionally I'm probably pretty typical, I cry when I'm supposed to**
 30 **cry** in fact I'm probably a bit **overly emotional**, and I would also say that
 (Very emotional)

Tables 6.17 to 6.20 present the coded frequencies for the eight imposed PAQ F sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response ($N = 19$) and text unit ($N = 45$).

Table 6.17

Gender Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 12)	Women (<u>n</u> = 7)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 6)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 13)	
Emotional Devoted	1	2	-.56	2	1	-.61
Gentle	6		-2.57*	3	3	-.03
Helpful Kind	2	1	-.61	1	2	-.56
Aware of feelings	1	1	-.02	2		-1.44
Understanding	5	2	-1.22	2	5	-1.15
Warm with others	2	4	-.81	1	3	-1.66

Note: * = significance at .01

Table 6.18

Gender Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					<u>Z</u>
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		
	Men (<u>n</u> = 32)	Women (<u>n</u> = 13)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 16)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 29)	
Emotional Devoted	3	4	-.56	4	3	-.61
Gentle	11		-2.57*	8	3	-.03
Helpful Kind	3	2	-.61	1	4	-.56
Aware of feelings	2	1	-.02	3		-1.44
Understanding	13	2	-1.22	2	13	-1.15
Warm with others	2	6	-.81	1	7	-1.66

Note: * = significance at .01

Table 6.19

Gender Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 4)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 5)	
Emotional Devoted			2	1	3.19
Gentle	1	1		2	5.57
Helpful Kind	2	1			3.30
Aware of feelings			2		4.88
Understanding	2	1	2	2	.31
Warm with others	2	1	2	1	.17

Table 6.20

Gender Identity PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 9)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 7)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 8)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 21)	
Emotional			4	3	3.17
Devoted					
Gentle	1	3		7	5.47
Helpful	3	2			3.28
Kind					
Aware of feelings	3		3		4.88
Understanding	2	1	2	10	.38
Warm with others	4	1	2	1	.19

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant occupation or PAQ classification effects were reported (see Tables 6.17 to 6.20). A statistically significant sex difference was again reported (see Tables 6.17 & 6.18). That is, more men made more references to themselves as being Gentle than women. There were no other statistically significant sex differences.

6.5.3 The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale

Only one PAQ M-F item, Dominant, was found in the data. Five participants made reference to the item Dominant, with a total of 12 text unit references to the item. Below is the text from the gender identity question that has been coded at the Dominant PAQ M-F sub-scale item node.

Extract 1.

*S1/FA/FX/33/3/1/0/19/FTS/A/S/0/T/Undiff

Text units 29-30:

29 Um, it means that **I don't like doing things other people's**
30 **way and I want to do it my way.**

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/MXFX/23/40/20/10/7/FTC/A/M/3/S/Undiff

Text units 18-20:

18 much fairly easy going in a lot of ways, ah, **like to get my own way**, don't

19 like to argue unless I know I'm right, ah, yeah, definitely don't like to

20 argue unless I know I'm right, um, and **like to be right a lot** (laugh), just,

Extract 3.

*S1/MA/MX/29/18/13/4/0/FTS/A/S/0/S/Mas

Text units 26-31:

26 As a man. ... you know I just think in the way you act I think that's

27 that's the main thing like, when **you try and take control I think and**

28 **that's that's the way I am on the** (sporting arena) **actually, like, I like I**

29 **like to take control I like to be the leader kind of** thing that's, I don't

30 know why I guess some people, get that, and I just I **just like being out**

31 **there leading you know** and I think that

Extract 4.

*S1/FC/FX/4/33/6/1/0/FTC/A/S/2/T/Undiff

Text units 58-58:

58 depending on what it's about. **I like to get my own way**. But then again,

Extract 5.

*S1/FC/MX/49/35/12/12/3/FTC/NZ/S/3/T/Mas

Text units 28-28:

28 being submissive, but **I'd never call myself submissive** (laugh).

For the participant response data, no statistically significant effects of sex $\underline{U} = 685.5$, $\underline{z} = -.43$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 685.5$, $\underline{z} = -.43$, $p > .05$, or PAQ classification $\chi^2(3) = 6.52$, $p > .05$ were reported. Similarly for the text unit data, no statistically significant effects were reported for sex $\underline{U} = 688.5$, $\underline{z} = -.36$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 687.5$, $\underline{z} = -.38$, $p > .05$, or PAQ classification $\chi^2(3) = 6.47$, $p > .05$.

6.5.4 The Complete PAQ Sub-scales

The coded responses for the imposed eight items for each PAQ sub-scale were copied into one combined sub-scale for overall analysis. Tables 6.21 to 6.24 present the coded frequencies of the combined sub-scales as a function of sex and occupation, with the unit of analysis as participant response data ($\underline{N} = 38$) and text unit ($\underline{N} = 194$).

Table 6.21

Gender Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex			Occupation		
	Men (<u>N</u> = 18)	Women (<u>N</u> = 20)	<u>Z</u>	Athletes (<u>N</u> = 16)	Coaches (<u>N</u> = 22)	<u>Z</u>
Masculine <u>n</u> = 23	7	16	-2.16*	11	12	-.17
Feminine <u>n</u> = 19	12	7	-1.39	6	13	-1.78
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 5	2	3	-.43	2	3	-.43

Note: * = significance at .03

Table 6.22

Gender Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex			Occupation		
	Men (<u>N</u> = 61)	Women (<u>N</u> = 73)	<u>Z</u>	Athletes (<u>N</u> = 58)	Coaches (<u>N</u> = 76)	<u>Z</u>
Masculine <u>n</u> = 78	23	55	-2.17*	35	43	-.23
Feminine <u>n</u> = 45	32	13	-1.39	16	29	-1.65
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 12	8	4	-.36	9	5	-.38

Note: * = significance at .03

Table 6.23

Gender Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>N</u> = 10)	Feminine (<u>N</u> = 7)	Androgynous (<u>N</u> = 9)	Undifferentiated (<u>N</u> = 12)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 23	5	3	6	9	6.41
Feminine <u>n</u> = 19	5	5	4	5	1.46
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 5	2			3	6.52

Table 6.24

Gender Identity Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>N</u> = 42)	Feminine (<u>N</u> = 18)	Androgynous (<u>N</u> = 20)	Undifferentiated (<u>N</u> = 54)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 78	27	12	12	27	5.10
Feminine <u>n</u> = 45	9	7	8	21	1.45
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 12	6			6	6.47

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant occupation or PAQ classification effects were reported for the three PAQ sub-scales (see Tables 6.21 to 6.24). A statistically significant sex effect was reported for the PAQ M sub-scale (see Tables 6.21 & 6.22). When describing themselves as gendered individuals, more women made more references to themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items than men. There were no other statistically significant sex effects.

6.5.5 PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences

The imposed PAQ sub-scale data were also analysed for usage differences using a Friedman two-way ANOVA as per Q1. There were no statistically significant usage differences between the coding frequencies of the combined three PAQ sub-scales for the participant response data $\chi^2 (2) = 5.36, p > .05$ or text unit data $\chi^2 (2) = 5.93, p > .05$. There were no statistically significant usage differences between the individual PAQ M sub-scale items, participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.13, p > .05$, text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.16, p > .05$, the PAQ F sub-scale items, participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.64, p > .05$, text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.51, p > .05$, or the PAQ M-F sub-scale items, participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = .75, p > .05$, text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = .78, p > .05$.

6.5.6 Conclusion: Gender Identity

With respect to the research questions associated with the gender identity interview responses, the qualitative data appears to suggest that some participants did make reference to themselves using the PAQ M, F, and/or M-F sub-scale items. Further, there were various sex usage differences. Hence the qualitative data from the gender identity question again presents a somewhat different picture to that found in the quantitative data in relation to sex differences. As discussed in the PAQ quantitative results section, it appears that there were no sex or occupation differences on PAQ responding. However when the PAQ items were imposed upon the gender identity qualitative data there appears to be sex differences. In the qualitative data women again appear to use the PAQ M items with greater frequency than men, and overall more women than men appear to use the PAQ M items when describing themselves⁶. There

⁶ The reader should again note that this discussion is in reference to the overall scale and not responses to individual items, as individual item analysis is not necessary for gender orientation classification (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

was however some similarity between the quantitative and qualitative PAQ data sets with no occupational differences reported in either data set.

In this instance, when participants came to talk about themselves as men/women, men and women appeared to differ in their use of PAQ items. However when the same said participants came to respond to the PAQ with its pre-formed or pre-existing descriptive traits, no significant sex differences were reported. As with idiosyncratic identity, there appears to be some discrepancy between what people say and how they respond to pre-existing trait descriptions. Again the lack of power associated with the PAQ quantitative results bodes caution when considering these assertions. This discrepancy will be discussed in Chapter 10.

The total text units that were represented by gender identity responses was 1003, with 74 participants responses represented. Of these 1003 text units, 194 (19.3%) text units were coded at a PAQ sub-scale node, with 38 (51%) participants using PAQ sub-scale items to describe themselves. This leaves approximately 80% of what was said unaccounted for when using the a-priori content analysis coding scheme, with 49% ($n = 36$) of participants not being represented by this coding scheme. Thus, whilst just over half of the participants did make reference to themselves using PAQ items, this accounted for a minority of the content.

6.6 Gender Identity in Sport and the A-Priori PAQ Content Analysis

6.6.1 The PAQ Masculine Sub-scale

Of the 75 participants responding to the gender identity in sport question⁷, 24 participants described themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items, with 110 text units ($N = 1858$) representing PAQ M sub-scale items. There were no coded matches with the PAQ M sub-scale items Very Independent or Can Make Decisions Easily. Below are

⁷ Q6 asked 'If you were to describe yourself as a man/woman in elite sport to another person, how would you do this?'

six text extracts from the gender identity in sport question that have been coded at the PAQ M sub-scale node.

Extract 1.

*S1/MC/MM/15/41/23/4/8/FTC/A/3/T/Undiff

Text units 52-52:

52 of the game and um, you know, **managing my emotions** and ah focusing

Text units 58-58:

58 very prepared, um, **mentally tough never** ah, ... I think I was um, mainly (Stands up well under pressure)

Extract 2.

*S1/FA/FX/19/22/8/8/6/FTA/A/S/1/TAFE/Fem

Text units 78-78:

78 didn't play sport, um, and yeah, **I'm a lot more confident**, a lot a lot (Very self confident)

Extract 3.

*S1/FA/FM/21/31/6/6/6/OTHER/A/M/0/T/And

Text units 62-63:

62 Yeah, yeah I think I'm really happy **happy to be fit, rather than, sitting**

63 **at home being a sloth**, um and to look fit as well, so, it's really good.

(Very active)

Text units 93-98:

93 there's some really hard (sporting arena) and I **get a lot of satisfaction out**

94 **of**, trying you know to get (sporting arena) without (skill) or, and, **being**

95 **able to (skill) better than the other women you know, (skill) that sort**

96 **of thing better than a lot of people, and a lot of other guys as well so,**

97 **gives me a lot of satisfaction, gives me a lot of adrenaline so, makes**

98 **me happy throughout the day sort of thing**

(Feels very superior)

Extract 4.

*S1/MA/MM/22/18/13/3/2/FTA/A/S/1/TAFE/Mas

Text units 76-77:

76 Oh ok um, how I think of myself as a man in elite sport? Um **I think I'm**

77 **pretty competitive**. I like um, like getting the edge on the opponent and I

(Very competitive)

Extract 5.

*S1/MA/MX/44/22/17/5/3/FTS/A/S/0/T/Undiff

Text units 61-65:

- 61 Ok, you have to be um, **fully committed, you have to be ... well you**
 62 **have to be tough, I said that committed, I guess you just have to, want**
 63 **you have to know what your goals are, have to be able to set them and**
 64 **know that you can achieve them and want to achieve them, so it's**
 65 **mainly wanting it more.**
 (Never gives up easily)

Tables 6.25 to 6.28 present the coded frequencies for the imposed eight PAQ M sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response data ($N = 24$) and text unit data ($N = 110$).

Table 6.25

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 11)	Women (<u>n</u> = 13)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 15)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 9)	
Independent						
Active		1	-.99	1		-1.01
Competitive	5	3	-.78	7	1	-2.27*
Decisive						
Never gives up easily	4	5	-.31	6	3	-1.10
Self-confident	1	3	-.99	3	1	-1.05
Feels superior	1	2	-.56	1	2	-.56
Stands pressure	2	2	-.03	1	3	-.99

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.26

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori ContentAnalysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 58)	Women (<u>n</u> = 52)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 81)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 29)	
Independent						
Active		2	-.99	2		-1.01
Competitive	23	4	-.87	25	2	-2.26*
Decisive						
Never gives up easily	24	11	-.13	26	9	-1.16
Self-confident	2	19	-1.02	19	2	-1.08
Feels superior	9	14	-.56	12	11	-.53
Stands pressure	6	2	-.05		7	-1.00

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.27

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori ContentAnalysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 7)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 7)	
Independent					
Active			1		2.41
Competitive	2	2	3	1	.69
Decisive					
Never gives up easily	4		3	2	2.86
Self-confident	1	3			8.44**
Feels superior		1	2		3.30
Stands pressure				4	15.37*

Note: * = significance at .001, ** = significance at .04

Table 6.28

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Masculine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ M items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 34)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 30)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 26)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 20)	
Independent					
Active			2		2.41
Competitive	8	13	5	1	.72
Decisive					
Never gives up easily	19		5	11	2.94
Self-confident	11	10			8.20**
Feels superior		7	14		3.30
Stands pressure				5	15.36*

Note: * = significance at .001, ** = significance at .04

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant sex effects were reported (see Table 6.25). A statistically significant occupation difference was reported (see Tables 6.25 & 6.26). More athletes made reference to themselves as being Competitive more often than coaches. There were no other statistically significant occupation effects. There were two statistically significant differences reported for PAQ classification responses (see Tables 6.27 & 6.28). That is, more Feminine classified participants made reference to themselves as being Self-confident than Masculine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated classified participants. Further, more Undifferentiated classified participants made more references to themselves as Stands Up Very Well Under Pressure more often than the other three PAQ gender orientation categories. There were no other statistically significant PAQ effects.

There was also a difference between the participant response and the text unit data sets. As can be seen from Table 6.26, it appears that Feminine and Masculine classified participants made more references to themselves as being Self-confident than Androgynous or Undifferentiated classified participants. Thus whilst the number of Masculine classified people who made reference to themselves as being Self-confident

was not significant (participant response data), they did use the item Self-confidence with greater frequency (text unit data).

6.6.2 The PAQ Feminine Sub-scale

In this analysis, 14 participants described themselves using PAQ F sub-scale items, with 87 text units ($N = 1858$) representing PAQ F sub-scale items. There were no reported coded matches with the PAQ F sub-scale items Able to Devote Self to Completely to Others, Kind or Very Emotional. Below are four text extracts from the gender identity in sport question that have been coded at the PAQ F sub-scale node.

Extract 1.

*S1/FC/FX/48/34/11/7/0/OTHER/USA/S/2/T/And

Text units 202-211:

202 I ever achieved was to teach someone to (skill) and (skill) I wouldn't
 203 coach, um, I like to be able to see, what my athletes achieve on the
 204 field that they carry into their private lives, and I like to, to know
 205 that when I see athletes make huge improvements, I'm not talking
 206 in skill, I'm talking in commitment and goal setting and desire, and
 207 their ability to set goals and achieve them, I like to know that that
 208 will carry into their private life, and I often find a parallel in what
 209 they achieve in their sport, in their personal life, um, and I don't
 210 think, to a large extent you can be that, and be, the person that is
 211 cracking the whip.

(Very helpful to others)

Text units 214-214:

214 Yeah, I think I'm **too soft**, I'm too player focused and I think, in my
 (Very gentle)

Extract 2.

*S1/MC/MX/16/39/8/5/5/FTC/A/M/3/T/Mas

Text units 79-79:

79 um ... but I certainly have a very **sensitive** and **caring** side of me and,
 (Very aware of feelings of others)

Extract 3.

*S1/MC/MXFX/23/40/20/10/7/FTC/A/M/3/S/Undiff

Text units 89-89:

89 have to be an actor, um, caring, **understanding I**

(Very understanding of others)

Extract 4.

*S1/FC/FX/4/33/6/1/0/FTC/A/S/2/T/Undiff

Text units 133-134:

133 can, so I think I'm **very giving in that area. I like to, um, be very open**134 **to them and be accessible to them**, um, but within the (age) (state)

(Very warm in relations with others)

Tables 6.29 to 6.32 present the coded frequencies for the eight imposed PAQ F sub-scale items as a function of sex, occupation, and PAQ classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response data ($N = 14$) and text unit data ($N = 87$).

Table 6.29

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori ContentAnalysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 8)	Women (<u>n</u> = 6)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 3)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 11)	
Emotional						
Devoted						
Gentle	1	1	-.02	1	1	-.02
Helpful	2	1	-.61		3	-1.73
Kind						
Aware of feelings	2	2	-.03		4	-2.01*
Understanding	5	1	-1.73		6	-2.50**
Warm with others	1	4	-1.35	2	3	-.43

Note: * = significance at .04, ** significance at .01

Table 6.30

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori ContentAnalysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies					
	Sex		Z	Occupation		Z
	Men (n = 30)	Women (n = 57)		Athletes (n = 6)	Coaches (n = 81)	
Emotional						
Devoted						
Gentle	2	5	1.0	2	5	1.0
Helpful	5	10	-.58		15	-1.73
Kind						
Aware of feelings	6	5	-.05		11	-2.01*
Understanding	17	23	-1.67		40	-2.50**
Warm with others	2	15	-1.40	5	12	-.48

Note: * = significance at .04, ** = significance at .01

Table 6.31

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori ContentAnalysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (n = 3)	Feminine (n = 2)	Androgynous (n = 4)	Undifferentiated (n = 5)	
Emotional					
Devoted					
Gentle		1	1		2.23
Helpful	1	1	1		.97
Kind					
Aware of feelings	1		1	2	2.49
Understanding	1	1	1	3	3.22
Warm with others	1		1	3	5.08

Table 6.32

Gender Identity in Sport PAQ Feminine Sub-scale Frequencies: A-Priori Content Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ F items	Frequencies				$\chi^2 (3)$
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine (<u>n</u> = 5)	Feminine (<u>n</u> = 8)	Androgynous (<u>n</u> = 31)	Undifferentiated (<u>n</u> = 43)	
Emotional					
Devoted					
Gentle		2	5		2.21
Helpful	1	4	10		.97
Kind					
Aware of feelings	3		3	5	2.41
Understanding	1	2	11	26	3.27
Warm with others	1		2	13	5.44

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant sex or PAQ classification effects were reported (see Tables 6.29 to 6.32). Two statistically significant occupation differences were reported (see Tables 6.29 & 6.30). Thus when describing their sporting gender identity, more coaches made more references to themselves as being Aware of Feelings of Others and Understanding of Others than athletes. There were no other statistically significant occupation effects.

6.6.3 The PAQ Masculine-Feminine Sub-scale

Of the 75 participants responding to the gender identity in sport question, 10 participants (Men = 3, Women = 7; Athletes = 6, Coaches = 4; Masculine = 2, Feminine = 4, Androgynous = 2, Undifferentiated = 2) described themselves using PAQ M-F sub-scale items, with 71 text units (Men = 21, Women = 50; Athletes = 51, Coaches = 20; Masculine = 14, Feminine = 26, Androgynous = 12, Undifferentiated = 19) representing PAQ M sub-scale items. There were no reported coded matches with the PAQ M- F sub-scale item Never Cries, Feelings Not Easily Hurt, Very Little Need For Security, Not at All Excitable in a Major Crisis, Indifferent to Others' Approval, or Very

Worldly. Below are two text extracts from the gender identity in sport question that has been coded at the PAQ M-F sub-scale node.

Extract 1.

*S1/FA/FX/19/22/8/8/6/FTA/A/S/1/TAFE/Fem

Text units 75-78:

75 the **aggressive person on (sporting arena)** so I'm the one (skill) and da
 76 da da so I guess that being, **that aggressive part of (sporting arena) I**
 77 **kind of bring out into my life now as well so I'm a little more**
 78 **aggressive and a little more assertive** than what I would have been
 (Very aggressive)

Extract 2.

*S1/FA/FF/38/20/11/5/5/FTS/NZ/S/1/T/Fem

Text units 104-107:

104 to say um, I'm I'm **more of a leader** um, than, than oh I like **to tell**
 105 **people what I'm thinking rather and rather than listening to it, I**
 106 **think** because I've been um, playing with younger girls **I like to guide**
 107 **them in a way that I think that could improve their ability.**
 (Very dominant)

With reference to the PAQ M-F item Very Aggressive, the following coded frequencies for the participant response data were reported: Men = 2; Women = 2; Athletes = 5; Coaches = 1. When considering the same item, the following coded frequencies were reported for the text unit data: Men = 15; Women = 33; Athletes = 45; Coaches = 3. In reference to the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant, the following coded frequencies for the participant response data were reported: Men = 2; Women = 2; Athletes = 1. When considering the same item, the following coded frequencies were reported for the text unit data: Men = 8; Women = 9; Athletes = 6; Coaches = 11.

The following coded frequencies were reported for the PAQ M-F item Very Aggressive: participant response data – Masculine = 2, Feminine = 1, Androgynous = 2, Undifferentiated = 2; text unit data - Masculine = 14, Feminine = 11, Androgynous = 10, Undifferentiated = 19. For the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant: participant response data –Feminine = 3, Androgynous = 1; text unit data - Feminine = 8, Androgynous = 3.

For the participant response data and the PAQ M-F item Very Aggressive, no statistically significant effects were reported, sex $\underline{U} = 667.0$, $\underline{z} = -.81$, $p > .05$,

occupation $\underline{U} = 626.5$, $\underline{z} = -1.73$, $p > .05$, and PAQ classification $\chi^2 (3) = .17$, $p > .05$. The same pattern of results was reported for the text unit data, sex $\underline{U} = 667.0$, $\underline{z} = -.81$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 625.0$, $\underline{z} = -1.76$, $p > .05$, and PAQ classification $\chi^2 (3) = .12$, $p > .05$. For the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant, no statistically significant effects of sex and occupation were reported for the participant response data, sex $\underline{U} = 702.0$, $\underline{z} = -.03$, $p > .05$ and occupation $\underline{U} = 666.5$, $\underline{z} = -.99$, $p > .05$. However a significant PAQ classification was found, $\chi^2 (3) = 8.44$, $p = .04$. The same pattern of results were reported for the text unit data, sex $\underline{U} = 702.5$, $\underline{z} = -.01$, $p > .05$, occupation $\underline{U} = 667.5$, $\underline{z} = -.97$, $p > .05$, and PAQ $\chi^2 (3) = 8.52$, $p = .04$. Thus more Feminine classified participants made more references to themselves using the PAQ M-F item Very Dominant than Masculine, Androgynous or Undifferentiated classified participants.

6.6.4 The Complete PAQ Sub-scales

The coded responses for the imposed eight items for each PAQ sub-scale were copied into one combined sub-scale for overall analysis as per Q1 and Q2. Tables 6.33 to 6.36 present the coded frequencies of the combined PAQ sub-scales as a function of sex, occupation, and gender orientation classification, with the unit of analysis as participant response data ($\underline{N} = 37$) and text unit data ($\underline{N} = 263$).

Table 6.33

Gender Identity in Sport Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 19)	Women (<u>n</u> = 18)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 19)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 18)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 24	7	16	-.41	11	12	-1.55
Feminine <u>n</u> = 14	12	7	-.64	6	13	-2.30*
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 10	2	3	-1.30	2	3	-.72

Note: * = significance at .02

Table 6.34

Gender Identity in Sport Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of Sex and Occupation, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies					
	Sex		<u>Z</u>	Occupation		<u>Z</u>
	Men (<u>n</u> = 106)	Women (<u>n</u> = 157)		Athletes (<u>n</u> = 136)	Coaches (<u>n</u> = 127)	
Masculine <u>n</u> = 110	58	52	-.10	81	29	-1.67
Feminine <u>n</u> = 87	30	57	-.49	6	81	-2.44*
Masculine- Feminine <u>n</u> = 71	21	50	-1.31	51	20	-.84

Note: * = significance at .01

Table 6.35

Gender Identity in Sport Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Participant Response Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine ($\underline{n} = 7$)	Feminine ($\underline{n} = 9$)	Androgynous ($\underline{n} = 10$)	Undifferentiated ($\underline{n} = 11$)	
Masculine $\underline{n} = 24$	5	5	7	7	1.87
Feminine $\underline{n} = 14$	3	2	4	5	2.29
Masculine- Feminine $\underline{n} = 10$	2	4	2	2	2.96

Table 6.36

Gender Identity in Sport Combined PAQ Sub-scales Frequencies: A-Priori Content
Analysis as a Function of PAQ Classification, Text Unit Data

PAQ sub-scales	Frequencies				χ^2 (3)
	PAQ classification				
	Masculine ($\underline{n} = 51$)	Feminine ($\underline{n} = 64$)	Androgynous ($\underline{n} = 67$)	Undifferentiated ($\underline{n} = 81$)	
Masculine $\underline{n} = 110$	34	30	26	20	1.11
Feminine $\underline{n} = 87$	5	8	31	43	2.79
Masculine- Feminine $\underline{n} = 71$	14	26	12	19	2.85

For the participant response and text unit data, no statistically significant sex or PAQ classification effects were reported for the three PAQ sub-scales (see Tables 6.33 to 6.36). However a statistically significant occupation effect was reported for the PAQ F sub-scale (see Tables 6.33 & 6.34). In this instance more coaches made more references to themselves using PAQ F sub-scale items than athletes. There were no other statistically significant occupation effects.

6.6.5 PAQ Sub-scale Coding Frequency Differences

The imposed PAQ sub-scale data were also analysed for usage differences, again using a Friedman two-way ANOVA as per Q1 and Q2. There was no significant usage differences between the coding frequencies of the combined three PAQ sub-scales for participant response data $\chi^2 (2) = 3.12, p > .05$ or text unit data $\chi^2 (2) = 2.66, p > .05$. Nor were there any significant usage differences between the individual items of the PAQ M sub-scale for participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = 2.91, p > .05$ or text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 2.79, p > .05$, the PAQ F sub-scale for participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.42, p > .05$ or text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.41, p > .05$, or the PAQ M-F sub-scale for participant response data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.28, p > .05$ or text unit data $\chi^2 (7) = 1.28, p > .05$.

6.6.6 Conclusion: Gender Identity in Sport

With respect to the research questions associated with the gender identity in sport interview responses, the qualitative data appears to suggest that some participants did make reference to themselves using the PAQ M, F, and/or M-F sub-scale items. Further, there were various occupational and gender orientation differences. The qualitative data from the gender identity in sport question, like the idiosyncratic and gender identity questions, presents a somewhat different picture to that found in the quantitative data in relation to sex differences. As discussed in the PAQ quantitative results section, it appears that there were no sex or occupation differences on PAQ responding. However when the PAQ items were imposed upon the gender identity in sport qualitative data there appears to be occupational differences. Coaches appear to use individual PAQ F items with greater frequency than athletes and overall more coaches than athletes appear to use the PAQ F items when describing themselves⁸.

⁸ The reader should again note that this discussion is in reference to the overall scale and not responses to individual items, as individual item analysis is not necessary for gender orientation classification (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

In this instance, when participants came to do their sporting gender identity, that is when they came to talk about themselves as men/women in elite sport, coaches and athletes appeared to differ in their use of PAQ items during this sporting gendered self-description. However, when the same participants came to respond to the PAQ with its pre-formed or pre-existing descriptive traits, no significant occupational differences were reported. As with the idiosyncratic and gender identity responses, there appears to be some discrepancy between what people say and how they respond to pre-existing trait descriptions. These comments are made with consideration of the low power levels reported with the PAQ analysis.

The total text units that were represented by gender identity in sport responses were 1858, with 75 participants responses represented in this question. Of these 1858 text units, 267 (14.4%) text units were coded at a PAQ sub-scale node, with 37 (49%) participants using PAQ sub-scale items to describe themselves. This leaves, however, approximately 85% of what was said unaccounted for when using the a-priori content analysis, with 51% of participants not being represented by this coding scheme. Thus, whilst just under half of the participants did make reference to themselves using PAQ items, this accounted for a minority of the content that was represented in their responses.

6.7 Conclusion: Comparing Across the Identities

One of the central points of this dissertation is that, in discursive interactions, speakers and hearers are positioned both interactively and reflexively. As discussed in Chapter Three, we can be located in conversations both intentionally and unintentionally by what other people say to or about us (interactive positioning), and what we say about ourselves (reflexive positioning) (Davies & Harre', 1990). In Q1, the interactive positioning was the idiosyncratic identity. In Q2, the interactive positioning was the gender identity, whereas in Q6, it became the sporting gender identity. What is of analytic interest is how the participant reflexively positions self in response to these interactive positioning changes. In this dissertation, when gender and sporting lenses

are layered upon a discursive interaction of interest is how this layering or interactive positioning positions the interlocutor.

With respect to PAQ sub-scale items and the idiosyncratic identity (refer to Table 6.37), it appears that more athletes reflexively positioned themselves using the PAQ M sub-scale item Competitive and the PAQ F sub-scale item Warm in Relation to Others, than did coaches.

Table 6.37

Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Idiosyncratic Identity

PAQ	Finding	Significance Level	Unit of Analysis
PAQ M sub-scale item Competitive	Athletes used more often	.04	PRD
		.04	TU
PAQ F sub-scale Item Warm in Relation to Others	Athletes used more often	.01	PRD
		.02	TU
PAQ M sub-scale items	Women used more often	.02	PRD
		.03	TU
PAQ M sub-scale items	Feminine classified participants used less often	.02	PRD
		.03	TU
Scale usage	PAQ M and F sub-scale items used more often	.00	PRD
		.00	TU

Note: PRD = participant response data, TU = text unit data

Table 6.38

Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Gender Identity

PAQ	Finding	Significance Level	Unit of Analysis
PAQ M sub-scale item Self-confident	Women used more often	.02	PRD
		.02	TU
PAQ F sub-scale item Gentle	Men used more often	.01	PRD
		.01	TU
PAQ M sub-scale items	Women used more often	.03	PRD
		.03	TU

Note: PRD = participant response data, TU = text unit data

Further, it appears that more women reflexively positioned themselves through using PAQ M sub-scale items than men. Thus when being interactively positioned as idiosyncratic individuals, athletes and women reflexively positioned themselves differently than coaches and men.

When applying a gender lens to the interactive positioning process, participants' use of the PAQ sub-scale items changed somewhat (see Table 6.38). That is, more women appeared to reflexively position themselves through using the PAQ M sub-scale item Self-confident more often than men. More men appeared to reflexively position themselves through using the PAQ F sub-scale item Gentle than did women. As with the idiosyncratic identity, when women described their gender identity, more women appeared to reflexively position themselves using PAQ M sub-scale items than did men. When being interactively positioned as men/women, men and women reflexively positioned themselves differently. The intentional application of a gender lens appears to have altered the reflexive positioning process in terms of individual PAQ sub-scale item use.

Table 6.39

Summary of Significant A-priori Content Findings Across Gender Identity in Sport

PAQ	Finding	Significance Level	Unit of Analysis
PAQ M sub-scale item Competitive	Athletes used more often	.02	PRD
		.02	TU
PAQ M sub-scale item Self-Confidence	Feminine classified participants used more often	.04	PRD
		.04	TU
PAQ M sub-scale item Stands up Well Under Pressure	Undifferentiated classified participants used more often	.001	PRD
		.001	TU
PAQ F sub-scale item Aware of Others Feelings	Coaches used more often	.04	PRD
		.04	TU
PAQ F sub-scale item Understanding of Others	Coaches used more often	.01	PRD
		.01	TU
PAQ M-F sub-scale item Very Dominant	Feminine classified participants used more often	.04	PRD
		.04	TU
PAQ F sub-scale items	Coaches used more often	.02	PRD
		.01	TU

Note: PRD = participant response data, TU = text unit data

Similarly when adding the next layer, (the elite sporting layer) changes in reflexive positioning emerge (refer to Table 6.39). More athletes appeared to reflexively position themselves through using the PAQ M sub-scale item Competitive than did coaches. Whereas more coaches appeared to reflexively position themselves through using the PAQ F sub-scale items Understanding of Others and Aware of Others Feelings more often than athletes. Again, the intentional application of sport and gender lenses appears to have altered the reflexive positioning process in terms of individual PAQ sub-scale item use. From the above it appears that intentional interactive positioning may influence participants reflexive positioning. However the above needs to be considered within the parameters of the number of statistical analyses carried out

in the a-priori content analysis. The large number increases the possibility of significant findings by chance, and thus the above results should be treated with caution.

As discussed in Chapter Three, Davies and Harré (1990) postulate that certain discursive resources (e.g., images, tropes, metaphors), within particular discursive practices (e.g., interpretative repertoires), within particular story lines⁷, are made relevant through interactive positioning. With reference to this dissertation, placing a gender lens and a sporting gender lens upon the participant's self-description processes may have influenced how participants made reference to themselves in terms of PAQ sub-scale items. The categorisation of participants as men/women in general and men/women in elite sport may have influenced how participants responded compared to categorisation as idiosyncratic individuals with reference to PAQ sub-scale items. Therefore, if we ask men and women to see themselves as men and women, we interactively position them as men and women, this in turn may limit the practices, resources, and stories that are available to them. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven. Having explored the first research question, this dissertation now moves onto the discursive analysis.

⁷ The reader is referred to Chapter Three for a discussion of descriptions as story lines and stories.

CHAPTER SEVEN
CONSTITUTING IDENTITIES: THE FEMALE COACHES, FIONA AND
KAREN

7.1	Introduction	165
7.2	Fiona	166
7.2.1	Idiosyncratic Identity: Talking the Talk of Androgyny But Walking a Masculine Walk	167
7.2.2	Gender Identity: Masculine Talking and Atypical Walking ..	173
7.2.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	180
7.2.4	Gender Identity in Elite Sport: Being Positioned as a Woman in Elite Sport.....	182
7.2.5	Fiona’s Story So Far: Being Positioned as an Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Woman, and as a Woman in Elite Sport	187
7.3	Karen	190
7.3.1	An Idiosyncratic Individual: Talking the Talk of Masculinity and Interpersonality and Walking a Masculine Walk	190
7.3.2	Now as a Woman: Equality Talking and Opposites Walking	194
7.3.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and the A-Priori Content Analysis: Karen	198
7.3.4	I’ve Never Thought of Myself as a Woman Coaching: Talking the Talk of the Female Coach but Walking the Walk of the Non-Issue.....	199
7.3.5	Karen’s Story So Far	202

7.1 Introduction

The following four chapters present the discursive analysis regarding interview Questions One (idiosyncratic identity), Two (gender identity), and Six (gender identity in sport). At the end of each chapter some preliminary observations have been made to facilitate ease of reading and understanding. A more comprehensive discussion chapter will ensue after Chapter Ten.

To reiterate, Research Question Two explored how elite sportswomen and sportsmen enact and negotiate membership of idiosyncratic identity categories, gender identity categories, and gender identity in elite sport categories in everyday talk. In order to answer this question, the discourse analysis sought to identify the discursive resources (e.g., interpretative repertoires, reflexive positions), and discursive strategies (e.g., extreme case formulations) associated with participants' responses to Questions One, Two, and Six¹. The decision to analyse these three questions was described in Chapter Six. The interview questions considered in the discourse analysis were:

1. Question One (Q1) - In general, if you were to describe yourself as a person to another person, how would you do this;
2. Question Two (Q2) - In general, if you were to describe yourself as a woman/man to another person, how would you do this; and
3. Question Six (Q6) - In elite sport, if you were to describe yourself as a woman/man to another person, how would you do this?

Each participant and their responses to the above three questions will be discussed separately. This presentation style offers the reader the opportunity to note changes and developments in identity positioning as the participant is moved interactively from idiosyncratic identity, to gender identity, and finally through to gender identity in elite sport². Presentation style and grammatical structuring has been

¹ The reader is directed to Chapter Four for discussion regarding this analytic process, and Chapter Three for discussion of interpretative repertoires, reflexive positions, and discursive strategies.

² The reader is directed to Chapter Three for a discussion of identities.

kept consistent and somewhat repetitive across the four discourse analysis chapters. This was done to assist the reader in focusing on identity developments across questions and across participants. Extract presentation has been kept consistent across all discourse analysis chapters, and the reader is referred to Chapter Six for a description of presentation. Text that is discussed outside of the extract has been italicised for ease of reading.

In reference to the sub-section titles in the discourse analysis chapters talking the talk refers to the interpretative repertoires that were used as discursive resources by participants during their reflexive positioning. Whereas walking the walk refers to the reflexive positions that participants took up within these interpretative repertoires. The reader is directed to Chapter Three for a discussion of interactive and reflexive positioning. The following participants were randomly selected from each of their associated sub groups in this dissertation (e.g., female athletes, female coaches, male athletes, male coaches)

7.2 Fiona

At the time of the interview Fiona³, a 25-year-old coach, was in her first year as a full-time elite level coach. She had been part-time coaching for 10 years, with 9 of these at the national level. Her current position combined coaching predominately female developmental⁴, national, and international level athletes. Fiona coached in a sport where men and women participated, with competition being same-sex only. Fiona was a former elite athlete.

³ The speaker of each extract has been given a pseudonym to ensure confidentiality.

⁴ Developmental squad athletes are junior level athletes (5-16 years of age) who have yet to record a national and/or international level performance but are considered to have the potential to perform at these levels.

7.2.1 Idiosyncratic Identity: Talking the Talk of Androgyny But Walking a Masculine Walk

As discussed in Chapter Four, Q1 explored how participants reflexively positioned self when interactively positioned as idiosyncratic individuals. In reference to identities, Q1 examined how participants gave meaning to their idiosyncratic identity. Thus the analytic focus of this question concerned how participants reflexively positioned their idiosyncratic identity through their use of discursive resources (e.g., interpretative repertoires & reflexive positions) and discursive strategies (e.g., three-part list).

Four questions were associated with Q1.

1. What were the reflexive positions that participants used to position themselves as idiosyncratic individuals;
2. What were the interpretative repertoires that participants used when doing this;
3. Did participants draw upon gender related interpretative repertoires when positioning themselves, and if so what were they; and
4. What were the discursive strategies that participants used to position themselves as idiosyncratic individuals, and how were these strategies used.

In response to the idiosyncratic positioning, Fiona draws upon an Androgynous repertoire when constituting her idiosyncratic identity. The basic premise of the Androgynous repertoire is that both masculine and feminine stereotypical descriptions are used in-conjunction to script up an idiosyncratic identity description. The Androgynous repertoire conforms discursively to the androgyny concept as espoused by Bem (1974). Bem's conceptualisation of androgyny refers to the co-existence of both masculine and feminine traits within the individual. That is, an individual who is Androgynous is able to draw equally upon masculine and feminine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours as the situation or context demands.

*S1/FC/FX/8/25/10/9/2/FTC/A/S/2/T/Undiff⁵

Text units 5-15:

5 Just um, just me in general? Ah, oh ... I like to be really active and keep
 6 busy all the time... um, like if I'm, like if I have spare time I like to be
 7 doing things all the time, um, I like to travel, um ..., I guess I'd have to be
 8 interested in sport, no I am, well, watching different sports, basically, um,
 9 pretty easy sort of going person, um, what else? I like to be with my
 10 friends and family a lot, um ..., I guess whatever I do I like to do the very
 11 best that I can do in it, whether um, it be just recreational work or
 12 whatever, and I get frustrated if I know I'm not doing the best that I can be
 13 doing at it, um I like to be sociable, I like to go out and mix with
 14 my friends and stuff all the time. Um, that's about it I think, is that
 15 enough?

The traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours used by Fiona are consistent with gender stereotype research in psychology (e.g., Bem, 1974; Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux, Winston, Crowley, & Lewis, 1985; Fiebert & Meyer, 1997; Harris & Griffin, 1997; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams, Satterwhite, & Best, 1999)⁶. To illustrate, the Masculine is seen on lines 5 and 6, *active and keep busy all the time* (active – Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best), and line 7, *I'd have to be interested in sport, no I am* (good at sports/athletic - Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich). The Feminine is seen on line 9, *I like to be with my friends and family a lot*, and lines 12 and 13 *I like to be sociable, I like to go out and mix with my friends and stuff all the time* (sociable – Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best).

A more precise reading of the extract reveals how Fiona utilises specific aspects of the Androgynous repertoire to script up, negotiate, and align herself as a particular type of individual on this occasion, a Masculine person. Fiona scripts herself up as being Androgynous through words associated with femininity and masculinity, however

⁵ The reader is directed to Appendix A.9 for header information.

⁶ Hereafter masculine will be used to represent the male stereotype, and feminine will be used to represent the female stereotype, as this is consistent with the usage proposed by Williams and Best (1994).

what is of interest is that she does not discursively bring the Masculine and Feminine discourses together.

The absence of co-existence between the Masculine and Feminine discourses alerts the reader to the possibility that Fiona is using the Androgynous repertoire as a discursive strategy to manage her idiosyncratic identity. To demonstrate, co-existence would have existed if Fiona had added the following co-junction words (in bold) to her discourse on lines 11 and 12, *I get frustrated if I know I'm not doing the best um **and (or but) I also like to be sociable too.*** These co-junction words would have joined together the Masculine and the Feminine thus linguistically inferring co-existence (Peters, 1995). Had Fiona used these she would have reflexively positioned herself as Androgynous instead of Masculine.

The form of talk that Fiona deploys as she negotiates her idiosyncratic identity on this occasion is one that scripts her up as being Masculine. This subtle reflexive position is interwoven within the Androgynous repertoire. The Masculine identity is characterised by being *really active and keep busy all the time* (line 5), *if I have spare time I like to be doing things all the time* (lines 6 & 7), *interested in sport* (line 7), *well watching different sports* (line 8), and *whatever I do I like to do the very best that I can do in it, whether um, it be just recreational work or whatever, and I get frustrated if I know I'm not doing the best* (lines 10 & 11). Whilst this construction may appear similar to the masculine traits discussed in the Androgynous repertoire, Fiona gives herself meaning on this occasion through her repetition (Speer, 2000) of the Masculine identity (see lines 7 to 14). The repetition makes her Masculine production her most prominent idiosyncratic identity, on this occasion, because these descriptions are associated with, or conform to, key descriptive elements of Masculinity (Wetherell & Edley, 1999).

Crawford and Unger (2000) assert that women who behave in ways that are considered socially unacceptable for women, risk psychological isolation and social ostracism. In any social interaction one of the key tasks, according to Hollway (1989), is self-presentation that enhances or protects one's ego. Therefore in this instance, Fiona risks sanction as a woman when self-prescribing masculine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours.

In her identity work Fiona is faced with an interactional dilemma (Billig, 1996). That is, of positioning herself so that she can still speak with some authority on what it is like to be an idiosyncratic individual, whilst at the same time speaking with the anticipation of how she will be heard and responded to by the hearer. Billig argues that everyday interactions are bound with conflicts or contrary culturally valued themes that the interlocutor, or speaker, can take up within interactions. These themes shape interactions; they pull and push the interlocutor in divergent ways within the interaction. According to Billig, the interlocutor is aware of these contrary themes and how they will be heard by, and responded to, in interaction. Further, Bakhtin (1986) asserts that we deliberately arrange forms of talk with the anticipation of how they will be heard, and acted upon, by the listener. Hence we talk with the anticipation of being heard and we actively manage our talk with the anticipation of how our discourse will be responded to by the listener. Fiona thus faces the interactional dilemma of how can she be an idiosyncratic individual and not be socially sanctioned or challenged in the interaction.

Fiona manages this dilemma through her use of the Androgynous repertoire. The Androgyny repertoire enables Fiona to manage her dilemma in such a way that does not undermine her self-production and minimises her risk of social ostracism and psychological isolation. It allows her to speak more freely of her Masculine identity, where the deployment of her Feminine side works to undermine any alternative descriptions from being considered by the hearer. It negates the possibility of Fiona being seen as too Masculine because she constructs herself as also Feminine.

Given the risks inherent in taking up a position that may be considered socially unacceptable for a woman, Fiona reinforces her Masculine identity through her use of extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986). In situations where people are trying to “justify, accuse or argue some conclusion ... extreme points are used on relevant descriptive dimensions” (Potter, 1996b, p.187), on this occasion, Masculine dimensions. Extreme case formulations can be used as a deliberate discursive strategy to manage how a speaker’s production will be heard and acted upon in identity negotiation. Extreme case formulations work to rhetorically strengthen and reinforce Fiona’s description of herself as someone who ascribes to a Masculine way of being. Extreme

case formulations, therefore, help Fiona manage the interactional demands of the interview situation.

To illustrate, *I like to be really active and keep busy all the time* (lines 5 & 6). ‘Really’ and ‘all the time’ work to invite from the hearer a shared value judgement where being Masculine is considered an acceptable way of being for a woman. Extreme case formulations therefore increase the facticity of what Fiona is saying⁷ (Potter, 1996b). They rhetorically counter any challenges to her description by reifying her description. ‘Really’ emphasises Fiona’s activeness, making Fiona not just active but *really active*, thus making any challenge to Fiona’s self-production difficult. To demonstrate, *really active* negates in the hearer the necessity to ask Fiona how active is she, what does this entail, and so forth. Because ‘really’ carries with it unspecified discursive expectations that Fiona’s activeness incorporates a certain level of activity.

It is of interest that Fiona also uses extreme case formulations with the Feminine descriptive dimension sociable; *I like to go out and mix with my friends and stuff all the time* (lines 12 to 13). Here ‘all the time’ could have been deliberately deployed as a discursive strategy to invite from the hearer a focus on her sociability rather than her tenuous Masculine prescription. Thus rhetorically shifting the descriptive focus from her masculinity to her sociability.

Fiona’s extract further displays how identity work in everyday talk is a site of negotiation, challenge, and disputation. Potter (1996b) asserts that identity work is a difficult and contentious task, a task that is open to challenge and criticism. This can be seen on line 5 where Fiona has some difficulty in accounting for herself as an idiosyncratic individual as evidenced by her repetition of my question and her pause and hesitations at non-transition-relevant places. Hesitations and pauses are indicative of the tenuous nature of the proceeding identity work, where the speaker is uncertain of the interactional requirements of the identity interaction (Speer & Potter, 2000).

⁷ The reader is directed to Chapter Three for a discussion of the epistemological orientation of discourse.

Potter (1996b) argues that talk, in and of itself, may not be treated as factual or literal. This is especially the case when identity negotiation is taking place, where impressions and thus identities are being managed to produce certain ways of being. Latour (1987) postulates that descriptions whose status are prefaced by 'I suppose', 'I guess', or 'I think', are often treated as highly suspect or provisional by the listener and thus treated as less factual than statements that are prefaced by 'I know', 'I am', or 'I believe'. Thus 'I suppose' statements can be used by the interlocutor to distance himself or herself from their accounts (Potter).

Fiona's use of *I guess I'd have to be interested in sport* (line 7) and her quick repair *no I am* (line 7), is reflective of the delicate identity work that she is about to undertake in scripting up a self that is contrary to societal expectations. By prefacing her descriptions with provisional statements Fiona allows herself the opportunity to manoeuvre her self-production of Masculine, should this be questioned, into the realm of a production that is more socially acceptable. Thus she is able to distance herself from her self-production should this be required. Provisional statements allow Fiona to script up alternative representations in the face of challenges or uncertainty (Potter, 1996b). To illustrate, under challenge about her interest in sport, *I guess* allows Fiona the discursive opportunity to respond in a way that deflects interest away, or distance herself from, a potentially risky identity.

Similarly, Fiona's use of the hedge words 'sort of' (line 8) work to soften the impact of her reference to being an easy going person and helps set limits on linguistic statements that could not be defended in their absolute form (Peters, 1995). Up to this point Fiona has scripted up a Masculine way of being with its potential for social sanction. 'Sort of', therefore, works to soften her alignment with being easygoing. It allows her the flexibility to align herself with some parts of easy going (e.g., relaxed in manner) but not others (e.g., placid and tolerant), should she be challenged about her production. Thus the deployment of 'sort of' rhetorically works to counter any hypothetical alternative descriptions that may be produced by the listener (Pomerantz, 1986). To demonstrate, I could have challenged Fiona on the discrepancy or discontinuity of her description. I could have asked how she can be sporting, active,

sociable, and easy going all at the same time? By prefacing her descriptions with hedge words Fiona can move her self-production so that is more acceptable to the hearer.

In response to my interactive positioning of her as an idiosyncratic individual, Fiona responded by reflexively positioning herself as Masculine through her referencing on lines 5 to 8. Thus Fiona used the Androgynous repertoire as a resource to walk a different walk within her Androgynous talk. Fiona did not script up a co-existence between her masculine and feminine traits thereby alerting the reader to the use of the Androgynous repertoire as a discursive strategy to manage an interactional dilemma. Through her use of an Androgynous discourse Fiona worked up a Masculine reflexive position that incorporated the negative perceptions that this can bring. Fiona's identity work suggested that taking up a Masculine position is a risky position. However these risks were minimised through various discursive strategies.

7.2.2 Gender Identity: Masculine Talking and Atypical Walking

Q2 explored how participants reflexively positioned themselves in response to being interactively positioned as women/men. In reference to identities, Q2 examined how participants gave meaning to their gender identity. The analytic focus concerned how participants reflexively positioned their gender identities through discursive resources and strategies. Analytically, I considered how the addition of a gender lens interacted with the construction process. Thus I looked at how positioning participants as a women/men may change their identity construction. Four research questions were associated with Q2:

1. What were the reflexive positions that participants used to position themselves as women/men;
2. What were the interpretative repertoires that participants used when doing this;
3. Did participants draw specifically upon gender related interpretative repertoires when reflexively positioning themselves, and if so what were they; and
4. What were the discursive strategies that participants used to position

themselves as women/men, and how were these used.

Text Units 24-46:

24 Oh gosh ... , as a woman to another person, I suppose, I guess this is my
 25 sporting background coming out I guess, I'm not like the typical female
 26 who likes to do, all the, oh... I don't know, I mean I don't know whether
 27 this is just my perception of a woman, I guess it's what's portrayed in the
 28 media, like a typical woman might like, get dressed up, do this do that, do
 29 that sort of thing, I just oh, um, how am I as a woman ...
 30 I KNOW THESE SEEM STRANGE QUESTIONS.
 31 Yeah I'm always told to be more of a lady (laugh). Um, that's from my
 32 mother um, sorry I don't know if that says something, what else? I guess,
 33 in comparison to the perception of what other women are like, I'm pretty
 34 like a tough, sort of person, um.
 35 WHEN YOU SAY TOUGH WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY TOUGH?
 36 Um what do I mean? You're not meant to ask me to clarify this um,
 37 ok ... I guess tough when like different problems come up in your life,
 38 whatever, in any aspect, I think I can, cope with them, rather than getting
 39 emotional about them this is a really bad image I'm portraying of a
 40 woman but anyway, um, yeah so, like I don't get as emotional about
 41 problems, I can deal with them more like realistically, um ... I suppose I'm
 42 really independent as well, um, what else?... .. And I mean, I'm tough
 43 on myself, um, with regards that expectations and on people, that I deal
 44 with in everyday life, whether it be at home, oh probably, not, probably
 45 more so at work than in my like individual life I guess yeah, just the
 46 expectations I set for, other people as well, even if they don't know it.

On this occasion when positioned as a woman, Fiona utilises a Masculine repertoire to constitute her gender identity. The Masculine repertoire consists of masculine stereotypical descriptions that are again consistent with gender stereotype research in psychology (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux et al., 1985; Fiebert & Meyer, 1997; Harris & Griffin, 1997; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999). The Masculine repertoire is seen on lines 33 and 34, *I'm a pretty tough sort of person*, (tough – Williams & Best; Williams et al.), line 38, *I think I can, cope with them, rather than getting emotional about them*, and line 40, *I don't get as emotional about problems* (unexcitable/unemotional – Crawford & Unger 2000; Williams & Best). Further on lines 40 and 41, *I can deal with them more like realistically* (good at reasoning – Williams & Best), and *um ... I suppose I'm really independent as well*, (independent - Crawford & Unger; Spence & Helmreich).

The reader at this point may ponder how this interpretative repertoire differs from the Masculine identity Fiona scripted up in the previous idiosyncratic section, and the Masculine aspect of the Androgynous repertoire. First, there are some similarities between the Androgynous repertoire used in the idiosyncratic identity and the Masculine repertoire used in the gender identity question. As discussed in with reference to the idiosyncratic positioning, Bem's (1974) conceptualisation of androgyny refers to the co-existence of both masculine and feminine traits within the individual. Thus there is overlap between the traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours associated with the Masculine repertoire and the masculine aspects of the Androgynous repertoire. Secondly, whilst the Masculine repertoire and Masculine identity share some traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours, they differ in how these traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours are used. The Masculine repertoire is used as a resource to script up an identity. Whereas the Masculine identity is an identity that contains highly invested, valued, or emotionally charged (Wetherell & Edley, 1999), masculine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. In this case, these traits are used to constitute an 'involved self-description' because they are associated with, or conform to, key descriptive elements of masculinity (Wetherell & Edley). To illustrate, Connell (1987) suggests that being interested in sport and being physically active are key elements of masculinity. Thus repertoires are resources that are used to give meaning to one's identity that is particular to the local interactional context.

When giving meaning to herself as a woman Fiona utilises specific aspects of the Masculine repertoire. That is, in response to being interactionally positioned as a woman, Fiona reflexively positions herself as being different from the typical female or Atypical. Fiona engages in what Billig (1996) calls particularisation. Particularisation is the opposing process of categorisation in that it captures the uniqueness of an individual within a social category, in Fiona's case, the global category of women. Individuals employ categorisation to locate people or things in categories whilst simultaneously employing particularisation to treat them as different or special. Billig argues that individuals may also engage in each process separately. Therefore, Fiona in this instance, scripts herself up as being unique or different from other members of her

dominant category, women. Fiona gives herself meaning through her repetition of key elements of the Atypical identity on lines 25 through to 41.

Fiona, therefore, distances herself from conventional ideals of what women 'should be like' and what they 'should do' by positioning herself as Atypical. This position is somewhat difficult to describe, it is almost a 'you'll know it when you hear it' production. The Atypical production of self is one where Fiona discursively positions herself as opposite to the typical female. To illustrate, *I'm not like the typical female who likes to do, all the* (lines 25 & 26), *I'm always told to be more of a lady* (line 31), and, *in comparison to the perception of what other women are like I'm pretty like a tough, sort of person* (lines 32 to 34).

As discussed in Fiona's idiosyncratic positioning, scripting up an identity that could be seen as contrary to societal expectations can be a tenuous identity for a woman to take-up. Fiona, therefore, faces an interactional dilemma of how can she behave in an Atypical way without being socially sanctioned or challenged in this interview. Fiona manages this dilemma by splitting her description into character and voice or autobiographical talk (e.g., I'm really) (Wetherell & Edley, 1999), to describe what she is like. By doing this, her production of self can appear to the listener as objective, not highly invested, valued, or emotionally charged (Wetherell & Edley), and thus not her significant identity.

If we prepare our discourse with the anticipation of how it will be heard and responded to by others, this use of autobiographical talk is a deliberate discursive strategy aimed at minimising the risks Fiona faces in taking up a production of self that is contrary to societal expectations of women. This de-investment, or splitting into character and voice, offers her the opportunity to adopt alternative descriptions should her production be challenged; it allows her the opportunity to distance herself from her own account (Potter, 1996b). For example, had I asked Fiona to provide examples of being independent, autobiographical talk allows her the opportunity to re-shape a description that is less risky. Fiona's response to this hypothetical challenge may have been 'well I'm not really what you would call independent, more lively and do things by myself...'.

Fiona's gender extract again displays that in conversation a person is faced with competing identities that one may script up, and that the taking up of certain identities carries with it risks. As seen from line 24, Fiona has difficulty in accounting for herself as a woman as evidenced by her pause and repetition of my question. She then starts her self-production with the provisional statements *I suppose, I guess* (line 24) to distance herself from her account. Fiona's use of provisional statements is reflective of the delicate identity work or risky position that she is to undertake. 'I suppose' allows Fiona the discursive opportunity to respond in a way that deflects interest away, or distance herself from, a risky identity.

Fiona's further difficulty with her self-production is evident on lines 25 and 26 where she begins to describe *the typical female who likes to do, all the, oh ... I don't know*. Here she does not finish her utterance because of her hesitation. The listener does not know what she was going to say about the typical female. This suggests that on this occasion Fiona is faced with an interactional dilemma (Speer, 2000). Fiona faces sanction for not being as society says she should, yet at the same time, should she produce a self that is typical she also faces being considered of low value, stereotypical, and conformist. This follows the assertion that femaleness and thus feminine is devalued whereas maleness and hence masculinity is valued in Western society (Crawford & Unger, 2000). Fiona is aware of the value-laden image that she portrays of the typical woman as illustrated in line 39; *this is a really bad image I'm portraying of a woman*.

In reference to interactional dilemmas, Fiona is being asked to describe herself as a woman. That is, to hold her sense of being a woman accountable and she is a woman which brings with it a category entitlement (Potter, 1996b) where who better to know what it is to be a woman than a woman. In certain contexts people from certain categories are assumed to be knowledgeable (e.g., a doctor in a hospital is assumed to know something about medicine). Therefore, the use of a category entitlement negates the need to ask how does the doctor know about medicine (Potter). In Fiona's case, it negates the need to ask how she knows about being a woman. Fiona faces the dilemma of positioning herself so that she can still speak with some authority on what it is like to

be a woman whilst at the same time distancing herself from a category that is often devalued by society.

Fiona manages this through an appeal to her lack of knowledge about the typical woman and by attributing her beliefs and opinions about typical women to the media portrayal of women (see lines 26 & 27). *I don't know* (line 26) is not necessarily indicative of an authentic lack of knowledge, rather it can be rhetorically worked up to portray a pretence of a lack of knowledge (Potter, 1996b). In Fiona's case, it works to bolster her argument that as a unique individual she lacks knowledge about the global category woman which she reinforces through the category entitlement of the media. Constructing the typical woman as a media production and not of Fiona's making, works to make her lack of knowledge about the typical woman normal and understandable, and makes her construction of an Atypical self reasonable. These discursive strategies enable Fiona to manage her interactional dilemma in such a way that it does not undermine her own self-production. Hence she is able to be a woman and still be valued.

Once having secured a less tenuous platform from which to produce a gendered self, Fiona reinforces her construction of her uniqueness through the use of extreme case formulations extreme case formulations (see line 31). 'Always' works to rhetorically strengthen her description of herself as being Atypical by reifying her description through the undermining of alternative descriptions. However on lines 31 to 32 Fiona remains apprehensive about this Atypical self-production through her referencing of the above statement to her mother. The social category of mother (Potter, 1996b) is used to rhetorically deflect responsibility for her description to others, as she did with the media.

What is of note is how Fiona constructs herself as tough which is not typically considered a female trait (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux et al., 1985; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999). She handles this questionable self-production through a variety of discursive strategies. Her first mention of being *tough* where she differentiates herself from other women (see line 33) is prefaced by *I guess*. This provisional statement allows her the opportunity to change her self-production of

Atypical; it allows her the opportunity to not only manoeuvre her toughness but also the 'other women' construction through distancing herself from her constructions.

Further, she does not talk about herself as being tough per se; she references herself as a *tough, sort of person* (line 33 & 34). As a rhetorical strategy, 'sort of' softens the impact or assertiveness of a statement or claim. In this case, the use softens her possession of a non-stereotypical characteristic and allows her to adopt an alternative description should her production be challenged.

When I ask her to clarify this description she finds this difficult as demonstrated by her hesitation and her repair to me that I have violated the implicit rules of self-description by asking her to clarify what she means (see line 36). This is indicative of the tenuous nature of taking up an identity that is not typical. She again uses provisional statements on lines 36 and 37, and on line 44 after her description of herself as being tough on others. When she moves her description to independent, she again prefaces her production with provisional statements. Therefore, she is able to manoeuvre her self-production of tough and independent to a production that is more socially acceptable should she need to.

In summary, in response to my interactive positioning of her as a woman. Fiona responded by reflexively positioning herself as Atypical through her explicit referencing on line 25 and implicitly on lines 32, 33, 38, 40, and 41. Through her use of the Masculine repertoire, Fiona worked up an Atypical position that incorporated the negative perceptions that this can bring. It demonstrated how being constructed as a typical woman carried with it implicit value judgements of which Fiona, at least, was aware. It illustrated how Fiona was caught between two self-productions that could be perceived as tenuous for her. How she scripted up one production the Atypical position, and then how she worked to negate the tenuousness of this position. Thus Fiona walked a different walk within her Masculine talk.

As the focus of this dissertation is on gender conceptualisation, it is appropriate that I consider the ideological functions that may be served by the gender and sporting gender positions presented by participants. Fiona's use of the Masculine repertoire can be read as working from a stereotypical male global discursive pattern. That is, the repertoire encompasses culturally familiar descriptions that we would usually associate

with men. This demonstrates that in everyday talk we are able to orient to something we would call Masculine in order to make sense of ourselves as gendered individuals. However Fiona's extract also illustrates that within this we are able to use specific aspects of this repertoire to give meaning to ourselves that is particular to the local interactional context.

Fiona utilises the Masculine repertoire to position herself as an Atypical woman. This position is a particularised self. It is a self that stresses what she is not, as well as what she is. She attributes her difference from other women to her sporting background. Fiona, on this occasion, is a woman who does not meet the idealised media representation of women, which in a latter part of her extract is considered to be a negative representation of women. Thus she notes in her talk that her portrayal of women, which she configures as a media representation, is an unfavourable stereotype. Such a position may give legitimacy to Fiona's descriptive process. As discussed, scripting up a self that is different from expectations is a risky position to take up. However being unique or different (i.e., individualism) is a valued way of being in Western society (Triandis, 1995). Thus the Atypical position may ideologically serve as an empowering discourse for women. It may be an identity that subtly challenges or rejects the societal expectations of what women should be through the delineation of a female self that is different. Whilst at the same time working within the auspices of an individualistic discourse that is favoured in Western society.

7.2.3 Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis

On the basis of her responses to the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), Fiona was classified as Undifferentiated⁸. Yet in the semi-structured interview Fiona positioned herself as a particular type of woman, an Atypical woman, through her

⁸ A person classified as Undifferentiated scored below the median on both the PAQ M and Feminine (F) sub-scales.

accomplished use of the Masculine repertoire. Further, in reference to the a-priori content analysis, a section of Fiona's extract (lines 37-41, 19%) was coded at the PAQ Masculine (M) sub-scale node. Therefore, on this occasion, there is inconsistency between Fiona's responses to the PAQ and her everyday talk. That is, when Fiona is asked to ascribe herself as a woman, the content of her construction and how she gives meaning to herself as a woman differs from her responses to the PAQ.

Billig et al. (1988) assert that "gender categories are (conceived as) stable, universal, cognitive structures which can be traced to real differences in the external environment" (p.124). Given this, it would be expected that Fiona's talk, at the least the content if not the positioning, would somehow be reflective of how she responded to the PAQ. This is not the case. There is inconsistency between what Fiona says and how she self reports.

The reader may suppose that Fiona's Atypicality is the discursive production of Undifferentiated. That is, this is what the doing of Undifferentiated may look like in everyday talk. However a classification of Undifferentiated on the PAQ does not infer an absence of masculine and feminine traits. The Undifferentiated individual still possesses masculine and feminine traits but possesses them to a lesser degree than a Masculine, Feminine, or Androgynous classified individual. This possession to a lesser degree is not seen in her discourse. Indeed, in lines 37-41 Fiona displays a possession of masculine traits, this accompanies her suggestion that she is not as emotional as others (see line 40). This, combined with her use of a broader Masculine repertoire, makes it difficult to see how this discourse would be considered and accounted for as Undifferentiated.

As outlined in Chapters One and Two, researchers who impose their own preconceived cultural conceptualisations of gender upon participants do so without consideration of cultural diversity and possible differences (Doyle & Paludi, 1995). On this occasion, the imposition of researcher defined gender conceptualisations has not matched Fiona's conceptualisation of herself as a woman. The PAQ has captured a part of how Fiona orients herself in terms of stereotypical instrumental and expressive traits. However these conceptualisations are not consistent with how Fiona gives herself her own meaning as a woman through her talk. The PAQ may have captured Fiona's

descriptions of herself, but it is not able to fully capture Fiona's prescriptions of herself. Such inconsistency calls to question more traditional approaches to gender (e.g., Constantinople, 1973). Approaches that assume gender-differentiating traits somehow contribute to a bipolar continuum of masculinity-femininity. Instead it gives support to the notion that gender is multifactorial (Spence & Buckner, 2000), at least in everyday talk. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven.

7.2.4 Gender Identity in Elite Sport: Being Positioned as a Woman in Elite Sport

The final question, Q6, explored how participants reflexively positioned themselves when being interactively positioned as women/men when sport is offered as a site of referencing. In reference to identities, Q6 examined how participants gave meaning to their gender identity in sport. Thus the analytic focus of this question concerned how participants reflexively positioned their gender identities within sport through various discursive resources and strategies. In this question I considered how the addition of a gender lens in the sporting context influenced the construction process. Four research questions were again associated with Q6:

1. What were the reflexive positions that participants used to position themselves as women/men in elite sport;
2. What were the interpretative repertoires that participants used when doing this;
3. Did participants draw upon gender related interpretative repertoires when positioning themselves, and if so what were they; and
4. What were the discursive strategies that participants used to position themselves as women/men in elite sport and how were these used.

Text units: 158-171

158 Ah I suppose one related to the position I'm in at the moment
 159 because my position is the (position) position so I have to help and guide
 160 and give assistance to well all clubs and coaches throughout the state.
 161 Um, um, I mean some people might have a bit of a ... I don't know issue,

162 the fact that I'm in such a high leading position and that I'm a female, it
 163 doesn't bother me. I have come across some male coaches who I think
 164 have just got male egos, um, but I don't know whether they'd be like that
 165 with male coaches either, they just yeah that's how I could summarise it,
 166 but I mean my philosophy is if they don't want to listen to me just
 167 because I'm a female, it's their loss, and their disadvantaging their own
 168 athletes um, in my position here as um (position), I really don't see it as a
 169 problem, um, that I'm female in the position um, I mean, even without
 170 coaches I don't have problem with the parents, I don't really have a
 171 problem because I'm a female in that position yeah.

When asked to position herself as a woman in elite sport, Fiona employs a Female Coach repertoire to constitute her identity. The basic premise of the Female Coach repertoire is that duties, skills, and/or responsibilities associated with the coach and the problems female coaches may face in elite sport, are used to script up a gender identity in elite sport. In this instance, Fiona draws specifically upon the potential for interpersonal difficulties to arise between male and female coaches, to constitute herself as a woman in elite sport. Thus Fiona uses a resource, a repertoire that has both salience for her sport and her gender. This repertoire is seen on lines 159 and 160, *my position is the (position) position so I have to help and guide and give assistance to well all clubs and coaches throughout the state* (teaching duties of the effective coach - Anshel, 1997), lines 161 to 163, *some people might have a bit of a ... I don't know issue, the fact that I'm in such a high leading position and that I'm a female, it doesn't bother me. I have come across some male coaches who I think have just got male egos, um* (interpersonal difficulties), and lines 168-169, *that I'm female in the position um, I mean, even without coaches I don't have problem with the parents* (interpersonal difficulties).

The form of talk that Fiona deploys in response to being interactively positioned as a woman in elite sport is non-issue as a female coach. Fiona scripts up the Non-Issue identity as being, *I'm a female, it doesn't bother me. I have come across some male coaches who I think have just got male egos, um, but I don't know whether they'd be like that with male coaches either* (lines 162 to 164), *but I mean my philosophy is if they don't want to listen to me just because I'm a female, it's their loss, and their disadvantaging their own athletes um, in my position here as um (position), I really*

don't see it as a problem, um, that I'm female in the position (lines 165 to 168), and *even without coaches I don't have problem with the parents, I don't really have a problem* (lines 168 to 169). Whilst this construction may appear similar to the Female Coach discourse discussed above, Fiona gives herself meaning on this occasion through her repetition of key elements of the Non-Issue identity (see lines 162 to 169).

As in idiosyncratic identity and gender identity questions, the above extract demonstrates how identity construction is a site of potential disputation and difficulty, where identities are carefully crafted to take into consideration the accountability of the speaker. This is demonstrated on line 158 and line 161, Fiona has difficulty in accounting for herself as a woman in elite sport as evidenced through her pauses and hesitations at non-transition-relevant places.

In elite sport, coaching is predominately a male dominated profession⁹, with 89% of Level 3 and 79% of High Performance NCAS coaches being men (Women in Sport Unit, 1998). As a woman engaging in a segregated occupational context (Blau & Ferber, 1987), Fiona faces an interactional dilemma in her description process. Fiona faces the dilemma of positioning herself so that she can still speak with some authority on what it is like to be an elite coach, whilst at the same time distancing herself from the category woman that is often devalued by society (see Lips, 1993). Fiona faces the interactional dilemma of how she can be an elite coach and be a woman and still be valued.

Fiona manages this dilemma in two ways. Firstly, she uses a three-part list (Jefferson, 1990) to summarise her coach way of being. This listing of different features of the same image, *help and guide and give assistance* (line 160), helps to construct her coach self as commonplace or normal. Jefferson argues that when a description is presented as a three-part list, the three parts are used to represent aspects of a general category, or that these parts constitute a more general class of things. She notes that

⁹ Coaching as a profession is taken in the context of a paid vocation not as a voluntary activity. Men however still continue to dominate the voluntary ranks of coaching (Level 1 = 71% men, Level 2 = 83% men) (Women in Sport Unit, 1998).

when people are asked to describe items, categories, and so forth, they commonly deliver a list of descriptive traits or items, as a listing of three parts (as the one in this sentence was delivered). Accompanying this was her observation that the way in which this listing is delivered is also indicative of its normative nature.

Firstly, people often complete a listing of items or traits with list completers (e.g., and, so forth, etc.). Secondly, listeners rarely interrupt the speaker after the first two items are listed even when given the opportunity to do so. These led Jefferson to suggest that the three-part list is used to infer that what is being described is commonplace, as related, or as representative of a general way of being rather than as isolated or individual descriptive instances. This does not suggest that lists that have more or less features are not real lists. Rather that when lists were used to summarise a class of things, such lists are commonly portrayed using this three-part structure. Hence, Fiona on this occasion has used the three-part list to stand for a more general or normative way of being, as something that is prescriptive of herself as a coach, and something that is not unusual for a coach to be. By using the three-part list she moves to position herself as a coach rather than as a female coach.

Fiona also manages her dilemma through her appeal to her lack of knowledge about what these problems may be (see line 161). As discussed in Fiona's gender identity section, *I don't know* (line 162) can be rhetorically worked to portray a pretence of a lack of knowledge. In this instance she scripts up her lack of knowledge to bolster her argument that being a coach and being a female is an issue for other people but not her. Constructing the problem as someone else's issue and thus not of Fiona's making, works to make her lack of knowledge about these problems normal and understandable, and make reasonable her construction of herself as having no problems with being a woman and being a coach. Further, her lack of knowledge works to make the other people, in this instance male coaches, who have a problem with Fiona being a coach and female, appear unreasonable. These discursive strategies thus enable Fiona to manage the interactional dilemma in such a way that it does not undermine her own self-production. Hence she is able to be a coach, a woman, and still be valued.

Fiona again reinforces her Non-Issue identity through her use of extreme case formulations. For example, on line 161 and 162, *the fact that I'm in such a **high** leading*

*position and that I'm a female, it **doesn't** bother me*, and lines 167 and 168, *I **really** don't see it as a problem*. 'High', 'doesn't', and 'really', rhetorically strengthen her description of being female and a coach as a non-issue, thus countering any challenges to her description by reifying her description through the undermining of alternative descriptions. To demonstrate, 'really' makes it difficult for the hearer to challenge Fiona about whether she is merely saying that she does not have or see any problems with her being a woman in elite sport, or whether she actually does not have or see any problems. It negates the need to ask about the potential for problems because it is not that there are just no problems, there are 'really' no problems.

Fiona further reinforces her construction through her use of narrative. When constituting her idiosyncratic identity and gender identity she used autobiographical descriptions. This was discussed in the second extract, where her splitting of the self into voice and character was used to objectify or increase the facticity of her account. The use of narrative occurs when the interlocutor relates an idiosyncratic account through the telling of a story (Sarantakos, 1998). Narrative can be used as a rhetorical construction to make what the speaker is saying more real, more believable, or more factual (Potter, 1996b). Fiona's use of narrative begins on line 162 and continues through to line 167. Her organisation of her discourse into experiences with male coaches, her attributions of their behaviour, and then the consequences of their behaviour is used rhetorically. They increase the plausibility of her assertions that for her being female is not problematic, but for others it is. The above discursive strategies do not suggest that her femaleness is not an issue in general. It is an issue, but it is an issue that others must deal with, not Fiona.

What is of note in her identity work is the lack of hedge words and provisional statements surrounding Fiona's reflexive positioning as a woman in elite sport. Unlike her positioning as an idiosyncratic individual and as a woman, Fiona does not preface her descriptions with these words or statements. Rather she begins her description with factual statements as evidenced on line 161 of ***the fact** that I'm in such a high leading position*. Latour (1987) argues that 'fact', 'I know', and 'I claim' statements are most often treated as factual and solid by the listener, and thus are used to reify descriptions.

In this case, Fiona's use of *the fact*, works to reify her description that being female is not an issue for her as an elite coach.

Fiona, therefore, positioned herself as not having a problem with being a woman and an elite coach through her repeated referencing on lines 162 to 170. It is through her use of the Female Coach repertoire that Fiona worked up a Non-Issue reflexive position that negated the negative perceptions that being an elite coach and being female can bring. Hence, Fiona walked a different path within her Female Coach talk.

The Female Coach repertoire can be understood as encompassing culturally familiar descriptions that we would usually associate with female coaches. Fiona positions herself as not having an issue with being a female coach through her use of these culturally familiar descriptions. The Non-Issue self is a self where gender problems in elite sport are portrayed as residing with male coaches not Fiona. That is, for Fiona there is no dissonance between being a woman and being a coach. Fiona attributes the male coaches dissonance as being indicative of a personality disposition. She suggests that these coaches would have problems with any coach, be they female or male, inferring that this is not a gendered perception but a personality perception. Ideologically, such talk serves to place gender practices in sport as residing within the individual rather than as a social construction. As an identity, such discourse makes challenge to current gender practices difficult because gender issues can be dismissed as being individual incarnations rather than as social practices.

7.2.5 Fiona's Story So Far: Being Positioned as an Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Woman, and as a Woman in Elite Sport

As Fiona was interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, as a woman, and then as a woman in elite sport, differences emerged in her use of discursive resources and strategies (see Table 7.1). When a gender lens was added to the descriptive process, Fiona emphasised her difference from other women. That is, Fiona worked to actively distance herself from her gender category membership and considered how this would be heard by and responded to by others (Bakhtin, 1986). When not interactively positioned as a woman, Fiona's Atypicality does not take

prominence in her description, rather her Masculinity does, albeit with consideration of how this would be heard and responded to by the listener.

When a sporting lens was added to the gender descriptive process, Fiona shifts her reflexive positioning to one in which being a woman and being an elite coach is perceived as non-problematic for Fiona. She scripts up problems as being related to male coaches perceptions of her. Thus, for Fiona, the integration of a sport and gender lens has made salient her gender and her elite coach position as problematic for others. This may be explained through in-group out-group preferences (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), where members of the dominant group (male coaches in this case) often perceive members of the minority group (female coaches in this case) unfavourably (Ely, 1994; Ely, 1995b).

Table 7.1

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Fiona Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Androgynous	Masculine	Female Coach
Reflexive positions	Masculine	Atypical	Non-Issue
Extreme case formulations	✓	✓	✓
Hesitations or pauses	✓	✓	✓
Provisional statements	✓	✓	
Reifying statements			✓
Hedge words	✓	✓	
Autobiographical talk	✓ *	✓	✓
Interaction dilemmas	✓	✓	✓
Don't know		✓	✓
Three-part list			✓
Narrative			✓

Note: * Autobiographical talk was not discussed in Q1 but is present.

Not only were there changes in the use of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions across the three questions, Fiona's use of discursive strategies to reify her reflexive positions also differed (refer to Table 7.1). As Fiona is moved from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender, and then to a gender identity in elite sport, Fiona rhetorically scripted up a pretence of a lack of knowledge about herself as a woman and

of women in elite sport (see Table 7.1). This worked to increase the facticity of Fiona's questionable reflexive positions (Atypical and Non-Issue in gender identity and gender identity in sport respectively), and deflect responsibility for her negative descriptions of women to other people's constructions.

The moving of the self from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender identity, and then to a gender identity in elite sport has influenced the reflexive positioning process on this occasion. This is consistent with Davies and Harré (1990) understanding of positioning. They assert that interactive positioning is akin to "giving people parts in a story, whether it be explicit or implicit, a speaker makes available a subject position which the other speaker in the normal course of events would take up" (p.48). Thus, giving Fiona a part in a gender story has explicitly on this occasion, made available to her an Atypical position. Similarly, giving Fiona a part in the gender sporting story has explicitly on this occasion, made available to her a Non-Issue position. In Fiona's case, positioning her as a woman has made her gender, salient. When positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, Fiona does not make her gender salient on this occasion. However positioned as a woman in elite sport makes salient, for Fiona, her female coach self. Hence, intentional or unintentional positioning may encourage people to take up certain positions as their own, and this may in turn influence how they see the world and how they respond to the world. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven. Being consistent with the epistemological base of discursive psychology, the observations made in the preceding sections are limited to Fiona's talk on this occasion. That is, when faced with different local interactional contexts, Fiona may script up different reflexive positions, using different interpretative repertoires, through different discursive strategies. Thus, the aforementioned analysis is not to be taken as indicative of etic properties.

Positioning Fiona across two different interactive positions enables her to employ two ideologically contrastive discourses that serve different purposes when talking about herself as a woman and a woman in elite sport. Her Atypical position is a self that constitutes gender difference as a social construction, whereas the Non-Issue position deflects gender differences as individual orientations. Thus, Fiona talks the talk of social construction in one instance and individual differences on another.

7.3 Karen

As a 43-year-old full-time coach, Karen had been coaching for the past 25 years. Nine of these were at the national level and one at the international level. Her current position combined coaching female developmental, national, and international level athletes. Karen like Fiona, coached in a sport where men and women participated, with competition at the elite level being same-sex only. However, in Karen's case, women dominated the coaching ranks in her sport. Karen was also a former elite athlete.

7.3.1 An Idiosyncratic Individual: Talking the Talk of Masculinity and Interpersonality and Walking a Masculine Walk

*S1/FC/FF/5/43/25/9/1/FTC/A/M/3/T/And

Text units 5-20:

5 ... Independent. Um ... I probably have strong opinions on things. I am
6 very, conscientious, I um, remember being told by my principal when I left
7 school that the one thing he thought I had to work on was my tolerance,
8 that I was intolerant of others who didn't perform to the level that I
9 expected of them or whatever, and I was horrified that he could make such
10 a statement, but I think that's probably very accurate. In fact I think I am
11 intolerant of imperfections with others. I've certainly learnt since I've had
12 my own children to be more tolerant, but I guess I expect of others the
13 same things as I of myself, um, so, if I'm prepared to do something and do
14 it well, then I don't understand why other people would muck around and
15 not do it, so, I guess that does make me intolerant. Um... very caring and
16 very genuine and I would never, I could never tell someone they'd done
17 something well if they hadn't. It's not in my nature. My nature is such that,
18 this is the way it is, and you know I'd rather be honest with you and then
19 tell you a lie. Um, what else? Does that make me forthright? Ah, I don't
20 know, that might, that might be it. Ok?

Unlike Fiona, Karen draws upon two repertoires, a Masculine as well as an Interpersonal repertoire, when constituting her idiosyncratic identity on this occasion. The Masculine repertoire is the same-shared discourse that Fiona used when constituting her gender identity and the reader is directed there for a more detailed discussion of this repertoire. Karen, however, draws upon the Masculine repertoire

during idiosyncratic not gender construction. Karen also draws upon an Interpersonal repertoire during idiosyncratic constitution. The basic premise of the Interpersonal repertoire is that interactions with others are used to work up an idiosyncratic identity. This is a self that is constituted through interactions, or as being located in, or dependent upon, interactions with other people. Thus, the Interpersonal repertoire discursively encompasses a self that gains meaning from interactions with other people.

The Masculine repertoire is seen on line 5, *Independent* (independent – Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams et al., 1999), and *um ... I probably have strong opinions on things*, (opinionated – Williams & Best, 1994), line 6, *conscientious* (precise - Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Williams & Best), and finally line 18, *does that make me forthright?* (outspoken – Spence & Helmreich) Whereas the Interpersonal repertoire is seen on lines 10 to 12, *in fact I think I am intolerant of imperfections with others, I've certainly learnt since I've had my own children to be more tolerant, but I guess I expect of others the same things as I of myself*. Further, on lines 15 to 17, *I could never tell someone they'd done something well if they hadn't. It's not in my nature. My nature is such that, this is the way it is, and you know I'd rather be honest with you and then tell you a lie*.

A further reading of the extract reveals that Karen negotiates a particular idiosyncratic self within these repertoires. Through her use of the Masculine and Interpersonal repertoires Karen reflexively positions herself as Masculine. Hence Karen walks a particular path within her Masculine and Interpersonal talk. The reader is referred to the above paragraph that discussed Karen's possession of masculine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours for an illustration of the Masculine identity. This subtle reflexive position is entwined within the Masculine and Interpersonal repertoires. Whilst the reader may ponder how this differs from the above Masculine repertoire on this occasion, it is through her repetition of the key elements of the Masculine identity (see lines 5 to 18), that Karen gives herself meaning.

As mentioned in regard to Fiona's self-descriptions, ascribing to a socially unacceptable way of being can be a tenuous identity for a woman to script up. In Karen's case, she risks sanction as a woman when self-prescribing masculine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. In her identity work, Karen faces an interactional

dilemma of how can she be an idiosyncratic individual and not be socially sanctioned or challenged in the interview.

Karen manages this dilemma through her change of footing. Footing refers to the different roles that an individual can have in a discursive interaction, where moving from one role to the other can present an account as more factual or distance an interlocutor from an account (Potter, 1996b). In terms of the roles that we can take up in an interaction, we may consider there to be only two roles, either we speak or we listen. However Goffman (1979; 1981) argues for a more divergent division of discursive roles. He suggests there are different speaking roles that we can speak from and different listening roles from which we can hear. For the purpose of this discussion, I will centre on speech production rather than reception roles. Hence in any particular piece of discourse, and at any given time within that discourse, we can take up the speech production roles of principal, author, or animator.

Consider the play *King Henry the V* by Shakespeare. The animator merely speaks Shakespeare's words in *King Henry the V*, thus the actor is the animator. The author role is the interlocutor who writes the words; in *King Henry the V*, this is Shakespeare who scripted the play. The principal is the one whose "position the talk is meant to represent" (Potter, 1996b, p. 143). Hence, when the actor takes up the part of *King Henry the V* (the principal), the words recited are meant to represent *King Henry's* position.

As mentioned above, an interlocutor can change footing in order to make a description appear more factual, or distance herself/himself from a contentious identity. Shifts in footing are often used when sensitive or controversial facts or claims are being scripted up (Potter, 1996b). In this instance, it may minimise the risk of social ostracism and psychological isolation. Karen changes footing from principal on lines 5 and 6, where she speaks from the first person and thus holds herself accountable for her production, to the role of animator on lines 6 through to 9. Here she speaks as quoting from another person, her school principal. This works to make her intolerance not of her making, but rather someone else's making, and thus shifts the accountability of her description from herself to her school principal. The shift of footing serves to manage a risky identity in such a way that does not undermine Karen's self-production.

This is not an isolated strategy; Karen also uses hedge words and provisional statements to soften the impact of her Masculine identity. As demonstrated previously, individuals, through their discourse, work to make solid and factual their self-productions by using particular provisional statements. Karen's use of the provisional statements, *I think that's probably very accurate. In fact I think I am intolerant of imperfections with others* (lines 9 & 10), *but I guess I expect of others the same things as I of myself* (lines 11 & 12), and *I guess that does make me intolerant* (line 14), are reflective of the delicate identity work that she is about to undertake in scripting up a self that is contrary to societal expectations. Under challenge about her intolerance, *I guess* allows Karen the discursive opportunity to respond in a way that deflects interest away or distance herself from a risky identity, in this case intolerant.

Similarly Karen's use of the hedge word 'probably', *I think that's probably very accurate* (lines 9 & 10), works to soften her alignment with being intolerant and allows her the flexibility to align herself with some parts of intolerant (e.g., fanatical), but not others (e.g., bigoted) should she be challenged about her production. Thus the deployment of 'probably' counters any alternative descriptions that could be produced by the listener. In this instance, I could have challenged Karen about her description. I could have remarked that this makes her sound narrow-minded. By prefacing her descriptions with hedge words, Karen affords herself the opportunity to re-structure her self-production into a description that is more acceptable to the hearer.

Karen is aware of how her description may sound to the hearer as seen on line 15. Here she deploys extreme case formulations when using the feminine descriptive dimension caring and genuine as seen on lines 14 and 15, *very caring and very genuine*. Extreme case formulations work to strengthen her description of herself as someone who ascribes to being caring and genuine. In this instance 'very' rhetorically shifts the descriptive focus from her masculinity to her caring and genuineness. Extreme case formulations also invite from the hearer an understanding where being caring and genuine is considered a positive and acceptable way of being. Karen is not just caring and genuine, but 'very' caring and 'very' genuine.

In reply to my interactive positioning of her as an idiosyncratic individual Karen responded by reflexively positioning herself as Masculine through her referencing on

lines 5 to 14, and through her use of the Masculine and Interpersonal repertoires. Thus Karen, walked a particular walk within her Masculine and Interpersonal talk. Further, Karen scripted up a Masculine self-production that incorporated the negative perceptions that this can bring. These risks were minimised through Karen's use of various discursive strategies.

7.3.2 Now as a Woman: Equality Talking and Opposites Walking

Text Units: 32-40

32 ... I don't really guess I think of myself as women as opposed to men
 33 because I, maybe I don't believe that there's anything that a man can do
 34 that a woman can't do either. But there's certainly things we can do that
 35 they can't do, so, we can have children, they can't. But, realistically I
 36 don't think other than society's perception of us, that there's anything we
 37 can't do, and therefore I would say, that just because you were born a
 38 male and I was born a female shouldn't stop me from getting where I
 39 want to do and I'm just as, entitled or whatever to strive for whatever it is
 40 that I want. So I probably don't think of myself in those terms.

When describing herself as a woman, Karen draws upon an Egalitarian repertoire to do so. This reflects a form of talk that is similar to the equal opportunities talk reported by Wetherell et al. (1987) in their study of gender and employment opportunities. The basic premise of the Egalitarian repertoire is that general liberal values are used to script up a gendered description of the self. General liberal values incorporate the principle of equal rights, opportunities for all, a freedom of choice for all individuals, fairness for all, and an equal state of affairs way of being. Thus the Egalitarian repertoire is the discursive production of general liberal values where there are few or no differences between men and women.

This is seen on lines 33 and 34, *I don't believe that there's anything that a man can do that a woman can't*, and lines 35 and 36, *I don't think other than society's perception of us, that there's anything we can't do* (no difference – Wetherell et al., 1987). Further, on lines 37 to 39, *just because you were born a male and I was born a female shouldn't stop me from getting where I want to and I'm just as entitled or*

whatever to strive for whatever it is that I want (equal rights & opportunities for all – Wetherell et al.).

It is through her use of the Egalitarian repertoire that Karen reflexively positions herself as Opposite to Men when scripting herself up as a woman. Hence, Karen walks a different path from her Egalitarian talk. This form of talk conforms closely to the notion of men and women as opposite as posited by Davies (1997). Karen aligns women, and thus implicitly herself, as different from men by drawing upon a binary notion of gender construction. Here gender is worked up through language as “two binary categories hierarchically arranged in relation to each other” (Davies, p. 22). That is, feminine and masculine take up their meaning as opposite to the other (Edley & Wetherell, 1997), thus feminine and masculine, and hence women and men are defined through the process of differentiation. By default, if one is not feminine (female) one is masculine (male), and vice-a-versa.

The binary category notion also incorporates a hierarchical relational structure where maleness, hence masculinity, is valued, and femaleness, hence femininity, is devalued (Davies, 1997)¹⁰. Thus men are valued over women. In this instance, what is scripted up is an opposite way of being where Karen gives herself meaning through her repeated use of the key elements associated with the binary position (see lines 32 to 38) on this occasion.

Karen deploys quite subtly the hierarchical nature of gender relationships in her discourse. That is, she talks of herself as being similar to men, as men and women being equal. However, within this is the notion of hierarchical relatedness where women are perceived by society as less able than men. This is illustrated by Karen’s recognition of societal perceptions, where she infers on lines 35 and 36 that women are perceived by society as not being able to do certain things, *but, realistically I don't think other than*

¹⁰ I acknowledge that the concept of gender is not fixed and that being female does not always imply the opposite to being male. In this instance the binary position is being presented as just one discursive strategy that men and women may utilise in their construction of themselves as gendered individuals.

society's perception of us, that there's anything we can't do. Further, on lines 37 to 39, *just because you were born a male and I was born a female shouldn't stop me from getting where I want to do and I'm just as, entitled or whatever to strive for whatever it is that I want.* Here Karen infers that women are seen, by society, to be not as entitled as men to do certain things. Karen prefaces this on lines 34 and 35 with *but there's certainly things we can do that they can't do, so, we can have children, they can't*, thus quite subtly invoking the opposite position.

A position of being different to men is a tenuous identity to take up. Here is a woman, in an interaction with another woman, who is also a gender researcher, acknowledging that the social position of women is at the very least different, if not less than men. Karen, like Fiona, faces an interactional dilemma of positioning herself so that she can still speak with some authority on what it is like to be a woman, whilst at the same time scripting up a category that is often devalued by society.

Karen manages this dilemma through her production that she doesn't *believe that there is **anything** that a man can do that a woman can't* (line 33). At this point she is scripting up the notion that whatever a man can do, a woman, or Karen in this case, can do. Her use of the extreme-case formulation 'anything' is used by Karen to strengthen her argument that what men can do she can do. Edwards (2000) suggests that extreme case formulations can be deployed in two ways. Firstly, as descriptive resources that strengthen or protect an argument against counterclaims. This is consistent with the Pomerantz (1986) usage discussed above and previously in Fiona's extracts. Secondly, extreme case formulations can work as indexical markers of the speaker's investment or commitment toward the description. In this sense, extreme case formulations work as non-literal in that they can be deployed to demonstrate in this case, the strength of Karen's conviction that there is nothing separating the sexes. Thus working to make what she is saying more factual. The use of extreme case formulations convey to the hearer a sense that she does not just describe herself, she prescribes herself.

Because of the very non-literalness, extremity, and potential reflection of the speaker's subjectivity inherent in extreme case formulations, extreme case formulations can be easily challenged and refuted by the hearer. Thus extreme case formulations

sometimes require softening (Edwards, 2000). Karen is aware of this as seen on lines 34 to 35. Here she uses this requirement as a resource (Speer, 2000) to limit her generalisation which at the same time manages to leave in place her proposition that women can do anything that men can. That is, she undermines her extreme claim with the counter-claim that there are things that women can do that men cannot, such as giving birth. She does not say anything about men doing things that women can't. Instead Karen works to soften her original claim based on reproductive differences. By offering only a partial counter to her extreme claim Karen portrays herself as reasonable and knowledgeable, as well as offering herself the opportunity to return to, and reinforce, her original statement of similarities between men and women. It allows for the acknowledgment of physical differences without these detracting from her original position.

Her acknowledgment appears to script up a position of similarity. She returns from biological differences to similarities as indicated by *but* (line 35). 'But' serves to alert the reader to an imminent change of descriptive view (Peters, 1995) by Karen from differences on line 34 to similarities on lines 35 to 39. Karen returns to her extreme case formulations of 'anything' on line 36 where she is aware of the non-literalness of this statement. However, instead of working post-hoc to soften the non-literalness of her claim as she did in the discussion above, Karen works a-priori, in that she produces a counter claim, *other than society's perception of us* (line 36), before the claim. This again works as a resource to script up her claim as reasonable and knowledgeable without contesting her position of no difference. Indeed she reinforces her argument of equal opportunities for all through her use of further extreme case formulations as seen on line 38, *I'm just as entitled or whatever to strive for whatever it is that I want*. These show her commitment or investment toward the similarities position.

In conclusion, when asked to describe herself as a woman Karen responded by reflexively positioning herself as Opposite to Men through her explicit referencing on line 32 and implicitly on lines 34 to 38. Through her use of an Egalitarian repertoire, Karen worked up an Opposite to Men position that incorporated the possible negative perceptions that this may bring. It demonstrated how being constructed as Opposite to Men carries with it implicit value judgements of which Karen, at least, is aware.

By scripting herself up as a woman, Karen's use of the Egalitarian repertoire can be interpreted as culturally familiar descriptions that are associated with the principal of equal rights, freedom to choose, fairness, and so forth. We are able to note how Karen utilises specific aspects of the Egalitarian repertoire to give meaning to herself that is particular to the local interactional context. The Opposite to Men position is a self that highlights perceived gender differences as social constructions. It is recognition of the value that society places on women and men. Through the utilisation of the Egalitarian repertoire Karen is able to open such social constructions to challenge and refute which she does in her talk. She notes the social construction of inequality, and challenges this inequality by situating difference as biological difference and pertaining only to biological difference. Where women's biological ability to give birth is portrayed as a positive difference not a negative difference.

7.3.3 Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and the A-Priori Content Analysis: Karen

Karen's PAQ classification was Androgynous¹¹. However her discourse was representative of an Egalitarian way of being through which she positioned herself as Opposite to Men. Like Fiona, there is inconsistency between her PAQ classification and how she gave meaning to herself through her everyday talk. Thus, there is discrepancy between gender methods.

Karen's extract was not coded at any PAQ a-priori content analysis node. That is, when asked to describe herself as a woman Karen does not draw upon any PAQ related items. As a theoretical measure of gender, the PAQ measures instrumentality and expressivity not global masculinity and femininity. It is possible that different constructs were being represented by the two different methods (PAQ & interview). However, Spence and Helmreich (1978) argue that instrumentality and expressivity are

¹¹ An Androgynous classification occurred when participant's scores on the PAQ M and F sub-scales fell above the median points on these same scales.

key aspects of masculinity and femininity. Thus, according to the stable cognitive perspective (see Billig et al., 1988 & Spence and Helmreich) it would be expected that there be some semblance of consistency across the different measures. The absence of consistency questions the utility of considering gender as a fixed, universal, cognitive representation, and suggests that a more complex conceptualisation of gender may be operating in this instance.

7.3.4 I've Never Thought of Myself as a Woman Coaching: Talking the Talk of the Female Coach but Walking the Walk of the Non-Issue

Text units: 138-146

138 ... Again I think that's difficult because you're asking me to describe a
139 woman and I don't, I don't know that I've ever consciously thought of it
140 in that terms. I think that I think of myself as a person coaching in the
141 sport that I love. Now, maybe that's very insular and easy to say, because
142 (sport) is traditionally a woman's sport and it's basically about women
143 and most coaches are women, so, therefore to me it seems the absolute
144 norm that I would be the one out there coaching, and, I've never thought
145 about consciously whether a male would do it better or should be there,
146 so, I've never thought in terms that I am a woman coaching.

The repertoire that Karen draws upon to constitute herself as a woman in elite sport is the As Normal repertoire. The As Normal repertoire considers women as coaches as being consistent with the norms, values, beliefs, and expectations of the particular sport. The As Normal repertoire discursively incorporates the notion that in Karen's particular sport it is standard practice for women to coach. This may be seen on lines 142 to 144, *because (sport) is traditionally a woman's sport and it's basically about women and most coaches are women, so, therefore to me it seems the absolute norm that I would be the one out there coaching.*

Through her use of the As Normal repertoire Karen reflexively positions herself as Not Seeing herself as a woman in sport, hereafter referred to as Not See. Karen scripts up the Not See identity as being, *I don't, I don't know that I've ever consciously thought of it in that terms. I think that I think of myself as a person coaching in the sport that I love* (lines 140 & 141), and *I've never thought about consciously whether a male*

would do it better or should be there, so, I've never thought in terms that I am a woman coaching (lines 145 to 147). Again it is the repetition of key elements of the Not See identity that give Karen meaning on this occasion (see lines 140 to 147).

Karen has difficulty in accounting for herself as evidenced through her pause at the beginning of her response (see line 139). Further, Karen distances herself from being a woman through her admission that the task of description becomes difficult when a gender lens is laid upon the sporting context (see lines 139 to 141). By rhetorically positioning herself as someone for whom gender categorisation does not come naturally, the above may work as an avoidance strategy that enables Karen to bypass her gendered self in sport. Karen is a member of the dominant group for her sport. Her sport is run predominantly by women for predominantly women athletes. Being a woman in this sport is not the exception but the rule.

Karen also uses extreme case formulations to reinforce her description of herself as someone who ascribes to a Not See way of being, *I don't know that I've **ever** consciously thought of it in that terms. I think that I think of myself as a person coaching in the sport that I **love*** (lines 140 & 141), and *I've **never** thought about consciously whether a male would do it **better** or **should** be there, so, I've **never** thought in terms that I am a woman coaching* (lines 145 to 147).

'Ever', 'never', 'love', 'better', and 'should' invite from the hearer a shared value judgement where not seeing self in terms of gender is considered an acceptable way of being for a female coach. As indexical markers of the speaker's investment, or commitment toward the description, they demonstrate the strength of Karen's conviction that she does not see herself as a woman in elite sport. Thus they increase the facticity of her self-production. The use of extreme case formulations convey to the hearer a sense that she does not just describe herself; she prescribes herself, she becomes the Not See person. 'Never' emphasises Karen's absence of thought on the topic making Karen not just someone for whom gender is not an issue but also someone for whom gender is not consciously considered.

Extreme case formulations can also be used to normalise a tenuous identity. As argued previously being a female coach brings with it a category entitlement. My interactive positioning of Karen as a woman in elite sport was a deliberate attempt to

make available to Karen the gender story line (Davies & Harré, 1990). As Davies and Harré postulate, in the normal course of a conversation this is an invitation to take up a particular story line, a gender story line. Through my interactive positioning I have invited Karen to conform to my question. For Karen to respond and thus continue to converse with me, Karen needs to make some sort of contribution to my questioning. However Karen only partially takes up my story line. Her use of extreme case formulations, therefore, normalises her absence of gender consideration and allows the conversation to continue.

Further, Karen uses extreme case formulations for their fact-constructural properties when introducing woman as the norm. This is seen on lines 142 to 144, *maybe that's very insular and easy to say, because (sport) is traditionally a woman's sport and it's basically about women and most coaches are women, so, therefore to me it seems the absolute norm that I would be the one out there*. Again by doing this there is an invitation for acceptance of woman as coaches. Therefore rhetorically strengthening her assertion that women coaches do not violate behavioural expectations, and it is a non-issue for a woman to be a coach. To demonstrate, 'absolute' emphasises the acceptance and normality of women in coaching positions making any challenge to Karen's self-production difficult. As an indexical marker, 'absolute' demonstrates the strength of Karen's conviction that she does not see herself as a woman in elite sport, and serves to strengthen Karen's position that she does not see her gender in her sport.

Karen further reifies her Not See position through her appeal to her lack of knowledge about whether she has thought about being a woman and being a coach (see line 140). As a pretence of a lack of knowledge, *I don't know* bolsters her argument that she has not considered herself in terms of her gender.

Claiming to not see her gender can be a tenuous position to take up. Karen's awareness of this is evidenced through her use of the provisional statement *I think that I think of myself as a person coaching in the sport that I love* (lines 140 & 141). 'I think' allows Karen the opportunity to distance herself from her original self-production and affiliate herself with a more accepted self-production, should this be necessary. For example, under challenge about her not having thought about herself as a woman in

elite sport, Karen can respond in a way that deflects interest away or distance herself from a potentially risky identity. To illustrate, she could respond to a hypothetical challenge by replying, 'well as I said women are the norm'. These discursive strategies enable Karen to manage challenges to her self-production in such a way that does not undermine it.

When interactively positioned as a woman in elite sport Karen responded by reflexively positioning herself as not seeing her gender through her repeated referencing on lines 140 to 147. Through her use of As Normal repertoire Karen worked up a Not See identity. The extract demonstrated how being constructed as a woman in elite sport carried with it implicit risks of which Karen is aware. Thus, Karen walked a different walk within her female as normal talk.

With reference to ideology, Karen's use of the As Normal repertoire can be understood as a global discursive pattern where woman as coaches are consistent with this particular sport's expectations. By using specific aspects of this repertoire Karen gave meaning to herself that was particular to the local interactional context. The Not See position is a self that negates gender as a social category impinging upon the descriptive process. That is, Karen does not see her gender as an important aspect of who she is as an elite coach. She attempts to make the coaching process genderless where being a woman or man does not equate with competent coaching practices. That is, she subtly infers a social construction by denying that men would coach better than women or that it is natural that men should be the coach and not women. She however does not directly refute this notion, rather it is placed as a non-conscious thought in her sporting culture.

7.3.5 Karen's Story So Far

Karen drew upon three different interpretative repertoires and reflexively positioned herself differently within each interactive positioning (see Table 7.2) across idiosyncratic identity, gender identity, and gender in sport identity questions. As a woman, Karen emphasised her difference from men. This is in contrast to Fiona who emphasised her difference from other women (see Table 7.1). When not interactively

positioned as a woman, Karen's female-male differentiation does not take prominence in her description, rather her masculinity does, albeit with consideration of how this will be heard and responded to by the listener. This is the same as Fiona, thus both female coaches when not interactively positioned as women, scripted up a Masculine identity.

Table 7.2

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Karen Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Masculine & Interpersonal	Egalitarian	As Normal
Reflexive positions	Masculine	Opposite to Men	Not See Self as Woman
Extreme case formulations	✓	✓ *	✓ *
Hesitations or pauses			✓
Provisional statements	✓		
Hedge words	✓		
Footing change	✓		
Interactional dilemmas	✓	✓	✓
Don't know			✓

Note: * Extreme case formulations change to incorporate strength of statement.

Karen is also aware of the tenuousness of scripting up a Masculine identity and works to make this identity less open to challenge and dispute through her use of various discursive strategies (see Table 7.2). Thus, taking up an identity that is contrary to societal expectations, is a risky identity to script up of which Karen is aware. The addition of a sporting lens to the gender descriptive process shifted Karen's reflexive positioning to one in which she does not see herself as a female elite level coach. Thus, the integration of a sport and gender lens has not made her gender salient for Karen. Again, this differs from Fiona where such integration made salient her gender, albeit as an issue for others.

When not interactively positioned as an elite coach Karen's gender takes prominence in her description through her opposition to men, albeit with consideration of how this will be heard and responded to by the listener. Therefore unless she is

interactively positioned so as to respond in a way where her gender becomes salient, Karen does not see the construction of her gender identity in elite sport to have a gender component. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Eleven.

The discursive strategies that Karen used to reify her reflexive positions differed across the three interpretative repertoires (refer to Table 7.2). Karen oriented herself to the tenuous position of not seeing her self as a woman in elite sport by rhetorically scripting up a pretence of a lack of knowledge about this identity. Karen's use of extreme case formulations changed when they were deployed as indexical markers of the speaker's investment or commitment toward the description. In this instance, they demonstrated the strength of Karen's conviction that she does not see herself as a woman in elite sport and that she sees herself as Opposite to Men. The prominence of interactional dilemmas is indicative of identity work in discourse as being a site of negotiation, challenge, and disputation.

When compared to Fiona, Karen had less difficulty in scripting up her identities as suggested by Fiona's greater use of hesitations and pauses, provisional statements, hedge words, and uses of 'don't know'. Each of these strategies has been discussed in detail in previous sections. However, overall, hedge words, 'don't know', hesitations, and pauses are suggestive of the difficulty that Fiona may have faced in these interactional tasks.

The differences between Fiona and Karen may be accounted for by the interactive occasion, as this is consistent with the epistemological and theoretical orientation of discursive psychology. However taking a wider view, the differing sporting cultures that each coach works within, and their potentially different psychosocial developmental stages may also have influenced the interactional differences. Karen worked within a sporting culture where women dominated the coaching ranks¹², whereas Fiona worked where men dominated. Thus, the difference in

¹² Quoting ratios and actual numbers may inadvertently reveal Karen's sport and hence her identity given the somewhat inclusive nature of elite sport in Australia, which would contravene participant consent conditions.

the way each coach has scripted up her coaching identity, and the identity itself, may reflect these potential cultural differences. Further, it is possible that Fiona and Karen are in different psychosocial stages of development (Erikson, 1963), with Karen perhaps being in middle adulthood and Fiona being in adolescence.

The moving of the self from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender identity, and then to a gender identity in elite sport appears to have influenced the reflexive positioning process. This is again consistent with Davies and Harré (1990) understanding of positioning. Giving Karen a part in a gender story has explicitly, in this instance, made available to her an Opposite to Men position. Similarly, giving Karen a part in the sporting gender story has explicitly made available to her a Not See position.

Positioning Karen across two different interactive positions enables her to employ two ideologically different discourses that serve somewhat different purposes when talking about herself as a woman and a woman in elite sport. Her Opposite to Men position is a self that constitutes gender difference as a social construction. The scripting up of the gender self within the sporting context serves a different ideological function. The Not See position negates gender as a social category impinging upon the descriptive process, serving to make the coaching process genderless. Like Fiona, there is variability across the different positions in reference to positions utilised and ideological purposes served. What this demonstrates is the complex but understated manner in which gender and gender relations are done in everyday talk. Again the preceding discussion pertains only to Karen's discourse on this occasion. Should Karen be asked the same questions associated with the aforementioned identity categories, it is possible that different interpretative repertoires, reflexive positions, and discursive strategies would be invoked that are particular to this new local interactional context. Having discussed gender identity negotiation with female coaches, this dissertation now turns to how male coaches enact and negotiate their identities.

CHAPTER EIGHT
THE MALE COACHES: MARK AND RALPH

8.1	Introduction	209
8.2	Mark	209
8.2.1	Idiosyncratic Identity: Coach Talking Whilst Directive Democrat Walking	209
8.2.2	I'm a Man's Man: Androgyny and Hegemonic Masculinity	215
8.2.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: Mark	222
8.2.4	A Man in Elite Sport: Back to the Effective Coach But With An Athlete Manager.....	223
8.2.5	Mark's Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Man, and a Man in Elite Sport	229
8.3	Ralph.....	233
8.3.1	Trait and Masculinity Talking But Structured Walking.....	233
8.3.2	Being Positioned as a Man: Talking the Talk of Traits But Walking an Atypical Walk	237
8.3.3	Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: This Time Ralph	241
8.3.4	A Man in Elite Sport: Innovation in Sport With Egalitarianism.....	242
8.3.5	Ralph and the Story So Far.....	248
8.4	Comparing Across the Coaches.....	251

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the two male coaches' responses to the idiosyncratic identity, gender identity, and gender identity in sport interview questions. At the end of this chapter a brief comparison will be made between the female and male coaches in regards to their use of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions, with a more detailed comparison occurring in Chapter Ten.

8.2 Mark

Mark was a 43-year-old full-time coach, who had been coaching for the past 14 years. Seven of these were at the national level and seven were at the international level. Mark coached female and male developmental, national, and international level athletes, however competition was same-sex only. Like both female coaches, Mark was a former elite athlete.

8.2.1 Idiosyncratic Identity: Coach Talking Whilst Directive Democrat Walking

As discussed in Chapter Four, Question One (Q1) examined how participants gave meaning to their idiosyncratic identities. Four research questions were associated with Q1 and the reader is directed to Chapter Seven for these.

*S1/MC/FXMX/12/43/14/7/7/FTC/A/M/3/T/And

Text units 5-37:

5 Um, in terms of a coach? A coach um, my coach athlete relationship is, is
 6 predominantly um, dominated by, my feelings and attitudes towards (?)¹
 7 to the athlete as I would have wanted to have been coached so, I, I tend to
 8 come, to grief a fair bit with administration, and um, hierarchy within
 9 sport, because my number one priority, in my coaching, is to develop the
 10 athlete and to give the athlete what I think is best for them, along what, they
 think is best for themselves, so, and
 11 that's always done very much cooperatively, um, so, to sum that up I, I
 12 tend to sort of think of myself as one that, I mean I act very much as the
 13 mediator for the athlete in terms of when there's conflict, but, everything's
 14 pretty much done in cooperation, um, we've developed through to where
 15 we are now, in terms of program with the athletes having um, a fair bit of
 16 say, you know, it's not total empowerment, the, the, the in vogue word, of
 17 the, of the, the last '90's, but, they have a fair bit to say and we listen to
 18 them, and that's not to say, that the, that the program's, athlete driven and
 19 we always try to say well you know our programs are very much, coach
 20 driven, which is what they're trying for us to do, but it's very much a
 21 cooperatively, driven programs, so, um, I think um, you know I guess I'm,
 22 pretty compassionate to what their needs are and um, and use them
 23 cooperatively.
 24 SO, WHAT AH, ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO ADD ABOUT
 25 WHAT SORT OF PERSON (NAME) IS?
 26 Um ..., in terms of um, day to day um, personality, type traits?
 27 YEP.
 28 Um ... yeah I, I mmm that's a good question, I don't ever sort of look at
 29 myself too often at times, you know I think you know, like I think it
 30 comes back to how I feel about, what needs, what are the needs, and it
 31 really is a lot a lot to do with the feelings individually, and that's one of
 32 probably the questions that I probably ask the most, you know on a day to
 33 day basis, how do you guys feel, you know, how do you girls feel you
 34 know, are we tired, are we this are we that you know, are we in a grumpy
 35 mood are we you know at the wrong time of the month and God knows
 36 what, you know just, to get the feeling so that, you're not (?) straight in
 37 there and, basically bashing heads.

On this occasion when asked to constitute a idiosyncratic self, Mark constitutes a social self or identity as indicated on line 5 where he reframes my question to encompass his coach or his social self. From a social identity theory perspective (e.g.,

¹ (?) = inaudible for transcription.

Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987), the social identity of coach is salient for Mark as he makes reference to himself in terms of traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours that are collectively shared and define the social group sport coaches. Mark is the only coach to engage in a social definition when positioned as an idiosyncratic individual in this dissertation. Mark utilises traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours associated with the effective coach to script up a description of a social, rather than idiosyncratic self. In particular, Mark draws upon the descriptive dimensions associated with Anshel's (1997) conceptualisation of an effective coach to constitute himself as an idiosyncratic individual (i.e., leader, follower, teacher, role model, limit setter, counsellor, friend, parent substitute, family member).

The Effective Coach repertoire is seen on lines 5 to 7, *my coach athlete relationship is, is predominately um, dominated by, my feelings and attitudes towards (?) to the athlete as I would have wanted to have been coached* (role model), lines 8 to 10, *my number one priority, in my coaching, is to develop the athlete and to give the athlete what I think is best for them* (teacher), and lines 10 and 11, *to give the athlete what I think is best for them, along what, they think is best for themselves, so, that's always done very much cooperatively* (leader & follower).

Further, on lines 12 to 13, *sort of think of myself as one that, I mean I act very much as the mediator for the athlete in terms of when there's conflict* (parent substitute), lines 14 to 19, *we've developed through to where we are now, in terms of program with the athletes having um, a fair bit of say, you know, it's not total empowerment, the, the, the in vogue word, of the, of the, the last '90's, but, they have a fair bit to say and we listen to them, and that's not to say, that the, that the program's, athlete driven and we always try to say well you know our programs are very much, coach driven, which is what they're trying for us to do* (limit setter), and lines 31 to 35, *ask the most, you know on a day to day basis, how do you guys feel, you know, how do you girls feel you know, are we tired, are we this are we that you know, are we in a grumpy mood are we you know at the wrong time of the month and God knows what, you know just, to get the feeling so that, you're not - straight in there and, basically bashing heads* (counsellor).

Mark proceeds to employ the Effective Coach repertoire as a discursive resource to position himself as a specific type of coach that is particular to the local interactional

context. His extract can be read as the deployment of talk that conforms closely to the notion of the Directive Democrat leader (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987) (or on this occasion coach). Muczyk and Reimann's notion of a directive democrat style of leadership when applied to sport, encompasses a coach who oversees program development, team strategy making, and so forth, whilst at the same time invites and encourages comment and input from others concerning these decisions (Anshel, 1997). Thus, Mark scripts himself up as a coach who keeps effective control of the coaching situation, whilst at the same time consults others and implements their suggestions should these be to the benefit of the individual athlete or the team.

The Directive Democrat Coach identity is characterised on lines 9 to 11, *one priority, in my coaching, is to develop the athlete and to give the athlete what I think is best for them, along what, they think is best for themselves, so, and that's always done very much cooperatively, um, so, to sum that up I, I tend to,* and 15 to 22, *program with the athletes having um, a fair bit of say, you know, it's not total empowerment, the, the, the in vogue word, of the, of the, the last '90's, but, they have a fair bit to say and we listen to them, and that's not to say, that the, that the program's, athlete driven and we always try to say well you know our programs are very much, coach driven, which is what they're trying for us to do, but it's very much a cooperatively, driven programs, so, um, I think um, you know I guess I'm, pretty compassionate to what their needs are and um, and use them cooperatively.* Whilst this construction is similar to the coaching discourse discussed in the Effective Coach repertoire, it is through his repetition (Speer, 2000) of key elements (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) of the Directive Democrat Coach notion, that Mark gives himself meaning on this occasion (see lines 9 to 35).

Mark's production of self here is "highly invested, it is a self that is valued and emotionally charged" (Wetherell & Edley, 1999, p. 342). In this case, his descriptions are 'involved self-descriptions' because they are associated or conform to key descriptive elements (Wetherell & Edley) of the Directive Democrat leader (e.g., *we listen to them*, line 17). Thus Mark not only talks the talk of being the Directive Democrat Coach, he constitutes the Directive Democrat identity through these involved self-descriptions.

Even though this is an involved self-description, Mark has some initial difficulty in accounting for himself as an idiosyncratic individual. As discussed in Chapter Seven, constituting the self in everyday talk is a task that is intricate, debatable, open to question, and denigration (Potter, 1996b). Hence Mark's difficulty on line 5 as evidenced through his repetition of my original question (Speer & Potter, 2000).

What is of note is what Mark does not say in his talk here. Mark deploys ontological gerrymandering (Potter, 1996b), where he selects the most advantageous or relevant issues and/or descriptions to script up. These are issues or descriptions that are most likely to support his argument or position while ignoring those in talk descriptions or issues that are likely to be contested. When it comes to description making some phenomena are seen as relevant, and are thus selected for inclusion, whilst others are ignored. Potter argues that this purposeful selection is an "extended sense of ontological gerrymandering; one realm of entities is constituted in the description while another is avoided" (Potter, p. 184).

Like electoral gerrymandering, where governments alter or draw electoral boundaries to effectively bias voting patterns in a way that advantages their particular party, ontological gerrymandering draws rhetorical boundaries around relevant descriptions to effectively bias the description making process in a way that advantages the speakers' position. Thus ontological gerrymandering works through ignoring those descriptions or issues that are difficult or contentious, and by selecting those that are advantageous and less open to challenge in order to present a description as unproblematic (Potter, 1996b). In Mark's case, there are a wide variety of descriptive terms that he could have drawn upon to script himself up as an idiosyncratic individual. By choosing a social self-description over an idiosyncratic self-description, he avoids being criticised for being inaccurate in his description, or for not telling the whole truth, and he avoids being challenged on the appropriateness of his description. Hence he avoids having his personal self questioned and examined.

By describing himself to me as a Directive Democrat Coach, Mark does not afford me the opportunity to challenge him on these descriptions because these descriptions are scripted up as reasonable and as prescriptive of himself. To illustrate, Mark's selection of himself as a Directive Democrat Coach is difficult to challenge for

the hearer may consider this to be a reasonable description of what an elite coach should be like.

Mark reinforces his Directive Democrat Coach identity through his use of extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986). As outlined in Chapter Seven, extreme case formulations strengthen his description of himself as someone who ascribes to a directive but democratic way of being. To illustrate, *we **always** try to say well you know our programs are **very** much, coach driven, which is what they're trying for us to do, but it's **very** much a cooperatively, driven programs* (lines 18 to 20), and *are we in a **grumpy** mood are we you know at the **wrong time of the month** and **God** knows what, you know just, to get the feeling so that, you're not (?) straight in there and, basically **bashing heads*** (lines 33 to 35).

'Always', 'very', 'grumpy', 'wrong time of the month', 'God', and 'bashing heads' are used to induce a shared understanding from the listener where being a directive, but democratic coach, is considered a customary way of being for an elite coach. They work to rhetorically counter hypothetical alternative descriptions or productions of Mark that could be produced by the listener. Thus, they work to make what Mark is saying more solid and factual (Potter, 1996b). As indexical markers (Edwards, 2000) of Mark's investment or commitment toward his description, extreme case formulations demonstrate the strength of Mark's conviction that he is a Directive Democrat Coach. The use of extreme case formulations convey to the hearer a sense that he is the man that he talks about. To illustrate, *number one priority* (lines 8 & 9) makes it unnecessary to ask Mark what is his conviction to his coaching, what does coaching mean to him, and so forth.

However by being both directive and democratic Mark is faced with an interactional dilemma (Billig, 1996)². On this occasion, Mark is faced with being a person who invites and encourages athlete interaction and input whilst at the same time keeping a close watch on the athlete and what they are doing. Mark manages these competing themes through the use of the discursive strategy 'you know'. Through the

² The reader is directed to Chapter Seven for a discussion of interactional dilemmas.

use of 'you know' the related behaviours of being directive and democratic are presented as normal (see lines 15, 18, 20, 28, 31, 32, 33, & 34). 'You know' on this occasion is used as an appeal to common knowledge or common behaviour (Speer, 2000). It works to elicit from the hearer an agreement concerning his behaviour, and works to head off any disapproval of his behaviour by placing it within the boundaries of normative behaviour (Speer).

This is not used as an isolated discursive strategy. Mark also uses the discursive strategy 'but' to script up his position as being both a directive and democratic coach. The discursive function of 'but' was delineated in Chapter Seven, where it informs the hearer of a change in discursive content (Peters, 1995) from directive on line 13, to democrat on line 14. Further, it works to soften the impact of Mark's statement as being both types of coaches. Through the above discursive strategies Mark is able to manage his dilemma in such a way that does not destabilize his own self-production. Hence on this occasion, he is able to be a democratic coach, and still be directive.

When interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual Mark responded by reflexively positioning himself as a Directive Democrat Coach through his recurrent referencing of key Directive Democrat elements on lines 9 to 35. Through his use of an Effective Coach discourse, Mark worked up a Directive Democrat reflexive position that assimilated the risks inherent in scripting up an idiosyncratic identity. These risks however were minimised through Mark's dexterous use of various discursive strategies.

8.2.2 I'm a Man's Man: Androgyny and Hegemonic Masculinity

As overviewed in Chapter Four, Question Two (Q2) examined how participants gave meaning to their gender identity. The research questions associated with Q2 were outlined in Chapter Seven.

Text units 36-55:

36 ... um.

37 OR WOULD YOU?

38 I do the washing up at home um (laugh), ... yeah, oh I guess I guess I'm,

39 probably, um..., if this is the right way to say it a man's man, in some,

40 some cases but, very much um, I guess it's probably, probably a reflection
 41 on on how, I live my life and how we live our life because um, you know
 42 my wife and I are both very busy and we've got three, growing children,
 43 um, so we, we very much share our whole, lifestyle, from, the, the laundry
 44 to the house to, to looking at picking up after kids, very much different to
 45 say like my next door neighbour who, who just like, doesn't know how to
 46 pick up a tea towel or fold one at least (laugh) you know, oh it's probably
 47 an interesting one but, yeah I probably sit on the fence in there somewhere
 48 that, you know, I mix, very, very well with um you know, in the man's
 49 man crowd and um, same um.
 50 WHEN YOU SAY MAN'S MAN WORLD WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY
 51 THAT?
 52 Oh a bit rough and tumble probably. Um, a beer and a joke, not too much
 53 beer, not allowed to anymore (laugh). One of my coaches in Sydney just
 54 had a stroke, which is, oh oh shit, gotta' do something about my body
 55 again (laugh).

On this occasion, Mark employs an Androgynous repertoire to position himself as a man. The basic premise and an overview of the Androgynous repertoire was outlined in Chapter Seven as Fiona has also used this repertoire, albeit to position herself as an idiosyncratic individual. The feminine is evidenced by line 38, *I do the washing up at home* (household duties – Deaux et al., 1985), line 39, *if this is the right way to say it a man's man* (hegemonic masculinity – Connell, 1987), and line 43 to 44, *very much share our whole lifestyle, from, the, laundry to the house to, to looking at picking up after the kids* (household duties). Whereas the masculine is illustrated on lines 47 and 48, *I mix, very, very well with you um you know, in the man's man crowd* (hegemonic masculinity).

Not only does Mark constitute himself by using descriptive references that are both masculine and feminine, he also brings these two descriptions together through his use of three different discursive strategies. This is unlike Fiona whose use of the Androgynous repertoire was noted for its lack of co-existence. On line 39 Mark talks about being a *man's man in some, some cases*. This infers that being a man's man is not a stable, fixed gender-identity. Rather this is an identity that emerges under specific circumstances and in specific contexts. Mark's production is thus consistent with Bem's (1974) conceptualisation of Androgyny where individuals engage in either masculine or feminine behaviours as the context demands.

Mark also draws the masculine and feminine together through the word *but* on line 40, thus notifying the hearer to an impending change of descriptive view from masculine on line 39 to feminine on lines 42 to 44. Mark further reinforces his production as both masculine and feminine through his use of the metaphor *I probably sit on the fence in there somewhere* (lines 46 & 47). Metaphors like *sit on the fence* work to rhetorically constitute a description as more factual or literal (Potter, 1996b). Lakoff (personal communication) argues in his analysis of the metaphors used by the North American government to justify their involvement in the Gulf War, that in everyday talk metaphors shift the focus of discursive events. In Mark's case, *sit on the fence*, shifts focus from the acceptability of constructing himself as a man's man to himself as being both masculine and feminine. The use of metaphors blurs the distinction between what is perceived as factual and what is perceived as metaphorical.

Mark uses the Androgynous repertoire as a discursive resource that gives meaning to himself that is specific to the local interactional context. It is through his talk that Mark deploys a gender identity that conforms closely to the notion of hegemonic masculinity as posited by Connell (1987). Connell in his application of Gramsci's (1971, as cited in Connell, 1995) notion of hegemony to masculinity, defines hegemonic masculinity as the "configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or takes for granted) the dominate position of men and the subordination of women (Connell, p. 77). Whilst Wetherell and Edley (1999) propose that the above definition is rather difficult to apply to data, there is some agreement concerning the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity. The Hegemonic Masculine ideal is one where masculinity is seen as natural or as given, it is the heroic male epitomised in films such as *Crocodile Dundee* and *Mad Max*, and in male sporting events such as the iron man series³ (Donaldson, 1993).

³ Here I have adapted Donaldson's (1993) description of hegemonic masculinity to Australian films and sporting events to be consistent with the gender relations approach that views gender as culturally, socially, and historically situated.

Connell (1987) argues that when men take up being male, they constitute identities that are either complicit or resistant to dominant masculine ways of being. The above extract reflects how Mark complicity aligns himself with conventional ideals of what men 'should be' like and what they 'should do'. The ideal that he scripts up is that of the 'drinking, joking' man (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). This position is somewhat difficult to describe in discourse as noted by Wetherell and Edley. This production of self is one where Mark does not only describe himself in terms of Hegemonic Masculine traits, behaviours, and/or characteristics, he also constitutes himself as the Hegemonic Masculine identity through his use of involved self-descriptions (e.g., line 47, *I mix very very well with um you know, in the man's man crowd*).

The Hegemonic production of self is, therefore, an identity that Mark scripts up quite shrewdly. This be seen on line 39 where he talks about being *a man's man*, and lines 47 and 48, *I mix, very, very well with um you know, in the man's man crowd*. It is the repetition of key elements of the Hegemonic Masculine position (see lines 39 & 47 to 48) that constitutes his meaning on this occasion.

Whilst Mark's production of self could be read as an Androgynous production, he uses the Androgyny repertoire as a clever rhetorical device to negate the risks that he faces in scripting up a Hegemonic Masculine identity. Here he plays upon the binary notion of gender, in that he challenges the binary position by describing himself as being able to engage in both male and female behaviours. As discussed in Chapter Two and Chapter Seven, the binary position is where gender is worked up through language as "two binary categories hierarchically arranged in relation to each other" (Davies, 1997, p. 22,). In Mark's case, the use of the binary notion of gender is a skilful use of discourse as it works to temper his man's man position whilst at the same time allowing him to stake claim to Hegemonic membership. It affords the question of how Mark can be that sort of man's man if he also helps around the house and picks up his children. How can he be both? Thus Mark subtly works up his Hegemonic Masculine identity.

The Androgyny repertoire enables Mark to moderate his production in such a way that does not undermine it. However, talking the talk of Androgyny can be a risky discourse to engage in, as sport overtly reinforces heterosexuality and hegemonic masculinity for men (e.g., Connell, 1995; Gill, 1993:, 1994; Vealey, 1997). Mark is

aware of this and works to produce a more conventional attribution of his feminine behaviours. This is seen in lines 40 to 42 where he ascribes his feminine behaviours as being reflective of his and his wife's lifestyle. As discussed in Mark's previous extract, advantageous issues or description are scripted up in discourse as these issues or descriptions are most likely to support the speaker's argument or position. Therefore, there are a wide variety of feminine descriptive terms that Mark could have drawn upon to script up himself as a man. By choosing a lifestyle description over a psychological description he avoids being criticised for being inaccurate, for not telling the whole truth, and being challenged on the appropriateness of his description because his feminine descriptions are worked up as reasonable. By describing himself to me as a man who helps around the house as a result of how his family chooses to live, Mark does not afford me the opportunity to confront him on these descriptions. Mark's deployment of ontological gerrymandering allows him to manage the difficult and contentious task of identity construction by selecting those descriptions that are resistant to challenge whilst ignoring those descriptions such as feminine psychological traits that are open to challenge and criticism.

Mark's prescription to the Hegemonic position is further reinforced through his use of extreme case formulations as indicated on lines 47 and 48, *I mix, very, very well with um you know, in the man's man crowd*. As a rhetorical strategy 'very' strengthens his description of himself as being a man's man and makes what he is saying more factual. It rhetorically counters any challenge to his description by reifying his description through the undermining of alternative descriptions. As a non-literal indexical marker of Mark's investment, extreme case formulations demonstrate the strength of his conviction that he is a man's man. Thus through the use of extreme case formulations, Mark scripts up a relationship between himself and the Hegemonic Masculine identity.

As discussed in the previous chapter, extreme case formulations can be challenged and refuted in interactions, thus extreme case formulations sometimes require softening (Edwards, 2000). Mark is aware of this as seen on line 47. His use of 'you know' presents his ascription as normal through an appeal to common knowledge or common behaviour. It standardises Mark's production by requesting a common

understanding and shared acceptance of his ascription and heads off any disapproval of his self-production by placing it within the boundaries of reasonable behaviour.

In this extract Mark is talking the talk of Androgyny but walking the walk of Hegemonic Masculinity. Edley and Wetherell (1999) report in their research about fatherhood and domestic life, that young men can talk liberal feminist themes (e.g., shared household roles, mutual Egalitarian relationships), whilst at the same time constituting a self that is aligned to traditional notions of what men 'should' and 'ought' to be like. Hence they talk a feminist talk but walk a traditional male image path, with its associated power and status. The same can be said in Mark's self-production. Mark talks of shared household roles, and infers a mutual egalitarian relationship with his wife, but he reflexively positions himself as the conventional man.

Talking and walking in different directions can be problematic. This is seen at the beginning of Mark's description where he has difficulty in responding to my request as evidenced by pauses and hesitations at non-transition relevant places (Speer & Potter, 2000) (see lines 36, 38, & 39). Mark is faced with an unusual interactional dilemma on this occasion, a dilemma of producing a self that is acceptable to both himself and the hearer. In this instance, a female psychologist and researcher, who is interested in gender issues in elite sport⁴.

Taking up a position of Hegemonic Masculinity consequently carries with it risks. In the context of this interview it carried the risk of opposition by a female gender researcher. Mark is being asked to describe himself as a man, to hold his sense of being a man accountable and he is a man, which brings with it a category entitlement (Potter, 1996b). Mark is faced with the interactional dilemma of positioning himself so that he can still speak as a man, whilst at the same time distancing himself from a category that is considered socially unacceptable, the man's man.

In managing this dilemma Mark uses a social comparison (lines 44 & 45) to differentiate himself from the real man's man, in this case his neighbour. He makes a

⁴ The participants were aware that I had an interest in gender issues with some assuming and commenting whether I was approaching this research from a radical feminist perspective.

distinction between what he is and the socially offensive image of men that he is holding accountable (Speer, 2000). In doing this he constructs himself as reasonable and the other, his neighbour as unreasonable. Thus he is able to construct an image of himself as the man's man, without having to account for what this man's man is.

Mark is aware of how his discourse or claim to group membership sounds to the listener (Bakhtin, 1986). Mark manages this by making mention of what he does in line 38 (household duties), and what he is *I guess I guess I'm probably, um ... if this is the right way to say it a man's man* (lines 38 & 39). By subtly making the distinction between what he does and what he is, his discourse constitutes his walk (Hegemonic Masculinity) but not his talk (Androgyny).

The above discursive strategies make it difficult to detect Mark's positioning as Hegemonic, for he embraces liberal feminist themes. His rhetorical use of the binary notion of gender minimises his Hegemonic Masculine position whilst at the same time allowing him to stake a claim to Hegemonic membership. However, the Hegemonic production is a risky position to script up as demonstrated on lines 38 and 39 where Mark prefaces his ascription with 'I guess' and 'I probably'. These provisional statements (Latour, 1987) allow him the prospect of engineering his self-production of Hegemonic into a production that is more tolerable, should this be challenged. To illustrate, had I challenged Mark about being a man's man, 'I guess' would have allowed Mark the opportunity to reframe his production (e.g., well perhaps not a man's man but).

Mark's use of what I have called the confessional, the questioning of whether this is the 'right' way to describe himself, demonstrates his awareness of the tenuousness of his description. The confessional is similar to Potter's (1996b) notion of stake confession where people discount others' descriptions on the basis of claiming that the interlocutor has a vested interest or stake in the description. Stake confession is where the interlocutor believes that their interest or stake is so salient that inoculation will be an invalid strategy. Hence owning up to the stake is the most appropriate course of action, as it works as a display of honesty. When interlocutors are faced with a delicate identity situation, a confession of the uncertainty of the proposed identity may also work as a display of objective awareness of the difficulty that this identity invokes.

In Mark's case, by admitting that claiming a man's man identity is not the right thing to do, he scripts up a display that his description is well considered and one that takes into account the social implications of the man's man ascription. Thus by default, it infers the negative implications that the listener could constitute when listening to his description. Mark then reinforces his argument by the use of the hedge (Peters, 1995), *in some cases* (line 39). This mitigates the impact of his claim of being a man's man, and prevents the claim from appearing too conceited, for it puts linguistic limits on a statement that cannot be absolutely defended.

A more careful reading of what Mark has said informs us of how Mark has worked up a Hegemonic Masculine identity through his repeated referencing on lines 39, 47, 48, 51 to 53. His use of an Androgynous discourse enabled Mark to work up a Hegemonic Masculine position that incorporated the negative perceptions that this brings. It illustrated how Mark was caught between two self-productions that were perceived as tenuous for him. How he scripted up one production, the Hegemonic Masculine position, and then how he worked to negate the tenuousness of this position. Thus Mark walked a different walk within his Masculine talk.

What is striking from this talk, when compared to Fiona and Karen, is that Mark used the Androgynous repertoire not only as a discursive resource, but also as a discursive strategy. It permitted Mark to seemingly portray himself as a caring, considerate, and helping husband whilst at the same time scripting himself up as Hegemonic Masculine. As a strategy, the Androgynous repertoire ideologically served to deflect attention from his Hegemonic talk. It made it difficult for the listener to question Mark on his production because the Androgynous repertoire was used to infer that Mark was apparently challenging current gender practices. This talk is not unusual and is consistent with the research findings of Wetherell and Edley (1999) and Gough (1998). Here the lure of the traditional male way of being is strong as it brings with it power and status (Wetherell & Edley).

8.2.3 Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: Mark

Mark was classified as Androgynous on the basis of his Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) scores. However in the interview, he positioned himself as Hegemonic Masculine. Further, Mark's talk was not coded in the a-priori content analysis. In Mark's case, there is inconsistency between his PAQ responses and his everyday talk. The PAQ may capture a broad picture of how Mark oriented himself in terms of instrumental and expressive traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours, but it cannot capture the complexity of gender conceptualisation. Like Fiona and Karen, such disparity lends support to the understanding that gender is multifactorial (e.g., Spence & Buckner, 2000), rather than a uni-dimensional and bipolar construct (e.g., Constantinople, 1973).

8.2.4 A Man in Elite Sport: Back to the Effective Coach But With An Athlete Manager

To reiterate, Question Six (Q6) examined how participants gave meaning to their sporting gender identities. The research questions allied with Q6 are to be found in Chapter Seven.

Text units: 97-121

97 ... Um, I, I probably relate, coaching, um, at this level as, as probably
 98 very precise management, um, one of the things that, that, that we need,
 99 that, that I, I guess, look at and how I deal with things, I guess if I was to
 100 explain it's like, it's managing the whole person you know, and one of
 101 the things we tried, and I try not to get, too involved with, is, the very
 102 much the personal, relationship issue of the athletes. They'll come to us,
 103 they'll come to me and, and at different times but, the way we've, we've,
 104 we've evolved over the years um, I guess it's because of the age too of
 105 the athlete we're now dealing with um, although, you know, it ranges
 106 predominantly from 18 year olds through to 30 year olds, and they all
 107 have a vastly different, need particularly from social aspects when they
 108 want to say come to us, um, but it really is, it's just that real balancing
 109 of, management balance of, the, the personal, career, sport, interaction,
 110 mix, and ah, and how we manage that, and, you know a lot of times you
 111 know I talk to, to ah, to my very much, Homer Simpson neighbour, that
 112 um, works in corporation business and um, we, we relate a lot of things
 113 to, to the dealing with, the way I deal with athletes to the way they deal
 114 with, their sales staff and how we motivate each other and, and um, ah,

115 yeah it's, interesting the way you put those question to um, to drag and
 116 answer out isn't it (laugh)? Um, I guess um ...yeah, elite coach,
 117 description um, really comes down to, to ah, one firstly it's a matter of,
 118 simply understanding our business and our business is the physiology
 119 and the psychology of the, and the social and ah, the interaction skills
 120 the athletes have um, and, bundled into one word it's just a management,
 121 skill I think.

Not only did Mark differ from Karen and Fiona in reference to the ideological function that his discourse served when constituting himself as a man, Mark's response to Q6 is different as well. Unlike Fiona and Karen, Mark does not bring his gender to bear upon his descriptive process. Fiona and Karen, whilst positioning their gender as an issue for others, and a non-issue respectively, still drew upon the notion of gender and gender relations in their scripting. Mark does not, at no point in his talk does he make mention of his gender. Thus he does not realise his standing as a man in elite sport through his talk. Ely (1995b) asserts that people in dominant groups (i.e., majority groups and in elite sport coaching, men⁵) have difficulty seeing their dominant status and group membership. She suggests that this is because the culture that they inhabit has been developed with their interests in mind. Thus as a member of the dominant group, men in elite sport, Mark is not able to easily reconcile himself as a man in elite sport.

Mark, therefore, returns to the Effective Coach repertoire that he used in the idiosyncratic identity question, to constitute his gender identity in sport. The reader is directed to this section for a discussion and overview of this. The Effective Coach repertoire is demonstrated on lines 100 to 103, *and I try not to get, too involved with, is, the very much the personal, relationship issue of the athletes. They'll come to us, they'll come to me and, and at different times* (corporator leader), and lines 106 to 108, *they all have a vastly different, need particularly from social aspects when they want to say come to us, um, but it really is, it's just that real balancing of, management balance of,*

⁵ The reader is directed to footnote number 8 in Chapter Seven for an overview of the number of male coaches in Australia.

the, the personal, career, sport, interaction, mix (developer leader). Further, on lines 111 and 112, *the way I deal with athletes* (integrator leader) and lines 116 and 117, *the physiology and the psychology of the, and the social and ah, the interaction skills the athletes* (developer leader).

Again using the Effective Coach repertoire as a discursive resource, Mark avails himself of an Athlete Manager form of talk in response to being interactively positioned as a man in elite sport. Mark scripts up the Athlete Manager identity as being, *I probably relate, coaching, um, at this level as, as probably very precise management* (lines 97 & 98), *I guess if I was to explain it's like, it's managing the whole person you know* (lines 99 & 100), *it's just that real balancing of, management balance of, the, the personal, career, sport, interaction, mix, and ah, and how we manage that* (lines 107 to 109), *of simply understanding our business and our business* (line 116), and *bundled into one word it's just a management, skill I think* (line 118). It is again through his repetition of the key elements of the Athlete Manager that Mark confers meaning on himself (see lines 97 to 118).

Mark's decision to answer from a coach perspective rather than male coach perspective is another example of ontological gerrymandering. I asked Mark specifically to answer as an elite sportsman. The lead up to the gender identity in sport question was a deliberate attempt to interactively position Mark as a man in elite sport. In Mark's case, there are a wide variety of descriptive terms that he could have drawn upon to script himself up as a man in elite sport. By choosing a coach-reflection over a male coach-reflection he avoids the gender position that I have placed him in. Mark's preference for a coach perspective is indicative of the interactional dilemma (Billig, 1996) that he is facing in this question. Mark is being asked to describe himself as a man in elite sport, to hold his sense of being a man in elite sport accountable, and he is a coach which brings with it a category entitlement. He consequently manages this through his avoidance of the gendered aspect of the question.

The above extract displays how gender as an interactively positioned identity can be ignored in talk. This be seen on lines 97, 98, 103, 108, 109, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, and 118 where Mark has some difficulty in accounting for himself as a man in elite sport as evidenced by his pauses and hesitations at non-transition-relevant places. To

illustrate, Mark on line 97 hesitates at the beginning of his description. Further, he hesitates after he frames his response in relation to coaching, here his pause and hesitation allows me the opportunity to redirect his description. He is checking with me if this is the correct story line that I have positioned him to take up. Mark then hesitates after his framing of his description to encompass the elite level. Speer (2000) suggests that hesitations are indicative of uncertainty concerning the discursive requirements of an interaction. As a member of a dominant group whose membership status is taken for granted, Mark is uncertain how to answer from a perspective when his gender is made salient. For Mark this is an unusual position to be placed in because for him his maleness is the norm. Hence his hesitations are an indication of the ambiguity that he faces in this descriptive process on this occasion.

Mark's difficulty with the self-description process is also illustrated through his use of provisional statements throughout his description (see lines 99, 103, 114, 118 for *I guess & I think*). As discussed in Chapter Seven, provisional statements are treated as less factual than reifying statements. In Mark's case his use of provisional statements is a response to the unusual position that he is about to script up for himself. By prefacing his descriptions with provisional statements, he allows himself the opportunity to manoeuvre his self-production of Athlete Manager should it be questioned. To illustrate, had I challenged Mark about how he deals with things (line 99), or what does he mean by managing the whole person (lines 99 & 100), 'I guess' allows Mark the opportunity to reframe his production (e.g., well perhaps it is more).

Further, the difficulty that Mark faces is apparent through his use of hedge words. Mark's use of the hedge word *probably* (line 97) works to soften the impact of his framing in respect to himself as a coach, and limits his statements. That is, 'probably' works to soften his alignment with being a coach and allows him the flexibility to align himself with being a coach (e.g., being a teacher), but not other aspects of himself (e.g., his gender), should he be challenged about his production. In this instance I could have challenged Mark about his description. I could have remarked that this is not talking about the male part of his description. In response to this challenge, hedge words allow him to script up alternative descriptions of himself that

are more suitable to the local interactional context. For example, Mark could have responded, 'I guess I didn't hear the male part of the question'.

As with his previous extracts, Mark also draws upon the use of extreme case formulations to reinforce his Athlete Manager production. This is seen on lines 97 and 98, *very precise management*, line 100, *managing the whole person*, lines 101 and 102, *very much the personal, relationship issue of the athletes*, lines 107 and 108, *it really is, it's just that real balancing of management balance*. Further, on lines 115 and 116, *one firstly it's a matter of, simply understanding our business*, and line 118, *bundled into one word it's just a management, skill*. These extreme case formulations rhetorically strengthen his description of himself as an Athlete Manager by increasing the facticity of his coach description. Further, they counter any challenges to his description by reifying his description through the undermining of alternative descriptions. To illustrate, *really* makes it difficult for the hearer to challenge Mark about his lack of attention to the gender side, and whether he is merely saying that he manages the athlete to avoid the gender side of the question.

Mark also works to make his Athlete Manager self-production more factual through his use of the discursive strategy 'you know' (see lines 100, 104, 105, & 109). By presenting the related behaviours of managing athletes as normal, 'you know' invites from the listener an understanding of this Athlete Manager behaviour and heads off any disapproval of his behaviour that does not address his gender side by placing it within the boundaries of acceptable coach behaviour.

What is of note in this extract is Mark's change of footing. From lines 98 to 116 Mark talks at different times from a plural voice or corroborating voice. This is indicated by his change of footing on line 97 from *I probably relate*, to *we need* (line 98). From *they'll come to us*, to *they'll come to me* back to *and at different times but the way we've we've we've* (lines 102 & 103), *how we manage to I talk* (line 109), and *our business* (line 116). As was discussed in Chapter Seven, footing refers to the different roles that an individual has in a discursive interaction, where moving from one role to the other presents an account as more factual, or distances an interlocutor from a contentious account or identity (Potter, 1996b).

Shifts in footing are used when sensitive or controversial facts or claims are being scripted up (Potter, 1996b). On this occasion, it minimises the risk that Mark faces in scripting up an Athlete Manager identity, rather than the male coach identity. When considering that we speak with anticipation of how we will be heard and responded to by others, Mark's change of footing from principal on line 97 (e.g., I), to animator line 98 (e.g., we) distances himself, and thus does not hold himself accountable for the Athlete Manager production. Here he adopts a position where he is seen as representing the viewpoints of others, as well as his own. Under hypothetical challenge about his lack of gendered representation the shift allows him the opportunity to speak directly to his Athlete Manager identity without having to account for his lack of gender description.

This corroboration works to make his innovation not just of his making, but also of someone else's, and thus shifts the accountability of his description from himself to the unknown others. Potter (1996b) asserts that the interlocutor increases the facticity of a description through the construction of corroboration. That is, corroboration makes a descriptive event more literal. Mark uses the notion of consensus quite skilfully in his use of the plural to shift the emphasis from the lack of gender in his description, to a focus on himself as the Athlete Manager. Plural voicing serves to make Marks's description of himself as an Athlete Manager a general known state of affairs. The shift of footing manages a risky identity in such a way that it allows for the appearance of consensus whilst at the same time allowing Mark independence in that he has the discursive opportunity to deny this statement, should it be questioned. Thus Mark's use of 'we' and 'us' infers consensus whilst at the same time inferring independence from his account as Mark does not explicitly state how many of his colleagues behave in this managerial manner.

In conclusion, in response to my interactive positioning of him as a man in elite sport, Mark responded by reflexively positioning himself as an Athlete Manager through his repeated referencing on lines 97 to 118. Through his use of an Effective Coach discourse, Mark worked up an Athlete Manager position whilst ignoring or avoiding any gendered references in his description. It illustrated how Mark refused to reflexively position himself as a man in elite sport, how he scripted up the Athlete

Manager position, and worked to produce this as being normative through various discursive strategies.

Again Mark's talk is strikingly different from the talk produced by Fiona and Karen. Mark avoids the interactive position of a male in elite sport through his use of the Athlete Manager position. It illustrates how he uses aspects of the Effective Coach repertoire to script up his Athlete Manager position, and avoids his prescription as a male coach through his use of various discursive strategies. As argued, making salient a position that is taken for granted causes Mark uncertainty in his description.

Ideologically the Athlete Manager production serves to deflect attention from his lack of gendered talk. It makes it difficult for the listener to question Mark on this production because the Athlete Manager is scripted up as normal and as an accepted way of being for a coach. It denies Mark the requirement to make himself gendered.

8.2.5 Mark's Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Man, and a Man in Elite Sport

Like the female coaches, the change in interactive positions induced a change in Mark's use of discursive resources and strategies. Not only did he draw upon different interpretative repertoires across the three positions, he also reflexively positioned himself differently within each interactive positioning (see Table 8.1). Mark emphasised his Hegemonic Masculinity, albeit with consideration of how this will be heard and responded to by the listener, when a gender lens was added to the descriptive process. However, when not interactively positioned as a man, Mark's gender did not take prominence in his description, rather his coaching self did.

The addition of a sporting lens shifted Mark's reflexive positioning to where he scripted himself up as a manager of the athlete. Thus, the integration of a sport and gender lens had not made salient for Mark his gender. This is indicated by his avoidance of himself as a gendered coach and through his making his identity as a coach salient. This is perhaps explained by Mark being a member of the dominant group (male coaches), which brings with it respectively the dominant position of power and status (e.g., Crawford & Unger, 2000; Lips, 1993). As such a member, Mark may

have perceived his position as being male and being a coach as normative and thus he was not able to perceive of his gender as salient (Ely, 1995b).

Table 8.1

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Mark Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires Reflexive positions	Effective Coach Directive Democrat Coach	Androgynous Hegemonic Masculine	Effective Coach Athlete Manager
Extreme case formulations	✓ *	✓	✓
Hesitations or pauses	✓		✓
Provisional statements		✓	✓
Hedge words			✓
Metaphors	✓		
Interactional dilemmas		✓	✓
You know	✓		✓
Social comparison		✓	
Ontological gerrymandering	✓	✓	✓
Footing			✓
Corroboration			✓
Coincidence	✓		
Confessional		✓	

Note: * Extreme case formulations change to incorporate strength of statement.

Mark's use of discursive strategies to reify his reflexive positions also differed with positioning (the reader is referred to Table 8.1). As I attempted to move Mark from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender, and then gender identity in sport, Mark was faced with interactional dilemmas (see Table 8.1). Further, his use of provisional statements increased allowing him the opportunity to manoeuvre his non-gendered sporting self-productions into the realm of productions that were more socially acceptable, should they have been challenged. What was similar across each descriptive instance was Mark's use of ontological gerrymandering. Again this is reflective of the difficulty that Mark faced in the doing of his identity across the differing contexts. As a member of the dominant group, making salient his gendered status has caused Mark difficulty in the descriptive process.

Mark's range of discursive strategies increased as he scripted up his gender identity in sport. His use of extreme case formulations, hesitations and pauses, and so

forth are again suggestive that Mark found the interactional task of describing his gendered identity difficult. What was of interest was Mark's use of what I have termed the confessional when scripting up his gender identity. As discussed earlier, this is a deliberate discursive strategy aimed at minimising the challenges to his man's man construction. Again this is indicative of the risks Mark takes up in scripting up identities that on this occasion, in interaction with a female psychologist and gender researcher, could be construed as not acceptable. A risk that Mark has actively worked to dissipate.

The moving of the self from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender identity, and then to a gender identity in sport has influenced Mark's reflexive positioning process. Giving Mark a part in a gender story has explicitly, in this instance, made available to him his Hegemonic Masculine position, a position that his dominant group membership (men) made normative, and thus not salient for him in everyday interactions. Similarly, giving Mark a part in the sporting gender story has explicitly made available to him his Athlete Manager position. Being consistent with the epistemological base of discursive psychology, the observations made in the preceding sections are limited to Mark's talk on this occasion. Mark may script up different reflexive positions, using different interpretative repertoires, through different discursive strategies, on different occasions. Thus the aforementioned analysis is not to be taken as indicative of etic properties.

Mark's talk is conspicuously ideologically different from that of Fiona and Karen. His use of the Androgynous repertoire in the gender identity question portrays a man who, as a partner, helps out around the home for necessity of lifestyle. However at the same time, he scripts himself up as Hegemonic Masculine. That is, he does not script up his self-production of Androgyny as a stand-alone description, but rather as something that is borne of necessity. This acts to deflect attention from his Hegemonic talk where the use of the Androgynous repertoire infers that Mark is challenging current gender practices. However in the gender in sport identity question, Mark avoids being positioned as a male coach through his use of the Effective Coach repertoire and his positioning as an Athlete Manager. Ideologically this form of talk allows Mark the opportunity to script up a position that is still reasonable for an elite coach to be without having to specifically address his gender. By doing this through various discursive

strategies, Mark affords himself his dominant status without having to hold this accountable.

8.3 Ralph

Ralph, a 30-year-old full-time coach, had been coaching for the past 12 years, with 5 years at the national level. His current position entailed working with male developmental, national, and international level athletes. Ralph coached in a sport where men and women participated, with competition being same-sex only. Ralph had also been a former elite athlete.

8.3.1 Trait and Masculinity Talking But Structured Walking

*S1/MC/MM/11/30/12/5/0/FTC/A/S/99/T/Mas

Text units 5-20:

5 How would I do that? What are my character traits? Um, ... , good point I
 6 think I'm, I'm very um, can't think of the right word, very methodical, and,
 7 I think I'm probably um, I always think sometimes I have that, I'm just
 8 trying to think of the terminology,... , I'm, I'm very structured I suppose is
 9 the easiest way. I like things to fit where they should, um, I like all the i's
 10 to be cross, all the t's to be crossed I like you know the boxes to be ticked
 11 so, um anything I do, I like to make sure there's a fair amount of planning
 12 goes into it, and that, you know there's a review process after it and I, I'm
 13 a very organised sort of person yeah.
 14 UH HUH. ANYTHING ELSE IF YOU WERE TO DESCRIBE
 15 YOURSELF?
 16 Um, no, I don't, I um, I think I have a reasonable amount of lateral
 17 thinking ability although I wouldn't see that as my strength, I think my
 18 strength is the fact that once, once I, I identify a direction I'm, I'm
 19 reasonably sort of ambitious to get that done, I'm determined to get that
 20 done.

When constituting his identity as an idiosyncratic individual Ralph utilises two repertoires, the Trait and Masculine. Ralph's talk in the sense of working up an idiosyncratic identity has more similarities with Karen and Fiona than Mark. Unlike Mark who situated his idiosyncratic identity as a coach identity, Ralph takes up the idiosyncratic identity storyline that is offered to him.

The basic premise of the Trait repertoire is that fixed and stable traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours are used to script up a general description of the self. The sense of self is worked up as being located within the individual. That is, there is an absence of social referents in this repertoire. In this repertoire self-meaning is fixed across differing contexts and differing interactions. The Trait repertoire reflects a form of talk that is similar to the trait/type repertoire talk reported by Marshall and Wetherell (1989) in their study of career and gender identities in male and female British law undergraduate students. In addition to this, Ralph also draws upon the Masculine repertoire. The Masculine repertoire has been discussed in Chapter Seven, and the reader is directed there for a more detailed discussion of this repertoire.

Therefore, on this occasion, Ralph employs two divergent repertoires to constitute himself as an idiosyncratic individual. To demonstrate, the Trait repertoire is depicted on line 5, *what are my character traits*, line 6, *very methodological*, line 8, *very structured*, lines 8 to 10, *like things to fit where they should, um, I like all the i's to be cross, all the t's to be crossed I like you know the boxes to be ticked*, and finally lines 10 to 12, *I like to make sure there's a fair amount of planning goes into it, and that, you know there's a review process after it and I, I'm a very organised sort of person yeah*. In contrast the Masculine appears on line 14, *reasonable amount of lateral thinking ability*, and lines 16 and 17, *once I, I identify a direction I'm, I'm reasonably sort of ambitious to get that done, I'm determined to get that done*.

Ralph proceeds to use these two repertoires to work up a Structured identity in his talk. For example, on line 6, *very methodological*, line 8, *very structured*, lines 8 to 10, *like things to fit where they should, um, I like all the i's to be cross, all the t's to be crossed I like you know the boxes to be ticked*, and finally lines 10 to 12, *I like to make sure there's a fair amount of planning goes into it, and that, you know there's a review process after it and I, I'm a very organised sort of person yeah*. Like before, it is Ralph's repetition of key elements associated with the Structured identity that gives meaning to himself on this occasion.

In order to increase the facticity of his description Ralph utilises extreme case formulations. This is seen on line 6, *I'm **very** um, can't think of the right word, **very** methodological*, line 8, *I'm **very** structured*, and line 9, *I like **all** the i's to be cross, **all***

the t's to be crossed. Further, on line 10, *anything I do I like to make sure there's a fair amount of planning goes into it*, and line 12, *I'm a very organised sort of person*. These strengthen his description of himself as someone who ascribes to a Structured way of being. To illustrate, when Mark uses *very* it negates in the hearer the requirement to ask what does Mark mean by organised, how organised, and so forth. 'Very' gives Mark's organised nature a discursive quantity. That is, Mark is no longer organised, his being very organised gives his organised nature a measure of organisation.

Like all the participants presented so far Ralph has some initial difficulty in elucidating himself as an idiosyncratic individual. On line 5 his repetition and rephrasing of my original question, and his pause and hesitations at non-transitional relevant places indicate that Ralph is struggling with the discursive demands of this question. Further, his repairs on lines 6, 7, and 8, where he has difficulty selecting what he considers the correct word to describe himself, is also illustrative of the difficulty that he is faced with when constructing his idiosyncratic identity. The above demonstrates that when we talk about ourselves our identity work is exposed to being challenged, disputed, and negotiated by other interlocutors.

Ralph's difficulty is further evidenced through his use of provisional statements and hedge words. That is, Ralph prefaces his descriptions with 'I think' (lines 5, 6 & 7), and 'I'm probably' (line 6). Further, when making reference to himself as being Structured, he follows his self-production with 'I suppose' (see line 8). By beginning his descriptions with provisional statements he is able to manoeuvre his self-production of Structured into the scope of a production that is more socially acceptable should this be questioned. For example, under challenge about his Structured way of being, *I suppose* affords Ralph the discursive opportunity to respond in a way that deflects interest away, or distance himself, from this Structured identity. It allows him the scope to alter his description so that it is appropriate for the local interactional context.

In addition, Ralph's use of the hedge words 'probably' (line 6) softens his alignment with being Structured and allows him the flexibility to align himself with some parts of Structured (e.g., organised) but not others (e.g., meticulous) should he be questioned about his production. Rhetorically 'probably' counters alternative descriptions that can be produced by the listener. In this instance I could have

challenged Ralph about his description. I could have remarked that this makes him sound businesslike and precise. In response to this challenge hedge words permit him the possibility to script up alternative descriptions of himself. For example, Ralph could have responded, 'no I'm more careful and considered than ...'.

Accompanying this is Ralph's use of the discursive strategy 'you know'. The related behaviours of being structured and organised are presented as normal through the use of 'you know' (see line 11). Hence Ralph's behaviour as a fairly organised type of person is typified by inviting from the listener a shared acceptance of his behaviour by placing it within the boundaries of acceptable behaviour.

In summary, Ralph's extract demonstrated how he used the Trait and Masculine repertoires to reflexively position himself as Structured through his repeated referencing on lines 6 to 10. Thus Ralph walked a particular walk within his Trait and Masculine talk. Through his use of these discourses Ralph scripted up a Structured self-production that included the negative perceptions that such an identity can bring. However through his use of various discursive strategies Ralph judiciously worked to minimise these risks.

8.3.2 Being Positioned as a Man: Talking the Talk of Traits But Walking an Atypical Walk

Text units 18-22:

18 Um, ... , as a man to, I'm a quiet man. Um, I'm not one of the, I'm not one
 19 of your, I suppose, um, boys boys, um, although I've played (sport) and
 20 (sport) a very social game, I wouldn't say I'm a social animal by any
 21 stretch of the imagination. So I'm probably far more reserved when it
 22 comes to that type of thing compared to others.

As he did in the idiosyncratic identity question, Ralph draws upon a Trait repertoire to construct his identity. However on this occasion it is his gender identity that is being scripted up. The reader is directed to earlier sections of this Chapter for a discussion of this repertoire. The Trait repertoire is seen on line 18, *I'm a quiet man*, line 19, *although I've played (sport)*, line 20 *I wouldn't say I'm a social animal by any stretch of the imagination*, and line 21, *So I'm probably far more reserved when it comes to that type of thing*.

Through his use of the Trait repertoire Ralph reflexively positions himself as Atypical. This is similar to the reflexive position that Fiona used when constituting herself as a women in Chapter Seven. Like Fiona, Ralph proceeds to distance himself from this group membership, in this instance men. Ralph produces this gender identity, albeit in a highly specific discursive interaction, that is constituted from a collectively shared discourse that reflects a Trait way of being. Within this collectively shared discourse Ralph adopts a differing reflexive position for describing himself as a man. Thus Ralph walks a particular path within his Trait talk.

The Atypical identity is seen in Ralph's discourse on lines 18 to 19, *Um, ... , as a man to, I'm a quiet man. Um, I'm not one of the, I'm not one of your, I suppose, um, boys boys, um, although I've played (sport) and (sport) a very*, and lines 19 to 20, *I'm probably far more reserved when it comes to that type of thing compared to others*. Consequently Ralph produces a gendered self that is different from others. Ralph, like Fiona, engages in what in Billig (1996) calls particularisation. On this occasion, Ralph distances himself from his dominant group through his self-production of being a quiet man. This draws attention to his difference or uniqueness compared to other men. He

then reinforces this with his description of being more reserved than others. In both of these instances Ralph scripts up a self-production that is unique when compared to other men. It is this repetition of key elements of the Atypical identity (lines 19 to 22) that gives Ralph his meaning on this occasion.

To offer an identity that is unique, or to construct oneself as being different from one's dominant group, carries with it the risk that the listener will react negatively to this identity (Edley & Wetherell, 1999). On lines 21 and 22 Ralph is aware of the negative consequences of constituting himself as not being one of the boys. For a male this is a problematic identity to script up. As suggested previously, sport is a context that for men, actively produces and reproduces hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987). Although the positioning of Ralph was as a man, he uses his membership in elite sport as a referent group to script up his identity on this occasion. For a man to not embrace his hegemonic masculinity raises suspicion of his status as a man (Speer, 2000).

Ralph is henceforth faced with an interactional dilemma. He is being asked to hold his sense of being a man accountable, and he is a man which brings with it a category entitlement. Ralph is faced with the dilemma of positioning himself so that he can still speak with some authority on what it is like to be a man whilst at the same time distancing himself from his dominant category, and retaining a sense of uniqueness. Ralph faces the interactional dilemma of how he can be a man, and still be a unique individual.

One way to manage such a dilemma and tenuous identity is through the use of show concessions (Antaki & Wetherell, 1999), a three part discursive structure of proposition, concession, and re-assertion. Antaki and Wetherell have demonstrated how show concessions can be used to make a pretence of conceding to differing views in an argument. Making a show, therefore, has a rhetorical effect in that the interlocutor makes an illusion of being aware of the various points of view put forward in an argument, of deliberating upon these points before seemingly presenting an informed decision about their own argumentative point. Antaki and Wetherell posit that this is not about actual conceding per se. Rather it is about making a rhetorical show of conceding. When considered as part of interactional business, show concessions feign concession to divergent viewpoints but the final output is a return to the interlocutor's original

proposition. On this occasion, Ralph uses a similar procedure in offering a concession to his own description. Through show concessions Ralph's own position is strengthened and reinforced by undermining alternative descriptions that can be worked up in response to his original tenuous identity (Antaki & Wetherell).

Using the above-mentioned three-part structure, Ralph's original production of being a quiet man and not being one of the boys is his original proposition (Antaki & Wetherell, 1999). As discussed above, it is an identity that is risky and vulnerable to question (see lines 18 & 19). This vulnerability is demonstrated by his use of the provisional statement 'I suppose' before his proposition on line 19, thus allowing him to script up alternative representations in the face of challenge or uncertainty. Had I interjected and challenged Ralph, *I suppose* would have allowed Ralph to change and temper his production so that it met the requirements of the interaction.

Ralph then concedes something to his original proposition. This is his concession (see lines 19 & 20) (Antaki & Wetherell, 1999), for without this concession Ralph could be challenged on his self-production. Thus, the concession as a rhetorical move, immediately defends his original position. This concession is marked by the word 'although' which acts as a concessionary marker. This is then followed by evidence that challenges his original production that he is not one of the boys and a quiet man. His reference to his playing a particular sport which he sees as social, counters his original position of not being one of the boys and being quiet. It should be noted how Ralph also uses extreme case formulations to strengthen this concession, *and (sport) a very social game* (lines 19 & 20), that makes his original claim appear sound and well defended. To identify the sport may disclose Ralph's identity, however the sport is one that is perceived as being a man's or masculine typed sport (Csizma et al., 1988).

Ralph proceeds to qualify his concession and reassert his original proposition, *so I'm far more reserved when it comes to that type of thing* (line 21). The reprise is marked by 'so', which, although not strictly a conjunction (Antaki & Wetherell, 1999), works on this occasion as a conjunction to join or link his concession to his reprise. Ralph deploys, to his rhetorical advantage, a show concession that allows him to strengthen his own position of being Atypical whilst at the same time defending this

self-production against challenge and attack. Hence his use of a show of concession is a strategy that manages his interactional dilemma.

In conclusion, Ralph reflexively positioned himself as Atypical through his repeated referencing on lines 19 to 22. Through his use of a Trait discourse, Ralph worked up an Atypical reflexive position with an understanding of the negative perceptions that this can bring for a man. It demonstrated how being constructed as Atypical carries with it implicit value judgements, of which Ralph is aware. As a consequence, Ralph walked a different walk within his Trait talk.

Ideologically Ralph's talk serves similar purposes to Fiona's. Ralph's talk portrays Ralph as a particularised man or what a typical man is not. Although he does the typical man activities, in that he played the appropriate sport for men, he is still not like other men. What we see in Ralph's talk is that he depicts a favourable image of the typical man, as a social, boisterous, and gregarious man. This differs from Fiona whose portrayal of the typical woman was a negative perception. Like Fiona, the Atypical position may lend legitimacy to Ralph's identity work. Scripting up a self that is different from group membership expectations is a tenuous identity to take up. However this can be alleviated when considered within a discourse that is favoured by Western society (Triandis, 1995). Like Fiona, such talk may ideologically serve to give Ralph the opportunity to challenge societal views of men whilst working within an identity that positively encouraged in a Western culture. Thus it may be an identity that can challenge current gender practices.

8.3.3 Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis: This Time Ralph

Ralph was classified as Masculine⁶ on the basis of his responses to the PAQ. Yet in the interview he deployed Trait talk to position himself as Atypical through various discursive resources and strategies. A portion of Ralph's talk (line 18) was coded at the PAQ Feminine (F) node during the a-priori content analysis. Hence there is inconsistency not only between the meaning Ralph gives to himself through his discourse and his PAQ responses, but there is also inconsistency between his PAQ response and his discursive content as evidenced by the a-priori content analysis. Thus the PAQ may be limited in its ability to inform us of how people ascribe to gender-related characteristics as measured by the PAQ. On this occasion, the PAQ may be able to capture Ralph's descriptions of himself, but it is not able to fully capture Ralph's prescriptions of himself.

Again the imposition of researcher generated gender conceptualisations has not matched Ralph's conceptualisation of himself as a man in everyday talk. Like the previous extracts, Ralph's irregularity questions the validity of monolithic bipolar conceptions of gender. Instead it lends credence to the multifactorial notion of gender where the etiological foundations of gender-related traits, characteristics, and behaviours are divergent both within and between women and men. Suggesting that gender is therefore a complex and multidimensional construct.

⁶ A person classified as Masculine scored above the median on the PAQ Masculine (M) sub-scale and below the median on the PAQ F sub-scale.

8.3.4 A Man in Elite Sport: Innovation in Sport With Egalitarianism

Text units 71-91:

71 So, to another person inside that sporting arena?

72 YEP, YEP, OR OUTSIDE.

73 Ok so how would I describe myself. Um obviously I suppose we see
74 ourselves as being reasonably cutting edge in what we're doing here, and I
75 mean I, you know I think, and I believe that, what we're doing is, is the
76 way to go about things, I think we have to, for the simple fact that we are,
77 I suppose, the minority here, (identifying information) sport in the
78 country, we, we facing competitors who is there is major winter sport
79 with, with far more money and a bigger player base so we have to be
80 innovative um, and I really think that if I was describing myself in elite
81 sport I would think that I am, someone who has some idea, and some, and
82 some reasonable sort of, direction in trying to stay cutting edge.

83 UH HUH, AND, IF YOU WERE TO DESCRIBE YOURSELF
84 SPECIFICALLY AS A MAN IN ELITE SPORT, HOW WOULD YOU
85 DO THAT?

86 No. I mean, I have um, some very strong relationships with a, with a
87 number of other sporting coaches and athletes who are female and from
88 other sports and I mean I can converse with them either way, about sport
89 and, I, I don't think this, I mean I know the old issue this is gender in sport
90 but I think at the elite level, you're an athlete, and it doesn't matter if
91 you're male or female, and that's the way you should be treated.

Like Mark, when he was describing himself as a man in elite sport, Ralph in the beginning does not orient himself to the gender portion of my question. That is, both male coaches talk from a coach position rather than a male coach position even though they are positioned as men in elite sport. This is unlike the female coaches who immediately spoke from a gender in sport point of reference. However unlike Mark, during Ralph's descriptive work I was able to interject and re-position his attention to the gender aspect of our interaction (see lines 82 & 83). From this point on Ralph takes up my storyline and speaks from a gender reflexive position (lines 84 onwards). The opportunity to interrupt was not as forthcoming from Mark's discourse.

Therefore, before my interruption, Ralph draws upon an Innovation in Sport repertoire when constituting his gender identity in sport. Although at this point he ignores the gender part of this identity. The basic premise of the Innovation in Sport repertoire is that traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours associated with being a leader

in the field of coaching and sporting developments are used to script up a sporting identity⁷. Ralph constitutes a sense of himself through his description of his sport as being a leader in coaching and sporting developments. The Innovation in Sport repertoire discursively incorporates the notion that Ralph's particular sport is innovative, creative, and a leader in developing athletes to the elite level. On this occasion, Ralph draws specifically upon the difficulties that his sport faces, and the need for innovation in attracting players.

However after my interactive re-position, Ralph proceeds to negotiate a particular gender identity in sport within a different interpretative repertoire. Indeed Ralph rejects my suggestion that the Innovation in Sport repertoire is one that encompasses the gender aspect of his sporting identity (line 84). Thus he works from a different interpretative repertoire when asked to reframe his response. On this local interactional occasion, Ralph draws upon an Experience With repertoire to constitute a sense of himself as a man in elite sport, where his alleged strong experience and professional working relationships with female coaches and athletes is used to script himself up as a man in elite sport. Within this collectively shared discourse, and in response to my interjection, Ralph reflexively positions himself as Egalitarian. Ralph, therefore, adopts a differing reflexive position for describing himself thereby walking a different walk within his Experience With talk.

When constituting himself as a man in elite sport Ralph avoids the gender aspect and begins by drawing upon his possession of traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours associated with his sport being a leader in the field of coaching and sporting developments. This is seen on lines 73 to 76, *I suppose we see ourselves as being reasonably cutting edge in what we're doing here, and I mean I, you know I think, and I believe that, what we're doing is, is the way to go about things, I think we have to, for the simple fact that we are, I suppose, the minority here*, and lines 79 to 81, *we have to be innovative um, and I really think that if I was describing myself in elite sport I would*

⁷ By using this term I am noting that Ralph has chosen to work with a sporting identity not a gender identity in sport.

think that I am, someone who has some idea, and some, and some reasonable sort of, direction in trying to stay cutting edge. However this is in reference to himself as a coach in elite sport not a man in elite sport. Therefore after my intrusion, Ralph takes up my gender storyline through his use of the Experience With repertoire. This is evidenced on lines 84, 86, *No. I mean, I have um, some very strong relationships with a, with a number of other sporting coaches and athletes who are female and from other sports and I mean I can converse with them either way, about sport.*

The form of talk that Ralph deploys in response to being re-interactively positioned as a man in elite sport is that of Egalitarian. This is very similar to the Egalitarian repertoire used by Fiona in Chapter Seven in her response to being interactively positioned as a woman. However on this occasion, Ralph's use of this is not as a discursive resource that is used to constitute another identity, rather it becomes his gender identity in sport. That is, Ralph gives himself his precise meaning on this occasion through his repetition of key elements of the Egalitarian notion (see lines 84 to 89).

Ralph scripts up the Egalitarian identity as being *I, I don't think this, I mean I know the old issue this is gender in sport but I think at the elite level, you're an athlete, and it doesn't matter if you're male or female, and that's the way you should be treated* (lines 86 to 89). As in previous extracts, Ralph demonstrates that in conversations, talking about who we are as individuals is open to negotiation, challenge, and dispute. This is seen on line 71 where Ralph helpfully reformulates my question by asking me to clarify the context to which my question pertains (Speer & Potter, 2000). Speer and Potter postulate that in everyday talk the use of a question to answer a question is indicative of the delicate identity work that the interlocutor is about to undertake. Thus, on this occasion, Ralph's clarification question is indicative of the intricate identity work that he feels he is about to embark upon.

What is of note is how Ralph answers my question in the second conversation turn (line 72, my reframe of the gender identity in sport). From lines 73 to 81 Ralph does not engage in a self-description per se but rather sport-reflection. This is indicated by his change of footing on line 73 from *how would I describe myself*, to *we see ourselves as being reasonably cutting edge in what we're doing here* (lines 73 & 74).

As discussed previously in this chapter, shifts in footing are frequently used when sensitive or controversial facts or claims are being scripted up. Thereby minimising the risk that Ralph faces in scripting up a leader in sporting and coaching identity. Laying claim to a mantle of being cutting edge carries with it risks. For example, Ralph risks being seen as boastful, as pretentious, and as being better than others. A cutting edge claim, by default, implicitly infers that Ralph and his sport are leading other sports in player development and perhaps other groups within his sport. Ralph's change of footing from principal on line 73 (e.g., I) to animator (e.g., we) dissociates himself, and does not hold himself accountable for his cutting edge production.

By adopting a position where he is seen as representing others' view points as well as his own, Ralph works to make his innovation not just of his making, but also of someone else's. In so doing he shifts the accountability of his description from himself to unknown others. Corroboration, therefore, makes more literal a descriptive event. This can be seen in Ralph's account of himself as a man in elite sport. Ralph uses the notion of consensus quite skilfully in his use of the plural 'we' thereby making his cutting edge description appear as a general known state of affairs. The shift of footing manages a risky identity by allowing for the appearance of consensus whilst at the same time allowing Ralph independence in that he has the discursive opportunity to deny this statement should it be questioned.

This does not appear to be used as an isolated strategy. Ralph's decision to answer from a sport-reflection view is an example of ontological gerrymandering. Just like Mark who also used ontological gerrymandering in his response to Q6, there are a wide variety of descriptive terms that are available to Ralph to draw upon when scripting himself up as a man in elite sport. By choosing a sport-reflection over a self-description he avoids having to answer from a gender perspective. Thus as with Mark, Ralph uses ontological gerrymandering to script up an identity that is most advantageous for him, an identity that does not deal with the gender aspect of himself. Therefore, it allows him to manage the difficult and contentious task of identity work by selecting those descriptions that are resistant to challenge whilst ignoring gender descriptions that are open to challenge and criticism. To illustrate, Ralph's selection of his sport and implicitly himself as cutting edge makes it difficult to challenge as this

hearer considers this to be a reasonable description of what elite coaches and professional sport should be doing.

Potter (1996b) argues that the pace of a real life conversation makes it difficult for the hearer to track and note the discursive strategies used by the interlocutor to manage risky identities. However, Ralph's absence of self-description is noted by myself on lines 82 and 83 through the reiteration of my original question. It is at this point that Ralph concedes to my interactive positioning and reflexively positions himself as Egalitarian. Ralph proceeds to increase the facticity of his Egalitarian identity using various discursive strategies. Firstly, Ralph uses extreme case formulations to strengthen and reinforce his description of himself as someone who ascribes to Egalitarian of being, *very strong relationships with a, with a **number** of other sporting coaches and athletes who are female and from other sports and I mean I can **converse** with them **either** way, about sport and, I, I don't think this, I mean I know the **old** issue this is gender in sport but I think at the elite level, you're an athlete, and it **doesn't** matter if you're male or female, and that's the way you **should** be treated* (lines 84 to 89).

As an invitation to consider Egalitarianism as an acceptable way of being for a male coach, extreme case formulations rhetorically strengthen his description of himself as being liberal and open minded, and work to make what he is saying more factual and solid. Further, as indexical markers, extreme case formulations demonstrate the strength of Ralph's conviction that he is Egalitarian. They convey a sense that Ralph does not just describe himself; he prescribes himself. Thus 'very strong' emphasises Ralph's strength of his relationship with female coaches in elite sport thus making any challenge to Ralph's self-production difficult. To illustrate, *very strong* (line 84) makes it difficult for the hearer to ask Ralph whether he has treated female coaches any differently than men, whether he sees men and women differently, and so forth.

From my preliminary discussion with Ralph in the demographic section of the interview and his responses to questions that have not been analysed in this dissertation, Ralph stated that he did not consider that gender was an issue in elite sport anymore and that elite sport was no longer a man's domain. He also notes this on lines 86 and 87. As outlined earlier, participants were aware that I was interested in gender issues in sport,

thus Ralph's scripting up of an Egalitarian position was an expected identity to take up in this particular interaction. Ralph has anticipated that I was expecting him to express negative views about women in elite sport, hence his use of a reifying statement on line 87. Here *I know the old issue this is gender in sport*. 'I know' works to make the issue of gender seem separate from Ralph. It works like Mark's confession, where confessing to an awareness of the problem or issue at stake works as a display that his description is well considered and one that takes into account the social implications of gender in sport. Thus, by default, it works to counter the negative implications that the listener could constitute when listening to his description.

Even though Ralph asserts that gender is not an issue, his use of the provisional statement, *I think at the elite level* (line 87) allows him the opportunity to restructure his self-production into a production that is more socially acceptable should this be challenged. Hence he is able to distance himself from his self-production should this be required. For example, under challenge about him not considering gender as an issue, *I think* allows Ralph the discursive opening to respond in a way that deflects interest away or distances him from a risky identity. To illustrate, he could have responded to this challenge by repairing, 'well at other levels it might be an issue' or 'in my sport at this level it is not an issue'. This discursive practice enables Ralph to manage challenges to his self-production in such a way that does not undermine it.

In conclusion, Ralph drew upon two different interpretative repertoires when constituting himself as a man in elite sport. In the first instance Ralph utilised an Innovation in Sport repertoire. However this repertoire was not being used to constitute a sense of himself as a man in elite sport. Rather it was being used to compose an elite sport identity that ignored the gender part of the positioning. Therefore in response to my continued interactive positioning of him as a man in elite sport, Ralph responded by reflexively positioning himself as Egalitarian through his repeated referencing on lines 86 to 89. Ralph scripted himself up as being Egalitarian through his use of the Experience With repertoire. Ralph's talk demonstrated how a man in elite sport can use various discursive strategies and resources to avoid being constructed as a man in elite sport. Scripting up a man in elite sport identity to a gender researcher carries with it

implicit risks. Thus illustrating the influence of the local interactional context on identity work in everyday talk.

Ralph's talk is different from that of Karen and Fiona. Like Mark, Ralph also avoids, at least in the first instance, the interactive position of man in elite sport by focusing on the elite sport side of my positioning. He does this in the first conversation turn through the use of the Innovation in Sport repertoire. Unlike Mark, I was able to break in on Ralph's descriptive talk and re-position him as a man in elite sport where he moves to a new interpretative repertoire (Experience With) to position himself as Egalitarian. Ideologically, an appeal to liberal values serves to portray the speaker as non-sexist, as reasonable, and fair. Indeed, Ralph discloses his knowledge of gender issues in sport (whatever this may be) thereby inferring some past inequity between women and men. However, Ralph does not go further. He stops at a challenge to current gender practices when he switches the discursive theme of his description to speak specifically of elite sport by scripting an equal treatment for female and male athletes. Whilst not a classic disclaimer such as 'I'm not sexist but' (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975), Ralph's use of *I know the old issue this is gender in sport but I think* (line 87) performs a similar function. Ideologically he is able to profess an egalitarian attitude without having to address the inequity that he infers, and that he, unwittingly, is a part of.

8.3.5 Ralph and the Story So Far

As seen in Table 8.2 as Ralph was interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, as a man, and then as a man in elite sport, differences emerged in his use of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions. A gender lens caused Ralph to accentuate his difference from other men. That is, Ralph worked to actively position himself as an Atypical man. This in direct contrast to Mark who had emphasised his typicalness or his Hegemonic Masculinity upon the addition of a gender lens. When not interactively positioned as a man Ralph's difference did not take prominence in his description rather his masculinity does, albeit with consideration of how this will be heard and responded to by the listener.

Table 8.2

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Ralph Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Masculine	Trait	Innovation in Sport
Reflexive positions	Structured	Atypical	Egalitarian
Extreme case formulations	✓	✓	✓ *
Hesitations or pauses	✓		
Provisional statements	✓	✓	
Hedge words	✓		
Footing			✓
Interactional dilemmas		✓	
Ontological gerrymandering			✓
Show concessions		✓	
Reframe			✓
Corroboration			✓
You know	✓		

Note: * Extreme case formulations change to incorporate strength of statement.

When a sporting lens was added to the gender descriptive process Ralph again shifted his reflexive positioning to where he did not see himself as a male elite level coach in the first conversation turn. Thus, the integration of a sport and gender lens, has not made gender salient for Ralph. It is only when I re-positioned him within a gender framework did Ralph take up my offered storyline. As with Mark, this is understandable as Ralph is a member of the dominant group, and he only coached male athletes. As such, Ralph may have perceived his position as being male and being a coach as normative, and thus he was not able to perceive of his gender as salient (Ely, 1995b). Therefore, unless he is interactively positioned so as to respond in a way where it becomes salient, Ralph has not seen the construction of his gender identity in sport to have a gender component.

Ralph's use of discursive strategies to reify these reflexive positions changes also across positionings (refer to Table 8.2). As Ralph was moved from an idiosyncratic identity to a gender identity, Ralph rhetorically scripted up a show concession (see Table 8.2). This worked to make Ralph's tenuous position (Atypical in the gender identity question) more factual. Further, when a gender and then sporting lens was laid

upon the self-description process, Ralph's use of extreme case formulations changed where they were deployed as indexical markers thus demonstrating the strength of Ralph's conviction that he sees himself as egalitarian in elite sport. What was different across each descriptive instance was that Ralph has faced an interactional dilemma only when a gender lens was laid upon the descriptive process.

Ideologically, Ralph's different talk serves different purposes in the gender identity and gender identity in sport questions. In Q2 Ralph's talk portrays him as a particularised man. As such this talk may ideologically serve to give Ralph the opportunity to challenge societal views of men whilst working within an identity that is positively encouraged in a Western culture. In the gender identity in sport question however, Ralph's Egalitarian talk is an appeal to liberal values which serves to portray him as non-sexist, as reasonable, and fair. At this point the two forms of talk may appear more similar than dissimilar. However Ralph's gender identity in sport talk does not challenge current gender practices. By stopping short of this challenge Ralph has the liberty to profess an egalitarian attitude without having to address the inequity that his talk seeks to redress.

Compared to Mark, Ralph had less difficulty in scripting up his identities as suggested by Mark's greater use of provisional statements and ontological gerrymandering (Potter, 1996b; Speer, 2000; Speer & Potter, 2000). Further, Mark made greater use of a wider range of strategies than Ralph, this again is indicative of the difficulty that Mark had in scripting up his identities. Both men were aware of the tenuousness of scripting up a risky gender identity, and both made their identities less open to challenge and dispute through their use of various discursive strategies (see Tables 8.1 & 8.2). Ralph and Mark were both aware of how their discourse would be heard and responded to by a female psychologist and gender researcher, as evidenced through their use of various discursive strategies to reinforce their reflexive positions. Again the preceding discussion pertains only to Ralph's discourse on this occasion. Should Ralph be asked the same questions associated with the aforementioned identity categories, it is possible that different interpretative repertoires, reflexive positions, and discursive strategies would be invoked that are particular to this new local interactional context.

The differences between Ralph and Mark can be accounted for by the interactive occasion, as this is consistent with the epistemological and theoretical orientation of discursive psychology. However taking a wider view, the differing sporting cultures that each coach works within, their potentially different psychosocial developmental stages, and different coaching populations (Mark coached men and women, Ralph coached men) could have influenced the interactional differences. Ralph worked within a sport that has been perceived as being masculine (Csizma et al., 1988), whereas Mark worked within a sport that is perceived as neutral (Csizma et al.). Thus the difference in the way each coach has scripted up his coaching identity, and the identity itself, may reflect these differences. Further, it is possible that like Fiona and Karen, Mark and Ralph were in different psychosocial stages of development (Erikson, 1963), with Mark perhaps being in middle adulthood and Ralph being in adolescence or young adulthood.

8.4 Comparing Across the Coaches

Table 8.3 below contains a comparison of the discursive resources used by the four coaches, with Table 8.4 containing a comparison of the discursive strategies.

Table 8.3

Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Male and Female Coaches Across Identities

Discursive Resources	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender identity in sport
Interpretative repertoires			
Masculine Trait	R	F	
Innovation in Sport			R
Masculine & Interpersonal Egalitarian	K	K	
As Normal			K
Androgynous	F	M	
Female Coach			F
Effective Coach	M		M
Reflexive positions			
Structured	R		
Atypical		F K	
Egalitarian			R
Directive Democrat Coach	M		
Hegemonic Masculine		M	
Athlete Manager			M
Masculine	F K		
Opposite to Men		K	
Not See Self as Woman			K
Non-Issue			F

Note: R = Ralph, M = Mark, K = Karen, F = Fiona

A perusal of Table 8.3 suggests that the male coaches draw less upon gender related interpretative repertoires (Ralph = Masculine, Mark = Androgynous) than the female coaches (Fiona = Androgynous, Masculine, Female Coach, Karen = Masculine, Egalitarian, Female As Normal). Of interest is that Karen and Fiona also draw upon tenuous gender related discourses (Masculine) (Crawford & Unger, 2000), whereas Mark and Ralph do not. It may be that working within the sporting context; a context that overtly values masculinity (Connell, 1987; Connell, 1995), exposes Karen and Fiona to alternative descriptive discourses that are rewarded in the sporting context. Further, working within sport with its masculine climate may highlight to Karen and Fiona their difference from men, thus making their gender more salient. Ely (1995a)

supports this with an argument that workplaces where women are by numbers in the minority, covertly emphasise women's difference from men which in turn makes women's gender more salient during identity construction.

This is appropriate for Fiona however Karen worked in an organisation where women dominated. This is not to assume that female dominated cultures cannot be masculine. Dunford (1992) argues that women only organisations can, and do, exercise what is considered masculine power, and can, and do, develop what is considered a masculine culture. To assume that all women organisations are different from all men organisations based on gender membership is an erroneous assumption (Dunford). As discussed earlier in Chapter Seven, as a member of the dominant group women, Karen may not have perceived her gender as a central aspect of her sporting identity, as woman is the norm in her sport. Thus Karen is able to recognise the overall social construction of gender (as she did in Q2), however within her particular sport, woman as norm makes it difficult for her gender to become salient in this context.

In terms of the reflexive positions that the participants took up within the three questions, differences are again apparent from Table 8.3. The female coaches drew upon more gender related prescriptions (Fiona = Masculine, Atypical, Non-issue, Karen = Masculine, Opposite to Men, Not See Self as Woman), than the males (Ralph = Atypical, Egalitarian, Mark = Hegemonic Masculine). Thus even in idiosyncratic identity prescription, Fiona and Karen position themselves as gender related individuals whereas Mark and Ralph position themselves in reference to gender only when interactively positioned as men and as male coaches respectively. Again this may be reflective of the masculinity inherent within the sporting context and the male as norm concept. As such, Ralph and Mark's discourse may reflect their privileged status of members of the dominant group, and as such members, they have the opportunity to make what they say the norm.

As is consistent epistemologically with a discursive approach, such use of resources and positioning is reflective of the interactive moment and that under different interactional conditions different discourses and positions would be produced. Accordingly identity production is appropriate for the local interactional context (Speer & Potter, 2000).

Table 8.4

Comparison of the Discursive Strategies Used by the Male and Female Coaches Across Identities

Discursive Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender identity in sport
Extreme case formulations	R K F M*	R M F K*	R* M K* F
Hesitations or pauses	R M K	F	M K F
Provisional statements	R K F	R M F	M
Hedge words	R K F	F	M
Metaphors	M		
Reifying statements			F
Autobiographical talk	F	F	F
Interactional dilemmas	K F	R M K F	M K F
You know	R M		M
Social comparison		M	
Ontological gerrymandering	M	M	R M
Footing change	K		R M
Corroboration			R M
Coincidence	M		
Show concessions		R	
Don't know		F	K F
Reframe			R
Three-part list			F
Narrative			F
Confessional		M	

Note: R = Ralph, M = Mark, K = Karen, F = Fiona

* Extreme case formulations change to incorporate strength of statement.

Whilst resources and positioning are reflexive, the strategies that we use to script up these resources and positions as factual may be more generalisable. What is of note from Table 8.4 is the consistent use of extreme case formulations across each interactive positioning. This is supportive of Potter's (1996b) and Pomerantz's (1986) claim that extreme case formulations are commonly used in discursive situations where the interlocutor is trying to justify, accuse, or support a particular position. Further, the consistent use of hesitations or pauses, provisional statements, and hedge words is indicative of identity work as a site of negotiation, dispute, and challenge. What is most

apparent is that identity description and prescription is associated with work. That is, all coaches have drawn upon various strategies in order to script up their identities. They selectively draw upon various resources to script up versions of themselves, and they also work to inoculate their identity prescriptions from challenges.

Ideologically the discourse of Fiona and Karen and Mark and Ralph are disparate. Both men talk from positions that serve to portray them as favourable, and as being reasonable and knowledgeable about gender issues in general as well as in sport. Albeit Mark does not address his gender in his response to Q6, the man in elite sport interactive position, and Ralph only does so after I re-position him to do so. Such talk is consistent with work by Gough (1998), Wetherell and Edley (1999), and Wetherell et al. (1987) where men worked to portray a pretence of enlightenment in reference to gender issues whilst maintaining the gender status quo in their talk. In contrast, Karen and Fiona's talk subtly questions the gender order by working up in everyday talk gender as a social construction. Whilst this varies across each question, both women recognise that gender difference lies within societal expectations, and both women suggest ways in which they work to challenge these expectations. Thus ideologically their talk serves to raise awareness of the position of women in society without being directly confrontational.

CHAPTER NINE
THE ATHLETES: MARSHA AND SUSAN

9.1	Introduction	257
9.2	Marsha	257
9.2.1	The Idiosyncratic Identity: Androgyny Talking and Good Person Walking	257
9.2.2	A Woman: Talking the Talk of Femininity But Walking an Opposite to Men Walk	262
9.2.3	Marsha: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	267
9.2.4	A Woman in Elite Sport: A Tough Walk Within a Lack of Recognition Talk	267
9.2.5	Marsha's Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Woman, and a Woman in Elite Sport	276
9.3	Susan	278
9.3.1	The Idiosyncratic Identity, Trait Talking and Walking.....	278
9.3.2	I am a Woman: Talking Traits But Walking Atypically.	280
9.3.3	Susan: Comparing the Discourse Analysis with the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	284
9.3.4	As Woman in Elite Sport.....	284
9.3.5	Susan's Story Thus Far.....	288

9.1 Introduction

The following two chapters present the athletes' responses to the idiosyncratic identity, gender identity, and gender identity in sport interview questions. This chapter will focus on the female athletes, with the following chapter, Chapter Ten, concentrating upon the male athletes.

9.2 Marsha

As a 19-year-old athlete, Marsha had participated in her sport for 6 years. Four of these had been at the national level and one had been at the international level. Women and men competed in this sport, however competition was same-sex and men dominated the elite level of competition. Marsha was also a full-time tertiary student with a full-time training schedule.

9.2.1 The Idiosyncratic Identity: Androgyny Talking and Good Person Walking

Analytic interest in the idiosyncratic identity question focused on how participants reflexively positioned their idiosyncratic identity through their use of discursive practices (e.g., interpretative repertoires) and strategies (e.g., extreme case formulations). To recapitulate four research questions were associated with the above question:

- 1) What were the reflexive positions that participants used to reflexively position themselves as idiosyncratic individuals;
- 2) What were the interpretative repertoires that participants used when doing this;
- 3) Did participants draw upon gender related interpretative repertoires when reflexively positioning themselves, and if so what were they; and
- 4) What were the discursive strategies that participants used to

reflexively position themselves as idiosyncratic individuals and how were these strategies used.

The research questions and analytic focus associated with each identity question are similar. The only difference is an identity change from idiosyncratic, to gender, through to gender identity in sport across Questions One, Two, and Six respectively.

*S1/FA/FA/25/19/6/4/1/FTS/A/0/T/And

Text units 5-16:

5 Um, friendly, sort of um, active, very sporting, um, I like going out, um

6 just having fun, really, um, always, like to have a, competitive element

7 um, when I play sport or, but my first and foremost thought is to go out

8 and have fun, so um. I consider myself a good friend, generally pretty

9 decent person.

10 ANYTHING ELSE AH, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT I'LL ASK YOU

11 QUITE A BIT, IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THERE THAT YOU

12 WANT TO ADD ABOUT HOW YOU WOULD DESCRIBE

13 YOURSELF TO ANOTHER PERSON?

14 No. Oh, good listener, you know if people ever, need me for anything I'm

15 always you know one you know to count on, um, reliable, and ah,

16 enthusiastic sort of person, I guess.

Like Fiona in Chapter Eight, Marsha draws upon an Androgynous repertoire when constituting her idiosyncratic identity. That is, she constitutes a sense of herself through her possession of masculine and feminine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. The masculine can be seen in Marsha's talk on line 5, *active* (active - Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999), line 5, *very sporting*, and lines 6 and 7, *when I play sport* (good at sports/athletic – Cejka & Eagly 1999; Spence & Helmreich). Further, on line 6, *like to have a, competitive element* (competitive - Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich). The feminine is located on line 5, *friendly*, line 8, *consider myself a good friend* (warm in relations with others – Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich), line 13, *good listener* (sympathetic/understanding of others - Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich), and lines 13 to 14, *you know if people ever, need*

me for anything I'm always you know one you know to count on

(supportive/devotes self to others - Cejka & Eagly; Spence & Helmreich).

In response to my interactive positioning, Marsha reflexively positions herself as a Good Person. Hence Marsha produces an idiosyncratic self, albeit in a highly specific discursive interaction, that is constituted from a collectively shared discourse that reflects an Androgynous way of being. However within this discourse, Marsha adopts a differing position for describing herself thereby walking a different path within her Androgynous talk.

The Good Person identity is typified by being a *good friend* (line 8), a *good listener* (line 13), *pretty decent person* (line 8), and by *my first and foremost thought is to go out and have fun* (line 7). Further by, *if people ever, need me for anything I'm always you know one you know to count on* (lines 13 & 14). Whilst this construction may appear similar to the feminine discourse discussed above, on this occasion Marsha gives herself meaning through her repetition of the Good Person identity (see lines 7-14) (Speer, 2000). The repetition makes her Good Person production her most prominent idiosyncratic identity in this local interactional context because Marsha's descriptions are associated with, or conform to, key descriptive elements (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) of the Good Person.

This way of being is not uncommon in identity work. Speer (2000), in a study that explored how young adult British men constructed and managed hegemonic masculinity in talk, noted that participants sometimes scripted up favourable images of themselves during self-production. That is, during the constitution process participants chose to focus on their strengths and thus portray a positive self, rather than their weakness or a negative self. Hence the Good Person position is consistent with this perspective.

Marsha works to reinforce the Good Person identity through her use of extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986). Marsha utilises extreme case formulations to strengthen her description of herself as someone who ascribes to a Good Person way of being. To illustrate, *good friend* (line 8), *good listener* (line 13), *pretty decent person* (line 8), *my first and foremost thought is to go out*

and have fun (line 7), *if people ever, need me for anything I'm always you know one you know to count on* (lines 13 & 14), and *just having fun, really* (line 6).

Marsha uses the extreme case formulations to maximise her goodness, her decency, and her likeability thus inviting from the hearer an understanding of Marsha as being a Good Person. Further, they rhetorically counter alternative descriptions or productions of Marsha that could be produced by the listener. Therefore, they work to increase the facticity of what Marsha is saying (Potter, 1996b). Marsha's discursive use of these extreme case formulations consequently makes questioning of her description difficult. For example, on lines 13 and 14, 'ever' and 'anything' work to make asking Marsha how much or what does she mean redundant on this occasion.

Interestingly Marsha does not limit her use of extreme case formulations to her Good Person self. She also uses extreme case formulations when describing herself as *very sporting* (line 5), and *always like to have a competitive element when I play sport* (lines 6 & 7). The descriptive dimensions that these extreme case formulations are associated with are those that would be considered typically masculine (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999). As argued in previous chapters, women risk psychological isolation and social ostracism when behaving in ways that are considered socially unacceptable (Crawford & Unger, 2000). As we prepare our discourse with the anticipation of how it will be heard and responded to by others (Bakhtin, 1986), Marsha's use of extreme case formulations in this local interaction context can be read as a discursive strategy that manages how her production will be heard and acted upon on this occasion. A strategy aimed at minimising the risks she faces in taking up a production of self that is contrary to societal expectations of women. Extreme case formulations when used this way, strengthen her description of herself as being sporty by making what she is saying appear more truthful. That is, rhetorically they counter any challenges to her description by reifying her description thereby undermining the scripting up of alternative descriptions.

As demonstrated in previous chapters, Marsha's talk also displays how identity work is a site of negotiation and dispute (Potter, 1996b). This can be seen on line 5 where Marsha's self-production begins with the hedging device 'sort of'. 'Sort of' works by alleviating the impact of Marsha's reference to herself as active and linguistically limits a statement that could not be defended in its absolute form (Peters, 1995). 'Sort of' allows Marsha the flexibility to align herself with some parts of being active (e.g., hard-working) but not others (e.g., forceful or forward), should she be challenged about her production (Pomerantz, 1986). This permits Marsha to respond in numerous ways that reinforce her position, or distances her from, her production depending upon the interactive climate. That is, it allows her to clarify or change her self-production during a discursive interaction, in situ, depending upon how the listener responds to her initial production.

In addition, Marsha ends her self-production with *enthusiastic sort of person* (line 14). Through her use of this hedge Marsha is able to realign herself with some parts of what enthusiastic represents but not others. Of note is that in both instances Marsha deploys a hedging device when she takes up a descriptive dimension that is not considered appropriate for a woman. Thus moderating her prescription and presenting her with the opportunity to alter her production if challenged. In everyday talk Marsha is aware of the risks and challenges inherent in taking up a self-production that is contrary to societal expectations. She therefore works to decrease these risks and challenges through her use of hedge words.

Once having established a less tenuous platform from which to talk, Marsha presents her Good Person position as normal through her use of 'you know' (lines 13 & 14). By doing this Marsha is inviting from the listener a shared acceptance of her Good Person behaviour (Speer, 2000). Marsha's appeal to common behaviour heads off any censure of her description by placing it within the boundaries of acceptable behaviour. Marsha, therefore, does not only script up a position of being Good Person through descriptive elements, she normalises this position through the discursive strategy of 'you know'.

In response to being interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, Marsha reflexively responded by positioning herself as the Good Person as seen through her referencing of key elements on lines 7 to 14. She did this through the use of the Androgynous repertoire. Thus she used this repertoire as a resource to walk a different walk within her talk. This demonstrated that in talk we are able to orient to something that we would call Androgyny when describing ourselves. Notwithstanding this Marsha did this in reaction to an idiosyncratic position and not a gender position. In everyday talk Marsha's Good Person identity is open to question, confrontation, and appeasement. As such, Marsha has worked to increase the facticity of her Good Person production through her use of 'you know' and extreme case formulations. Further, she has allowed herself the opportunity to re-script her production had this been challenged through her use of hedging devices.

9.2.2 A Woman: Talking the Talk of Femininity But Walking an Opposite to Men Walk

As discussed in Chapter Eight, the gender identity question placed a gender lens upon the self-description process. Thus this question examined how participants gave meaning to their gender identity.

Text Units 17-21:

17 Um, as a woman, caring, I guess sort of um, sort of ... a woman am I
 18 yeah, probably um, sensitive, um, thoughtful, I don't know just sort of, I
 19 never really think about it much um, but um I feel open like I sort of,
 20 probably more than, I've probably been more open to people than I
 21 would be if I was a male.

On this occasion, Marsha utilises a Feminine repertoire when constituting herself as a woman. Up to this point no other woman (or man) has drawn upon the Feminine repertoire as a stand-alone entity to constitute any of their positioned identities. In previous chapters participants have drawn upon feminine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours as part of the Androgynous repertoire

when scripting up their identities. However as a repertoire in its own right, this is the first instance of such use.

The underlying basis of the Feminine repertoire is that female stereotypical descriptions are used as resources to script up a gendered representation of the self. These traits, behaviours, and/or characteristics are again consistent with gender stereotype research in psychology (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Deaux et al., 1985; Fiebert & Meyer, 1997; Harris & Griffin, 1997; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999). The Feminine repertoire is illustrated on line 17, *as a woman, caring* (helpful to others – Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best; Williams et al.), and line 18, *sensitive* (sensitive - Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best; Williams et al.). Further on line 18, *thoughtful* (helpful to others - Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best; Williams et al.), and line 19, *open to others* (warm to others – Spence & Helmreich; Williams & Best; Williams et al.).

Marsha's extract can be read as an utilisation of the Feminine repertoire to position herself as Opposite to Men. This talk conforms closely to the notion of men and women as different as posited by Davies (1997) and that Karen deployed in Chapter Eight. The reader is directed to this chapter for a more detailed discussion of the binary notion of gender. Thus like Karen, Marsha aligns herself as different from men by drawing upon a binary notion of gender construction, and it is through her use of key elements of the Opposite to Men identity that Marsha gives herself meaning (see lines 19 & 20).

Marsha positions herself as Opposite to Men through being more open, *I've probably been more open to people than I would be if I was a male* (lines 19 to 21). By positioning herself as Opposite to Men Marsha implies that when she as a woman has more of one trait, men must have less. The Opposite to Men production is invoked through her use of *more open* and *than I would be if*. Her use of the extreme case formulation 'more', strengthens her argument that as a woman she possesses substantially more openness than men do. As discussed previously, Edwards (2000) suggests that extreme case formulations can be deployed in two ways. Firstly, as descriptive resources that strengthen or protect

an argument against counterclaims and secondly, as indexical markers of the speaker's investment or commitment toward their description. As non-literal, extreme case formulations can be employed to demonstrate, in this case, the strength of Marsha's conviction that she is different from men. In doing so the extreme case formulations work to increase the facticity of her discourse. Her use of extreme case formulations conveys to the hearer a sense that Marsha does not just describe herself; she prescribes herself. It is in this sense that Marsha invokes 'more', it conveys a sense that she is not just different, she is 'more' different than men.

On its own this use of 'more' would not suffice to infer opposition. It is through combining this with 'than' which conjures up a quasi-comparison (Peters, 1995) with men, that Marsha's Opposite to Men position gains substance. Peters argues that a number of adverbs and adjectives are not able to imply comparison because they cannot be amended with common comparative suffices (e.g., -er). On such occasions, speakers prefer to use collocations such as *more open to people than* (line 20) to imply comparison. For example, there is no such word as more opener. Marsha's use of 'than' is consistent with Peter's proposition and in conjunction with 'more', works to rhetorically invite from the hearer an Opposite to Men position.

Because of the very non-literalness, extremity, and potential reflection of the speaker's subjectivity inherent in extreme case formulations, extreme case formulations are open to challenge and refutation by the hearer. As such the speaker sometimes softens their use of extreme case formulations. Marsha is aware of this as seen on line 20. Here she uses this requirement as a resource to limit her generalisation whilst at the same time managing to leave in place her proposition that she is Opposite to Men. She does not undermine her extreme claim post hoc, she works a-priori through her use of the provisional statement (Latour, 1987), *I've probably been more open*. Here Marsha is not saying that she is definitely more open than men. Instead she has diminished her original claim through this provisional statement, thus inferring that she may be more open. By offering a provisional statement Marsha is able to rework her original statement

should she be questioned about her production. Marsha gives herself the opportunity to acknowledge that this may not be the case with all men without this detracting from her original Opposite to Men position (Potter, 1996b). For example, Marsha could reply under questioning ‘perhaps not every man, but more open than the majority of men’.

Given the length of this extract, Marsha’s talk is replete with hedge words and provisional statements. For example, *I guess* (line 17), *sort of* (lines 17 to 19), and *probably* (lines 18 & 19). Taken in the context of a this particular research interview, Marsha’s scripting up of a Feminine identity and positioning herself as Opposite to Men may be tenuous given that she is talking to a female researcher who is exploring gender issues in elite sport. Marsha may have been anticipating my possible reactions and felt that scripting up a Feminine way of being would be viewed poorly in this particular interaction. Thus, Marsha’s use of provisional statements and hedge words reflect the delicate identity work that she is about to undertake in this particular local interactional context.

In particular, Marsha’s use of ‘sort of’ tempers the impact of her statements. In this case the use softens her possession of stereotypical characteristics in her description of herself as a woman. It allows her to adopt alternative descriptions should her production again be challenged. For example, had I questioned her on being caring and thoughtful and being an athlete, ‘sort of’, would enable her to respond in numerous alternative ways that would initiate different constructions to be worked up.

In conclusion, when Marsha was positioned as a woman, she responded by reflexively positioning herself as Opposite to Men. She did this through her use of the Feminine repertoire and an assortment of discursive strategies. Her use of the Feminine repertoire as a separate repertoire was the first occasion of its use in this dissertation. Thus, in our everyday talk we are able to orient to something that we would call feminine in order to make sense of ourselves as gendered individuals. Her use of this repertoire and locating herself as Opposite to Men were uncertain discursive resources to engage in on this occasion. This was an occasion of talking to a female gender researcher. Hence Marsha worked to avoid

confrontation through her use of provisional statements, hedge words, and extreme case formulations.

Marsha's use of the Feminine repertoire can be understood as working from a stereotypical female global discursive pattern. That is, the repertoire encompasses culturally familiar descriptions that we would usually associate with women. The Opposite to Men position stresses her difference from men. Marsha works this up quite cleverly in her discourse. Unlike Karen, Marsha does not highlight this difference as a social construction. Marsha is different from men, however this difference is in the socially expected direction. This strategy reinforces rather than confronts accepted gender practices. Davies (1997) argues that the binary construction of gender is "held in place because we come to see it as the way the world (...) ought to be" (p. 9). Thus binary productions become inherent within our language structures, they become absolutes, givens, or natural ways of being. This illustrates how the same position, Opposite to Men, can be used for divergent ideological functions. Moving beyond what is said, to how something is said, may allow the analyst to understand how current gender practices are reproduced and maintained in everyday talk.

9.2.3 Marsha: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis

Marsha was classified as Androgynous on the basis of her responses to the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). However in the interview she deployed a form of talk that was representative of a Feminine way of being which she then utilised to position herself as a particular type of woman through a variety of discursive practices and strategies. Intriguingly Marsha's talk was coded at the PAQ Feminine (F) sub-scale in the a-priori content analysis. Thus, on this occasion, there is some consistency between the content of her discourse and the discursive resource that she uses to position herself as a woman. There is however inconsistency between her PAQ classification of Androgynous and her talk thereby suggesting that how we see ourselves as women and men in relation to gender-related characteristics, is a complex and variable production that is contextually and culturally dependent.

9.2.4 A Woman in Elite Sport: A Tough Walk Within a Lack of Recognition Talk

The gender identity in sport question explored how participants reflexively positioned themselves when being interactively positioned as women or men in elite sport. In reference to identities, this question examines how participants gave meaning to their gender identities in sport.

Text units: 57-114

57 Um, I think, I'm a, I'm a minority, um, I think it's, it's, it's tough kind of
 58 being a female (athlete) 'cause you sort of um, you don't get the
 59 recognition of like yours Susie O'Neill's and, and um, you know those,
 60 Cathy Freeman's and, those sort of people because it's, it's very hard in a
 61 sport that is, dominated so much by men, um but I try not to look upon
 62 it, too much you know um, I just sort of try, focus on my job at hand you
 63 know sort of, go out there and do what I have to do and you know, if, if
 64 you get a profile it's, from that, that's good you know, good for the sport,
 65 first and foremost and then good for yourself, second.

66 COUPLE OF THINGS THERE I'D JUST LIKE TO PICK UP ON
 67 WHAT YOU SAID, YOU TALK ABOUT IT'S TOUGH BEING A
 68 (ATHLETE), BEING A FEMALE (ATHLETE) UM, AND THAT,
 69 THAT'S SOMETHING AH, BEING IN A MALE DOMINATED
 70 SPORT, CAN YOU TELL ME A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT,
 71 THAT IT'S LIKE, BEING THE MINORITY IN THE MALE
 72 DOMINATED SPORT?

73 Yeah, it's, it's kind of tough because you know, you tell people sort of
 74 sometimes um you know, people you know say oh what do you play and
 75 you say (sport) and, you know you see their faces that they pull as if to
 76 say you know 'you play (sport)?' you know 'girls don't play (sport)', you
 77 know 'it's just not done' because I guess they're so familiar with men
 78 playing (sport) it's, it's always in the media, it's always there and you
 79 never hear much about the female (athlete), um, so it's kind of, hard to
 80 actually get people to understand that, you play (sport) first of all, and
 81 that you can actually play (sport) and at a competitive level, because
 82 they um, they can't comprehend it, there are actually women out there
 83 who play, the game of (sport) you know, and we can play it, at a, you
 84 know, just as good level as what the men can play it.

85 HOW DOES THAT MAKE YOU FEEL WHEN YOU, WHEN
 86 PEOPLE YOU KNOW, PULL THE FACES AND THEY, THEY
 87 DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THAT, YOU KNOW, BEING A
 88 FEMALE (ATHLETE)?

89 Oh, it's kind of, frustrating, you know 'cause you'd like to, you know,
 90 'cause you can say well you know I am an elite athlete and, this is what
 91 I do and all these people are getting recognised you know, why can't we,
 92 why don't people know that I play this sport or and you know I'm
 93 representing my country, but um, you kind of get used to it after a while,
 94 which is, it's disheartening overall, um, but it's good to see that it's
 95 growing at the moment and um, it's, it's promising for me though to like
 96 um, a lot of people even just at (occupation place) are interested, in my
 97 progress in (sport), um, so just recently like I was on stand-by to go to
 98 (country), with the Australian team and um, people come up to me and
 99 are you goin, are you goin, and ah, it was even better that a lot of the
 100 guys I know would come up, and ask me and, and they show interest
 101 which is which is promising for you know, that I guess um, you know
 102 they accept that I play (sport) and you know they accept that you know
 103 the women are the (position in world) and, and but I guess you need to
 104 broaden on that and take it into the public side not just your friends.

105 ANYTHING ELSE THERE THAT YOU WANT TO ADD
 106 ABOUT DESCRIBING YOURSELF AS A WOMAN IN ELITE
 107 SPORT TO ANOTHER PERSON?

108 Um, no. It's just ah, very tough, especially in this sport um, because
 109 there's no, um, monetary benefits you know, we don't get paid, um, you
 110 really have to be passionate, about playing, you really got to want to
 111 play because you love it, not because of the benefits because, in the end

112 we're the ones who have to pay ourselves and you know, if we get a
 113 sponsor that's that's great so, it can be tough you know, it's not just all
 114 the glory that you, hear and see through the media.

First, this extract is one of the most detailed to date. In comparison with Marsha's previous two extracts it is a verbose and wide-ranging piece of discourse. This is most likely due to the conversational (Nunan, 1993) nature of the extract. That is, it is the first extract to contain an exchange of dialogue that goes beyond the first or second conversation turn. It includes a reprise and further clarification, another reprise, and so forth that are more indicative of a spontaneous conversation. This was one of the few instances where I interjected and moved the conversation beyond the first turn. There are seven turns within the extract as I ask Marsha to tell me more about what it is like and how it feels being an elite female athlete. As such, it is one of the richer extracts in terms of discursive resources and strategies and how these are used to exacting rhetorical effect. This is not to suggest that previous participants were not capable of producing such lengthy, detailed, or rich discourses. It may have been that in this discursive exchange I was able to identify her reflexive positioning better than in other exchanges.

When constituting herself as a woman in elite sport, Marsha draws upon the Lack of Recognition repertoire to do this. The Lack of Recognition repertoire encompasses a self that is perceived as not receiving the same recognition for sporting achievements that other female elite athletes receive. This is seen on line 57, *I'm a minority*, lines 58 to 61 *you don't get the recognition of like yours Susie O'Neill's and, and um, you know those, Cathy Freeman's and, those sort of people because it's, it's very hard in a sport that is, dominated so much by men,* line 62 *um but I try not to look upon it*, and lines 76 to 78, *I guess they're so familiar with men playing (sport) it's, it's always in the media, it's always there and you never hear much about the female (athlete).*

It is through her use of the Lack of Recognition repertoire that Marsha negotiates the reflexive position of Doing it Tough. In her discourse, Marsha produces a self that is faced with difficulties at the elite sporting level, a self that

finds it tough at this level. How this differs from a Masculine identification is that toughness is directly related to her being a woman competing at the elite level in her specific sport. Thus this is not a trait or character reference to herself as being tough, it is about the difficulty that Marsha faces as an elite women in her particular sport. On this occasion, Marsha gives herself meaning through her repetition of key elements of the Doing it Tough identity (see lines 57 to 113).

The Doing it Tough identity is characterised by, *I think it's, it's, it's tough kind of being a female (athlete) 'cause you sort of um, you don't get the recognition of like yours Susie O'Neill's and, and um, you know those, Cathy Freeman's (lines 57 to 60), it's very hard in a sport that is, dominated so much by men (lines 60 & 61), Yeah, it's, it's kind of tough because you know, you tell people sort of sometimes um you know, people you know say oh what do you play and you say (sport) and, you know you see their faces that they pull as if to say you know 'you play (sport)?' you know 'girls don't play (sport)', you know 'it's just not done' because I guess they're so familiar with men playing (lines 72 to 77), and so it's kind of, hard to actually get people to understand that, you play (sport) first of all, and that you can actually play (sport) and at a competitive level, because they um, they can't comprehend it, there are actually women out there who play, the game of (sport) (lines 78 to 82).*

Further, on lines 88 to 91, *Oh, it's kind of, frustrating, you know 'cause you'd like to, you know, 'cause you can say well you know I am an elite athlete and, this is what I do and all these people are getting recognised you know, why can't we, why don't people know that I play this sport, lines 92 and 93, you kind of get used to it after a while, which is, it's disheartening overall, lines 101 to 103, but I guess you need to broaden on that and take it into the public side not just your friends (here she is talking about recognition), lines 107 and 108 It's just ah, very tough, especially in this sport um, because there's no, um, monetary benefits you know, we don't get paid, and lines 110 to 113 in the end we're the ones who have to pay ourselves and you know, if we get a sponsor that's that's great so, it can be tough you know, it's not just all the glory that you, hear and see through the media.*

Scripting up a Doing it Tough identity is a risky identity for Marsha to take up. As discussed previously, we speak with anticipation of how we will be heard and responded to by others. Therefore, scripting up a Doing it Tough identity exposes Marsha to challenge and dispute from the hearer. It is possible that the hearer may interpret Marsha as complaining about her status as an elite female athlete, how she feels that she is treated unfairly because she competes in a minority sport for women, or as demanding recognition for what she does. If the hearer does this then it is possible that the hearer may respond with derision and disdain toward Marsha.

Marsha is therefore faced with an interactional dilemma (Billig, 1996). In this instance, Marsha is faced with being an elite female athlete who does not get the recognition that she thinks she deserves whilst at the same time she participates in a minority sport for women where recognition is the domain of the male athlete. Marsha is faced with how she can be an elite sportswoman and not be seen as complaining and ungrateful.

Marsha manages this dilemma as evidenced by her use of provisional statements and hedge words that precede her Doing it Tough identity (see lines 57 to 88). For example, on lines 57 to 60, *Um, **I think**, I'm a, I'm a minority, um, **I think** it's, it's, it's tough **kind of** being a female (athlete), 'cause you **sort of** um, you don't get the recognition of like yours Susie O'Neill's and, and um, you know those, Cathy Freeman's and those **sort of** people, and lines 72 and 73, Yeah, it's, it's **kind of** tough because you know, you tell people **sort of** sometimes um you know. Further, on lines 78 and 79, and so it's **kind of**, hard to actually get people to understand that, you play (sport) first of all, line 88, Oh, it's **kind of**, frustrating, and lines 92 and 93, you **kind of** get used to it after a while, which is, it's disheartening overall.*

Prefacing her descriptions with provisional statements (e.g., I think) affords Marsha the chance to distance herself from her self-production should this be required. Provisional statements allow Marsha to script up alternative representations and permit her to distance herself from her account. For example,

under challenge 'I think' would allow Marsha the discursive opportunity to respond in a way that deflects interest away or distance her from a risky identity.

Similarly, Marsha's use of the hedge words (e.g., sort of, kind of) softens and limits the impact of her reference to Doing it Tough. Marsha has scripted up a Doing it Tough way of being with its potential for social sanction. 'Sort of' and 'kind of' gives her flexibility to align herself with some parts of Doing it Tough (e.g., lack of monetary benefits – line 108), but not others (e.g., being seen as complaining or whinging), should she be challenged about her production. Thus, the deployment of hedge words rhetorically work to counter alternative descriptions that can be produced by the listener.

Further, Marsha is aware of how her discourse may sound as seen on lines 61 to 65. Here she repairs with *but* (line 61) that alerts the reader to a change discursive content (Peters, 1995). Here Marsha moves from talking about how tough it is not getting personal recognition on lines 57 to 61, to talking about how this is not an issue because she can refocus her energies on her sport and that it is really recognition for the sport as a whole that is more important. This shift in discursive content displaces the hearer's focus from Marsha to her sport. This is a clever rhetorical strategy for it affords Marsha the opportunity, in conjunction with her hedge words, to shift the complaint from herself and her lack of recognition, to her sport and the sport's lack of recognition.

Marsha works to reinforce this sport not self emphasis through her use of extreme case formulations on lines 63 and 65, *if you get a profile it's from that, that's good you know, good for the sport, **first and foremost** and then good for yourself, **second***. From this the hearer is invited to consider that doing it tough is an acceptable way of being for an elite female athlete because it raises the profile of the sport rather than scripting up alternative descriptions of Marsha. This therefore increases the facticity of what Marsha is saying. To illustrate, *if you get a profile it's from that, that's good you know, good for the sport, first and foremost and then good for yourself, second* (lines 62 to 65) negates in the hearer a challenge to Marsha about whether she is complaining for self-centred reasons.

Marsha further manages her interactional dilemma through the use of the discursive strategy 'you know'. Through the use of 'you know' the related behaviours of Doing it Tough are presented as normal, (see lines 59, 62, 63, 64, 72, 73, 74, 75, 82, 88, 90, 99, 100, 101, 108, & 112). To illustrate, on line 59, *you know those, Cathy Freeman's*, encourages in the hearer an understanding of the difference in the recognition, and perhaps covertly the monetary benefits, between that received by Susie O'Neill and Cathy Freeman, compared to Marsha as an unknown but still elite female athlete.

Marsha's discourse illustrates how interlocutors can use a combination of discursive strategies to rhetorically script up certain ways of being and to strengthen the fact construction properties of their description. To illustrate, consider Marsha's use of 'you know' in the above paragraph and her choice of athletes to compare herself with, Susie O'Neill and Cathy Freeman¹. Extreme case formulations can be produced by Marsha to make what she is saying more solid and they may also be used for their ability to be hearably extreme. In this instance, the mentioning of only one of these athletes would have been sufficient to convey a sense of Doing it Tough compared to other elite female athletes. However her use of both Susie and Cathy is more than is factually necessary to convey this difference. Thus they become hearably extreme. Extreme case formulations as indexical markers demonstrate, in this case, the intensity of Marsha's assertion that she is Doing it Tough.

Because of the extremity and non-literality inherent in the extreme case formulation, the speaker often needs to work to soften the extreme case formulation. Speer and Potter (2000) argue that speakers can use this requirement as a resource without challenging the extremity of the original claim. Marsha does this through her use of the word *because* (see line 60). 'Because' works to

¹ At the time of writing Susie O'Neil and Cathy Freeman were the reigning world champions in their chosen sports (swimming and track and field respectively) and were gold medallist at the Sydney Olympics in September 2000.

construct her original claim regarding her non-recognition as the fault of being in a sport that it dominated by men. By constructing this as factual, the original assumption that she is doing it tough because she is not as recognised as Susie and Cathy remains untouched.

When I ask Marsha to expand on what it is like being in a male dominated sport, Marsha relates experiences of what it is like when people ask her what she does. This shift from autobiographical to narrative voicing works as a rhetorical device to make what the speaker is saying more real, believable, or factual (Potter, 1996b). Marsha's use of narrative begins on line 73 and continues through to line 76. Here her organisation of her discourse into her experiences when asked what she does and other people's reactions to this are used rhetorically to increase the plausibility of her assertions that being female in a male dominated sport is difficult. Secondly, she supports this through her use of active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992). First, her use of plural active voicing infers that this is a general experience that has occurred across a range of different people. To illustrate, *you see their faces that they pull* (line 74). Secondly, it infers that this is the type of response that people would normally say as no one individual owns the quote. It is used as a deliberate display of what people would usually say. Again this works as an illustration of a generalised experience that Marsha faces when talking about herself as an elite female athlete to others and thus increases the facticity of her account.

Marsha walked differently within her discourse on this occasion. When asked to position herself as a woman in elite sport, Marsha drew upon a Lack of Recognition repertoire to position herself as Doing it Tough in elite sport. This position was worked where her difference from higher profile female athletes served to highlight how as a woman in a male dominated sport, she found it difficult to achieve recognition for her sporting accomplishments. Marsha was aware of the potential for this position to be heard and responded to negatively by the listener. Hence she was faced with an interactional dilemma where through various discursive strategies she worked to make her position more solid and factual and less open to question and debate.

Ideologically, when Marsha compares herself to Susie O'Neill and Cathy Freeman she chooses two highly successful female athletes, and she links this with her participation in a male dominated sport. By doing this, she works to focus attention on gender inequity issues in elite sport. In the first instance Marsha makes it clear that not all women are treated equally (or unequally) in sport. That is, according to Marsha, those athletes who participate in more mainstream sports do not suffer from being a woman in elite sport, at least in reference to recognition. This raises the issue of heterogeneity in sport. Where Marsha scripts up a view of sport where not all woman are equal and cannot be treated as equal without consideration of the context in which they participate.

Secondly, the Doing it Tough position raises awareness of gender as a social construction. That is, through her reference to people being more familiar with men playing as a result of media presentations, she highlights how this leads people to infer that women do not play her sport. This is the second time that the media was invoked as constructing gendered perceptions. Fiona also used this when she talked about herself as a woman. Marsha further states that there is no difference in the playing level of women and men. Both of these serve to underscore that perceived differences are not biologically based. Rather it is from the perceptions perpetuated by the media, that people presume that women do not play her sport and, if they do, they cannot play to the same standard as men.

9.2.5 Marsha's Story So Far: An Idiosyncratic Individual, a Woman, and a Woman in Elite Sport

Like the participants before her, Marsha's use of discursive resources and strategies changed as she was interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, as a woman, and then as a woman in elite sport (see Table 9.1). The addition of a gender lens underscored Marsha's difference from men. That is, Marsha worked to position herself as being Opposite to Men within a Feminine repertoire. When interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, Marsha's Good Person identity takes prominence in her description.

When asked to describe herself as a woman in sport, Marsha, like the two female coaches, made her gender salient. She did this by outlining how being a woman in her particular sport was different to being a woman in other sports. How Marsha found it arduous in her sport without the recognition that higher profile female elite athletes enjoy. Thus, the integration of a sport and gender lens has made salient for Marsha her place as a woman in a male dominated sport. When not interactively positioned as an elite female athlete, Marsha's gender also took prominence in her description through her difference from men. In both cases she utilised her difference as the platform from which she scripts her identity. Therefore, Marsha constructs her identity in such a way that is particular to the local interactional context.

Marsha's use of discursive strategies to reify her reflexive positions differed also (see Table 9.1). In particular, when she is placed as a woman in elite sport, Marsha's discourse illustrated the difficulty that she has in working up this identity as factual through her use of a wider range of discursive strategies. Moving from a gender to a gender identity in sport was a tenuous move for Marsha. Up to this point Marsha's descriptive discourse had been less complicated, however the addition of a sporting gender lens added another layer of complexity to the descriptive process. This is illustrated by her use of active voicing, narrative, 'because', and the use of 'but'. Marsha used these to increase the fact construction property of her description.

Table 9.1

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Marsha AcrossIdentities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Androgynous	Feminine	Lack of Recognition
Reflexive positions	Good Person	Opposite to Men	Doing it Tough
Extreme case formulations	✓	✓ *	✓ *
Active voicing			✓
But			✓
Interactional dilemma			✓
Narrative			✓
Provisional statements		✓	✓
Because			✓
Than		✓	
You know	✓		✓
Hedge words	✓	✓	✓

Note: * = use of extreme case formulations as indexical markers

As with all of the previous extracts, moving of the self from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender identity, and then to a gender identity in sport has influenced the reflexive positioning process. Similarly, the movement from gender to gender identity in sport enables Marsha to employ different discourses for different ideological purposes. Marsha's use of the Opposite to Men position in her gender identity discourse stresses her difference from men. However this difference is in the socially expected direction thereby reinforcing rather than confronting accepted gender practices. When asked about herself as a woman in elite sport her Doing it Tough talk, Marsha's comparison with two highly successful female athletes, and her participation in a male dominated sport is used dexterously to focus attention on gender inequity issues in elite sport. Not all women are treated equally (or unequally) in elite sport, thus emphasising the heterogeneity of women's experiences in sport. According to Marsha, women do not speak with the same voice in her world. The Doing it Tough position raises an awareness of gender as a social construction. This serves to underscore that

perceived differences are not biologically based. Rather it is from the perceptions perpetuated by society (i.e., the media), that people presume differences between women and men. The preceding discussion pertains only to Marsha at this point. There is no suggestion that other female athletes would take up the same interpretative repertoires and subject positions, nor would they necessarily use the same discursive strategies. Indeed as Susan's extracts will reveal, there are other culturally familiar discourses that the female athlete is able to draw upon in different interactions. What is of note is that the repertoires and positions that are used are specific to the local interactional context. That is, what is said and how it is said is shaped in situ.

9.3 Susan

At the time of this interview Susan was 20 years old. For the past 11 years, Susan had been playing sport, 5 of these at the national level and 5 at the international level. Men and women were able to participate in this sport. However on this occasion, unlike Marsha, women dominated elite level competition. Participation at higher levels of competition was also restricted to same sex competition. Susan, like Marsha, was a full-time tertiary student with a full-time training schedule.

9.3.1 The Idiosyncratic Identity, Trait Talking and Walking

*S1/FA/FF/38/20/11/5/5/FTS/NZ/S/1/T/Fem

Text units 5-5:

5 Um, let's say open, friendly, um, enthusiastic, yeah.

Unlike other extracts, Susan's extract is less detailed and less involved. What sets this extract apart from others is that it is a listing of traits. This is perhaps the closest of all the extracts presented so far, where focusing on what has been said, may best capture the identity work that Susan is undertaking during her identity construction. That is, a content reading of the extract may best

capture how Susan gives meaning to herself as an individual, how she does being an individual, and how she discursively positions herself as a particular type of individual.

In her response to the idiosyncratic identity question, Susan draws upon a Feminine repertoire. The Feminine repertoire was discussed earlier in this chapter and the reader is directed to that section for an overview of the repertoire. Susan appears to constitute a sense of herself as an idiosyncratic individual through her possession of feminine traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. The reader is directed to line 5 and Susan's use of open (Cejka & Eagly, 1999), friendly (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and enthusiastic (Williams & Best, 1990).

Susan reflexively positions herself as Trait Like through her use of the Feminine repertoire. The listing of traits deployed by Susan as she negotiates her idiosyncratic identity produces a self that is fixed and consistent. That is, in response to being interactively positioned as an idiosyncratic individual, Susan describes herself in relation to her Trait self. Susan makes this identity her significant identity through her use of a three-part list (Jefferson, 1990) to summarise her positioning as fixed. The reader is directed to Chapter Eight for a discussion of the use of the three-part list. The listing of different features of the same image, *open, friendly, um enthusiastic* (line 5), constructs her position as commonplace or normal. Susan, on this occasion, uses the three-part list to stand for a more general or normative way of being, as something that is prescriptive of herself (Potter, 1996b). By using the three-part list, she positions herself as a person who not only talks the talk of being open, friendly, and enthusiastic, she also walks the walk. Hence through her use of the three-part list Susan becomes the Trait identity.

Of interest in this extract is what is not said in this extract. Susan does not make reference to any social influences or social category memberships. Marsha, Fiona, Karen, and Mark all made references to a social category or to other members of social categories when scripting up their idiosyncratic identity. The only participant beside Susan not to have done this thus far was Ralph. As discussed in Chapter Eight, ontological gerrymandering is where speakers select

advantageous or relevant descriptions to script up and ignore those that are difficult or contentious (Potter, 1996b). In this particular interaction, Susan's deployment allows her to protect her identity against challenge by choosing a trait over a more social description. Through this she avoids having to acknowledge a social self and eludes being criticised for being considered as not telling the truth about herself. Susan's extract differs from previous extracts in that she does not even begin to script up a risky or problematic identity. Whereas Fiona, Karen, and Marsha scripted up risky identities and then worked to make these identities more factual, Susan through ontological gerrymandering, ignores the risky identity all together.

In conclusion, Susan employed a Feminine repertoire to script up a Trait identity when constituting herself as an idiosyncratic individual. She did this through her use of the three-part list and ontological gerrymandering. This is a unique extract that has not been encountered thus far in this dissertation, as it is a listing of traits. These traits are presented as stand alone entities and are not referenced to social categories or to members of social categories. It is almost a surreal self that is presented. A self that is separate from the social world in which Susan dwells.

9.3.2 I am a Woman: Talking Traits But Walking Atypically

Text units 9-10:

- 9 Um, tall, um, taller than average anyway, um ... blonde hair, um, medium
10 build

Susan's response to the gender identity question is similar in discursive structure to her idiosyncratic identity response. That is, it is a listing of traits. On this occasion, Susan draws upon a Trait repertoire when constituting her gender identity. This is the same repertoire used by Ralph in Chapter Eight, and the reader is directed there for a discussion of this. In response to being interactively positioned as a woman, Susan describes herself in relation to her physical self (see lines 9 & 10). Susan's extract in this instance is again somewhat less detailed

and less involved. It is a listing of traits where she draws upon her possession of physical traits and characteristics to produce a gender self.

A more fine-grained reading of the extract reveals that Susan, through her use of the Trait repertoire, reflexively positions herself as Atypical. Thus Susan produces a gender identity that is constituted from a collectively shared discourse that reflects a fixed way of being. However within this discourse Susan adopts a differing reflexive position for describing herself. Thus she walks a different path within her Trait talk.

The Atypical form of talk specifically deployed by Susan, on this occasion, is a self-production that is different from others. This is similar to the Atypical position that was utilised by Fiona in Chapter Seven where she positioned herself as different from the typical women in terms of psychological traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. Susan engages in a comparable deployment, however on this occasion, Susan makes reference to her physical appearance rather than her psychological self and does not reference this to the social category women.

Susan gives herself meaning through her use of particularisation (Billig, 1996). Fiona in Chapter Seven also engaged in particularisation and the reader is directed to this chapter for a discussion of this. Thus Susan scripts herself up as being physically unique or different in terms of her height². Susan does not explicitly mention that she is taller than other members of her dominant category women. However the question was specific to Susan as a woman and her use of ‘than’ in *taller than average anyway* (line 9) conjures up a quasi-comparison with women. Speakers prefer to use collocations such as *taller than average* (line 9) to imply comparison on those discursive occasions when adverbs and adjectives cannot be amended with common comparative suffices (e.g., -er, Peters, 1995). For example, there is no such word as averager. Susan’s use of

² Susan stood 6 foot 4 inches tall.

'than' is consistent with the above proposition and thus linguistically invites an Atypical position.

Scripting up an identity that is unique or different from one's dominant category is a tenuous activity. Susan therefore faces an interactional dilemma. Susan faces the dilemma of positioning herself so that she can still speak with some authority on what it is like to be a woman whilst at the same time distancing herself from her dominant category and retaining her sense of uniqueness.

Susan manages this dilemma through her use of ontological gerrymandering. In her description of herself as woman Susan does not make reference to any psychological traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. Whilst other participants have made passing reference to their physical characteristics, this is the first instance when a purely physical description was proffered. By choosing a physical description over a psychological one, Susan avoids the tenuousness inherent in her Atypical description. By describing herself to me as taller than average, blonde hair, with a medium build, Susan does not afford me the opportunity to challenge her on these descriptions because she is sitting in front of me. I can see that she is taller than average, I can see that she has blonde hair, and I can see that she has a medium build.

As suggested in previous chapters, gender identity is a potential site of negotiation and disputation and thus is difficult and contentious (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Susan's deployment of ontological gerrymandering may also allow her, in situ, to manage this difficult and contentious task by selecting those descriptions that are resistant to challenge whilst ignoring those descriptions such as psychological traits, characteristics and/or behaviours that are open to challenge and criticisms. To illustrate, Susan's deployment may have been used as a deliberate strategy to manage the problematic situation of describing a psychological self to a psychologist.

In conclusion, Susan walked an Atypical talk within her Trait talk. Through her use of ontological gerrymandering, than, and the three-part list, Susan worked up a physical self that is different from her dominant group, women. The extract demonstrated how gender identity might be ingeniously

scripted up from what appeared to be a limited discursive interaction. That is, it was her use of the above three discursive strategies that strengthened her position as Atypical.

Susan's use of the Trait repertoire can be read as a global discursive pattern concerning a fixed and stable self. It is through the Trait repertoire that Susan gives herself meaning as Atypical that was specific to this local interactional context. The Atypical position is a self that stresses how she is physically different from others, where others were worked up to infer other women. It is of interest that this is a physical description. Sport is a physical activity. Thus it is a culture where the physical attributes of the athlete are considered key indicators for athletic success (Anshel, 1997). Susan's deployment of a physical self may ideologically serve as an empowering discourse for her. It is an identity that is valued and promoted in sport. Thus she may be able to speak about herself as a female from the auspices of a physical discourse that is favoured in sport. Again what has been argued is limited to Susan's talk on this occasion, for this occasion.

Susan is the only participant to speak of a physical self. The reader may find this surprising given the physical nature of sport. The coaches may not have easily used this discourse as they are no longer physical entrants in sporting contests. Rather they are the skilled tacticians who assist the athlete in their physical pursuits. The other athletes may not have availed themselves of this position because they were selected as elite competitors due to their physical abilities rather than their physical appearance. That is, their skill levels rather than their stature was the main determinant of selection. However Susan participated in a sport where athletes of her physical stature were at a distinct advantage compared to those athletes who were of lesser physical build. Selection in talent identification programs is driven by physical appearance guidelines rather than skill guidelines. Thus the culture in which she performs, with its emphasis on physical build, may make the physical position more readily available than other discourses.

9.3.3 Susan: Comparing the Discourse Analysis with the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis

When asked about herself as a woman in the interview Susan deployed a Trait repertoire to position herself as an Atypical woman. Susan's talk was also not coded at any PAQ sub-scale node during the a-priori content analysis. Yet on the basis of her responses to the PAQ, Susan was classified as Feminine. Thus her PAQ classification and how she gives meaning to herself are contradictory. However her use of the Feminine repertoire, when scripting up herself as an idiosyncratic individual, is consistent with her PAQ classification. Trew (1998) points out that the sense we have of ourselves as women and men is paramount to how we see ourselves as individuals. It forms the basis of our self-concept, self-esteem, and self-perception. Perhaps this is reflected through Susan's use of the Feminine repertoire when being asked to script up an individual self.

9.3.4 As Woman in Elite Sport

Text unit: 86-102

86 Um ... can you just ask that again please.

87 IF YOU WERE TO DESCRIBE YOURSELF AS A WOMAN IN
88 ELITE SPORT TO ANOTHER PERSON, HOW WOULD YOU DO
89 THIS?

90 Gosh, um, as in like how would I explain myself to say you, as in what
91 I've done?

92 UM, THAT'S ONE WAY OF LOOKING AT IT, WHAT SORT OF
93 SPORTSWOMAN ARE YOU?

94 Oh ok, well I'd have to say um I'm competitive, um, but then there's the
95 side of me where um I know it's only for fun, I take it as fun, but as soon
96 as I step out on a (sporting arena) um, like something goes through me
97 and I think right, this this is where I have to perform and this is what I
98 train for but whereas on the training track I have a joke now and again
99 you know, um, and we all get in and laugh and I think that's very
100 important, um, I'd have to say um, I'm I'm more of a leader um, than,
101 than oh I like to tell people what I'm thinking rather and rather than
102 listening to it, I think because I've been um, playing with younger girls I
103 like to guide them in a way that I think that could improve their ability.

On this occasion, Susan's discourse is similar to that produced by Mark and Ralph. That is, she does not orient to the woman part of my positioning. This is unlike Fiona and Karen, the two coaches, and Marsha, the other female athlete who located themselves firmly as women in elite sport. Susan only makes one mention of her gender in this interaction. This is on line 102 and 103 where she makes reference to herself as guiding the younger athletes in her team during training. This however pertains more to herself as a guide than to herself as a female athlete. Thus she does not realise her standing as a woman in elite sport through her everyday talk.

Ely (1995b) asserts that people in dominant groups have difficulty seeing their dominant status and group membership. Susan's sport was a female dominated sport. That is, more than 80% of the registered participants in her sport were women (Australian Sports Commission, 1998). Women dominate coaching positions at all levels of competition and dominate administration and officiating positions. Thus for Susan being a woman equated with her being a member of the dominant group for this sport.

When asked to script herself up as a woman in elite sport, Susan draws upon a Masculine repertoire to do this. The Masculine repertoire was discussed in Chapter Seven and Chapter Eight and the reader is directed to these chapters for a discussion of this repertoire. The Masculine repertoire is demonstrated on line 93, *I'm competitive* (competitive - Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and lines 99 to 102, *I'm I'm more of a leader um, than, than oh I like to tell people what I'm thinking rather and rather than listening to it, I think because I've been um, playing with younger girls I like to guide them in a way that I think that could improve their ability* (acts as a leader – Spence & Helmreich).

The form of talk that Susan deploys as she negotiates her gender identity in sport is one that scripts her up as being able to adapt to the demands of the context. The Context identity is characterised by being *well I'd have to say um I'm competitive, um, but then there's the side of me where um I know it's only for fun, I take it as fun, but as soon as I step out on a (sporting arena) um, like something goes through me and I think right, this this is where I have to perform*

and this is what I train for but whereas on the training track I have a joke now and again you know, um, and we all get in and laugh and I think that's very important (lines 93 to 98). Whilst this construction may appear somewhat similar to the Masculine repertoire discussed above, Susan gives herself meaning on this occasion through her repetition of the Context notion (see lines 93 to 98).

At the beginning of Susan's description she has some difficulty in responding to my request as evidenced by her pause and hesitation at non-transition relevant places (see line 86), her request that I reframe my question (line 86), and her request for clarification of how I would like the answer framed (lines 89 & 90) (Speer, 2000). This indicates that she is unsure of what I am actually asking her to describe, thus her hesitation. Further, she hesitates after my re-frame of the question and her query regarding the boundaries of my question. Here her pause and hesitation allows me the opportunity to redirect her description, it is as though she is checking with me whether this is the correct story line that I have asked her to take up. Thus her hesitations, reframes, and queries are indicative of her uncertainty concerning the requirements of this interaction (Speer). As a member of a dominant group whose membership status is taken for granted, Susan's uncertainty may be reflective of how she is to answer when her gender is made salient. For Susan this may be an unusual position to be placed in because, for Susan, her femaleness is the norm.

Susan's difficulty and uncertainty with the self-description process is further illustrated through her use of the word *but* (see lines 93, 94, & 96). As discussed previously, 'but' serves to alert the reader to an imminent change of descriptive view by Susan from one identity (e.g., competitive, having to perform on the arena) on lines 93 to 96, to another (e.g., having fun, jovial) on lines 94 and 97. Susan is thus able to move the discursive interaction from one identity to the other without having to substantiate or be challenged on either identity. 'But' allows her to manage her uncertainty in such a way that does not undermine her self-production. The admission of her other side works to undermine any alternative descriptions from being considered by the hearer.

Susan reinforces her Context identity through her use of extreme case formulations. To illustrate, *I'd **have** to say um I'm competitive* (line 93), *I **know** it's **only** for fun* (line 94), and *we **all** get in and laugh and I think that's **very** important* (line 98). These invite from the hearer a view of Susan that is considered acceptable for an elite female athlete. Extreme case formulations thereby counter alternative descriptions or productions that the listener could produce and work to increase the facticity of what Susan is saying. As indexical markers, they further demonstrate the strength of Susan's certainty that she can change her behaviour as she sees fit. The use of extreme case formulations conveys to the hearer a sense that she does not just describe herself; she prescribes herself.

Fascinatingly Susan uses a change of footing within this extract. On line 98 Susan talks for a moment from a plural voice or corroborating voice. This is indicated by her change of footing on line 97 from *whereas on the training track I have a joke now and again* to *and **we** all get in and laugh* (line 98). Moving from one role to the other can either present an account as more factual or distance an interlocutor from a potentially contentious account or identity (Potter, 1996b). In this instance the change minimises the risk that Susan faces in scripting up a context identity. Susan's change of footing from principal on line 97 (e.g., I) to animator line 98 (e.g., we) distances herself and does not hold herself accountable for her context position.

This corroboration works to make her innovation not just of her making, but also of someone else's and thus shifts the accountability of her description from herself to the unknown others. Potter (1996b) asserts the interlocutor can increase the facticity of a description through the construction of corroboration. Susan uses consensus quite skilfully serving to make Susan's description of herself as being able to change and have a laugh appear as a general known state of affairs. The shift of footing manages a risky identity in such a way that it allows for the appearance of consensus whilst at the same time it gives Susan independence in that she has the discursive opportunity to deny this statement, should it be questioned.

When interactively positioned as a woman in elite sport, Susan responded by reflexively positioning herself as Context dependent through her repeated referencing on lines 93 to 98. Through her use of the Masculine discourse, Susan worked up a Context position that avoided any gendered references in her everyday talk. It illustrated how Susan scripted up the Context position and worked to produce this as being normative through various discursive strategies.

Susan's talk is strikingly different from the talk produced by the other female participants. Susan avoids the interactive position of a female in elite sport through her use of the Context position. As a member of the dominant group in her sport, making salient a position that is taken for granted caused Susan uncertainty in her description. Ideologically the Context production serves to deflect attention from her lack of gendered talk. That is, it works to present Susan as an athlete rather than as a female athlete. Susan made it difficult for the listener to question her on this production because the Context self is scripted up as normal and as an accepted way of being for an athlete. It denied Susan the requirement to make herself gendered.

9.3.5 Susan's Story Thus Far

When a gender lens was added to her descriptive process, Susan emphasised her physical difference from other women. (see Table 9.2). That is, Susan worked to actively distance herself from her dominant member category women. When not interactively positioned as a woman, Susan's Atypicality does not take prominence in her description rather her Traitness does. However the addition of a sporting lens caused Susan to shift her reflexive positioning to where she saw herself as being context dependent. In this sense, she avoided talking about herself as a woman in elite sport. This is the same as the elite male coaches who also eluded the gendered point of my positioning.

Table 9.2

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Susan Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Feminine	Trait	Masculine
Reflexive positions	Trait	Atypical	Context
Extreme case formulations			✓
Hesitations or pauses			✓
Corroboration			✓
But			✓
Interactional dilemma		✓	
Ontological gerrymandering	✓	✓	
Three-part list	✓	✓	

Not only were there changes in the use of repertoires and positions across the three identity questions, Susan's use of discursive strategies differed as well (see Table 9.2). As Susan was moved from an idiosyncratic identity to a gender identity, Susan was faced with an interactional dilemma (see Table 9.2). She did not face this when being asked to hold herself accountable as an idiosyncratic individual or as a woman in elite sport. Susan therefore managed this dilemma through her use of extreme case formulations, corroboration, and the use of the word 'but' in the sporting gender interactive position and through her use of the three-part list and ontological gerrymandering in the gender interactive position.

Until the gender identity in sport question, Susan's descriptive discourse was less complicated. However the addition of a sport and gender lens has added another layer of complexity to the descriptive process as illustrated by her use of pauses and hesitations, and the use of 'but'. Because of her dominant status Susan was able to ignore her gendered self in this context through her use of extreme case formulations and corroboration to increase the facticity of her description, thereby increasing the fact construction property of her description.

As with all of the previous extracts, moving of the self from an idiosyncratic identity, to a gender identity, and then to a gender identity in sport has influenced the reflexive positioning process. Giving Susan a part in a gender

story has explicitly, in this instance, made available to her an Atypical position (Davies & Harré 1990). Similarly, giving Susan a part in the sporting gender story has explicitly made available to her a context position but not a gender position. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven.

Susan's different discourses serve different ideological functions. Susan's woman in sport talk is conspicuously different from the talk produced by the other female participants. As discussed, Susan has not spoken from the position of a female in elite sport when asked to do so. Due to Susan's dominant group status, Susan may not see herself as a woman in elite sport but as an elite athlete. Susan consequently does not make herself gendered with her talk. However this does not mean that Susan is not able to talk from a gendered position. In response to her being positioned as a woman, Susan scripted up a self that was physically different from other women. Susan's deployment of a physical self may ideologically serve as an empowering discourse for her. It is an identity that is valued and promoted in sport. Thus she may be able to speak about herself as a female from the auspices of a physical discourse that is favoured in sport.

CHAPTER TEN

FINALLY THE MALE ATHLETES, DANIEL AND ADAM

10.1	Introduction	292
10.2	Daniel	292
10.2.1	As an Idiosyncratic Individual	292
10.2.2	Gender Identity, Trait Talking and Trait Walking	294
10.2.3	Daniel: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	296
10.2.4	As a Man in Elite Sport	296
10.2.5	Daniel's Story So Far: As Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Man, and Then as a Man in Elite Sport	299
10.3	Adam	301
10.3.1	Ok as a Person	301
10.3.2	An Old-Fashioned Man	304
10.3.3	Adam: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis	307
10.3.4	I Have No Idea.	308
10.3.5	Adam's Story So Far	311
10.4	Comparing the Athletes: Susan and Marsha With Daniel and Adam	313
10.5	Comparison Across All Participants – Interpretative Repertoires and Reflexive Positions	315

10.1 Introduction

At this point the reader should be well versed in the discursive psychology mantra that has been espoused in the past three discourse chapters. As such the reader may no longer need, nor want, to read the detailed and repetitive format that characterised the previous three chapters. Therefore this final analysis chapter diverges from the former layout. This chapter will still retain some semblance of the preceding chapters, however I will not be going into such painstaking detail as before. Instead, I will focus more on the complexity, dexterity, and ideological purpose of everyday talk when constituting different identities across different local interactional contexts. This chapter details the responses of the two male athletes to my three interactive positions. At the end of this chapter I will compare responses across the female and male athletes and then conclude with a comparison of the interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions used by the eight randomly selected participants.

10.2 Daniel

Having competed for the past 20 years, with 15 of these at the national level and 11 at the international level, Daniel was the most experienced athlete that I interviewed. At 37 years of age, Daniel was in the twilight of his career and announced his retirement from elite sport approximately six months after I had spoken with him.

10.2.1 As an Idiosyncratic Individual

*S1/MA/MX/74/37/20/15/11/FTA/A/M/0/S/Mas

Text units 5-7:

- 5 Oh I'd say I'm a committed person, um, who is an elite athlete, married
 6 with a couple of kids, um, very dedicated to my sport, but my family still
 7 means a lot to me.

In this extract Daniel identifies in his positioning something that would be considered as two social category repertoires, an Elite Athlete repertoire and Family

repertoire. This talk is similar in discursive content to that adopted by Mark in Chapter Eight, where a social self or identity is being constituted instead of an idiosyncratic identity. The social identity of father/husband is given salience through Daniel's reference to himself in terms of family category labels (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987) (lines 5 to 7). The basic premise of the Family repertoire is that labels associated with being in a family are used to work up a general description of the self. This is a self that is constituted through self-labelling rather than through traits, characteristics, and/or behaviours. The social identity of elite athlete is given prominence on lines five and six through category labels and traits and behaviours that are collectively shared and define the group elite athlete as advocated by Anshel (1997). Thus, Daniel produces a personal self that is constituted from collectively shared discourses that reflect both an elite athlete and family way of being.

Through his use of the Elite Athlete and Family Man repertoires, Daniel reflexively positions himself as a Family Man. He refers to the Family Man image and outlines its personal value to him on lines 6 and 7, *but my family still means a lot to me*. Daniel makes this identity the most important in this interactional context through his adroit use of footing change (Potter, 1996b) from author and animator in lines 5 and 6 (e.g., third person usage, *who*), to principal at the end of line 6 and the beginning of line 7 (first person usage *my & me*). By moving from animator to principal, thus elite athlete to family man respectively, Daniel constructs' himself as being a committed family man, thereby taking ownership of this identity. The family man becomes something that is prescriptive of him rather than reflective of the type of person Daniel is. Daniel gives further credence to his Family Man position through his use of 'but' on line 6 thereby inferring an impending change of discursive context (Peters, 1995), and through his use of extreme case formulations (Pomerantz, 1986), *but my family still means a lot to me* (lines 6 & 7).

At this point it may seem strange to the reader that here is an elite athlete working to distance himself from this identity. However taken in deference to the local interactional context, Daniel is being asked specifically to script up a personal identity rather than a sport identity. Thus his positioning as a Family Man may be the most appropriate response on this occasion. It is indexical of the particular interactive

moment. Later on in the interview Daniel talks about some family difficulties that he is currently facing regarding his elite athlete status and his status as a family man. Given this, Daniel's scripting of the family position may be reflective of his current situation.

When dissected from a discursive psychological approach, what appeared as a mundane piece of talk manifests as a multifaceted and subtle interaction. Daniel used the requirements of the interaction to draw attention to his Family Man position that was produced in situ. In doing so, he employed three discursive strategies that allowed him to skilfully construct his Family Man identity.

10.2.2 Gender Identity, Trait Talking and Trait Walking

Text units 10-11:

10 Um, honest, sincere, ah, reliable, um, ... some someone that someone can
11 trust.

Our construction of our identities and the positioning of ourselves in relation to these identities is never definitive (Potter, 1996b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Speer & Potter, 2000; Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Identities and positions are re-worked and re-created within each interactional moment. Therefore, different identities and positions are elucidated in different interactional contexts. As such, Daniel draws upon a different interpretative repertoire and different reflexive position in response to the next conversational turn, the gender identity question. On this occasion, Daniel scripts up a Trait position from a Trait repertoire. That is, the listing of traits deployed by Daniel as he negotiates his identity portrays a notion of being trait like. This is the same repertoire that Ralph and Susan drew upon in response to my gender interactive positioning and the reader is directed to Chapter Eight and Chapter Nine for the basic premise of this repertoire.

Daniel's extract has discursive structural similarities with Susan's first two extracts. It is a listing of traits, albeit it is not in the form of a three-part list. Like Susan, Daniel does not make reference to any social influences such as social category memberships, yet he does this in the first conversation turn, the idiosyncratic identity. Thus, his use of ontological gerrymandering (Potter, 1996b) allows Daniel to portray a

self that is less likely to be challenged and criticised, for descriptions of an individualistically orientated self are common in Western society discourse (Marshall & Wetherell, 1989).

Daniel's deployment of ontological gerrymandering permits him to avoid the gender position that I have placed upon him. He is the only participant at this point to ignore in either his repertoire or position, a gendered standing in the gender identity question. Whilst Ralph and Susan both utilised the Trait repertoire in the gender identity question, both positioned themselves as different from their dominant group, men and women respectively, thereby invoking a gender-related position. Taking up a form of talk that is common in Western society affords Daniel the opportunity to avoid a gendered description that would be open to dispute or denigration in an interaction with a female gender researcher. Thus in situ, Daniel is able to manage the demands of the interactional situation in such a manner that provides him with an acceptable platform from which to stake an identity claim.

As argued in previous chapters, dominant group membership makes it difficult for members to see themselves as members of this grouping (Ely, 1995b). As a man, Daniel's avoidance may be reflective of his dominant group status where men as a group have more power over women, than women as a group have over men (Lips, 1993; Unger, 1979). It may not necessarily be the case that he does not want to talk about himself as a man, although that may be the case given the demands of the interaction. Rather it may be that he is unable to easily see his gendered self because of his dominant grouping. However, this does not infer that Daniel's identity negotiation on this occasion is without thought or effort. Indeed his hesitations and pauses at non-transition relevant places indicate the contrary (Speer & Potter, 2000). Daniel's brief work displays the quandary that he faces in scripting up this identity on this occasion.

Daniel's use of the Trait repertoire encompasses a global discursive pattern concerning a fixed and stable self. It is through the Trait repertoire that Daniel gives himself meaning as being Trait like that is specific to this local interactional context. The Trait position ideologically serves to allow Daniel the opportunity to avoid or ignore the gendered aspect of my positioning. Speaking from the boundaries of a valued Western discourse, Daniel manages to distance himself from the gendered requirements

of this interaction. In this sense, Daniel's Trait position possesses duality. He is able to speak as a favoured identity, and this works as an interactional resource in helping Daniel to discount his gendered self.

10.2.3 Daniel: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis

Daniel's Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) classification was Masculine. When asked about himself as a man he positioned himself as being Trait like. In addition, the a-priori content analysis did not capture Daniel's gender talk at any PAQ related node. Thus his PAQ classification, the content of his talk, and how he gives meaning to himself are inconsistent, consequently suggesting that how we see ourselves as women and men is multifaceted and multifactorial. Daniel's incongruence is not an isolated occurrence. Of the seven participants so far, six have differed in how they responded across the self-report methods utilised in this dissertation.

10.2.5 As a Man in Elite Sport

Text units 50-55:

50 Um ... tough, um committed, um, friendly.

51 WHEN YOU SAY TOUGH, WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?

52 Um, tough meaning I'll pop out the door and train whether it's rain, hail

53 or shine, I don't let anything ah interfere with the fact that I have to train,

54 I'm very committed to my sport which is, what I believe is the reason why

55 I've achieved a fairly high level, I'd never let anything stand in my way.

At this point we join Daniel after an interlude of three other questions relating to gender stereotypes in the general context that were not analysed in this dissertation.

Question Six (Q6) deliberately positioned Daniel as a man in elite sport and resulted in his most detailed response to date. As a result of this positioning, Daniel deploys what may be glossed over as an Athlete Repertoire when constituting himself as a male elite athlete. This is seen on lines 50 and 52, *tough*, line 50 *friendly*, lines 50 and 54, *committed*, line 52, *don't let anything ah interfere*, and line 55, *I'd never let anything*

stand in my way. Thus, Daniel constitutes a sense of himself as a male elite athlete through his use of traits and behaviours that are consistent with elite athlete ways of being (Maddi & Hess, 1992; Wittig & Schurr, 1994).

A more fine-grained reading of the extract reveals that Daniel proceeds to negotiate an Elite Athlete within the Athlete repertoire. This orientation is in response to my interruption and request for clarification on line 51. Thus in his second turn, which begins on line 52, Daniel characterises himself as an Elite Athlete as evidenced by, *I'll pop out the door and train whether it's rain, hail or shine, I don't let anything ah interfere with the fact that I have to train* (lines 52 & 53), and *I'd never anything stand in my way* (line 55). These traits and behaviours are consistent with successful athlete disposition research in sport psychology (Maddi & Hess, 1992; Orlick & Reed as cited in Orlick, 1980; Wittig & Schurr, 1994)¹. In order to give himself his meaning on this occasion, Daniel makes repeated reference (Speer, 2000) to key elements (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) of the elite athlete identity (see lines 50 to 55).

The reader at this point may argue that whilst the above may be consistent with an elite athlete positioning, it is a male athlete positioning. That is, it is a positioning that reflects an idealised masculine image, of toughness, competitiveness, and success (Connell, 1987). Given the above the reader may reason that Daniel's discourse is better represented by a more generalised Masculine discourse. Thereby believing that Daniel talks and walks a male way.

Whilst this construction may appear on the surface similar to the Masculine discourse discussed above, on this occasion, Daniel gives himself his meaning through the descriptive dimension *friendly* (line 50). Sport psychology personality research (Morgan & Costill, 1972; Rasch & Kroll, 1964; Reilly, 1979) suggests that there is a tendency for high performing athletes to be more sociable and extroverted than non-

¹ I acknowledge the criticisms that have been levelled at the sport psychology personality research regarding personality as a poor predictor of athletic performance. The focal point of this discussion concerns the dispositions of elite athletes per se not disposition as predictors of athletic success.

athletes or lower performing athletes. Further, although friendly is considered a feminine trait (Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), Daniel's discourse is not reflective of an Androgynous position due to the absence of co-existence between the masculine and the feminine (see Chapter Eight for a discussion of co-existence and Androgyny). Thus, Daniel's use of friendly in conjunction with the other descriptive dimensions of tough and committed positions Daniel as an Elite Athlete. Therefore, in his everyday talk Daniel has ingeniously made more salient his membership of the elite athlete social group than his membership of the elite male athlete social group.

The dispositions of being tough, committed, and dedicated, when placed within the local interactional context of a male elite athlete talking about himself as a male elite athlete, become non-gendered notions. They are safe domains or expressions for Daniel to advocate. It is legitimate for an elite athlete to want to be like this. Daniel indeed holds himself accountable for his possession of these traits through his use of autobiographical talk on lines 51 and 52, and through his use of the first person on lines 52 to 54. It is because he is tough and committed that he has attained the heights of success that he has.

Even though these may be exalted dispositions Daniel still has difficulty with his production as substantiated by his hesitations and pauses on line 50. Moreover, in what appears to be a routine response, Daniel works to reinforce his Elite Athlete identity through his use of a three-part list on line 50 (Jefferson, 1990). His use of another three-part list on lines 52 and 53 when describing his athletic training behaviour, is different than previous discussions of the three-part list. On this occasion, Daniel lists different environmental conditions *rain, hail or shine* under which he engages in the same training behaviour. By using these three-part lists he positions himself as a man who not only talks the talk of tough, committed, and friendly, he also walks the walk. In addition Daniel's use of extreme case formulations *I don't let anything ah interfere with the fact that I have to train* (lines 52 & 53), *I'm very committed* (line 53), and *I'd never anything stand in my way* (line 55) as hearable extremes (Edwards, 2000) display his degree of commitment and toughness. They are deployed to show the strength of his ascription to the Elite Athlete way of being, therefore increasing the facticity of his production.

Like the male coaches and Susan, Daniel has not explicitly or implicitly laid claim to the mantel of being gendered in the sporting context. The Elite Athlete talk enables Daniel to speak from the auspices of a supported discourse that deflects the need to bring gender into the discursive equation. As a male athlete in elite sport, Daniel, like Ralph and Mark before him, is a member of the dominant group. Whilst male and female participation numbers are approximately equal (see Active Australia, 2000), sport is perceived by women and men in Australia as a male domain and ‘owned’ by men (Active Australia, 1997). Thus, perhaps making it difficult for Daniel to discern his gender on this occasion.

Ideologically, Daniel’s talk allows him the freedom to speak as an elite athlete rather than as a male elite athlete on this occasion. It denies the listener the easy retort and confrontation about his lack of gendered ascriptions. For on this occasion it is worked up as normative. By denying the gendered aspect of my positioning, Daniel inadvertently produces and reproduces current gender practices in sport. His lack of recognition lends credence to sport being a male bastion. Making gender salient does not afford him the recognition that as an elite athlete he has gendered status.

10.2.5 Daniel’s Story So Far: As Idiosyncratic Individual, as a Man, and Then as a Man in Elite Sport

During this interaction Daniel drew upon different repertoires and positions that were particular to the local interactional context in which he found himself (see Table 10.1). The addition of a gender lens to the descriptive process did not make Daniel’s position as a man salient for him in this interaction. He was able to ignore his gender through his use of the Trait and Elite Athlete positions respectively.

Table 10.1

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Daniel Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Elite Athlete and Family	Trait	Athlete

Reflexive positions	Family Man	Trait	Elite Athlete
Extreme case formulations	✓		✓*
Hesitations			✓
Three-part list			✓
Autobiographical talk			✓
Footing change	✓		
But	✓		
Ontological gerrymandering		✓	

Note: * = use of extreme case formulations as indexical markers

Daniel's use of discursive strategies to reify these reflexive position changes is less elaborate than the participants before him (refer to Table 10.1). When asked to respond as a man in elite sport, Daniel faced uncertainty and difficulty as evidenced by his increased use of discursive strategies to reify his position. In particular, Daniel deployed extreme case formulations as indexical markers of his investment in his Elite Athlete description, thereby demonstrating the strength of Daniel's conviction that he was an Elite Athlete.

What is prominent in his extracts is that Daniel did not talk from a gendered position. In the first gendered position Daniel spoke from the boundaries of a valued Western discourse consequently distancing himself from the gendered requirements of the interaction. His second gendered riposte gave Daniel the legitimacy to speak as an elite athlete rather than as a male elite athlete. By denying the gendered aspect of both positionings, Daniel may inadvertently produce and reproduce current gender practices.

10.3 Adam

A late starter in his sport, Adam a 36-year-old male athlete, had been competing for the past eight years. All his competition had been at the national level, with the past seven years encompassing international level competition as well. Adam had made this late start due to a transition at 28 from a different sport where he had attained regional representation. Adam was employed full-time in a non-sporting related occupation whilst maintaining a full-time training schedule.

10.3.1 Ok as a Person

*S1/MA/MX/72/36/8/8/7/OTHER/A/M/0/TAFE/Mas

Text units 5-16:

5 Ok um, a person that's not so much shy, but, you'd have to come up and
 6 say hello to me before I'd come up and say hello to you, um, I'm pretty,
 7 clear cut, straight forward sort of thing, just like my wife is, um, yeah, it's
 8 not whether a person whether it's a matter of I don't like you or not, I
 9 don't go like that sort of thing, I'm not like, rude or nothing, unless I'm
 10 provoked sort of thing, but, yeah, I'm sort of, just I'm a bit stand offish
 11 there, I have a few like with the categories with my friends like, I have
 12 like about ten friends, loads of mates and and stuff like that, and I treat
 13 them accordingly on what what I tell people and what I don't, just sort of a
 14 bit guarded, I'm just like most of the time I'm real cruisy, easy to get on
 15 with, um, that's about it really, I'm just really, flexible, really, don't have a
 16 problem.

Adam, like Daniel, draws upon two different repertoires in response to the idiosyncratic positioning. However unlike Daniel, Adam's extract is more detailed with a greater use of discursive strategies to reify his position. Adam utilises Trait and Interpersonal repertoires as resources to script up a particular idiosyncratic self on this occasion. The Trait repertoire (lines 6 & 7, 9 & 10, 12 to 15) has been discussed previously in Chapter Eight and the reader is directed to this chapter for a more detailed discussion of this repertoire. The Interpersonal repertoire constitutes a self through interactions with others, as being located in or dependent upon interactions with other people (see lines 5 to 14). The reader is directed to Chapter Seven for an overview of

this repertoire. Within these two repertoires Adam adopts a Reserved reflexive position when describing himself.

The Reserved position is seen on lines 5 and 6 through his deployment of not being the instigator in interpersonal interactions, and on lines 10 through to 13 with his scripting up of a self that has few friends but many acquaintances. Adam gives himself meaning on this occasion through his repetition of key elements of the Reserved notion (lines 5-13).

Adam begins his description with a denial that he is shy, thereby contrasting himself against what he is not. Denial is not an unusual strategy to take up in everyday talk when one's authenticity or accountability is open to scrutiny. Wetherell and Edley (1999) identify such contrasting in their research that explored how men work to contrast themselves against archetypal versions of masculinity. Scripting up a position of shy is however a tenuous identity to take up. Considering that shy is seen as a feminine trait (e.g., Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999), and feminine traits are often devalued in Western society (Crawford & Unger, 2000), Adam may be anticipating that I will respond disapprovingly to such a self-production. Adam is thus faced with an interactional dilemma (Billig, 1996), he is faced with being a person who waits for others to initiate interactions whilst at the same time he does not want to appear rude or shy. Adam is thus caught between two contrasting themes in this interaction.

Adam manages this dilemma through the use of 'but' (line 5) and works to distance himself from the possibility of being perceived as shy as seen on lines 5 and 6. The change of descriptive view from denial of shyness on line 5 to behaviours that could be perceived as shy on lines 5 and 6, tempers the impact of his counter claim by allowing Adam the opportunity to script up a shy demeanour that at the same time renounces his membership to the social category shy. Therefore, Adam manages this dilemma in such a way that does not undermine his self-production. Hence he is able to act in ways that constitute a shy production without claiming group membership to this category.

Immediately after this production Adam begins to script up a more positive or valued way of being. This is seen on lines 6 and 7 where he makes reference to himself

as being *pretty clear cut, straightforward, sort of thing*. This three-part list constructs his position as commonplace or normal. By using the three-part list, he positions himself as a man who is not only reserved or guarded but also straight forward and down the line. Thus, rhetorically working to head off any alternative descriptions that may be produced by the listener.

Adam is not only aware of the negative implications of the social category shy, he is aware of how this talk of waiting for others to instigate interactions can sound (Bakhtin, 1986). On lines 7 to 9 Adam works to distance himself from being perceived as rude or not liking people. Thus, he is faced with a new dilemma of portraying a reserved sense of self without being seen as being socially inept.

This is deftly managed through the use of the hedges word ‘sort of’ (Peters, 1995), *I don’t go like that **sort of** thing, I’m not like, rude or nothing, unless I’m provoked sort of this, but yeah I’m **sort of** stand offish there* (lines 8 to 10). Further, Adam uses ‘sort of’ when describing himself as guarded (see lines 12 & 13). Thus Adam is only partly rude, partly stand offish, and partly guarded. These domains are then only partially representative of who Adam perceives himself to be. By aligning his rudeness with the action of others (provocation line 9) it becomes something for which Adam cannot easily be held accountable. Adam’s rudeness is not because he wants to be rude, it is a reaction to others. It is constructed as a reluctant choice rather than as a social deficit.

At a later point in his extract, lines 10 to 12, Adam categorises his interactions and relates this to how he treats each friend category accordingly. Here he aligns his behaviour as being dependent upon the category of friend that he is dealing with. This again works to absolve him from being accountable for his interactive behaviour. It is the result of using the category of friend that he is dealing with. His behaviour here is constructed not as deficient but as pertaining to the demands of the interactional category.

Further by drawing upon the extreme case formulations, ‘just’ (lines 7, 10, 12 & 13), ‘real’ (line 13), and ‘really’ (lines 14 & 15), Adam works to inoculate himself against accusations of being rude. This strategic use of extreme case formulations work as a display of Adam’s orientation to the potential for his description to be heard as

problematic (Speer & Potter, 2000). It further works as a recognition that his talk requires careful management in the first instance. That is, the above works as a display of investment in a view that is managed for its dilemmatic qualities.

10.3.2 An Old-Fashioned Man

Text Units 19-37:

19 If I was to describe myself as a man, um, I'm a person who's pretty
 20 old-fashioned, um, ... I'm not I don't try to be like other people, but I try
 21 to have like, role models, it's really like it's probably going to sound
 22 strange, I watch a lot of John Wayne movies, um, don't hit girls, I don't
 23 like people who do that, you don't take drugs or anything like that, drink
 24 yeah, annoy other people when I'm drunk yeah I do that, I admit it
 25 you know, like with (friend's name), like we go out and we have a great
 26 time at other people's expense, I mean we don't try to get into too much
 27 get into to too much trouble but, you know like you see if you see people
 28 like um, um, are who are in trouble and a whole lot of people won't do
 29 nothing, well I'll go give them a hand, um, just really, really, I I like
 30 when it comes to that I'm just really old fashioned, why I do that is just,
 31 if you stick to the basics, like with sport, if you stick to the basics you
 32 can't really get into too much trouble, I've got a good family, lovely wife,
 33 great kids, um, yeah, just we're nothing flash about us, like my wife she's
 34 also an elite (sport) coach, so we've you know got a very big sport
 35 background, we hope our kids do the same thing you know, but
 36 we're like just very easy going, like I said, I'm um very basic, yeah, that's
 37 the word I'm nothing no frills, that's probably the best way.

Speer (2000) argues that there are many ways to construct our sense of self as women or men. Working to distance ourselves from our dominant category membership is but one way in which this sense of self can be constructed. An alternative way is to embrace those aspects of category membership that portray a positive way of being a man on this occasion (Speer). Like Daniel's duality in his gender identity talk, Adam is able to use this positivism as a resource to manage his alignment with being a man and to differentiate himself from other more maligned images of men at the same time. This is similar with respect to the individualistic discourse that had been used by other participants.

On this occasion, Adam uses the Masculine Repertoire (line 20, 24 to 26, 27 to 29) to position himself as Hegemonic Masculine man. The reader is directed to previous chapters for a discussion of this repertoire and position, in particular Chapter Eight. When men take up being male, they constitute identities that are either complicit or resistant to dominant masculine ways of being (Connell, 1987). The above extract reflects how Adam complicity aligns himself with positive, but still conventional, ideals of what men 'should' be like and what they 'should' do. The ideal man that he scripts up is that of the 'heroic' man (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Adam not only describes himself in terms of masculine traits, behaviours, and/or characteristics, he also scripts up a coincidence between himself and the heroic masculine identity through his repetition of key elements of hegemonic masculinity. This can be seen on lines 21 to 23, where he talks about having *like role models, it's really like it's probably going to sound strange, I watch a lot of John Wayne movies, um, don't hit girls, I don't like people who do that, you don't take drugs or anything like that*. Thus, Adam not only talks the talk of masculine, he prescribes to the heroic masculine identity. He moves to make his heroic masculine identity factual or real.

In terms of populist culture, John Wayne has been proffered as the quintessential, all American, male hero (Wills, 1998). Adam implicitly aligns himself with the heroic position through his referencing of watching John Wayne movies and his take up of the heroic ideal on lines 22 and 23. Here he uses a three-part list to summarise his positioning as heroic. Adam's production of self (lines 21 to 23) is reinforced by two other discursive strategies that work to soften and limit his reference to John Wayne and to make what he is saying more factual. First, he prefaces his reference to John Wayne through the use of hedge words, *it's probably going to sound strange* (line 21). An Australian referencing himself to a man who is American, deceased, and representative of a 1940's or 1950's way of life is a problematic identity to take up. 'Probably' softens his alignment with John Wayne and allows him the flexibility to align himself with some of Wayne's representative heroic behaviour (e.g., not hitting women) but not others (e.g., the 1940's social position of women).

Further, the use of extreme case formulations strengthen and reinforce his description of himself as someone who ascribes to a heroic way of being, *I watch a lot*

of John Wayne movies, um, **don't** hit girls, **I don't like** people who do that, **you don't** take drugs or anything like that (lines 22 to 23). Adam's use of these discursive strategies rhetorically script up a particular positive hegemonic way of being.

The heroic position is also scripted up through Adam's references to his drinking behaviour with his friend (see lines 24 to 27). Connell (1987) and Gough (1998) propose that alcohol consumption is consistent with Hegemonic Masculine ways of being, where excessive drinking amongst males is considered a complicit conventional display of hegemonic masculinity. The related behaviour of annoying people when Adam is drunk is presented as normal through the use of *you know* (Speer, 2000) (see lines 25 & 27). The heroic production of self is further worked up through references to meeting the challenge of helping other people in need of assistance (see lines 27 to 29) and through sport references (see lines 31 & 34) (Wetherell & Edley, 1999).

At this point in his production of self, Adam has discursively become the heroic identity. The extract has demonstrated how Adam did not merely talk the talk of Masculinity, but how he walked the walk of a very specific type of masculinity, hegemonic masculinity, with its associated heroic ideal. He discursively deployed a self that was constituted as a protector for those who could not protect themselves, as an upholder of a chivalrous code of conduct, and a sporty family man. It discursively encompassed the notion that there may not be one male or one masculine way of being, rather that there may be different subtypes of men (Crawford & Unger, 2000) or many masculinities (Connell, 1987; Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Wetherell & Edley, 1999).

Ideologically, the Hegemonic Masculine position reinforces the perception that masculinity is natural or given. It allows Adam to talk with a discourse that is valued by Western society. A focus on the positive aspects of Hegemonic Masculinity deflects attention from the negative aspects of this position, such as the subordination of women. It allows current gender practices to be perpetuated by negating challenge to its more subversive side. The heroic ideal therefore makes it difficult to confront the ideology inherent in Adam's talk.

10.3.3 Adam: Comparing the Discourse Analysis With the PAQ Response and A-Priori Content Analysis

Like Daniel, Adam's PAQ classification was Masculine. In the interview he deployed a form of talk that on the surface would be considered representative of a Masculine way of being, and he then positioned himself as a particular type of Masculine man, the Hegemonic Masculine man. With respect to the a-priori content analysis, one line of his interview talk was coded at the PAQ Feminine (F) sub-scale. Thus, his PAQ classification and how he gives meaning to himself are partially consistent. On this occasion, Bem's (Bem, 1981; 1974) postulation that gender self-report measures such as the PAQ, are measures of global masculinity and femininity is given some support by Adam's talk. Therefore, Adam who displayed stereotypical self-report scores on the PAQ also displayed a wider range of gender-congruent traits and behaviours in his talk. The reader is reminded that talk is considered as behaviour in discursive psychology and thus any suggestion that what we say and what we do is contradictory is moot when considered from this perspective.

Adam's talk is the first occasion in this dissertation where there has been partial consistency between the different self-report measures. This is not to dismiss this as an aberrant case or as a non-true case. Indeed such a dismissal would be counter to the very epistemological groundings of the discursive psychology approach. Rather, what it suggests is that "depending upon the context in which they appear, masculinity and femininity have various implicit meanings and underlying presumptions" (Spence & Buckner, 2000, p.58). That is, on this occasion, in this context, consistency has been produced.

10.3.4 I Have No Idea

Text units 148-157:

148 I have no idea, um ... if I were to describe myself as a man in elite sport
 149 um, all right, um, my sport is (sport), I'd be filthy if a girl beat me, um,
 150 I'm just, I I like I said it comes down to, if I'm playing elite sport it's not
 151 whether I'm a man or a woman or nothing I'm just there to do the best
 152 that I can possibly be, um, but yeah, that's about it, I I like everyone
 153 looks at you and go oh, there's a big man, he's got the muscle or
 154 whatever, you want to say about my size but trust me, when I've
 155 finished (sport) I want to get as skinny as I possibly can, I want to buy
 156 normal clothes and have a bit of like a kick around with my kids and
 157 sort of liven it up you know. Yeah just like yeah.

Adam begins his response with a claim that he has no idea how to describe himself as a man in elite sport. Adam's assertion is consistent with Spence and Buckner (1995) who assert that women and men are unable to articulate their sense of self as women and men. When meaning is ventured it is characterised by bewilderment and a focus on valued traits rather than on their intrinsic sense of gender identity. However, a discursive psychology approach would consider this response quite differently. Whilst not strictly an 'I don't know' statement (Potter, 1996b), *I have no idea* (line 145) works in a similar way in that it can work interactionally to infer an absence of knowledge about the self.

The rhetorical affect of his 'no idea' statement is further defined by his detailed scripting of himself as a man in elite sport after having laid claim to the mantel of not knowing how to do this. Having staked a claim to a lack of knowledge, it is surprising that Adam goes on to constitute himself as a male elite athlete. Adam in some ways lands himself in his discourse by giving meaning to himself after his claim. It is not that he had no idea, but that in situ he had no idea. That is, interactionally the demands of the interaction were such that a display of lack of knowledge was called for. He is a man, talking to a female gender researcher, who has asked for his help in her research. By qualifying his production, Adam cannot be held accountable for what he says in this interaction. After all he has no idea about how to do this, but he does and thus his

ownership of psychological difficulty allows him to implicate himself as a man in elite sport without having to take responsibility for that position.

Therefore, Adam draws upon the Performance repertoire as a resource to script up a Big Elite Athlete position. The Performance repertoire is where being a man or a woman is not the main issue or point for the elite athlete. This is seen on lines 149 to 151, *I'd be filthy if a girl beat me, um, I'm just, I I like said it comes down to, if I'm playing elite sport it's not whether I'm a man or a woman or nothing I'm just there to do the best that I can possibly be*. Adam uses this to negotiate his gendered sporting identity as a big or muscular elite athlete. This is a subtle position that is implicitly interwoven within his Performance discourse. This Big Elite Athlete identity is characterised by other people noticing that he is bigger in stature or musculature than normal people, *I I like everyone looks at you and go oh, there's a big man ,he's got the muscle or whatever, you want to say about my size but trust me* (line 152 to 153), and by wanting to be within normal body size ranges, *when I've finished (sport) I want to get as skinny as I possibly can, I want to buy normal clothes and have a bit of like a kick around with my kids and sort of liven it up you know* (lines 153 to 156). Adam gives himself meaning, on this occasion, through his repetition of key elements of the Big Elite Athlete notion (see lines 153 to 156).

The reader at this point may consider that being an elite athlete by default will encompass being physically stronger, taller, fitter, muscular, and so forth than the 'normal' individual. For the reader's benefit, Adam not only looked stronger, and more muscular than normal individuals, due to the demands of his particular sport, he was also physically different from other elite athletes². To go into any more detail than this may give the sport away and unintentionally Adam's identity. Later in the interview

² Adam does not look different from other athletes who participate in his sport.

Adam made mention to this and other elite athletes' suspicions that he was a 'roid head'³.

Adam reinforces his Big Elite Athlete identity through his use of a three-part list, *big man, he's got the muscle or whatever* (line 152 & 153), and through his use of extreme case formulations, *I I like **everyone** looks at you and go oh, there's a **big man**, he's got the muscle or **whatever**, you want to say about my size but **trust me** when I've finished (sport) I want to get as **skinny** as I possibly can, I want to buy **normal** clothes* (lines 153 to 155). Further, his use of active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992), *everyone looks at you and go oh, there's a big man, he's got the muscle or whatever, you want to say about my size* rhetorically reifies his identity as something that is prescriptive of him rather than reflective of the type of elite athlete he is.

Whilst superficially it may appear that Adam has not oriented to the gender feature of my positioning, a closer look at his talk indicates otherwise. On line 149 and line 150 he talks of two contrasting elements. He begins his gender identity description (after his lack of knowledge claim) by stating *I'd be filthy if a girl beat me* (line 149). First, this is an unusual discourse in its sporting sense, in that women and men cannot compete against each other in Adam's particular sport. It is illogical for it cannot occur within the bounds of accepted sport competition practices. He then professes that being female or male is not an issue. Rather he professes that doing the best you can at the elite level is of import. In this sense this claim is similar to that offered by Ralph when he talked about himself as a man in elite sport (see Chapter Eight). If it is not an issue being a woman or man then Adam's earlier production appears redundant.

Adam must perceive his claim as an issue as evidenced by his use of the extreme case formulation 'just' (line 149, 151) which works as a display of the degree of his non-issue with being a man in elite sport. Adam conveys this view in such a way that attends to possible rhetorical counters, indicating a need for him to attend in this first

³ Roid head was a sporting slang term used by Adam to mean steroid user and thus drug cheat. Steroid use is banned under International Olympic Committee rules and all international sporting governing bodies rules.

place. Indeed, Adam appears sensitive to the potentiality for his opening comment about himself and women to reflect negatively upon his identity. Whilst not explicitly sexist, Adam works to avoid this perception. By using extreme case formulations he is able to pre-empt and deflect such potential negativity thus accounting for the rhetorical design of his account on this occasion.

In conclusion, in response to my interactive positioning of him as a man in elite sport, Adam has responded by reflexively positioning himself as a Big Elite Athlete through his referencing on lines 152 to 156. Ideologically this position serves to deflect attention from his original gendered position on line 149. It makes it difficult for the listener to question Adam on this production because the Big Elite Athlete is scripted up as a normal and accepted way of being for an athlete. It denies Adam the requirement to answer to his gendered talk.

10.3.5 Adam's Story So Far

As seen in Table 10.2, Adam's use of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions differed as he was moved from identity to identity. It is only when he is explicitly positioned as a man, without any other descriptive lens, that Adam talks from a predominately gendered position. When he is positioned as a man in sport, whilst making mention of gender, he focuses more on himself as an athlete rather than himself as a male athlete.

Table 10.2

Overview of the Discursive Resources and Strategies Used by Adam Across Identities

Discursive Resources/ Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires	Trait and Interpersonal	Masculine	Performance
Reflexive positions	Reserved	Hegemonic Masculine	Big Elite Athlete
Extreme case formulations	✓	✓	✓
But	✓		
Active voicing			
You know		✓	✓
Hedge words	✓	✓	
Three-part list	✓	✓	✓
Interactional dilemma	✓		
I have no idea/Don't know			✓

Adam's use of discursive strategies also changes across positioning (see Table 10.2). Of particular note is the rhetorical move to script up a pretence of a lack of psychological knowledge when positioned as a man in elite sport. Thereby not holding himself accountable for this position. This lack of accountability was somewhat lacking in his previous two responses.

Adam's talk serves somewhat different purposes in the gender identity question when compared to the gender in sport identity question. In the later, the Big Elite Athlete is scripted up as a normal and accepted way of being for an athlete thereby denying Adam the requirement to answer to his gendered talk. In the former, a focus on the positive aspects of hegemonic masculinity deflects attention from the negative aspects of this position such as the subordination of women. It allows current gender practices to be perpetuated by negating challenge to its more subversive side. The heroic ideal therefore makes it difficult to confront the ideology inherent in Adam's talk. On both occasions the forms of talk serve to make it difficult to bring to the forefront the gendered aspects of everyday interactions. Once more I acknowledge that this discussion is limited to these athletes on this occasion.

10.4 Comparing the Athletes: Susan and Marsha With Daniel and Adam

Table 10.3 below contains a comparison of the discursive resources used by the four athletes, with Table 10.4 containing a comparison of the discursive strategies.

Table 10.3

Comparison of the Discursive Resources Used by the Female and Male Athletes Across Identities

Discursive Resources	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Interpretative repertoires			
Masculine Trait		A D Su	Su
Trait & Interpersonal Lack of Recognition	A		Ma
Feminine Androgynous	Su Ma	Ma	
Performance Athlete			A D
Elite Athlete & Family	D		
Reflexive positions			
Hegemonic Masculine		A Ma	
Opposite to Men Atypical		Su	
Family Man	D		
Trait Reserved	Su A	D	
Elite Athlete			D
Big Elite Athlete	Ma		A
Good Person			
Doing it Tough Context			Ma Su

Note: A = Adam, D = Daniel, Su = Susan, Ma = Marsha

Table 10.4

Comparison of the Discursive Strategies Used by the Male and Female Athletes Across Identities

Discursive Strategies	Idiosyncratic Identity	Gender Identity	Gender Identity in Sport
Extreme case formulations	D A Ma	A Ma*	D* A Ma* Su
Hesitations or pauses			D Su
Provisional statements		Ma	Ma
Hedge words	A Ma	A Ma	Ma
Than		Ma	
Active voicing			Ma
Autobiographical talk			D
Interactional dilemmas	A	Su	Ma
You know	Ma	A	A Ma
Because			Ma
Ontological gerrymandering	Su	D Su	
Footing change	D		
Corroboration			Su
But	D A		Ma Su
Don't know/have no idea			A
Three-part list	A Su	A Su	D A
Narrative			Ma

Note: A = Adam, D = Daniel, Su = Susan, Ma = Marsha

* Extreme case formulations change to incorporate strength of statement.

A perusal of Table 10.3 suggests that the male athletes, like the male coaches, drew less upon gender related interpretative repertoires than the female athletes. Of interest is the use of sport related repertoires by the male athletes when compared to the female athletes. This varied usage may be explained in that working within sport with its masculine climate may highlight for Susan and Marsha their difference from men, thus making their gender more salient. Ely (1995a) supports this with an argument that workplaces where women are by numbers in the minority, covertly emphasise women's difference from men, which in turn makes women's gender more salient during identity construction.

In terms of the reflexive positions that the participants took up within the three questions, differences are again apparent from Table 10.3. Again the female athletes drew upon more gender related prescriptions, than the males. Again this may be

reflective of the masculinity inherent within the sporting context and the male as norm concept. As is consistent epistemologically with a discursive approach, such use of resources and positioning is reflective of the interactive moment and that under different interactional conditions different discourses and positions would be produced. Accordingly this identity production is appropriate for the local interactional context (Speer & Potter, 2000).

Whilst resources and positioning are reflexive, that is, what we say is somewhat generalisable across situations, the strategies that we use to script up these resources and positions as factual may be more generalisable. What is of note from Table 10.4, as with the coaches, is the consistent use of extreme case formulations across each interactive positioning. This is supportive of Potter's (1996b) and Pomerantz's (1986) claim that extreme case formulations are commonly used in discursive situations where the interlocutor is trying to justify, accuse, or support a particular position. Further, the consistent use of hedge words, interactional dilemmas, you know, and the three-part list is indicative of identity work as a site of negotiation, dispute, and challenge. Moreover, it is indicative of the participants being aware that they are accountable for their discursive productions. What is most apparent is that identity description and prescription is associated with work. That is, all athletes have drawn upon various strategies in order to script up their identities. They selectively drew upon various resources to script up versions of themselves and they also worked to inoculate their identity prescriptions from challenges. This will be discussed further in Chapter Eleven.

10.5 Comparison Across All Participants – Interpretative Repertoires and Reflexive Positions

Summaries of the interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions used by participants across the three interview questions can be found in Tables 10.5 to 10.10

Table 10.5

Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes: Idiosyncratic Identity

Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Masculine & Interpersonal	Effective Coach	Elite Athlete & Family	Trait & Interpersonal
CR	AS	CF AM	CK	CM	AD	AA

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Table 10.6

Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes: Gender Identity

Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Egalitarian	Trait
CF AA	AM	CM	CK	CR AS AD

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Table 10.7

Interpretative Repertoires Used by Coaches and Athletes: Gender Identity in Sport

As Normal	Masculine	Female Coach	Effective Coach	Innovation in sport	Performance	Athlete
CK	AS	CF	CM AM	CR	AA	AD

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Table 10.8

Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes: Idiosyncratic Identity

Masculine	Directive Democratic Coach	Family Man	Good Person	Reserved	Trait	Structured
CF CK	CM	AD	AM	AA	AS	CR

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Table 10.9

Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes: Gender Identity

Hegemonic Masculine	Opposite to Men	Atypical	Trait
CM AA	CK AM	CR CF AS	AD

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Table 10.10

Reflexive Positions Used by Coaches and Athletes: Gender Identity in Sport

Not See Self as Woman	Non-issue	Atypical	Egalitarian	Athlete Manager	Big Elite Athlete	Successful Elite Athlete	Context
CK	CF	AM	CR	CM	AA	AD	AS

Note: CR = Ralph - coach, CM = Mark - coach, CK = Karen - coach, CF = Fiona – coach, AM= Marsha – athlete, AS = Susan – athlete, AD = Daniel – athlete, AA = Adam – athlete

Beginning with the idiosyncratic positioning, what is apparent from Table 10.5 is that women drew upon more gender related discourses than men on this occasion. However, when the interactive positioning was moved to a gender position, such differentiation between women and men began to decrease (3:2, see Table 10.6). It

appears that giving these men parts in a gender storyline on this occasion, made available to them gendered resources from which to script up their identities. Moving further to the position of women or men in elite sport, another resource change emerges. This time only women (the reader is referred to Table 10.7) drew upon the gendered resources.

As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven, positioning appears to have influenced the resources from which participants worked up their identities. When not positioned specifically as men, fewer men availed themselves of gender resources to script themselves up. The addition of a sporting lens upon the gender descriptive process makes more salient, sporting resources than gender resources for men. As discussed within the appropriate chapters, this may be accounted for by men's dominant status. However such an assertion belies the multifactorial and multifaceted nature of the gender construct. It appears that the local interactional context has also impacted upon the descriptive process. Considering gender in the atheoretical sense, gender varies not only developmentally, culturally, and historically (Spence & Buckner, 2000) but also moment-by-moment as determined by the person-to-person interaction. That is, the sense we have of ourselves, how we portray ourselves, and how we negotiate our meaning is done in situ. This will be outlined in Chapter Eleven.

Not only did the resources from which positions were scripted up differ, the positions themselves differed across the three identities. Again a similar overall pattern of positioning evolved. More women positioned themselves as having a gendered aspect of themselves than men (see Table 10.8) but when deliberately positioned as men, the men were able to position themselves accordingly. Thus again speaking to the influence of positioning this time on the positions themselves. This is consistent with Davies and Harre' (1990) understanding of positioning. When applied to gender, this suggests that giving people a part in a gender story has explicitly, on this occasion, made available to them gender related positions. Hence intentional or unintentional positioning may encourage people to take up certain positions as their own, and this may in turn influence how they see the world and how they respond to the world. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Eleven.

When men were positioned as men in elite sport, not one man scripted up a gender related position. The salience of gender as an identity appears from the above to be usurped in some interactions with some people. The salience of social category membership can be explained utilising a Deaux's and Major's (1998) contention that gender identities and gender salience differ across different people.

CHAPTER ELEVEN
PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

11.1	Introduction	321
11.2	Alternative Ways of Understanding Gender	322
11.2.1	Gender as a Social Construction	323
11.2.3	Many Masculinities and Many Femininities	327
11.2.4	Gender as an Ideological Practice	331
11.2.5	Summary	335
11.3	Methodological Implications.....	338
11.4	Limitations and Future Directions.....	339
11.5	Conclusion.....	345

11.1 Introduction

The research presented in this dissertation explored how gender identity in elite sport is constructed through discourse. This dissertation began with comments from Don Talbot, Australian head swimming coach, concerning two elite athletes, one a woman, the other a man. In Chapter Three I suggested that Talbot discursively positioned each athlete differently. He positioned Samantha Riley as a female through his account of her disappointing performances and reactions as being typical of women. In comparison he positioned Scott Goodman's reaction to his disqualification as normal or expected of any reasonable person given that Goodman had trained years to obtain his chance at sporting glory. This introduced the reader to the prospect of considering language as a research site in, and of, itself where language is used to achieve particular outcomes. Chapters Seven to Ten then demonstrated the complexities and subtleties inherent in negotiating one's identity across varying identity categories in everyday talk.

Gender identity construction was investigated in this dissertation using a mixed methods approach. Firstly, how women and men perceived themselves in terms of gender-related traits was examined using the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) and an a-priori content analysis of the interview data. Secondly, how identity categories are enacted and negotiated was explored using a discursive psychological approach. This final chapter, therefore, reflects upon, and evaluates, the findings of this dissertation in relation to current gender theorising. I will not reiterate the exacting findings of this dissertation. Rather I will debate the meaning that these findings have in terms of challenging how we think about gender identity.

11.2 Alternative Ways of Understanding Gender

The decision to analyse the interview data using a discursive psychological perspective arose after closer examination of the data revealed unexpected discursive complexity and dynamism. This alternative way of understanding gender re-conceptualises gender as multidetermined, dynamic, bi-directional, and multi-dimensional. Focusing on how participants used language to make sense of themselves across identity categories allowed gender identity to be conceptualised as a principle of social organisation.

The PAQ and two factor model research has been criticised on a number of grounds as outlined in Chapter Two. To reiterate, the PAQ treats gender as being structured within the individual rather than as a principle of social organisation (Ely, 1995) thereby essentially ignoring gender as a social construction. By treating gender as universal across all settings and all individuals, the PAQ ignores potential contextual and cultural diversity (Deaux, 1985). Whilst Spence and Helmreich (1978) do suggest contextual differences in PAQ responding, they maintain a trait perspective in terms of methodology and conceptualisation at the macro-level.

Hence gender, from this theoretical perspective, cannot be conceived as dynamic and interchangeable (Wetherell et al., 1987). The treatment of gender as static and unvarying de-contextualises gender, and does not allow for gender to be considered as constructed within a situation or within the particular person-to-person context. That is, gender cannot be conceived as a socially constructed and interactionally negotiated construct. A construct that is variable not only across contexts, but within contexts, and within individuals.

The PAQ further conceptualises individuals as having one gender classification. That is, one is either Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated. One of the key assumptions of the PAQ is that it measures traits that are at the core of masculinity and femininity. This infers that there is one Masculine and one Feminine to which we are either compliant (e.g., Masculine or Feminine) or resistant (e.g., Androgynous or Undifferentiated). Further when

conceptualised as a set of traits, gender, as an ideological practice, is neglected. This neglect potentially reinforces and reproduces a gender order where masculine is valued and feminine is devalued. The reader will note that I orient the following discussion to pertain specifically to gender identities however the discussion applies to identity work in general.

11.2.1 Gender as a Social Construction

The findings of this dissertation suggest that the way in which participants give meaning to themselves is variable, inconsistent, and contradictory. In the interviews, participants were able to use different discourses to describe themselves as idiosyncratic, gendered, and gendered individuals in sport. However not all participants did this. Some participants did draw upon the same interpretative repertoire across different identity categories. However they still drew upon different reflexive positions within this interpretative repertoire. That is, participants drew upon differing, and at times, contradictory positions within these interpretative repertoires when negotiating their identities. Participants thus talked, if not always walked, differently across each identity.

Variability and inconsistency was also evident across the two self-report methods. Whilst there were no significant sex effects on PAQ sub-scale responding, there were some significant sex differences when an a-priori content analysis was applied to the interview data. However the low power of the PAQ quantitative analysis brings into question the PAQ results. This is acknowledged with a lower confidence in the PAQ quantitative analysis results. When a discursive psychology approach was used with the interview data disparity again was the norm rather than the exception. How some participants¹ responded to the PAQ, the content of their interview talk, and how they talked appears to have differed.

¹ 6 out of the 8 participants displayed identity disparity across methods and analyses.

Billig et al. (1988) assert that social psychological models of gender consider “gender categories are stable, universal, cognitive structures which can be traced to real differences in the external environment” (p.124). Given this, it would be expected that participants talk, at the least the content, if not the positioning, would somehow be reflective of how participants responded to the PAQ. This was not necessarily the case. There was some inconsistency between what participants said and their PAQ classification. The use of participant generated medians in the PAQ median split method by default infers that classification will reflect the unique population and context. As such the above inconsistency may be reflective of context differences. Thus from this it is difficult to see how cognitively orientated social psychological theories of gender would account for these variable descriptions across the various identity categories and across methodologies. Such variability questions the utility of such theoretical orientations as future models of research when accounting for gender identity in everyday talk.

Spence and Buckner (2000) would argue that such inconsistency, variability, and contradiction questions the utility of traditional approaches to gender (e.g., unifactorial, two factor models Constantinople, 1973). Indeed, the above results give support to their postulation that gender is multifactorial, dynamic, bi-directional, and multidimensional. According to Spence and Buckner gender-related characteristics have disparate etiological foundations. Therefore, differences are likely to emerge across different self-report measures thus indicating the complex and variable nature of gender. In this sense, PAQ responses are only related to outcomes that are directly influenced by instrumentality and expressivity. Thus, on this occasion, what was said by participants was, only partly if at all, indicative of instrumentality and expressivity.

In order to embrace the multifactorial and multidimensional notion of gender, Spence and colleagues (Spence, 1984; Spence & Buckner, 1995; 2000) have proposed that masculinity and femininity be re-considered in reference to the notion of gender identity. That is, women and men’s sense of belonging to

their own gender is represented as mutually exclusive categories. It is the acceptance of our gender as a social psychological construction and an understanding that we do not necessarily have shared meanings of masculinity and femininity. However this posits that whilst gender-related characteristics may change across individuals, an individual's sense of who she or he is as a woman or man remains unswerving (Spence & Buckner). Such a contention presumes that gender identity is relatively enduring and consistent across situations and across the lifespan. Data in this dissertation suggests otherwise.

To this point I argue that how we see ourselves as women and men is dynamic. It is not a stable and enduring entity that has automatic meaning to the individual. Gender identities are therefore not pre-conceived sets of attributes. Rather identities are constantly being accomplished and negotiated. Whilst not all participants were inconsistent, variable, and contradictory in their identity work, closer examination of these participants reveals that the PAQ classification and discourse analysis results were only broadly consistent. That is, in their talk, these participants drew upon Feminine or Masculine interpretative repertoires to work up their identities, where these repertoires were representative of broader culturally familiar themes of masculinity and femininity. Thus they drew upon other aspects of masculine and feminine to make sense of themselves. This provides support for the multifactorial notion of gender that asserts that gender-related factors are essentially independent (Deaux, 1998a).

The discrepancy across methods, coupled with the differences across identities, suggests that gender is more than a multidimensional and multifactorial notion. The data suggests that gender identity is a moveable category. There is no consistent sense of who we are as women and men. On the contrary, when looking at how participants talked about their gender and other selves, contradictory, variable, and inconsistent self-descriptions that depended upon the interactive position and local interactional context emerged. Shifting constructions and group memberships appeared and these were options that could be taken up, negotiated, or rejected.

Variability, inconsistency, and contradiction are therefore considered the result of identity work being occasioned. That is, the identities that were scripted up in this dissertation were specific to the local interaction context. A context that is constantly changing from moment-to-moment. Identities are elements of talk in interaction, where identities change moment-by-moment depending upon the task of the interaction (Zimmerman, 1998). Thus, it is not just the social context that influences how we see ourselves, it is also the person-to-person interaction, within the context, that shapes our identities on that occasion. We may become situated as women or men in an interaction, however what type of women and men we continue to be will change as the interaction evolves. In this sense Zimmerman talks about identities becoming layered in interactions.

The results of this dissertation therefore question gender as an inherent property of the individual. The premise that we are stable individuals whose gender dispositions or traits are unvarying was not reflected in the above discussion. Instead the results support constructionist based approaches to gender such as discursive psychology.

The proposition of variability, inconsistency, and contradiction is opposite to traditional views of psychological constructs. The reader may ask whether this means that we should abandon the search for etic psychological properties. Some purist constructionists would encourage such abandonment. Rather than engage in such debate I would invite a consideration of the purposes that are served by conceptualising psychological constructs as stable. Not wanting to pre-empt the discussion of ideological practices, looking for stability in gender may perpetuate dominant gender practices where women are devalued and men valued. The cultural stereotypes associated with men reflect stability, consistency, and logic (e.g., decisive, logical, stable, stands up well under pressure Williams & Best, 1990; 1994; Williams et al., 1999), whereas cultural stereotypes for women reflect instability (e.g., emotional, flexible, fickle Williams & Best, 1994; Williams et al.). Research that continues to explore categorical difference based on these stereotypes may unintentionally reproduce and reinforce the very practices that they seek to redress.

In this dissertation I argued that sport is a unique socio-cultural context where gender, as a social category may be enacted differently and similarly than in other contexts. To this end, how participants perceived themselves in terms of traditional gender-related characteristics was explored. The results of the PAQ quantitative and qualitative analysis give tentative support to this situated proposition. The lack of significant differences in PAQ sub-scale responses, and the differences concerning PAQ item usage in talk suggest that sportswomen and sportsmen may see themselves differently and similarly with reference to instrumental and expressive traits. Indeed, Helmreich and Spence (1977) argue that the instrumental climate of the sporting context encourages women to be instrumental as well as expressive. However the use of Gentle (PAQ Feminine item) by men to describe themselves as men, and the use of Very Dominant (PAQ Masculine-Feminine item) by Feminine classified people, suggest that the contextual relationship between gender and sport may be more complex than Helmreich and Spence's original assertion. Further, participants' ability to draw on contrary and variable discursive resources again supports the situated nature of gender.

Constructionist approaches consider gender as culturally, historically, and contextually situated and reliant upon particular social practices. Discursive psychology argues that being a woman or man becomes an agreed upon position that occurs within the course of the interaction, where this agreed upon position may change as the interaction changes. In this manner, gender is conceived as fluid, variable, rich, and dynamic. The results of this dissertation confirm this position. Thus, it is difficult to see how two factor models of gender would account for the identity work that took place in this dissertation.

11.2.3 Many Masculinities and Many Femininities

When participants gave meaning to themselves across different identity categories they were able to draw upon shared cultural meanings associated with being women and men to work up these identities in everyday talk. That is, culturally familiar norms, beliefs, values, and knowledge about women and men

were used as discursive resources from which other identities were worked up. Thus some participants were able to avail themselves of gender-related interpretative repertoires to script up ways of being that were appropriate to the context in which the description was occurring.

Therefore, participants attended to identities in their discourse that gender scholars have considered masculine, feminine, and androgynous (e.g., Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The gender conceptualisations that have been discussed previously in this dissertation may be able to capture part of the content of the gender related repertoires that participants used to make sense of themselves in their discourse. To this point I assert that we have an understanding of the commonly accepted culturally specific notions of what gender is and should be like, and we are able to draw upon these culturally specific discursive characteristics to various degrees when making sense of ourselves as women and men. In this dissertation participants were able to articulate a sense of themselves as women and men. This is contrary to Spence and Buckner's (1995; 2000) assertion that gender identity, as a primitive state of being, can't be clearly articulated. Indeed this dissertation demonstrated the contrary through the dexterity by which participants articulated their sense of self.

However the above is not suggestive that there is one Masculine and one Feminine. When individuals negotiated their identity they drew upon interpretative repertoires to reflexively position themselves again with reference to the local interactional context. Thus, in this sense, their talk was both context free (Sacks, 1992) and context sensitive (Wieder, 1974). Words come with culturally prescribed or ready made meanings attached to them, but it is how they are used within a particular interaction (indexicality) that gives rise to similarity and difference. In this way participants were able to alternate between alignment with, and differentiation from, a masculine, feminine, and androgynous that was remarkably consistent, and at the same time inconsistent, across extracts and across individuals. Thus, there are many Masculinities and many Femininities that we may take up in a given situation.

The reflexive positions therefore suggest that there are a multitude of identities that we can script up when making sense of ourselves as women and men. We may orient to something we would call masculine, feminine, and androgynous when scripting up our identities and use this is in the scripting up process. However it is in the doing of our gender identities, that is specific to the local interactional context, that allows for the multitude of identities to emerge. This is contrary to the assumption of the PAQ that we have one Masculine, one Feminine, one Androgynous, and one Undifferentiated classification.

The positioning, or the giving of parts within a story, brings with it an offering of particular resources (i.e., interpretative repertoires) from which parts are to be scripted. This, therefore, influences the identities that are to be scripted up within an interaction. When we are asked to respond to a particular storyline, the storyline invokes a range of discursive resources from which we can construct our part, resources that we would normally accept in order for the story or conversation to be continued. For some participants when positioned as women and men, gender resources are invoked from which gendered positions are constituted. However these resources are just that, resources. They are not stable, inherent dispositions. As resources they are used to give people their specific meaning across different social contexts and particular local interactional contexts.

It is therefore through positioning that we negotiate our identity or make sense of ourselves. In this sense the interpretative repertoire is not representative of an identity per se. It is what is negotiated with the interpretative repertoire that becomes the identity on this occasion, for this occasion. Thus, this dissertation has shown that identity work is located within the reflexive positions that people take up in everyday talk. Reflexive positions contain interpretative repertoires and it is from these repertoires that the positions, and hence identities, are constituted (Davies & Harré, 1990).

The point is that participants in this dissertation were offered descriptions from which femininity, masculinity, and androgyny were inferred. Whilst we do orient broadly to something that we call femininity, masculinity, and androgyny,

these are broad resources that we implicitly use to position ourselves, where positions take into consideration the local interactional context. Identity work is therefore intricate and complicated. It is not a reflection of pre-existing and stable traits that can be quickly and easily identified from answers to questionnaires. The doing of gender in everyday talk is henceforth implicit, subtle, negotiated, achieved, and particular. In this sense, this dissertation has revealed that how we talk to people can influence how they make sense of themselves. That is, the storylines that we offer people will in relationship with the local interactional context, determine the interpretative repertoires and positions that are made available for them to work up their identities.

Having said this does not mean that researchers should automatically interpret this as evidence that Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous actually exist as identities, or that we can easily identify Masculine, Feminine, and Androgynous persons from their discourse. Rather I am arguing that as cultural categories or ways of describing, femininity, masculinity, and androgyny exist discursively. That is, they exist as discursive resources that some people can use to make sense of themselves, where the characteristics that make these gender categories do exist for individuals. But as entities, in and of themselves, they may not exist.

When gender is considered as a central part of an individual's personality and identity, it forms a basis of her or his self-concept, self-esteem, and self-perceptions (Crawford & Unger, 2000; Spence, 1984; 1993; Spence & Buckner, 1995; 2000). According to this argument, how we see ourselves as women and men implicitly influences how we see ourselves as individuals. However what this dissertation has shown is that how we are positioned discursively within particular storylines can influence how we see ourselves as individuals. That is, the local interactional context and the storyline that is brought to this context, shapes the discourse within that context and thus shapes the identity that is worked up for that interaction. It makes available different identity possibilities and makes others difficult. In this sense it is not only how we see ourselves as women and men that implicitly influences how we see ourselves as individuals.

This may be only part of what occurs. How we make sense of ourselves may also come from the local interactional context and the storylines within that context. Thus if we make a gender storyline available within a local interactional context, we are asking the interlocutor to take up a gender position within this context for the interaction to proceed.

The above is not to suggest that the ineffability of gender puts understanding how women and men do gender out of the reaches of the applied researcher and within the auspices of the theoretician. Although the tendency of discourse analysis to be concerned primarily with ‘the two second pause’ has been raised by critics of the approach². When we understand how a person does her/his gender, how these ways of being can be oppressive as well as emancipatory, then we can begin to develop discourses that challenge dominant and oppressive discourses. This would allow for alternative ways of being to become accepted and thus drawn upon. Indeed the challenge for discursive psychology is to move within applied domains, and it is hoped that this dissertation is a small step toward this challenge. Exactly how this may be done is in need of consideration and is beyond the bounds of this dissertation at this point in time.

11.2.4 Gender as an Ideological Practice

Wetherell (1997) argues that trait perspectives make it difficult to conceptualise gender as an ideological practice. By considering the discursive practices that we use to make sense of ourselves as women and men, we can make apparent the ideological function of gendered discourse. Ideological function is defined as “the elimination of the awareness of contradictions in material circumstances or perception of exploitation; mainly through the

² For an overview of this debate see Speer and Potter (2000).

presentation of relationships (which seem important only for a particular kind of social arrangement)³ as natural or common sense” (Wetherell, p.161).

It is therefore offered that interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions are the discourses through which ideological practices are engaged (Wetherell, 1998; 1999; Wetherell, in press; Wetherell & Edley, 1999). It is through these interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that gender as a social practice is reproduced, reinforced, and challenged. This was evidenced through the action and epistemological orientation of participants’ talk. This dissertation illustrated how identities did certain things. That is, identities were used to manage dilemmas, to constitute a self that has specific characteristics, and to ignore some parts of the self yet emphasise others. In this way the descriptions were not just static entities that once articulated were reflective of a true way of being, rather they are actively deployed to portray certain ways of being. These descriptions were also worked up to be seen as true ways of being. In this instance versions of the self were reified, made difficult to undermine and question. The self was also constituted in such a way that under challenge, ways of being could be modified to redirect attention from risky identities. In this sense, there is no certainty that what we say will be taken as a factual representation of our world. Thus in our discourse we work to increase the facticity of what we are saying.

It is through this deployment that social categories (e.g., woman, female athlete) are conceptualised as descriptive resources that people use for interactional business and ideological purpose. For example, Mark employed the Androgynous repertoire to negotiate a sense of himself as Hegemonic Masculine. His use of the above interpretative repertoire reproduced and reinforced male ways of being as natural and common place. Further, his use of the Hegemonic Masculine reflexive position reproduced gendered ideological practices where male ways of being are valued. Marsha through the Feminine repertoire, accepted her position as Opposite to Men thereby reinforcing her place within the

³ Brackets as per original quote.

ideological binary of gendered practices. Conversely, Fiona challenged the cultural expectations associated with being a woman through her use of the Masculine repertoire when positioning herself as Atypical. However Fiona's challenge comes with an acknowledgement of the power inherent in Feminine ideology. This is evidenced by her accounting making strategies that minimised the risks inherent in taking up a position that is contrary to these cultural expectations.

On these occasions, no explicit ideological formulations were scripted up. Rather a description of self was offered from which ideological functions were inferred. However in this interactional context, participants' descriptions of themselves identified them as Hegemonic, Opposite to Men, Atypical, and so forth. It is the description that infers ideological function, and this is particular to the position, thereby making some positions more viable than others.

The above participants may not have been seen as Feminine females or Masculine males on the PAQ. But this does not mean that they were immune to the ideological power that is inherent in Masculine and Feminine ways of being. Indeed their very orientation to problematic dilemmas, risky identities, and their work to protect their positionings from alternative descriptions suggest the contrary. Whether we can be classified as Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated, and the content of these classifications, becomes secondary to the power inherent in the possibility that we can be classified at all. That is, it is the possibility of being classified as a Masculine male or a Feminine female, and of having those labels accepted as part of a natural or accepted way of being men and women, that gives talk its power to constitute reality.

The results of this dissertation have conferred an understanding of how the identities being offered and the action being done by these identities can be representative of ideological functioning. What is of issue here is not the content of what participants say per se, but the sensitivity to ideological practices inherent in the identities that the participants script up. When we offer self-descriptions in everyday talk we open these descriptions to scrutiny. As mentioned previously in the discourse chapters, ego protection is a central task in social interaction

(Hollway, 1989), thus presenting the self in ways that could be seen as unfavourable is a risky position to take up. As we speak with the anticipation of how we will be heard and responded to by others (Bakhtin, 1986), we are aware of the potential sensitive nature of our identity work. It was shown that a focus upon interpretative repertoires might divert the hearer's attention from potentially risky identities (reflexive positions), to identities that are more in keeping with what is culturally expected from women and men. By doing this current gender practices are reproduced and reinforced.

Participants thus produced their descriptions and definitions in such a way that showed concern for their identity. That is, they were aware that they were accountable for their productions. Participants therefore did not just define and describe themselves in an ad hoc manner. Rather identities were carefully scripted to portray the self as aligning with being female or male, whilst at the same time positioning the self quite differently. Participants were able to display themselves in certain ways that demonstrated that they were sensitive to the potential of being heard as women and men.

11.2.5 Summary

The results of the discursive analysis challenge the way gender is conceptualised by social psychological measures of gender characteristics (e.g., PAQ). The fragmented and often contradictory discourses that participants drew upon to make sense of themselves across different identity categories make it difficult to see how social psychological approaches would account for the gender identity work that occurred in this dissertation.

The results of the discourse analysis suggest that our sense of ourselves as gendered individuals is in a constant state of flux. This sense is not only variable but also inconsistent in that we can take up contradictory identities, we can be one and the other so to speak. Gender in this sense is multifactorial, multidimensional, dynamic, and contradictory. Who we are as women and men is changeable depending upon the context in which we interact.

I have argued that classifying individuals as Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated on the basis of responses to a questionnaire may not be able to fully capture the subtlety, the precision, the negotiation, and the intricacy with which we perform our identity work. Further, such a classification and conceptualisation of gender cannot comprehend gender with reference to interactional particularities (i.e., action and epistemological orientation). The utility of cognitive based social psychological theories of gender is therefore somewhat limited. They cannot fully account for the doing of gender in everyday talk. They cannot account for the subtle and intricate manner in which masculinity and femininity as cultural resources can be used to construct differing ways of being.

Gender is not only multifactorial and multidimensional; it is also flexible, dynamic, diverse, contradictory, and unordered. The meaning that we give to ourselves as women and men is not inherently given but negotiated according to the interaction. This moves analytic focus from the identification of characteristics, to the ways in which masculinity and femininity define situations and discourses, how they are adopted for the characterisation of self and others in

specific interactions but not others. Again poignantly it allows for attention concerning what is achieved by these different accounts. What becomes of import is not whether we are Masculine and/or Feminine but how we negotiate ourselves to be Masculine and/or Feminine, and the power that we gain from supporting this discourse.

This dissertation has therefore extended our current understanding of gender identity in that it has considered and demonstrated how gender identity is done in everyday talk. This process of making sense of ourselves as women and men recognises that we do understand that people are members of different identities (e.g., male/female, student/teacher) and that these categories have associated with them culturally familiar, recognisable themes, familiar tropes, metaphors, and descriptions. It is at this juncture that the dissertation extends the work of Bem (1981; 1993) Spence and colleagues (Spence, 1984; 1993; Spence & Buckner, 1995; 2000; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), Deaux and colleagues (Deaux, 1985; 1998; 1999; Deaux & Lafance, 1998; Deaux & Major, 1987), and other gender scholars.

The relevance of this position to gender scholarship is that discursive psychology enables the analyst to demonstrate how gender is taken up by individuals in everyday talk. It focuses our attention not on what is taken up but how is it taken up, the focus is on the processes by which gender is done. To say that someone is Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous or Undifferentiated, we need to be able to track analytically how being Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous or Undifferentiated is made available to people and how they take this up and negotiate this as their own identity on particular occasions. Discursive psychology allows for this and allows for the analysis of how interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions are woven together and how positions can be rejected and accepted.

Discursive psychology also enables us to understand the variability inherent in our identity work, how we may talk one way and walk the other. Where walking and talking is dependent upon where you are walking and who you are doing the talking with. Thus

“‘male’ and ‘female’ ... develops from ... repertoires, and accounting systems available to individuals to make sense of their position, and which historically and contingently have come to be marked as feminine or masculine responses” (Wetherell, 1997).

Perhaps more poignantly the discursive psychology approach is able to focus upon masculinity, femininity, androgyny and other positions as ideological practices. Thereby gendered ways of being can be scripted up to appear inevitable and normal, the result of biology or experience. Other conceptualisations of gender have difficulty in treating gender categories in this way. Bem’s (1981; 1974) and Spence and colleagues’ (Spence, 1984; Spence & Buckner, 1995; 2000; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) treatment of gender as a set of stable, unitary traits rather than as metaphorical devices may perpetuate the very ideological practices that they seek to redress. They assume meaningful difference rather than considering the way in which the content of the categories constitute that difference.

In summary, what this dissertation has shown is how sophisticated we are at managing talk and our identities within this talk. How we can use culturally familiar notions of what it is to be a woman or a man for our own purposes. However it has also shown how at the same time, we can work against these culturally familiar or acceptable notions should we choose to do so within the local interactional context. It has also shown that we are sensitive to the implicit messages or positions within discourse. That is, participants were able to talk the acceptable Masculine, Feminine, or even Androgynous talk yet at the same time, work to give themselves their own meaning that was appropriate for the interaction and for themselves. Such a focus on discourse moves gender to a different level of conceptualisation in psychology.

11.3 Methodological Implications

The points made with reference to positioning have important implications for qualitative research in particular. Although there is an awareness of the importance of question development, probing, and general researcher responses in qualitative research (Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor, & Tindall, 1994), this dissertation has demonstrated how such questioning advertently or inadvertently makes available particular response alternatives for the participant. We may unintentionally invite a world-view from participants that is taken up so that our storyline may continue. Thus, what identity is scripted up will be dependent upon the storyline that respondents interpret as being offered. Consequently what is critical in identity work is the local interactional context and storylines, for it is these that will shape how we see ourselves as individuals.

It is through these interactions that we give meaning to ourselves as members of social and personal categories. If we position someone as a woman, man, victim, perpetrator, and so forth then we are inviting her or him to take up those positions. Davies and Harré (1990) suggest that whether we take up the position that is offered to us will be dependent upon whether we have understood the storyline that is being offered. We may outright reject that story and hence the position, attend to our own storyline, and so forth. We may also not reject the positions on offer due to power differences between speakers, a lack of perceived choice, and so on. The main point from this is that we need to be even more astute in how we ask questions for we may be unintentionally asking the right questions to get the right answers to our research questions.

What I, therefore, have shown is the context sensitive manner in which meaning is given to gender identity, how participants can position themselves using culturally familiar resources depending upon the local interactional context. In particular interactional contexts, participants defined and described themselves differently. In reference to gender, it is not just the degree of alignment with a gender category that changes with positioning but it is also the definitions that are given to the category that change to suit the local interactional context. It is

through this that we give ourselves different meanings across different contexts and identities. Looking at the reflexive positions there is less similarity of positions than there were with the interpretative repertoires. Thus through the use of reflexive positions the self is given different meanings across different categories and contexts. This illustrates how people in everyday talk make use of both the inference rich (Sacks, 1992) and indexical (Wieder, 1974) properties of a category and that this use is contextually dependent.

The fusion of qualitative and quantitative methodologies allows for an exploration of concepts that combine the strengths of each methodology. In this dissertation it allowed for a greater understanding of gender identity in sport. As discussed in previous chapters, the relationship between gender identity and sport was unclear. The mixed methods approach allowed for a richer account of gender than was possible under a separatist design. In this dissertation the use of qualitative data allowed for rich data about the gendered identities of sportswomen and sportsmen. The addition of the qualitative data allowed for a more complete picture to be drawn concerning gender identity in sport. Thus mixed methods can be employed to great advantage in extending our understanding of both unexplored and well theorised areas in psychology.

However the above should not be read as a call for all researchers to utilise mixed methods in the design, collection, and interpretation of data. The ways in which qualitative and quantitative data inform each other often have unplanned outcomes as illustrated in this dissertation. The exact uses and advantages of a mixed method approach may not be clearly envisaged at the outset of a project. This does not mean that one should abandon such attempts to combine methodologies. Rather it is an acknowledgement that mixed method approaches, can and often do, have unexpected implications for the research process. The researcher needs to consider how this would sit within her/his own frame of reference should one set of data question the utility of the other.

11.4 Limitations and Future Directions

One of the main limitations in this dissertation is that this work does not go beyond what is said. As mentioned in previous chapters and sections, the discursive psychology approach does not rely upon cognitive explanations of what is being said in order to understand what is occurring in this interaction. Thus going beyond the text is not the aim of discursive psychology. This does not suggest that in a discursive psychological analysis language is divorced from cognition, rather that discursive psychology does not attempt to explain what is occurring in the interaction with reference to underlying cognitive schemas or representations. As discussed previously, discursive psychology does not suggest that nothing is going on cognitively during everyday talk nor does it negate the importance of looking at cognition. Rather it does not place at the forefront of analysis a need to explicate all behaviour as having a cognitive association. This is not to suggest that language has no interrelationship with behaviour. Instead it is that discursive psychologists' do not engage in the effect of language on the behaviour of the individual. A future direction for research may be the integration of cognitive and discursive perspectives of behaviour where emphasis is on integration rather than explanation.

Dealing with only what is said does not imply that nothing of benefit will come of such analysis. Speer (2000) believes that such an approach is of critical importance to feminist psychology in particular. Discursive psychology permits such concepts as gender relations and associated power relations to be tracked as they occur in everyday talk, in the here and now. Discursive psychology is therefore able to pursue gender inequalities as they are produced and reproduced in everyday talk. Discursive psychology allows for an understanding of how gender gets done in everyday mundane talk, the action or end to which it is put, and how gendered categories can be used as effective rhetorical strategies for maintaining the status quo. In this way, understanding what particular gender identities achieve, how they are negotiated, and are rhetorically protected from challenge allows for further understanding of how they can be challenged. It is in this way that we will be able to expose the ways in which gender is built up within our discourses as natural ways of being and thus difficult to challenge.

Davies (1997), therefore, argues that one strategy to challenge the current gender status quo is to understand how gender is constructed as two separate, hierarchically related categories, the binary position, and then de-construct this position. In this way the production and reproduction of oppression, discrimination and inequality can be analytically exposed in talk. For it is not the idea of oppression or discrimination that is oppressive and discriminatory, it is the use of these ideas and their outcomes that produce oppression and discrimination (Gough, 1998).

Through a focus on ideological practices we can trace the ways in which challenge to inequitable practices are negated through rhetorical stands that make further challenge difficult to mount. Such work is being undertaken from a discursive psychological perspective (e.g., Gough, 1998; Speer, 2000; Speer & Potter, 2000; Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 1999; Wetherell et al., 1987). However this work is in its infancy and more work in different contexts (e.g., sport, workplace) and across different practices (e.g., sexual harassment) may enable researchers to better understand and thus be better equipped at subjugating those oppressive practices. Further, participants talking about themselves as gendered individuals across different interactions may also expose how gender practices are maintained.

The second limitation in this dissertation is that the interview is a specific kind of everyday talk. Interview talk brings with it its own contextual framework, local interactional context, and storyline. As such, the questions I used in this interview would have impacted upon the interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that I made available for use by the participants. The intention of each question was to deliberately invoke different contexts from which the participants could respond. The same question framed differently, therefore, may have invoked different storylines and thus different interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions that the participants could use. However the gender related interpretative repertoires that were deployed by participants are likely to be similar across differently framed questions as these are more abstract, culturally specific themes that are not as sensitive to the local interactional

context as the reflexive positions. As the focus of discursive psychology is not so much on what is said through the interpretative repertoires and reflexive position but rather the how these interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions are executed in everyday talk, future research should consider how identity negotiation differs across different local interactional contexts. That is, a focus on how and for what purpose the local interactional context invokes particular identities would extend current understandings of gender as a culturally, historically, and socially situated concept.

Related to the above point is that this dissertation has not revealed any universal gender interpretative repertoires or laws. The main aim for most psychology research has been generalisation. One of the main criteria of scientific legitimacy has been in the generalisability of findings. The search for the etic is the search for universal processes or common processes. This search for etic processes is at odds with the underlying epistemology of discursive psychology. Qualitative research in general, including discursive psychology, often focuses deliberately on the emic processes occurring within a particular group of participants. This does not inherently assume that discursive psychology believes that there are no etic processes to be uncovered in psychology. Rather, discursive psychology research prefers to focus on the more specific and unique qualities or contexts of people in order to more fully understand the world, as the participant perceives it. Thus the focus is upon how the context enables particular etic descriptions to arise and not others. Again the underlying theme is contextual and situational influence. By their very nature contexts and situations are ever changing. Thus the search for etic processes that are divorced from contextual influences is not of primary interest to discursive psychology. The search for the emic is, therefore, more in keeping with the epistemological underpinnings of discursive psychology.

In this way what is said is considered to be specific to the historical, social, cultural, and local context. In this respect this dissertation is consistent with the discursive psychology. This dissertation is able to inform gender scholars of etic and emic discursive resources and strategies that people use to

make sense of themselves as women and men. In this way this work has extended the current understanding of gender as a situated concept. However more research is needed to extend this across different settings and populations and with particular attention to local interactive contexts.

As a new and somewhat radical approach (Potter, 1996) to social psychology, discursive psychology has not been a focal point of social psychological research and gender research in particular. Whilst there is a growing number of researchers using the discursive approach to a number of different topics (Potter, 1997), as a theoretical and methodological approach it is still in its beginning. Therefore, more work needs to be done that further extend the notion of interpretative repertoires and reflexive positions, both in gender categories and other social categories, so that we can understand how discursively we make sense of ourselves. It may be at a future juncture that these notions are rejected as other discursive resources and strategies replace them. At this point, the findings of this dissertation are consistent with those other researchers focusing upon interpretative repertoire and/or reflexive positions in gendered talk (e.g., Wetherell, 1998; *in press*; Wetherell & Edley, 1999; Wetherell et al., 1987).

Methodologically, the absence of investigator triangulation may be seen to limit the trustworthiness of the interpretative repertoire and reflexive position interpretations. However as argued in Chapter Four, there is an absence of agreement within the qualitative literature on the utility of investigator triangulation as a method of trustworthiness, credibility, and rigour (Tindall, 1994). Further, some qualitative researchers have rejected the notions of reliability and validity (e.g., Guba, 1981), as such concepts are epistemologically and theoretically founded within objectivism and positivism, and are inconsistent with constructionist and discursive ways of knowing and understanding. Following from this, what is of import is that the reader of qualitative research agrees with how the qualitative researcher came to her/his coding interpretations, rather than whether the reader agrees with the interpretations *per se*. As the reader

and researcher may be working within different epistemological, theoretical, and value frameworks, different interpretations may arise.

The intervention by the researcher within the participant's response would have influenced the number of discursive strategies that were drawn upon in an intervened interaction. Indeed there is discussion on the legitimacy of comparing turns in talk (see Potter, 1996). However a discursive analysis moves beyond a focus on the number of strategies used. What discursive psychology allows is a move to look at how strategies are being used to build up accounts, what are the ideological purposes of such accounts, to what rhetorical effect are they being used, and so forth. Thus comparing across talk with varying amounts of turn taking does not become problematic, in that what is being tracked is not the quantity of discourse but how this discourse is being used. In this sense, future research could include more analysis of the interviewer's interventions as part of the account building process.

Two further methodological limitations are in need of consideration. One is the possibility that participants use of different interpretative repertoires, reflexive positions, and discursive strategies across identities reflected a desire to avoid redundancy in descriptions and not changes in positioning. A review of transcripts not included for analysis in this dissertation revealed some participants referring the researcher to previous responses when they felt that they had already answered a particular question. The point being made here is that some participants worked not to avoid redundancy but to include redundancy in their responses. Further, in the initial rapport building stage of the interview, participants were verbally instructed to alert the researcher to questions that they felt that they already reported. Thus the inclusion of redundancy was normalised in this instance.

The second potential limitation is the effect of the PAQ and Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS) being administered after the interview. As outlined in Chapter Four, this presentation was used to minimise the possible sensitisation to the area of gender identity on participants' responses.

However order effects may have occurred and future researchers may like to consider counterbalancing the order of interview-questionnaire presentation.

Further research is needed that extends this dissertation in the ways suggested above. A discursive psychological analysis of the expressions of disadvantage and advantage by women and men in sport, everyday talk between coach and athlete, the everyday talk of team-mates, and media representations of women and men may enable stronger challenges to the inequities that currently exist for women in sport. Future research that considers the importance of the local interactional context in constructing gender identity, research that goes beyond the historical, social, and cultural context is needed to understand the sophistication in which we do our gender that is particular for this occasion.

Methodological concerns temper the PAQ results in this dissertation. Further the number of tests employed with the a-priori analysis bodes caution when interpreting these results as chance significant findings may have occurred. Inadequate power levels in the PAQ analysis suggest that this non-significance may be due to poor power rather than a lack of difference (Stevens, 1992). This lack of difference refers to a specific set of instrumental characteristics, thus empirically and theoretically sex differences may be found outside of these characteristics. The results of this dissertation may also be reflective of this particular population and may not be easily generalisable across other levels of competition, developmental stages, cultures, social groups, and so forth. The above results, therefore, need to be considered with respect to the various conceptual, methodological, and theoretical criticisms that have been made about the PAQ. Henceforth the results that pertain specifically to the PAQ need to be interpreted cautiously.

11.5 Conclusion

To paraphrase the words of Frank Sinatra ‘and now the end is near, I face the final last section’, it is perhaps pertinent to take a broad view on what I have argued in this dissertation. First and foremost, this dissertation has introduced to

the reader the proposition that we move analytic focus from mental states to language, and associated with this the action and epistemological orientation of language. The focus of discursive psychology is discourse itself, from how it is constructed, the functions that language use serves, to the consequences of particular discursive strategies. I am not suggesting at any point that cognitive processes should not be the focus of analysis, rather that a division between what occurs in the mind and what we say is a non-issue. Thus, discursive psychologists are not concerned with whether what someone says is true and whether this matches some cognitive map. What concerns the discursive psychologist is language, how do people make what they say appear factual, and the action that language portrays. Mental process and states are not implied from overt behaviour but treated as discursive social practices.

Secondly, this dissertation has demonstrated that focusing on language, on the how rather than the what, moves discussion of gender categories to a different level of conceptualisation. It suggests we do orient to something that we have called femininity, masculinity, and androgyny, but that we give ourselves our precise meaning as women and men not only through our alignment with the content of these categories but also through our use of these categories. That is, it is not just the descriptions per se that constitute our identity; it is how we negotiate these descriptions with attention to the action and epistemological orientation of the descriptions, and the ideological power of gendered social categories that constitute our identities. As aforementioned, we make use in our discourse of both the inference rich (Sacks, 1992) and indexical (Wieder, 1974) nature of these categories. Our understanding of what it means to be female or male, Feminine or Masculine is therefore both context free and context sensitive.

In this way our meanings are particular to the local interactional context. That is, our identities are produced moment-by-moment. They are the reflection of how we are interactively positioned as individuals, as women or men, as athletes or coaches, or female/male athletes or coaches in talk. Gender is not just historically, socially, and culturally situated, it is also locally situated in

discourse. As individuals our meaning making is variable, inconsistent, and sometimes contradictory, and that this is a response to the changing local interactional context and the ideological power of the categories to which we orient.

This dissertation is but the beginning. No doubt in time to come I will look back upon this and see new insights and different ways of looking at the data. In that respect I feel that this dissertation is a novice attempt at gender conceptualisation. At this point it is clear to me that the results in this dissertation have asked many many more questions than they have answered. What it has shown is that identity work in everyday talk is negotiated, achieved, intricate, subtle, and complicated. That everyday talk is where the majority of our psychological phenomena are played out, thus if we are to fully comprehend phenomena such as gender identity then we need to understand how these are achieved in everyday mundane talk and understand the ideological power that such identities hold for us.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Account – an account is explanatory discourse.

Action orientation – we use descriptions to perform certain actions or we use descriptions as part of certain actions. In this sense words do things.

Ascribe – when descriptions are used to become a constitutive part of the description.

Autobiographical talk – when interlocutor splits their description into character and voice or autobiographical talk (e.g., I'm really). By doing this, the production of self can appear to the listener as objective, not highly invested, valued, or emotionally charged.

BSRI – Bem Sex Role Inventory.

But - serves to alert the reader to an imminent change of descriptive view.

Category entitlement - in certain contexts people from certain categories are assumed to be knowledgeable (e.g., a doctor in a hospital is assumed to know something about medicine). The use of a category entitlement negates the need to ask how does the doctor know about medicine.

Confessional – is the questioning of whether this is the 'right' way to describe oneself. Confession is where the interlocutor believes that their interest or stake is so salient that inoculation will be an invalid strategy. Hence owning up to the stake is the most appropriate course of action as it works as a display of honesty.

Constitute/Constitution/Constitutive – we use words, descriptions, and accounts to build or construct certain versions of our world. Words by themselves have no inherent sense, it is through their use that they constitute meaning.

Context - is not just the social, historical, or cultural context. It incorporates the immediate conversational or person-to-person context where the sequential context influences how an account or description is designed.

Corroboration - works to shifts the accountability of a description from the speaker to the unknown others. This increases the facticity of a description.

Discourse - encompasses both formal and informal verbal communication and interactions (e.g., election speeches and discussions with friends over dinner), as well as formal and informal written text (e.g., email chat group messages and scholarly text respectively).

Discursive practices – incorporate discursive resources and discursive strategies.

Discursive psychology - attempts through the examination of discourse, to understand how interactions and life occurs within the social sphere. The main concern is what people do with their talk.

Discursive resources – these are the discursive patterns or themes that participants use to script up their identity. An interpretative repertoire is an example of a discursive resource.

Discursive strategies – these are particular linguistic rules or concepts that are used by participants to increase the facticity of their description or to do certain things with their language. An extreme case formulation is an example of a discursive strategy.

Doing or do – how psychological phenomena (e.g., gender) are created and maintained by discursive resources and strategies that are part of social processes.

Epistemological orientation – we can use descriptions and accounts to make what we are saying more factual. There is no inherent truth in what we say, we make what we say more true through various discursive practices.

Extreme case formulations – when interlocutor uses extreme points on relevant descriptive dimensions to rhetorically strengthen and reinforce what they are saying. Can be used as a deliberate discursive strategy to manage how a speaker's production will be heard and acted upon in identity negotiation.

Facticity – refers to making what is said appear more truthful or plausible. To increase the facticity of what is being said is to make what is being said appear more true.

Footing - refers to the different roles that an individual can have in a discursive interaction, where moving from one role to the other can present an account as more factual or distance an interlocutor from an account.

Full-time athlete/coach - financially dependent upon a sporting salary, scholarship, or sponsorship.

Gender - encompasses the shared meanings that we hold about the prescribed characteristics of maleness and femaleness, and the behaviours, attitudes, and feelings associated with these characteristics. In this sense gender is in a constant state of flux, as a construct that is multiple, fragmented, and local (particular to the immediate interactional situation context).

Gender identity - is our subscription to socio-cultural stereotypes or prescriptions related to being male or female, it is the psychological sense we have of being male or female. It is how we see ourselves as women or men.

Gender identity in sport – is our subscription to socio-cultural stereotypes or prescriptions related to being male or female in the sporting context. It is the psychological sense we have of being sportswomen or sportsmen. It is how we see ourselves as women or men in sport.

Hedge words/Hedges – soften the impact of a descriptive reference and help set limits on linguistic statements that could not be defended in their absolute form.

I don't know - can be rhetorically worked to portray a pretence of a lack of knowledge.

Idiosyncratic identity – how the participant sees themselves as a unique individual. Akin to personal identity in Social Identity Theory.

Indexical/Indexicality - the understanding that the meaning we give to words (and utterances) is context specific. We need to understand the context in which a conversation or description occurs in order to understand the meaning inherent in a conversation or description.

Inference rich - words come with culturally prescribed meanings attached to them.

In situ – when used discursively in situ refers to how descriptions are scripted up within ever evolving interactions and how this description reflects the particular demands of the evolving interaction.

Interactional business – discourse that is designed to perform particular actions and can be deployed either explicitly or implicitly.

Interactional dilemma – in interactions we are faced with divergent themes that we can take up within interactions. Through our discourse we manage these dilemmas.

Interactive positioning - where what we say to and about others, either implicitly or explicitly, positions them in the conversation.

Interpretative repertoires - recurrent, culturally familiar, habitual arguments or stable global discursive patterns that individuals use to make sense of themselves, events, actions, cognitive processes, and other phenomena in conversations.

Language - is not only an abstract system of rules but also a practical activity.

Language is seen, as a social action in it's own right, as an interactive activity, and as a process of communication.

Local - the immediate context in which an interaction occurs. It is the person-to-person (or persons) interactional context. See local interactional context.

Local interactional context - is the 'real world' in which the discourse is situated (i.e., the person-to-person context). This includes the conversational sequence (e.g., greeting), topic of conversation, purpose of the conversation, physical setting in which the conversation is situated, the interlocutors and their relationship, and the social, historical, and cultural context.

Metaphors - work to rhetorically constitute a description as more factual or literal. In everyday talk metaphors shift the focus of discursive events thus blurring the distinction between what is perceived as factual and what is perceived as metaphorical.

Methodological relativism - the aim of the researcher is to examine how the participant makes what they say appear true.

MC-SDS – Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

N4 – NUD*IST 4

Narrative - when the interlocutor relates an idiosyncratic account through the telling of a story. Narrative can be used as a rhetorical construction to make what the speaker is saying more real, more believable, or more factual.

NCAS – National Coaching Accreditation Scheme.

Negotiate/Negotiation – in a discursive interaction being male or female becomes an agreed upon position that occurs within the course of the interaction, where this agreed upon position may change as the interaction changes. In this way gender is negotiated.

Non-transitional relevant places – when there is no relationship between successive articulations.

Ontological gerrymandering – selection of the most advantageous or relevant issues and/or descriptions to script up. These are issues or descriptions that are most likely to

support the interlocutor's argument or position while ignoring those in talk descriptions or issues that are likely to be contested.

PAQ – Personal Attributes Questionnaire.

PAQ F– Personal Attributes Questionnaire Feminine sub-scale.

PAQ M– Personal Attributes Questionnaire Masculine sub-scale.

PAQ M-F– Personal Attributes Questionnaire Masculine-Feminine sub-scale.

Particularisation –is the opposing process of categorisation in that it captures the uniqueness of an individual within a social category.

Part-time = income drawn from non-sporting sources.

Positioning - is a discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines.

Provisional statements – descriptions whose status are prefaced by 'I suppose', 'I guess', or 'I think', are often treated as highly suspect or provisional by the listener and thus treated as less factual than statements that are prefaced by 'I know', 'I am', or 'I believe'. Such statements can be used by the interlocutor to distance themselves from their accounts

Q1 – interview question one.

Q2 – interview question two.

Q6 – interview question six.

Reflexivity - incorporates the action aspect of discourse in that descriptions and accounts are not just describing something; they are an integral part of the description.

Reflexive position – is offered as an alternative discursive notion to the social psychological concept of role. A person is not considered as an individual free agent, but rather as the subject, where the individual takes up or is placed in various subject positions depending upon the discourse and the particular social context in which the individual interacts. Thus we make sense of ourselves, or position ourselves, within social interactions through the cultural and personal resources that are made available to us in our discourse.

Reflexive positioning - is when what we say about ourselves, either implicitly or explicitly, positions ourselves in conversation

Rhetoric – in this dissertation rhetorical or rhetorically is used from a discursive standpoint to encompass the notion that “all words and categories contain rhetorical affordances, they can be used contrastively to bolster an argument” (Speer, 2000, p. 15). That is, all words and categories can be used persuasively to support or distance oneself from a particular position, description, or argument.

Script up -refers to how language, discursive strategies, and practices are used specifically to constitute a particular description.

SDR – social desirability responding.

Show concessions - a three part discursive structure of proposition, concession, and re-assertion. These can be used to make a pretence of conceding to differing views in an argument. When considered as part of interactional business show concessions feign concession to divergent viewpoints but the final output is a return to the interlocutor’s original proposition.

Social comparison – when we use a social category to make a distinction between what we are and what we are not. In doing this we construct ourselves as reasonable and the other as unreasonable.

Social discourse – discourse which occurs in interactions between two or more people.

Subject positions - an alternative discursive notion to the social psychological concept of role. A person is not considered as an individual free agent, but rather as the subject, where the individual takes up or is placed in various subject positions depending upon the discourse and the particular social context in which the individual interacts.

Three-part list – is a listing of different features of the same image that help to construct a description as commonplace or normal. The three parts are used to represent aspects of a general category or that these parts constitute a more general class of things.

USA – United States of America.

Work up – see script up.

You know – is used as an appeal to common knowledge or common behaviour. It works to elicit from the hearer an agreement concerning the speaker’s behaviour, and works to head off any disapproval of this behaviour by placing it within the boundaries of normative behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Albion, M. (2000). Developing and validating a model of career decision making. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.
- Allison, M. (1991). Role conflict and the female athlete: Preoccupations with little grounding. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 3, 49-60.
- Active Australia. (1997). Participation resources. Canberra, Australia: Australian Sports Commission.
- Active Australia. (2000). The numbers game: A description of organised sport and physical activity participants in Australia. Canberra, Australia: Australian Sports Commission.
- Anderson, K. L. (1999). Snowboarding: The construction of gender in an emerging sport. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 23(1), 55-79.
- Andre, T., & Holland, A. (1995). Relationship of sport participants to sex role orientation and attitudes toward women among high school males and females. Journal of Sport Behavior, 18(3), 241-253.
- Anselmi, D. L., & Law, A. L. (1998). Introduction: Defining sex and gender. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 1-13). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Anshel, M. H. (1997). Sport psychology: From theory to practice. (3rd ed.). Scottsdale, Arizona: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.
- Antaki, C., & Wetherell, M. (1999). Show concessions. Discourse Studies, 1(1), 7-27.
- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), Identities in talk (pp. 1-14). London: SAGE.
- Australian Sports Commission. (1998). Participation facts 'n stats. Canberra, Australia: Australian Sports Commission.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Speech genres and other late essays. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M., & Tindall, C. (1994). Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Bannon, S. F. (1999). Goal orientation and the endorsement of aggressive acts in Australian Rules football. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba.
- Belansky, E. S., & Boggiano, A. K. (1994). Predicting helping behaviors: The role of gender and instrumental/expressive self-schemata. Sex-Roles, 30(9-10), 647-661.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S., L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing. Psychological Review, 88(4), 354-364.
- Bem, S. L. (1993). The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Billig, M. (1996). Arguing and thinking. (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking. London: SAGE.
- Birrell, S., & Richter, D. M. (1987). Is a diamond forever? Feminist transformations of sport. Women's Studies International Forum, 10(4), 395-409.
- Blau, F. D., & Ferber, M. A. (1987). Occupations and earnings of women workers. In S. Koziara, M. Moskow, & L. D. Tanner (Eds.), Working women: Past, present, and future (pp. 37-68). Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.
- Blinde, E. M., & Taub, D. E. (1992). Homophobia and women's sport: The disempowerment of athletes. Sociological Focus, 25, 151-166.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bredemeier, B. J. L., Desertrain, G. S., Fisher, L. A., Getty, D., Slocum, N. E., Stephens, D. E., & Warren, J. M. (1991). Epistemological perspectives among women who participate in physical activity. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, *3*, 87-107.

Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and quality in social research. London: Routledge.

Bryson, L. (1994). Sport and the maintenance of masculine hegemony. In S. Birrell & C. L. Cole (Eds.), Women, sport, and culture (pp. 47-64). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Burroughs, A., Ashburn, L., & Seebohm, L. (1995). Add sex and stir: Homophobic coverage of women's cricket in Australia. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, *19*, 266-284.

Cahn, S. K. (1990). Coming on strong: Gender and sexuality in women's sport, 1900-1960. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minnesota.

Cameron, D., & Coates, J. (1989). Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex: Vol. 13-26 (pp. 93-115). London: Longman.

Caplan, P. J., & Caplan, J. B. (1994). Thinking critically about research on sex and gender. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Cejka, M. A., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *25*(4), 413-424.

Coates, J. (1989). Gossip revisited: Language in all-female groups. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex (pp. 100-132). London: Longman.

Cogan, K. D., & Petrie, T. A. (1997). Diversity in sport. In J. L. Van Raalte & B. W. Brewer. (Eds.), Exploring sport and exercise psychology. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Colker, R., & Widom, C. S. (1980). Correlates of female athletic participation: Masculinity, femininity, self-esteem, and attitudes toward women. Sex Roles, *6*(1), 47-58.

- Collins, H. M. (1981). What is TRASP? The radical programme as a methodological imperative. Philosophy of Science, 11, 215-224.
- Coltrane, S. (1998). Gender, power, and emotional expression: Social and historical contexts for a process model of men in marriage and families. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), Men in families: When do they get involved? What difference does it make? (pp. 193-211). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and power. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). Masculinities. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to the famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 80(389-407).
- Crawford, M., & Unger, R. (2000). Women and gender: A feminist psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crowne, D. P. (1979). The experimental study of personality. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24(4), 349-354.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Csizma, K. A., Wittig, A. F., & Schurr, K. T. (1988). Sport stereotypes and gender. Journal of Applied Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10, 62-74.
- Davies, B. (1993). Shards of glass. Children reading and writing beyond gendered identity. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Davies, B. (1997). Constructing and deconstructing masculinities through critical literacy. Gender and Education, 9(1), 9-31.
- Davies, B., & Harre', R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20(1), 43-63.
- Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decades research on gender. American Psychologist, 39, 105-116.
- Deaux, K. (1985). Sex and gender. Annual Review of Psychology, 36, 49-81.

Deaux, K. (1998a). Psychological constructions of masculinity and femininity. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 206-215). New York: McGraw Hill.

Deaux, K. (1998b). Sorry, wrong number-A reply to Gentil's call. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 21-24). New York: McGraw Hill.

Deaux, K. (1999). An overview of research on gender: Four themes from 3 decades. In W. B. J. Swann & J. H. Langlois (Eds.), Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence. (pp. 11-33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Deaux, K., & Lafance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology: Vol. 1 (pp. 788-827). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. Psychological Review, 94(3), 369-389.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1998). A social-psychological model of gender. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 367-389). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Deaux, K., Winston, W., Crowley, M., & Lewis, L. L. (1985). Level of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. Social Cognition, 3, 145-167.

Del Ray, P. (1989). Women, physical activity and sport: Issues related to empowerment. Paper presented at the International Congress on Coach Education, Maccabiah-Wingate Institute for Physical Education and Sport, Netanya, Israel.

Del Ray, P., & Sheppard, S. (1981). Relationship of psychological androgyny in female athletes to self esteem. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 12, 165-175.

Denmark, F., Rabinowitz, V., & Sechzer, J. (2000). Engendering psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Desertrain, G. S., & Weiss, M. R. (1988). Being female and athletic: A cause for conflict? Sex Roles, 18(9/10), 567-582.

Dewar, A., & Horn, T. S. (1992). A critical analysis of knowledge construction in sport psychology. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), Advances in Sport Psychology (pp. 13-23). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity. Theory and Society, 22, 643-657.

Doyle, J. A., & Paludi, M. A. (1995). Sex and gender: The human experience. Madison, WI: WCB Brown & Benchmark.

Dufur, M. J. (1999). Gender and sport. In J. Chafetz Saltzman (Ed.), Handbook of the sociology of gender (pp. 583-599). New York: Kluwer Academic.

Dunford, R. W. (1992). Organisational behaviour: An organisational analysis perspective. Sydney, Australia: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Eagly, A. H. (1998). On comparing women and men. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 93-104). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eble, L. (1999). Classroom talk: How men and women use language differently. Strani Jezici, 28(1), 11-15.

Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. Discourse and Society, 8(2), 203-217.

Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1999). Imagined futures: Young men's talk about fatherhood and domestic life. British Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 181-194.

Edwards, D. (1996). Discourse and cognition. London: Sage.

Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softners, investment, and doing nonliteral. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33(4), 347-373.

Egan, G. (1998). Change agent skills in helping and human service settings. Monterey, California: Brookscole Publishing Company.

Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 39, 203-238.

Ely, R. J. (1995a). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. Academy Management Journal, 38(3), 589-634.

- Ely, R. J. (1995b). The role of dominant identity and experience in organizational work on diversity. In S. E. Jackson & M. N. Ruderman (Eds.), Diversity in work teams (pp. 161-186). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Epstein, C. F. (1988). Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender and the social order. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.
- Evans, R. G. (1982). Clinical relevance of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale: A review and Recommendations. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46(4), 415-425.
- Fiebert, M. S., & Meyer, M. W. (1997). Gender stereotypes: A bias against men. Journal of Psychology, 131(4), 407-410.
- Forman, E. A., & McCormick, D. E. (1995). Discourse analysis: A sociocultural perspective. Remedial and Special Education, 16(3), 150-158.
- Freed, A. F., & Greenwood, A. (1996). Women, men, and type of talk: What makes the difference? Language in Society, 25, 1- 26.
- Gentile, D. A. (1998). Just what are sex and gender anyway? A call for a new terminological standard. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 14-17). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. American Psychologist, 40(3), 266-275.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gerson, J. M., & Peiss, K. (1985). Boundaries, negotiation, consciousness: Reconceptualizing gender relations. Social Problems, 32(4), 317-331.
- Gibbons, J. L., Hamby, B. A., & Dennis, W. D. (1997). Researching gender-role ideologies internationally and cross-culturally. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21, 151-170.
- Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (1984). Opening Pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists discourse. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, D. L. (1993). Psychological, sociological and cultural issues concerning the athletic female. In A. J. Pearl (Ed.), The athletic female (pp. 19-40). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Gill, D. L. (1994a). A feminist perspective on sport psychology practice. The Sport Psychologist, 8, 411-426.

Gill, D. L. (1994b). Psychological perspectives on women in sport and exercise. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives (pp. 253-261). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Gill, D. L. (1995). Gender issues: A social-educational perspective. In S. M. Murphy (Ed.), Sport psychology interventions (pp. 205-234). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Gill, D. L. (1999a). Gender and competitive motivation: From the recreation centre to the Olympic arena. In B. D. (Ed.), Gender and motivation. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 45 (pp. 173-207). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Gill, D. L. (1999b). Gender issues: Making a difference in the real world of sport psychology. In G. G. Brannigan (Ed.), The sport scientists: Research adventures (pp. 133-147). New York: Longman.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). Emergence vs. forcing: The basics of grounded theory analysis. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. Semiotica, 25(1-29).

Goffman, E. (1981). Forms of talk. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Gough, B. (1998). Men and the discursive reproduction of sexism: Repertoires of difference and equality. Feminism and Psychology, 8(1), 25-49.

Gough, B., & Edwards, G. (1998). The beer talking: Four lads, a carry out and the reproduction of masculinities. The Sociological Review, 46(3), 409-436.

Green, R. (1974). Sexual identity problems in children and adults. New York: Basic Books.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. Education Communication and Technology Journal, 29, 75-92.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 30(4), 233-252.

Halbert, C. (1997). Tough enough and women enough: Stereotypes, discrimination, and impression management among women profession boxers. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 21(1), 7-36.

Hall, M. A. (1988). The discourse of gender and sport: From femininity to feminism. Sociology of Sport Journal, 5, 330-340.

Hall, M. A. (1990). How should we theorize gender in the context of sport? In M. A. Messner. & D. F. Sabo. (Eds.), Sport, men and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives (pp. 223-240). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Hall, M. A. (1993). Gender and sport in the 1990's: Feminism, culture, and politics. Sport Science Review, 2(1), 48-68.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), Questions of cultural identity (pp. 1-18). London: SAGE.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1998). Asking the right questions: Feminist psychology and sex differences. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 104-108). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hargreaves, J. (1986). Where's the virtue? Where's the grace? A discussion of the social production of gender relations in and through sport. Theory, Culture, and Society, 3(1), 109-121.

Hargreaves, J. (1993). Gender in the sports agenda. In A. G. Ingham & J. W. Loy (Eds.), Sport in social development. Traditions, transitions, and transformations (pp. 167-185). Champagne, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hargreaves, J. (1994). Sporting females. London: Routledge.

Harmison, R. J., & Petrie, T. A. (1998). Factor analysis of the attitudes toward seeking sport psychology consultation questionnaire (ATSSPCQ): A replication and extension. Paper presented at the 12th annual meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology, Cape Cod, MA.

Harris, M. B., & Griffin, J. (1997). Stereotypes and personal beliefs about women physical education teachers. Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 6(1), 49-83.

Has the fun gone out of it for sad Sam? (1998, January 18). The Sunday Mail, pp. 151.

Helmreich, R., & Spence, J. T. (1977). Sex roles and achievement. In D. M. Landers & R. W. Christina (Eds.), Psychology of motor behavior and sport (Vol. 2, pp. 33-46). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(10), 1631-1644.

Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Wilhelm, J. A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Sex Roles, 7, 1097-1108.

Heritage, J. (1988). Explanations as accounts: A conversation analytic perspective. In C. Antaki (Ed.), Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods (pp. 127-144). London: SAGE.

Hewitt, J. P., & Stokes, R. (1975). Disclaimers. American Sociological Review, 40, 1-11.

Hollway, W. (1989). Subjectivity and method in psychology. London: SAGE.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice (pp. 103-141). London: SAGE.

Hutchins, D. E., & Cole, C. G. (1992). Helping relationships and strategies. (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Jackson, S., & Marsh, H. (1986). Athletic or antisocial?: The female sport experience. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 8, 198-211.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and resource. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), Handbook of discourse analysis (Vol. 3,). London: Academic Press.

Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. Administration Science Quarterly, 24, 602-661.

Katz, E., & Hanegby, R. (1995). Sex-typing of the Israeli female tennis player from theory into practice. Paper presented at the AIESEP World Congress, Netanya, Israel.

Kitzinger, C. (1994). Anti-lesbian harassment. In C. Brant & Y. L. Too (Eds.), Rethinking sexual harassment. London: Pluto Press.

Kishton, J. M., & Dixon, A. C. (1995). Self-perception changes among sports camp participants. Journal of Social Psychology, 135(2), 135-141.

Koivula, N. (1999). Sport participation: Differences in motivation and actual. Journal of Sport Behavior, 22(3), 360-381.

Kolnes, L. J. (1995). Heterosexuality as an organizing principal in women's sport. International Review for Sociology of Sport, 30, 61-79.

Krane, V. (1994). A feminist perspective on contemporary sport psychology research. The Sport Psychologist, 8, 393-410.

Krane, V. (2001). "We can be athletic and feminine", but do we want to? Challenges to femininity and heterosexuality in women's sport. Quest, 53(1), 115-133.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (Revised ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Labov, W. (1990). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. Language Variation and Change, 2(2), 205-254.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and women's place. New York: Harper & Row.

Lamont-Mills, A. (in press). Computer aided qualitative research-A NU*DIST approach. In G. Tenenbaum & H. Haag (Eds.), Research methodology for sport and exercise sciences: A problem-based holistic methodology. London: SAGE.

Lantz, C. D., & Schroeder, P. J. (1999). Endorsement of masculine and feminine gender roles: Differences between participation in and identification with the athletic role. Journal of Sport Behavior, 22(4), 545-548.

Latour, B. (1987). Science in action. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Leahy, T. (1997). Elite athletes anxiety experiences. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Lenny, E. (1991). Sex roles: The measurement of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of personality and psychological attitudes: Volume 1 of measures of social psychological attitudes (pp. 573-661). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lerman, H. (1986). From Freud to feminist personality theory: getting there from here. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 1-18.

Lewis, M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1979). Social cognition and the acquisition of self. New York: Plenum Publishing Corporation.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Lips, H. M. (1993). Women, men, and power. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Maddi, S. R., & Hess, M. J. (1992). Personality hardiness and success in basketball. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21, 21-35.

Magnay, J. (1998, January 17). Faces tell the fortunes as new guard takes over. The Age, pp. 21.

Marecek, J. (1995). Gender, politics and psychology's ways of knowing. American Psychologist, 50(3), 162-163.

Marshall, H., & Wetherell, M. (1989). Talking about career and gender identities: A discourse analysis perspective. In S. Skevington & D. Baker (Eds.), The social identity of women (pp. 106-129). New York: SAGE.

Martin, B. A., & Martin, J. H. (1995). Comparing perceived sex role orientations of the ideal male and female athlete to the ideal male and female person. Journal of Sport Behavior, 18(4), 286-302.

Martin, P. Y. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections of Connell's masculinities. Gender and Society, 12(4), 472-475.

McCloskey, L. A. (1996). Gender and the expression of status in children's mixed-age conversations. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 17(1), 117-133.

McCreary, D. R., & Steinberg, M. (1992). The personal attributes questionnaire in Britain: Establishing construct validity. British Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 369-378.

- McKay, J. (1991). No pain, no gain? Sport and Australian culture. Sydney, Australia: Prentice Hall.
- McKinlay, A., Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1993). Discourse analysis and social representations. In G. M. Breakwell & D. V. Canter (Eds.), Empirical approaches to social representations (pp. 134-156). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- McLennan, W. (1995). Australian social trends. Canberra, Australia: AGPS.
- McLeod, W. T. (1987). The new Collins dictionary and thesaurus in one volume. London: Collins.
- Messner, M. A. (1988). Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. Sociology of Sport Journal, 5, 197-211.
- Messner, M. A., Duncan, M. C., & Jensen, K. (1993). Separating the men from the boys: The gendered language of televised sports. Gender and Society, 7(1), 121-137.
- Miles, M. S., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Miller, J. L., & Levy, G. D. (1996). Gender role conflict, gender typed characteristics, self-concepts, and sport socialization in female athletes and nonathletes. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 35(1-2), 111-123.
- Mischel, W. (1970). Sex-typing and socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology: Vol. 2 (pp. 3-72). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moore, B. (1997). The Australian concise Oxford dictionary: The new Australian standard (3rd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, W. P., & Costill, D. L. (1972). Psychological characteristics of the marathon runner. Journal of Sports Medicine, 21(3), 42-46.
- Morse, J. M. (Ed.). (1992). Qualitative health research. Newbury Park, CA,: Sage Publications.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), Feminists theorize the political (pp. 369-385). New York: Routledge.

- Muczyk, J. P., & Reimann, B. C. (1987). The case for directive leadership. Academy of Management Executive, 1(301-311).
- Mulkay, M. (1981). Action and belief or scientific discourse: A possible way of ending intellectual vassalage in social studies of science. Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 11, 163-171.
- Murray, S. (1996). "We all love Charles" Men in child care and the social construction of gender. Gender and Society, 10(4), 368-385.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nordstrom, C. R., Huffaker, B. J., & Williams, K. B. (1998). When physical disabilities are not liabilities: The role of applicant and interviewer characteristics on employment interview outcomes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28(4), 283-306.
- Nunan, D. (1993). Introducing discourse analysis. London: Penguin Books.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oglesby, C. A. (1978). Women in sport: From myth to reality. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Oglesby, C. A. (1984). Interactions between gender identity and sport. In J. M. Silva III & R. S. Weinberg. (Eds.), Psychological foundations of sport (pp. 387-399). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Oglesby, C. A., & Hill, K. L. (1993). Gender and sport. In R. N. Singer, M. Murphy, & L. K. Tennant (Eds.), Handbook of research on sport psychology (pp. 718-728). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Orbach, I., & Mikulincer, M. (1996). Repressive coping styles and the architecture of emotion-related memories: Is their relationship that simple? British Journal of Social Psychology, 35(4), 459-472.
- Orlick, T. (1980). In pursuit of excellence. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- O'Sullivan, L. F. (1995). Less is more: The effects of sexual experience on judgments of men's and women's personality characteristics and relationship desirability. Sex Roles, 33(3-4), 159-181.

- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press Inc.
- Peters, P. (1995). The Cambridge Australian English style guide. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pirinen, R. M. (1997). The construction of women's positions in sport: A textual analysis of articles on female athletes in Finnish women's magazines. Sociology of Sport Journal, 14, 290-301.
- Plaisted, V. (1995). Gender and sport. In T. Morris & J. Summers (Eds.), Sport psychology: Theory, applications and issues (pp. 538-574). Brisbane, Australia: John Wiley and Sons.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A new way of legitimating claims. Human Studies, 9, 219-230.
- Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. New York: Basic Books.

Potter, J. (1996a). Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: Theoretical background. In J. T. E. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research methods for psychology and the social sciences (pp. 125-140). London: The British Psychological Society.

Potter, J. (1996b). Representing realities: Discourse, rhetoric, and social construction. London: SAGE.

Potter, J. (1997). Discourse and critical social psychology. In T. Ibanez & L. Iniguez (Eds.), Critical social psychology (pp. 55-66). London: SAGE.

Potter, J. (1998). Discursive social psychology: From attitudes to evaluative practices. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), European review of social psychology (pp. 233-266). London: John Wiley & Sons.

Potter, J., Edwards, D., & Wetherell, M. (1993). A model of discourse in action. American Behavioral Scientist, 36(3), 383-401.

Potter, J., & Mulkay, M. (1982). Making theory useful: Utility accounting in social psychologists. Fundamenta Scientiae, 34, 259-278.

Potter, J., & Reicher, S. (1987). Discourses of community and conflict: The organization of social categories in accounts of a 'riot'. British Journal of Social Psychology, 26, 25-40.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and social psychology. London: SAGE.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995a). Discourse analysis. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré, & L. V. Langenhove (Eds.), Rethinking methods in psychology (pp. 80-92). London: SAGE Publications.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995b). NATURAL ORDER why social psychologists should study (a constructed version of) natural language, and why they have not done so. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 14(1-2), 216-222.

Qualitative Solutions Research Pty Ltd. (1997). QSR NUD*IST 4 user guide. Melbourne, Australia: Qualitative Solutions Research Pty Ltd.

Rasch, P. J., & Kroll, W. (1964). What research tells the coach about wrestling. Reston, VA: AAHPERD.

Reilly, T. (1979). What research tells the coach about soccer. Reston, VA: AAHPERD.

Rollins, J. H. (1996). Women's minds women's bodies: The psychology of women in a biosocial context. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on conversation. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. Journal of Extension, 37(2), 1-5.

Sarantakos, S. (1998). Social research. Melbourne, Australia: MacMillan Publishers.

Sherif, C. W. (1982). Needed concepts in the study of gender identity. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6, 375-398.

Shields, S. A. (1998). Gender is the psychology of emotion: A selective research review. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 376-389). New York: McGraw Hill.

Shifren, K., Furnham, A., & Bauserman, R. L. (1998). Instrumental and expressive traits and eating attitudes: A replication across American and British students. Personality and Individual Differences, 25, 1-17.

Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J. (1988). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spears, B. (1978). Prologue: The myth. In C. A. Oglesby (Ed.), Women in sport: From myth to reality (pp. 3-15). Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger.

Speer, S. (2000). Reconsidering the concept of hegemonic masculinity: Discursive, conversation analysis, and participants' orientations. Feminism and Psychology, 11(1), 107-135.

Speer, S. A., & Potter, J. (2000). The management of heterosexist talk: Conversational resources and prejudiced claims. Discourse and Society, 11(4), 543-572.

Spence, J. T. (1984). Gender identity and its implications for concepts of masculinity and femininity. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation 1984: Psychology and gender: Vol. 32. (pp. 59-96). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for multifactorial theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *64*, 624-635.

Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. (1995). Masculinity and femininity: Defining the undefinable. In P. J. Kalbfleisch & M. J. Cody (Eds.), Gender, power, and communication in human relationships (pp. 105-138). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. E. (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes. Psychology of Women Quarterly, *24*, 44-62.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1979). The many faces of androgyny: A reply to Locksley and Colten. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *37*(6), 1032-1046.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behaviors. Psychology of Women Quarterly, *5*(2), 147-163.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *32*, 29-39.

Spender, D. (1980). Man-made language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stevens, J. (1992). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Human groups and social categories. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Tannen, D. (1994). Gender and discourse. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, J. (1984). Studies in the theory of ideology. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Tindall, C. (1994). Issues of evaluation. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor, & C. Tindall (Eds.), Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide (pp. 142-159). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Trew, K. (1998). Identity and the self. In K. Trew & J. Kremer (Eds.), Gender and psychology (pp. 1-14). London: Arnold.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Turner, J., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Unger, R. (1983). Through the looking glass: No wonderland yet! (The reciprocal relationship between methodology and models of reality). Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8, 9-32.

Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. American Psychologist, 34(11), 1085-1094.

Unger, R. K., & Crawford, M. (1998). Commentary: Sex and gender-the troubled relationship between terms and concepts. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes (pp. 18-21). New York: McGraw Hill.

Vaughan, G., & Hogg, M. (1995). An introduction to social psychology. Sydney, Australia: Prentice Hall.

Vealey, R. S. (1997). Transforming the silence on lesbians in sport: Suggested directions for theory and research in sport psychology. Journal of Women in Sport and Physical Activity, 6, 165-188.

Vella-Brodrick, D. A., & White, V. (1997). Response set of social desirability in relation to the mental, physical and spiritual well being scale. Psychological Reports, 81(1), 127-130.

Watson, P. J., Milliron, J. T., & Morris, R. J. (1995). Social desirability scales and theories of suicide: Correlations with alienation and self-consciousness. Personality and Individual Differences, 18(6), 701-711.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. Gender and Society, 1(125-151).

Wetherell, M. (1997). Linguistic repertoires and literary criticism: New directions for a social psychology of gender. In M. M. Gergen & S. N. Davis (Eds.), Toward a new psychology of gender (pp. 149-167). New York: Routledge.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. Discourse and Society, 9(3), 387-412.

Wetherell, M. (1999). Discursive psychology and psychoanalysis: Theorising masculine subjectivities. Paper presented at the Millennium World Conference of Critical Psychology, Sydney.

Wetherell, M. (in press). Discourse analysis. In C. Davidson & T. M (Eds.), An introduction to social research in New Zealand. Auckland, New Zealand: Addison Wesley Longman.

Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psych-discursive practices. Feminism and Psychology, 9(3), 335-356.

Wetherell, M., & Maybin, J. (1996). The distributed self: A social constructionist perspective. In R. Stevens (Ed.), Understanding the self (pp. 220-279). London: SAGE.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In C. Antaki (Ed.), Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods (pp. 168-183). London: SAGE Publications.

Wetherell, M., Stiven, H., & Potter, J. (1987). Unequal egalitarianism: A preliminary study of discourses concerning gender and employment opportunities. British Journal of Social Psychology, 26(1), 59-71.

Wheaton, B., & Tomlinson, A. (1998). The changing gender order in sport? The case of windsurfing subcultures. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 23(3), 252-274.

Wieder, L. (1974). Language and social reality. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Wilkinson, S., & Kiltzinger, C. (1995). Introduction. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kiltzinger (Eds.), Feminism and discourse: Psychological perspectives (pp. 1-9). London: SAGE.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). Measuring sex stereotypes: A multinational study. (Revised ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1994). Cross-cultural views of women and men. In W. J. Lonner & R. Malpass. (Eds.), Psychology and culture. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Williams, J. E., Satterwhite, R. C., & Best, D. L. (1999). Pancultural gender stereotypes revisited: The five factor model. Sex Roles, 40(7-8), 513-525.

Wills, G. (1998). John Wayne's America: Touchstone Books.

Wittig, A. F., & Schurr, K. T. (1994). Psychological characteristics of women volleyball players: Relationships with injuries, rehabilitation, and team success. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 322-330.

Women in Sport Unit, (1998). Australian women in sport and recreation strategy. Canberra, Australia: Australian Sports Commission.

Women in Sport Unit. (1999). Active women: national policy on women and girls in sport, recreation, and physical activity. Canberra, Australia: Australian Sports Commission.

Wood, J. (1994). Gendered lives: Communication, gender, and culture. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wooffitt, R. (1992). Telling the tales of the unexpected: The organisation of factual discourse. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wright, J. (1997). Engaging the personal, political, and pedagogical to reconstruct gender in physical education and sport. Changing Education: A Journal for Teachers and Administrators, 4(2-3), 23-24.

Wrisberg, C. A. (1988). Self perceptions of male and female collegiate basketball coaches. Paper presented at the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Cincinnati.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context, and interaction. In S. W. C. Antaki (Ed.), Identities in talk (pp. 87-106). London: SAGE.

APPENDIX A

A.1	Personal Attributes Questionnaire.....	377
A.2.	Personal Attributes Questionnaire – Scoring Sheet	379
A.3	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	381
A.4	Personal Reaction Inventory – Scoring Sheet	383
A.5	Semi-structured Interview Guide	385
A.6	PAQ Imposed Items Across Identities	390
A.7	A-priori Coding	393
A.8	Recruitment Letter.....	394
A.9	Document Header Information.....	399

A.1 Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a *pair* of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:

Not at all Artistic A....B....C....D....E Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics-that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a letter, which describes where *you* fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose A. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose D. If you are only medium, you might choose C, and so forth.

Scale

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Not at all aggressive | A....B....C....D....E | Very aggressive |
| 2. Not at all independent | A....B....C....D....E | Very independent |
| 3. Not at all emotional | A....B....C....D....E | Very emotional |
| 4. Very submissive | A....B....C....D....E | Very dominant |
| 5. Not at all excitable
in a major crisis | A....B....C....D....E | Very excitable in a
major crisis |
| 6. Very passive | A....B....C....D....E | Very active |
| 7. Not at all able to devote
self completely to others | A....B....C....D....E | Able to devote self
completely to others |
| 8. Very rough | A....B....C....D....E | Very gentle |
| 9. Not at all helpful to others | A....B....C....D....E | Very helpful to
others |
| 10. Not at all competitive | A....B....C....D....E | Very competitive |
| 11. Very home orientated | A....B....C....D....E | Very worldly |
| 12. Not at all kind | A....B....C....D....E | Very kind |

13. Indifferent to others' approval	A....B....C....D....E	Highly needful of others' approval
14. Feelings not easily hurt	A....B....C....D....E	Feelings easily hurt
15. Not at all aware of feelings of others	A....B....C....D....E	Very aware of feelings of others
16. Can make decisions easily	A....B....C....D....E	Has difficulty making decisions
17. Gives up very easily	A....B....C....D....E	Never gives up easily
18. Never cries	A....B....C....D....E	Cries very easily
19. Not at all self confident	A....B....C....D....E	Very self confident
20. Feels very inferior	A....B....C....D....E	Feels very superior
21. Not at all understanding of others	A....B....C....D....E	Very understanding of others
22. Very cold in relations with others	A....B....C....D....E	Very warm in relations with others
23. Very little need for security	A....B....C....D....E	Very strong need for security
24. Goes to pieces under pressure	A....B....C....D....E	Stands up well under pressure

A.2. Personal Attributes Questionnaire – Scoring Sheet***Scale**

M-F Not at all aggressive	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very aggressive</i> **
M Not at all independent	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very independent</i>
F Not at all emotional	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very emotional</i>
M-F Very submissive	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very dominant</i>
M-F <i>Not at all excitable in a major crisis</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Very excitable in a major crisis
M Very passive	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very active</i>
F Not at all able to devote self completely to others	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Able to devote self completely to others</i>
F Very rough	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very gentle</i>
F Not at all helpful to others	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very helpful to others</i>
M Not at all competitive	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very competitive</i>
M-F Very home orientated	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very worldly</i>
F Not at all kind	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very kind</i>
M-F <i>Indifferent to others' approval</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Highly needful of others' approval
M-F <i>Feelings not easily hurt</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Feelings easily hurt
F Not at all aware of feelings of others	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very aware of feelings of others</i>
M <i>Can make decisions easily</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Has difficulty making decisions
M Gives up very easily	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Never gives up easily</i>
M-F <i>Never cries</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Cries very easily

M Not at all self confident	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very self confident</i>
M Feels very inferior	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Feels very superior</i>
F Not at all understanding of others	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very understanding of others</i>
F Very cold in relations with others	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Very warm in relations with others</i>
M-F <i>Very little need for security</i>	A....B....C....D....E	Very strong need for security
M Goes to pieces under pressure	A....B....C....D....E	<i>Stands up well under pressure</i>

* The scale to which each item is assigned is indicated below by M (Masculinity), F (Femininity) and M-F (Masculinity-Femininity).

** Italics indicate the extreme masculine response for the M and M-F scales and the extreme feminine response for the F scale. Each extreme masculine response in the M and M-F scales and extreme feminine response on the F scale are scored 4, the next most extreme score is 3, etc.

E = 4 D = 3 C = 2 B = 1 A = 0

Spence, J. T., and Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlation and antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. Reproduced with the kind permission of the authors.

A.3 Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability ScalePersonal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is TRUE or FALSE as it pertains to you personally.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|
| 1. | Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all candidates. | T | F |
| 2. | I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. | T | F |
| 3. | It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. | T | F |
| 4. | I have never intensely disliked someone. | T | F |
| 5. | On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. | T | F |
| 6. | I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. | T | F |
| 7. | I am always careful about my manner of dress | T | F |
| 8. | My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. | T | F |
| 9. | If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. | T | F |
| 10. | On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. | T | F |
| 11. | I like to gossip at times. | T | F |
| 12. | There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. | T | F |
| 13. | No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. | T | F |
| 14. | I can remember 'playing sick' to get out of something. | T | F |
| 15. | There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. | T | F |
| 16. | I'm always willing to admit it when I made a mistake. | T | F |
| 17. | I always try to practice what I preach. | T | F |
| 18. | I don't find it particularly difficult to get along, with loud-mouthed obnoxious people. | T | F |
| 19. | I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. | T | F |
| 20. | When I don't know something I don't mind at all admitting it. | T | F |
| 21. | I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. | T | F |
| 22. | At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. | T | F |
| 23. | There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. | T | F |

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings. T F
25. I never resent being asked to return a favour. T F
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. T F
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. T F
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. T F
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell people off. T F
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me. T F
31. I have never felt that I was punished without a cause. T F
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. T F
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. T F

A.4 Personal Reaction Inventory – Scoring Sheet

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 1. | Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all candidates. | T |
| 2. | I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. | T |
| 3. | It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. | F |
| 4. | I have never intensely disliked someone. | T |
| 5. | On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. | F |
| 6. | I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. | F |
| 7. | I am always careful about my manner of dress | T |
| 8. | My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. | T |
| 9. | If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. | F |
| 10. | On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. | F |
| 11. | I like to gossip at times. | F |
| 12. | There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. | F |
| 13. | No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. | T |
| 14. | I can remember 'playing sick' to get out of something. | F |
| 15. | There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. | F |
| 16. | I'm always willing to admit it when I made a mistake. | T |
| 17. | I always try to practice what I preach. | T |
| 18. | I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with, loud-mouthed obnoxious people. | T |
| 19. | I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. | F |
| 20. | When I don't know something I don't mind at all admitting it. | T |
| 21. | I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. | T |
| 22. | At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. | F |
| 23. | There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. | F |
| 24. | I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings. | T |
| 25. | I never resent being asked to return a favour. | T |
| 26. | I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. | T |
| 27. | I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. | T |
| 28. | There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. | F |
| 29. | I have almost never felt the urge to tell people off. | T |

- 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me. **F**
- 31. I have never felt that I was punished without a cause. **T**
- 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. **F**
- 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings **T**

Scoring instructions: Match = 1, Non-match = 0.

Crowne, D. P., and Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of pathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24 (4), 349-354.

Reproduced with kind permission of the authors.

A.5 Semi-structured Interview Guide

Thank you (name) for your time today. You've read the information sheet and signed the consent form so you know a little bit about what we will talk about today. Basically I'm looking at how elite athletes like yourself, see yourself as in sport and whether this influences your performances. What's important is that you tell me honestly, no holds barred. I'm interested in hearing your thoughts, your ideas, your views, not what you think I want to hear. There are no right or wrong answers, the only answers are from you. This is your chance to tell it like it is, if you like. If anything doesn't make sense, just ask me, it means that I'm not being clear. Sometimes I may ask you to tell me more about something, or ask you to say something again, give me some examples. This doesn't mean that you have done anything wrong, it just means that I haven't quite understood what you were saying and I'm asking to get a better understanding of your point of view.

Because it's important that I understand your views, thoughts and ideas, I will be tape recording what we talk about. This way I can listen to you without missing anything. I may still take some notes, they'll probably be reminders to myself to ask you something later. If you don't want to answer any question, just say so, I'll respect your decision and we'll just move on to the next.

When I transcribe the tapes I will be erasing any names of people that you may mention, including yours, any sporting references and any other information that might possibly identify you. When I look at what you've said later I'll be giving you a number so I'll be the only one who will know who said what, when. Is this ok? Any questions?

Demographics

We'll start with some basic information questions - it's really to get me used to talking to you and you used to talking to me, Ok? First we'll start with some questions about you and ----- (sport).

First -Tell me a little about how you got started in ----- (sport). Why did you start playing?

Approximately how long have you been playing?

What is the highest level of ----(sport) that you have reached as a player?

Approximately, how long have you been a State level athlete?

Approximately how long have you been a National level athlete?

Your birth date is?

So you are how old?

What is your occupation/job?

Are you still at school/studying?

If left, what level/year did you leave school?

What are you studying? Course, level.

Nationality?

Do you coach as well in your sport? NCAS?

Marital status?

Overseas playing experience?

Questions

Personal Identity

If you were to describe yourself to another person, how would you do this?

Tell me more about what you mean.

Gender Identity

In general if you were to describe yourself as a man/woman to another person, how would you do this?

Tell me about what you mean.

Man/woman differences general

Ok, what are your thoughts about differences between men and women in general?

Can you give me some examples?

How long would this last?

How do you deal with this?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical man?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical woman?

Sporting Gender Identity

If you were to describe yourself as a man/woman in elite sport to another person, how would you do this?

Tell me more about what you mean.

How long would this last?
How do you deal with this?

Man/woman differences in sport

What are your thoughts about differences between men and women in elite sport?
Can you give me some examples?
How long would this last?
How do you deal with this?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical elite female athlete? the typical elite male athlete?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical elite female coach? the typical elite male coach?

Being man/woman and effect in sport

Would you describe for me the ways in which being a man/woman has affected you at the elite sporting level?
Tell me more what you mean?

Negative effect

How has being a man/woman been a hindrance (use term they use) to you at the elite sporting level?
Tell me more about this.
Can you give me some examples?
How long would this last?
How do you deal with this?

Positive effect

How has being a woman/man has been a help to you at the elite sporting level?
Tell me more about what you mean.
How long would this last?
How do you deal with this?
Based on what you've said, how well do you think you fit in being a man/woman at the elite sporting level?

Importance of self as man/woman

Is being a man/woman an important part of yourself?
How is being a man/woman an important part of yourself?
Tell me more about what you mean.

Masculine/Feminine Identity

We've talked about name the person, the man/woman, now I want to ask you about "you" as masculine/feminine. (if not mention masculine/feminine)

In general if you were to describe yourself as masculine or feminine to another person, how would you do this?

Tell me about this

How long would this last?

How do you deal with this?

So you would consider yourself to be a masculine or feminine person?

Masculine/feminine differences general

Ok what are your thoughts about differences between a masculine person and a feminine person?

Can you give me some examples?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical masculine person? the typical feminine person?

Sporting Masculine/Feminine Identity

If you were to describe yourself as masculine or feminine person in elite sport to another person how would you do this?

Tell me more about what you mean.

How long would this last?

How do you deal with this?

So you would consider yourself to be a masculine or feminine person in sport?

Masculine/feminine differences in sport

What do you think someone who is masculine brings to the elite sporting level?

Can you give me some examples?

Ok, what do you think someone who is feminine brings to the elite sporting level?

Can you give me some examples?

Would you describe for me your idea of the typical masculine elite athlete? the typical feminine elite athlete?

Importance of self as masculine/feminine

So is being masculine/feminine an important part of yourself?

How is being masculine/feminine an important part of yourself?

Tell me more about what you mean.

Occupational Identity

You've described (name) the person, if you were to describe yourself as an elite athlete to another person how would you do this?

Tell me more about what you mean?

Can you give me some examples

Importance of self as athlete

Last of all is being an elite athlete an important part of yourself?

How is being an elite athlete an important part of yourself?

Tell me more about what you mean

Conclusions

Thank you very much for sharing with me your thoughts and views. Before we stop are there any other things that you would like to add that would throw some more light on how being a man or a woman has shaped your sporting experiences? How sport has shaped your experiences of being a man or a woman?

Are there any questions that you have about what we have talked about?

How are you feeling about what we raised today?

What happens now? I'll transcribe our talk and if there are any questions that I have I'll give you a call. If not as soon as I've finished talking to other coaches and athletes, I'll send you out a summary of what people thought was important.

Ok?

A.6 PAQ Imposed Items for Questions One, Two, and Six

Note items include synonymous words as well as PAQ items.

PAQ Masculine-Feminine sub-scale items search

Aggressive

Words searched – aggressive, aggression, assertive, bold, dynamic, forceful, pushy, vigorous

Dominant

Words searched – authoritative, commanding, controlling, control, leading

Need for approval

Word searched – approval

Never Cries

Words searched – cries, cry, cried, teary, tears, tear

Not at all excitable in a major crisis

Words searched – excitable, edgy, nervous, boisterous, calm, cool

Feelings not easily hurt

Words searched – hurt, feelings hurt

Very worldly

Words searched – home, homey, orientated, worldly

Little need for security

Words searched – security, secure

PAQ Feminine sub-scale items search

Aware of feelings of others

Words searched - aware, empathetic, sympathetic

Emotional

Words searched - excited, emotional, emotions, demonstrative, excitable, passionate, sensitive, sentimental, tender, temperamental, affectionate

Able to devote self completely to others

Words searched - devote, committed, loyal, faithful, steadfast, true

Gentle

Words searched - gentle, compassionate, kind, quiet, soft, sweet-tempered, tender

Very helpful to others

Words searched - helpful, accommodating, supportive, sympathetic

Very kind

Words searched - kind, thoughtful, understanding, generous, obliging

Very understanding of others

Words searched - understanding, accepting, compassionate, discerning, forgiving, kindly, patient, perceptive, responsive, sensitive, sympathetic, tolerant

Very warm in relations to others

Words searched - warm, affectionate, friendly, happy, cheerful, pleasant, cordial, generous

PAQ Masculine sub-scale items search

Very active

Words searched - doing, busy, involved, occupied, energetic, active

Very competitive

Words searched - competition, competitive, compete

Very self confident

Words searched - assured, fearless, poised, secure, confident, sure, self reliant, confidence, self belief

Very independent

Words searched - self-contained, free, autonomous, independent, independence

Never gives up easily

Words searched - tenacious, adamant, stubborn, dedicated, determined, dogged, persistent, resolute, strong willed

Feels very superior

Words searched - superior, expert, better, greater, higher, cocky

Stands up well under pressure

Words searched - control, calm, pressure, apathetic, cold, cool, impassive, indifferent, reserved, unexcitable, unfeeling, unimpressionable, unresponsive

Can make decisions easily

Words searched - decisive, decisions, make mind up

A.7 A-priori Coding

The text was coded using the following method. First the text was searched by N4 for PAQ items and synonymous words. The results of these search hits (words in the text that were seen by N4 as matching the PAQ items or synonymous words) were then checked using a modified version of the Glaser and Strauss (1960) constant comparative method. Here the N4 hits from each search were compared with each other to determine if they captured the same underlying concepts or items (e.g., emotional vs. excitable as possible hits for the F sub-scale item emotional) or if they were capturing differing concepts (e.g., emotional vs. sensitive, emotional hit for F sub-scale item emotional, sensitive hit for F sub-scale item awareness of others feelings). Those N4 hits that were seen as not representative of the PAQ item were discarded, and those items that were seen as representative of a differing item were coded under the appropriate node. This procedure was followed for all questions analysed in this thesis.

In addition to the above, the text was read through to identify any other possible common features associated with the PAQ items that may have been missed by the imposed N4 search. The results of these read-through searches were included under the sub-scale item node and were treated the same as the above imposed text search results. Content analysis has been criticised for not being sensitive to the surrounding text and for being at risk of taking data out of context, thus increasing the possibility of making misleading interpretations [Krane, 1994 #170; Potter, 1996 #232]. To address this search hits were compared as de-contextualised text that is independent of the surrounding text or response. Then they were compared as contextualised text where the hit was considered within the surrounding text or response. This was done to enhance the trustworthiness and rigour of the data coding and analysis process. The constant comparison method alternated between both de-contextualised and contextualised text and was repeated until no changes were made to the item in question in either text styles.

A.8 Recruitment Letter

(name)
(address)
(date)

Dear (name)

My name is Andrea Lamont-Mills and I am doing my PhD at the University of Southern Queensland in Sport Psychology. (Director), (Section Manager), and (Coach) (Coach omitted if participant was the coach) have given me their permission to contact you in regards to asking you to participate in my PhD research with the (Institute of Sport) actively supporting this research project. Your name was randomly selected from the (Institute squad) (sentence omitted if participant was a coach).

My research is looking at how being a female/male athlete/coach may contribute to shaping your experiences as a (athlete/coach) and how sport may contribute to shaping how you see yourself as a woman/man. I am also asking male/female athletes as well as female and male coaches, how they feel being a male or female may have contributed to shaping their sporting experiences.

Please read the enclosed information sheet/consent form as this will tell you a little bit more about what I am looking at and what you would be required to do. If you would like to participate please sign the consent form in the four places and return the consent form to me in the envelope enclosed. Please note that the data collection interview should only take about one and a quarter hours.

I will be contacting you in about a week to discuss with you any questions that you may have about this request. If you have any questions before this time please don't hesitate to ring me on one of the numbers below. I do hope that you will participate in this important research and look forward to speaking with you soon.

Yours sincerely

Andrea Lamont-Mills
Department of Psychology
University of Southern Queensland
PO Darling Heights
Toowoomba
QLD AUSTRALIA 4350

ph - 07 46 31 1730
mobile - 041 163 9143
fax - 07 46 31 2721 Email - lamontm@usq.edu.au

INFORMATION SHEET/CONSENT FORM - STUDY 1

This study is part of a series of Doctoral level studies focusing on how you see yourself as a person and as an athlete/coach in sport. Your participation is being sought for this study about your experiences and your feelings of being a female elite athlete. Your participation is voluntary and you are under no personal or sporting obligation to participate. The (Institutes of Sport), have all given their support and approval to this research project.

What do you need to do?

I will ask you some questions about how you have felt in the past and currently feel about being an elite athlete/coach, and some questions about your past experiences and current experiences as an elite athlete/coach. I would like you to answer honestly, openly and frankly. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your thoughts and feelings, not what you think I want to hear. What is most important is that it is your experiences and your feelings as an elite athlete/coach. Sometimes I may ask you to tell me more about something you have said or ask for some examples to help me better understand what you have said. This doesn't mean that you have done anything wrong, it simply means that I haven't quite understood what you were saying and I ask these questions to better understand your point of view. I will be audiotaping our conversation so that I do not miss anything that we discuss. I may also contact you at a later date in order to follow up what was discussed in our interview.

If at anytime you do not want to answer any particular question please say so. I will respect your decision and there will be no recourse or recrimination should you decline to answer.

You will also be required to rate a number of sports in terms of their masculinity and femininity, how socially acceptable is it for men and women to participate in these various sports, and how likely you think it would be for men and women to participate in each sport. Both the interview and the rating should take only about 2 hours of your time.

What you need to know?

Sometimes when we talk about our experiences and feelings it can bring up some unpleasant thoughts and feelings. If talking about being an elite athlete/coach causes you discomfort, anxiety or distress, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact me, a trusted friend, your doctor or psychologist to talk to someone about how you feel.

If you feel that answering a question may cause you discomfort, distress or anxiety, please feel free to decline to answer. I will respect your decision and there will be no recourse or recrimination. Further if you feel that participation may cause you discomfort, distress or anxiety, you may withdraw your participation at anytime without recourse or recrimination.

What the study will tell us

With your help this study will be used to develop some practices that will help athletes and coaches to better maximise their athletic/coaching potential. Further, this study will be used to help sporting organisations, coaches, athletes, managers, medical staff, psychologists and other professionals to become more aware and sensitive to the experiences, feelings, expectations and pressures that athletes face when competing at the elite level.

What the study will NOT tell us

This study will not determine your athletic/coaching ability or potential ability. Furthermore it will not identify any underlying psychological abilities or disabilities that you may have.

Can you be identified?

The information that you provide will be used for educational purposes only. All identifying information will be kept strictly confidential and can only be accessed by myself or my supervisor, Associate Professor Grace Pretty. Any references that you make to people, places, sporting events, general events, or sports that could be used to identify you, will be removed prior to data analysis to ensure your anonymity. All information will be used for educational purposes only. Parts of our conversation may be used for educational purposes. If this occurs all identifying information will be removed prior to inclusion.

If you have any questions, about this study or and if something has not been made clear, please feel free to contact me. If at anytime should you change your mind about participating in this study, you may withdraw from the study or withdraw any data supplied without recourse or recrimination.

What do you need to do now?

If you would like to participate in this study please sign the consent form on page 3 and page 4 and return page 3 and page 4 to me in the envelope provided. I will be contacting you after this to arrange a suitable time for us to talk.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT

Participant's Name (capitals): _____

Project: The construction of gender in Australian elite sporting contexts

Name of Researcher: Andrea Lamont-Mills

- 1 I consent to participate in the above project, the particulars of which, including details of procedures which have been explained to me on page 1 and page 2 of the information sheet/participant consent form.
- 2 I authorise the researcher to use with me the procedures outlined on page 1 and page 3 of the information sheet/participant consent form.
- 3 I acknowledge and understand that:
 - a) I have been informed that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study, withdraw any data supplied, or decline to answer any question at anytime as outlined on page 2 of the information sheet/participant consent form.
 - b) I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded as outlined on page 2 of the information sheet/participant consent form.
 - c) That I have been given an information sheet and that I have read and understood said sheet as outlined on page 1 and page 2 of the information sheet/participant consent form.

Participant

Date

4. I acknowledge and give my permission for the following conversation between myself and Andrea Lamont-Mills to be audiotaped and transcribed as per page 1 of the information sheet/participant consent form.

Participant

Date

5. I acknowledge and give my permission for Andrea Lamont-Mills to contact me at a later date - if necessary, to explore further what will be discussed in our interview as per page 1 of the information sheet/participant consent form.

Participant	Date
-------------	------

6 I acknowledge and give my permission for Andrea Lamont-Mills to use any part of our conversation verbatim, for educational purposes only. I acknowledge and understand that any potential identifying information will be removed before this occurs as per page 2 of the information sheet/consent form.

Participant	Date
-------------	------

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the information sheet (page 1 and page 2) or the consent form (page 3 and page 4) please feel free to give me a call on the following:

(07) 4631 2061 (work) (07) 4635 5125 (home) (041) 163 9143
(mobile)

Yours sincerely

Andrea Lamont-Mills
Department of Psychology
University of Southern Queensland
PO Darling Heights
Qld 4350

PLEASE RETURN THIS CONSENT FORM IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED. THANKYOU.

A.9 Document Header Information

The following header information was used to summarise participants' demographic information. The abbreviations were given by the researcher and are somewhat consistent with the discursive literature.

Header information

e.g., S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/FTA/A/S/O/T/And

S1 = study 1

S1/FA = female athlete

Other abbreviations used:

FC = female coach

MA = male athlete

MC = male coach

S1/FA/FM = competing against or coaching women in male dominated sport (80% or more of the total number of participants are men)

Other abbreviations used:

MM = male competing against or coaching men in male dominated sport (80% or more of the total number of participants are men)

FXMX or **MXFX** = coaching both men and women who compete in a mixed sport (less than 80% of participants are men)

FF = female competing against or coaching women in female dominated sport (80% or more of the total number of participants are women)

MX = male competing against or coaching men in a mixed sport (less than 80% of participants are men)

FX = female competing against or coaching women in a mixed sport (less than 80% of participants are men)

XX = competing or coaching in a sport where both men and women participate against each other

FMMM = coaching both men and women who compete in a male dominated sport (80% or more of participants are men)

FO = female competing or coaching women in a women's only sport (no men participate at a competitive level)

S1/FA/FM/1 = identification number

S1/FA/FM/1/25 = age

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4 = number of years competing in the sport

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3 = years as a National level athlete

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2 = years as an International level athlete

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA** = full-time athlete

Other abbreviations:

FTC = full-time coach

PTC = part-time coach (employed on a part-time contract)

PTA = part-time athlete (part of income is generated from being an athlete)

FTS = full-time student

Other = other occupations

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA/A** = place of birth Australian

Other abbreviations:

NZ = New Zealand

UK = United Kingdom

EUROPEAN = European

USA = North American

SOUTH PACIFIC = South Pacific

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA/A/S** = marital status single

Other abbreviations:

M = married

DE FACTO = de facto

Sep = Separated

WIDOW = widow

Div = divorced

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA/A/S/O** = NCAS level

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA/A/S/O/T** = education level tertiary

Other abbreviations:

S = secondary

TAFE = Technical college

S1/FA/FM/1/25/4/3/2/**FTA/A/S/O/T/And** = Androgynous PAQ classification based on participants medians

Other abbreviations:

Mas = Masculine

Fem = Feminine

Undiff = Undifferentiated

APPENDIX B

B.1 Demographic Data..... 402
B.2 Assumption Testing – Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale..... 404
B.3 Assumption Testing – Personal Attributes Questionnaire 405

B.1 Demographic Data

Table Appendix B.1a

Shapiro Wilk Test of Normality for Age and Years of Participation in Sport as a Function of Sex

Variables	Sex	Statistic	df	p
Years as coach/athlete	Women	.933	38	.039
	Men	.955	37	.249
Years at national level	Women	.889	38	.010*
	Men	.887	37	.010*
Years at international	Women	.752	38	.010*
	Men	.875	37	.010*
Age	Women	.916	38	.010*
	Men	.910	37	.010*

Note: * This is an upper bound of the true significance.

Number of Women = 38, Number of Men = 37.

Table Appendix B.1b

Shapiro Wilk Test of Normality for Age and Years of Participation in Sport as a Function of Occupation

Variables	Occupation	Statistic	df	p
Years as coach/athlete	Coach	.951	38	.162
	Athlete	.955	37	.253
Years at national level	Coach	.818	38	.010*
	Athlete	.909	37	.010*
Years at international	Coach	.767	38	.010*
	Athlete	.842	37	.010*
Age	Coach	.962	38	.356
	Athlete	.846	37	.010*

Note: * This is an upper bound of the true significance.

Number of Coaches = 38, Number of Athletes = 37

Table Appendix B.1c

Levine's Test for Equality of Variances for Age and Years of Participation in Sport as a Function of Sex

Variables	F	p
Age	.206	.652
Years as coach/athlete	2.675	.106
Years at national Level	5.627	.020*
Years at international	.189	.665

Note: * Homogeneity of variance violated.

Table Appendix B.1d

Levine's Test for Equality of Variances for Age and Years of Participation in Sport as a Function of Occupation

Variables	F	p
Age	2.643	.108
Years as a coach or athlete	4.665	.034*
Years at National Level	.777	.381
Years at international	.222	.639

Note: * Homogeneity of variance violated.

B.2 Assumption Testing – Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Table Appendix B.2a

Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality for Social Desirability Responding as a Function of Occupation and Sex

Variable	Status	Statistic	df	p
Sex	Coach	.627	38	.010*
	Athlete	.628	37	.010*

Note: * This is an upper bound of the true significance.

B.3 Assumption Testing – Personal Attributes QuestionnaireUnivariate Homogeneity of Variance Tests

Variable Masculine-Femininity

Cochrans C (18,4) = .36763, P = .238 (approx.)

Bartlett-Box F (3,9062) = 1.68102, P = .169

Variable Femininity

Cochrans C (18,4) = .42654, P = .048 (approx.)

Bartlett-Box F (3,9062) = 2.17525, P = .089

Variable Masculine

Cochrans C (18,4) = .33708, P = .469 (approx.)

Bartlett-Box F (3,9062) = .59395, P = .619

Multivariate test for Homogeneity of Dispersion matrices

Box's M = 25.82675

F WITH (18,17726) DF = 1.32383, P = .161 (Approx.)

Chi-Square with 18 DF = 23.85511, P = .160 (Approx.)

WITHIN CELLS Correlations with Standard Deviations on the Diagonal

	M-F	FEM	MASC
M-F	3.995		
FEM	-.204	3.457	
MASC	.522	.117	3.510

Statistics for WITHIN CELLS correlations

Log (Determinant) = -.43413

Bartlett test of sphericity = 30.02740 with 3 D. F.

Significance = .000

F (max) criterion = 1.33543 with (3,71) D. F.

APPENDIX C

C.1	Linguistic Markers Question One	408
C.2	Linguistic Markers Question Two.....	409
C.3	Linguistic Markers Question Six.....	410

C.1 Linguistic Markers Question One

PAQ Masculine sub-scale

Active- active/ energetic/ like going things all the time

Independent- independent

Stands up under pressure- calm/ relaxed

Competitive- competitive

Self-confident- confident/ self-belief

Not give up easily- tenacious/ stubborn/ determined/ persistent/ dedicated/ putting your all in/ when I start something I want to finish it

PAQ Feminine sub-scale

Aware of others feelings- react on people/ empathetic/ I read I think people/ sensitive to other people's needs/ considerate/ more inclined to consider others feelings

Devotes self to others- caring/ loyal/ devoted

Emotional- moody/ emotional/ passionate/ care to much/ get too emotionally involved

Gentle- gentle/ quiet/ patient/

Helpful to others- helpful/ supportive

Kind- kind

Understanding- understanding/ compassionate/ listen/ listener/ sympathetic

Warm to others- friendly/ approachable/ easy to get along with/ good to get along with/

I like most people/ basically friends with everyone/ affable/ good friend/I like people

PAQ Masculine-Feminine sub-scale

Aggressive- aggressive

C.2 Linguistic Markers Question Two

PAQ Masculine sub-scale

Active- energetic/active

Competitive- love competition/ want to win/ competitive

Confident- assertive/ confident

Independent- independent

Not give up easily- strong willed/ dedicated/ determined

Stands up under pressure- no emotional/ I cope well rather than getting emotional

Decisive- decisive

PAQ Feminine sub-scale

Emotional- nervous/ sensitive/ emotional/ passionate

Gentle- quiet/ softer/ not really aggressive/ soft

Kind- patient

Understanding- sensitive/ caring for others/ understanding to people /thoughtful/
understanding

Warm to others- affectionate/ friendly

PAQ Masculine-Feminine sub-scale

Dominant- I like to take control/ I like to be the leader

C.3 Linguistic Markers Question Six

PAQ Masculine sub-scale

Active- energetic/active

Competitive- love competition/ want to win/ competitive

Confident- assertive/ confident

Independent- independent

Not give up easily- strong willed/ dedicated/ determined

Stands up under pressure- no emotional/ I cope well rather than getting emotional

Decisive- decisive

PAQ Feminine sub-scale

Emotional- nervous/ sensitive/ emotional/ passionate

Gentle- quiet/ softer/ not really aggressive/ soft

Kind- patient

Understanding- sensitive/ caring for others/ understanding to people/ thoughtful/
understanding

Warm to others- affectionate/ friendly

PAQ Masculine-Feminine sub-scale

Dominant- I like to take control/ I like to be the leader