

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

10-30-2020

Coaches' and Athletic Directors' Use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: An Exploratory Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective

Chelsey Hannah Leahy
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Leahy, Chelsey Hannah, "Coaches' and Athletic Directors' Use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: An Exploratory Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective" (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 8455.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/8455>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Coaches' and Athletic Directors' Use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: An Exploratory
Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope
Perspective

by

Chelsey H. Leahy

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Faculty of Human Kinetics in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Human Kinetics at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

© 2020 Chelsey H. Leahy

COACHES' AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' USE OF STRENGTHS IN
IMPLEMENTING POLICY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF TRANSGENDER
POLICIES IN U SPORTS AND CCAA FROM A STRENGTHS AND HOPE
PERSPECTIVE

by

Chelsey H. Leahy

APPROVED BY:

C. Collier
Department of Political Science

P. Millar
Department of Kinesiology

V. Paraschak, Advisor
Department of Kinesiology

September 15th, 2020

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing, within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

In September 2018 U SPORTS released for the first time a transgender policy; CCAA had released their policy seven seasons earlier. Currently there exists no research on how sport administrators (i.e., coaches and athletic directors) might implement these policies, which leads to the purpose of this exploratory study, which was to examine how coaches and athletic directors (ADs) might implement transgender related policy in U SPORTS and CCAA. Framed within a strengths and hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013b), participants' shared preferred futures were established (Jacobs, 2005) as well as an understanding of how they shaped and simultaneously were shaped by others. A multi-method approach was used for this study. Nine semi-structured interviews were completed: three ADs and six coaches. Interviews were coded using open and focused coding (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012). Further, U SPORTS 80.80.5 *Transgender Student-Athlete* and CCAA *Operating Code Article 5 – Eligibility Section 16 Policy on Transgender Student-Athletes* were examined using discourse analysis, which looks at how documents can be recontextualized (Spratt, 2017). Three forms of success emerged: athletic, academic and intra/interpersonal well-being; however, only intra/interpersonal well-being was linked to policy implementation by the interviewees. Strengths that emerged were communication, openness, inclusion and prior experiences. Further, participants identified the following resources to further their ability to achieve a preferred future: material and especially human resources. Finally, participants believed they could be a resource for others by using their communication skills with an openness and willingness to discuss prior experiences tied to the policy.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my work to all those who have not had the opportunity to participate in sport with the same privilege I have experienced. The hard work and dedication that marginalized individuals put in to simply play, inspires me to try and make the sport system a little more inclusive for ALL. Regardless of what the barriers might be, all HUMANS have the right to participate in sport in an equitable manner.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my advisor and good friend Vicky. Not only have you helped make this process as stress free and enjoyable as it could be, you have been there to support me in all other endeavors I have undertaken since the start of my masters journey, whether it was presenting at my first conference or making the decision to take my current job, which would have me leave Windsor and put my thesis on the back burner for some time. You have shown me compassion, understanding, acceptance, and have never once let me doubt myself along this journey and for that I thank you.

Thank you to my committee members, Drs. Patti Millar and Cheryl Collier for agreeing to be on my committee and the feedback you have provided me throughout this process.

I would also like to thank my Rankin Family. 727 will always hold a special place in my heart. Thank you for the number of sleepless nights sitting around the table writing papers and assignments but also all the fun moments. Bryan, Lauren, Sara, Katie, John, and Steph. You all made a place that was unfamiliar feel like home, and somewhere I will miss forever.

Kimberley Anne, no I did not forget about you in that list. You simply deserve your own acknowledgement. Thank you for being there every step of the way and staying up until we were both too tired to be looking at a computer but somehow still writing. Thank you for being my travel buddy, my writing partner, French song singer, my shoulder to cry on and my best friend. Words can't express how thankful I am to have met you during my time in Windsor.

Thank you to my undergraduate advisor Dr. Kristi Allain for the continual support you have shown me over the past five years and for constantly asking me how my thesis is going when I am simply trying to buy a coffee. Those days pushed me to continue working on this and not to give up when things got hard in this last year.

To my family – Mom, Dad, Chris, Steph, Colin, Neil and Julie – thank you. Thank you for everything you have done for me. Thank you for believing in me from day one and not letting any barriers come in the way of my education. Thank you for making me put in the work when it seemed too hard as a kid, and for never giving up on me. And although I could have done without, thank you for the constant nagging about when I will finish.

Xavier, Sophia, Emma and Quinn, thank you for filling my heart with hope for the future and for reminding me that having fun and playing like a child is important. The breaks to play and snuggle each of you has made this easier and I hope the sport system changes for the better by the time you each fully understand the structural inequalities that are currently happening within it.

And finally, Laura. You may have only come into the picture towards the end of this. However, you have supported me in ways that I never knew I needed in the last year of this process. You have made me write when I would have preferred to watch a movie or hangout. You have made me stay home on weekends when you knew I needed to get work done. But most importantly you have been there and supported me through all the ups and downs of the messy journey that has been finishing this project while working fulltime. I will forever be thankful for your understanding and support as I struggled to finish and for supporting me in anything, I decide to do next.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration of Originality	iii
Abstract	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Appendices	xi
List of Abbreviations	xii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Operational Definitions	3
Successful	3
Supportive	3
Gender	3
Transgender	5
Assumptions	5
Practical and Theoretical Justifications	9
Theoretical Framework	10
Duality of Structure	10
Hope Theory	13
Strengths Perspective	15
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	17
Transgender Issues in Sport	17
Transgender Policy in Sport	21
Critical Policy Analysis	24
Policy Implementation	25
Policy Process	26
Implementation Challenges	27
Chapter 3: Research Methods	31
Data Collection	31
Documents	31
Semi-structured interviews	32
Participants	34
Data Analysis	34
Analysis of Interviews	34
Document Analysis	35
Researcher Positionality and Reflective Practice	35
Directional propositions	38

Chapter 4: Results	40
Participants	40
Participants’ Understanding of Gender and Transgender	40
Sub-Problem 1 – Policies as Resources.....	42
U SPORTS	42
CCAA	43
Perspective on policy as a resource.....	43
Sub-Problem 2 – Hope for “Success” in a preferred future	48
Athletic success.....	48
Academic success	49
Intra/interpersonal well-being	51
Intrapersonal well-being	51
Interpersonal well-being	52
Perceived strengths for achieving ‘success’.....	53
Communication.....	54
Openness	56
Inclusion.....	58
Prior experiences.....	59
Sub-Problem 3 – Hope-Enhancing Environment	63
Access to resources	63
Material resources	64
Human resources.....	65
Home institution.....	66
Personal resources.....	67
Other human resources.....	68
Acting as a resource for others.....	69
Chapter 5: Discussion	73
Participants	73
Understandings of the Terms Gender and Transgender	74
Working Towards ‘Success’ Using Strengths and Resources.....	75
Academic and athletic success.....	76
Intra/Interpersonal well-being.....	77
Strength of communication.....	77
Strength of openness.....	78
Strength of inclusion.....	79
Strength of prior experiences	81
Resources	82
Access to material resources.....	83
Access to people as resources	84
Participants as a resource for others.....	85
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	87
Summary of Findings	87
Limitations and Delimitations	88
Further Recommendations.....	90
Practical recommendations	90

Theoretical recommendations	91
References.....	94
Appendices.....	104
Appendix A – (Additional Definitions).....	105
Appendix B – (Interview Guides)	107
Appendix C – (Information Letter)	111
Appendix D – (Recruitment email).....	117
Appendix E – (Consent for Audio Taping)	118
Appendix F – (Letter of Consent)	119
Appendix G – (A Priori Codes).....	125
Appendix H – (Conceptual Baggage)	126
Vita Auctoris.....	131

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Additional Definitions.....	105
Appendix B: Interview Guides	107
Appendix C: Information Letter	111
Appendix D: Recruitment email	117
Appendix E: Consent to Audio Tape	118
Appendix F: Letter of Consent	119
Appendix G: A Priori Codes.....	125
Appendix H: Conceptual Baggage.....	126

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADs – Athletic directors

AFL – Australian Football League

CCAA – Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association

CCES – Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport

FTM – Female-to-Male

IAAF – International Association of Athletics Federations

IOC – International Olympic Committee

LGBTQ+ – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer plus

MTF – Male-to-Female

NCAA – National Collegiate Athletic Association

NGB – National Governing Body

NSO – National Sport Organization

REB – Research Ethics Board

RMC – Royal Military College

STU – St. Thomas University

TUE – Therapeutic Use Exemption

UNB – University of New Brunswick

VSCs – Voluntary Sport Clubs

WADA – World Anti-Doping Agency

Chapter 1

Introduction

In July 2017, CBC News New Brunswick featured a story of two transgender athletes from St. Thomas University (STU) in Fredericton, NB. The news article highlighted the struggles of Alex Hahn and Jacob Roy to find a place where they felt comfortable playing sport at the university level (Burgos, 2017). Hahn competed for STU on the women's soccer team (members of Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA)). A female-to-male (FTM) transgender, Hahn identified as a man, playing on a women's team. He explained briefly achieving a dream that became tainted with cheers such as "let's do it girls' and 'we can do it ladies'" (Burgos, 2017). On the other hand, Roy discussed his attempt as an FTM transgender to get a tryout with the University of New Brunswick (UNB) men's soccer (members of U SPORTS) and rugby teams (club team). Roy was denied a try out for either team, as he has artificial testosterone in his system, a banned substance by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA). After being told he could not play at UNB, Roy contacted STU, where he had the intention of trying out for the men's rugby team for the 2017-2018 season (Burgos, 2017).

The number of individuals in western society that identify as transgender is increasing, potentially due to public figures publicly identifying as transgender such as former Olympian and reality television personality Caitlyn Jenner (Jones, Arcelus, Bouman & Haycraft, 2016). With an increased number of transgender individuals in society it is no surprise that more are coming out in the world of sport. Take, for instance, former Canadian Women's Hockey League Toronto Furies player Jessica Platt, a male-to-female (MTF) transgender (Bennett, 2018), and National Women's Hockey League retired player Harrison Browne, a FTM transgender who played in the league for three seasons while being open about his gender identity to the public

during his final two seasons (Masisak, 2018). American Olympian Chris Mosier (Chris Mosier on Trans Athletes, 2017), American high school track and field athletes Terry Miller and Andraya Yearwood and American high school wrestler Mack Beggs (Mayer, 2018) are names of just a few of the athletes who are challenging gender norms and the way we view modern sport. Burgos' (2017) article on Hahn and Roy demonstrates that within the Canadian university and college sport systems there are transgender athletes who have wanted to play. This brings me to the purpose of this research, which was to examine how athletic directors (ADs) and coaches shape and are shaped by others and available to when working towards their preferred future in relation to transgender policy.

Statement of the Problem

How do ADs and coaches in U SPORTS and CCAA, through the use of transgender policy implementation, create supportive, successful programs while optimizing opportunities for transgender athletes and others?

Sub-problem # 1

How do U SPORTS and CCAA transgender-related policies and documents potentially serve as a resource to enhance ADs' and coaches' ability to create successful teams?

Sub-problem # 2

- a) What personal strengths do ADs and coaches draw upon in order to implement policies effectively? How are/might these strengths be used to implement transgender policy?
- b) How can they further their strengths or develop new strengths in relation to implementing transgender policy?

Sub-problem # 3

- a) What resources have/do ADs and coaches in U SPORTS or CCAA draw upon to implement policy effectively? How are/might these resources be used to implement transgender policy?
- b) How are ADs and/or coaches in U SPORTS and CCAA acting as resources for others when implementing policy? How might they be resources for others in implementing transgender policy?

Operational Definitions

Successful. For the purpose of the study, successful was not pre-defined for participants. Success can have various meanings depending on the values the individual holds or places on success. Participants were therefore asked to define how they perceive a successful team.

Supportive. Similar to success, support can take various forms. For instance, one could be autonomy-supportive, which Thorton (2020) described as a coach that includes their athletes in decision making. One could also provide social support in various ways (Hoar, 2003). Hoar (2003) discusses three forms of social support: social network of support, received support and perceived support. Although supportive climates can be important, rather than defining it for the participants, support emerged naturally when interviewees discussed being a resource for others.

Gender. Sex and gender are commonly used interchangeably, however these two terms differ in meaning. Gender is a social construct that is typically associated with cultural understandings of masculinity and femininity (Butler, 1990; Stryker, 2017; Travers, 2018). Sex, on the other hand, is associated with biological characteristics (i.e., chromosomes and genitalia) (Butler, 1990; Stryker, 2017; Travers, 2018). “Gender is the social organization of bodies into

different categories of people” (Stryker, 2017, p.14). In North America, the sorting by gender has traditionally resulted in two categories related to biological sex, women and men (Stryker, 2017), although gender categories have been expanding to include other gender identities. Within our culture, individuals and institutional practices largely reduce the range of body types and identities to two genders (Stryker, 2017). These binary beliefs about gender have been socially constructed based on biological sex, and as a way for greater social control (Stryker, 2017). For instance, in sport this is done through sex-segregation (or gender-segregation) into categories of male and female, which some have argued is a way to reinforce dominant beliefs surrounding male superiority in sport (Travers, 2018; Vilain, Betancurt, Bueno-Guerra, & Martinez-Patiño, 2017).

The gender binary has been produced to appear as “natural”, with one gender – men – being viewed as physically superior to women (Messner, 2002; Travers, 2018). This belief underpins sport, making it one of the most gender-segregated institutions in our society (Messner, 2002), which normalizes the “two-sex system” (Travers, 2018). Although I believe that gender is a social construction, I acknowledge that modern sport, including U SPORTS and CCAA, currently operates within a binary gender system. Thus, when referring to gender categories in sport, I use the common understanding of gender as being associated with sex; that is, gender as male/man and female/woman based on sport operating within binary genders (i.e., sex). Further, within much of the literature surrounding gender/sex in sport authors have not been consistent in using sex or gender, often changing between the two when discussing the topic within sport. I will therefore be using gender-segregation as opposed to sex-segregation throughout the remainder of this thesis, as most sport organizations categorize sport into categories of women/girl and men/boy and within the two governing bodies studied, they are

characterized as such. When discussing other gender identities, I have labelled it specifically throughout (See Appendix A).

Transgender. First, it is important to acknowledge that although necessary for this project, defining the term *transgender* is problematic, because the correct term by which a person should be identified should only be determined by that individual him-, her-, or themselves¹ (Stryker, 2017). Despite this complexity, in this study I have used the following definition of transgender: “people who move away from the gender they were assigned at birth, people who cross over (trans-) the boundaries constructed by their culture to define and contain that gender” (Stryker, 2017, p. 1). Aligning with Stryker (2017), I used the term transgender as an umbrella term to include all individuals who do not identify with their gender assigned at birth, unless otherwise indicated by a variety of possible identifiers, such as: *male-to-female or female-to-male transgender, agender, gender-nonconforming, gender-queer, or nonbinary* (See Appendix A for definitions).

Assumptions

1. Gender is socially constructed. As mentioned above, the term gender is not synonymous with sex. A biologically deterministic definition of the term gender aligns a man or a woman with his/her biological sex: male or female. However, many do not understand gender, myself included, in this way. Stryker (2017) notes that some people look at gender as being similar to language, as opposed to biology. That is, humans “have a biological capacity to use language” but are not born with a “hard-wired language” pre-programmed into the brain. We have a biological capability to learn language, and in the same manner we have the ability to

¹ Although third person singular pronouns have been traditionally he/him/his and she/her/hers, some gender non-conforming individuals use they/them/their as singular pronouns, which more accurately account for their preferred gender identity. They/them/their will be used in this thesis in both a singular and plural context, to respect the preferred pronouns of those gender non-conforming individuals.

learn gender norms and practices. Butler (1990) argues that gender has been socially constructed to align with biological sex. Individuals who do not identify with the binary of man and woman fall under the umbrella term transgender, while others may identify themselves as gender-queer. This assumption shapes this study in my acknowledgement that each individual may have a different understanding of gender based on how they have learned it, whether that is based on the assumption that gender is associated with sex, or that gender is socially constructed and a learned behaviour. Participants have thus been asked to define their understanding of gender as a starting point for the interviews.

2. Sport is segregated by gender at most levels. Sport is one of the most formally gender-segregated institutions in Western society (Messner, 2002). The ideological belief that biological men are athletically and physically stronger than biological women has created a naturalized belief that sport should be segregated by gender (or sex) (Theberge, 1998). The naturalized understanding that biological men are stronger than biological women has left individuals who do not identify as cis-gender having to navigate a system that does not have a clear space for them (Travers, 2018).

When transgender individuals do participate they may be perceived as having an unfair advantage, such as when Renee Richards became the first transgender professional tennis player (Pieper, 2017); more recently high school track runners Terry Miller and Andraya Yearwood faced the accusation of having an unfair advantage (Mayer, 2018), despite these three individuals having medically transitioned prior to participating in their preferred gender category.

Testosterone is often viewed as providing a biological advantage in sport, underpinning the belief that biological men are physically and athletically stronger than biological women (Anderson & Travers, 2017). This belief surrounding testosterone as a performance enhancer is

one of the reasons for concern over transgender individuals' participation in sport (Anderson & Travers, 2017). The assumption that testosterone gives an unfair advantage – either before or as part of transitioning – continues to be present in sport, and may influence how participants understand the stage of transition a transgender athlete should be through before playing sport at the university/collegiate level.

3. Policies are not always implemented. According to Bergsgard, Houlihan, Mangset, Nødland, and Rommetvedt (2007) implementation of sport policy is a complex process, as it involves various levels of governance (i.e., national, regional and local). Further, while policy change may be well intentioned, there are several barriers when implementing policies (Cooper et al., 2016). These barriers may include a “lack of motivation, resources, key constituency support, and clear policy objectives” (Cooper et al., 2016, p.134). To ensure that policy is being followed/implemented, Cooper et al. (2016) suggest that an accountability system should be put into place. If individuals who are supposed to be implementing policy are not kept accountable, there are no motivational factors for them to follow policies. The assumption made for this research is that coaches and ADs may not necessarily implement the policy outlined by their governing body (U SPORTS or CCAA).

4. Athletic directors make the final decisions. Although coaches have some flexibility within athletic departments to make decisions for their teams, Branch (1990) explains that ADs have the role of making the ultimate decisions for their athletic department. Furthermore, the position of athletic director is the highest-ranked position in an athletic department at the collegiate and university level (Christy, Seifried, & Pastore, 2008). Despite there being individuals in higher positions such as university/college President, I am making the assumption in this exploratory study that ADs have the power to disseminate information as they please, and

to use their agency to make decisions that could ultimately influence how an athletic department could create success and/or be supportive towards transgender athletes, their teammates and the resources that are made available to these individuals and their coaches.

5. Coaches create the climate of a team. Adams, Anderson, and McCormack (2010) discuss the nature of how coaches police players' behaviour through discourse. They note that to make a team, the coaches in their research looked for one thing or another – player ability or warrior attitude (Adams et al., 2010). Further they discuss how coaches use a certain discourse to influence how their players play (Adams et al., 2010); this in turn shapes the language and behaviour of a team while at the venue (or in the presence of the coaches). Players tend to follow the language and behaviour of their coaches while at training, in a game and in the locker room; however, this does not necessarily translate into their daily lives, or social events between teammates (Adams et al., 2010). Coaches facilitate the athlete-coach interaction and behaviour, and therefore according to Côté, Young, North and Duffy (2007), require behavioural and social competence when interacting with their athletes. As such, the assumption is being made for this research that coaches play a key role in how athletes interact, as well as influence the type of environment that is present during team sanctioned events (i.e., games, practices, travel, etc.)

6. All individuals have strengths. Strengths Perspective principles include:

(1) Individuals, whatever their current situation, have demonstrated strengths in their behaviours/choices to this point, and so the beginning of any analysis is to identify those strengths. (2) All individuals have resources in their environment that can be identified and drawn upon to enhance these strengths.

(Paraschak & Thompson, p. 1048)

For this study, I am assuming that all individuals have existing strengths that they can use in order to work towards their goals or preferred future and to be a resource for others. Within the structure of U SPORTS or CCAA, resources (human, financial and/or material) are available (e.g., the policies) to all the participants in U SPORTS or CCAA that can enhance existing strengths and/or create new strengths for those individuals. Additionally, I am making the assumption that the participants of this study, although shaped by the governing bodies or institution within which they work, also have the ability to shape (or create change) within the institution or governing body wherein they operate.

Practical and Theoretical Justification

The exploratory study was designed using a strengths and hope perspective to understand how coaches and ADs may act as a resource for others, while drawing on their strengths and available resources for policy implementation and how they have or might use these strengths and resources when having a transgender athlete within their team or department, all while operating within the boundaries placed on them by their governing body (U SPORTS or CCAA). There exists a gap in the literature from a Strengths and Hope perspective of administrators (coaches or ADs) acting as resources for their athletes and others; as well, to my knowledge, no existing research focused on coaches' and ADs' perspective or understanding of transgender athletes. Given the increasing number of transgender athletes coming out publicly in sport (Bennett, 2018; Burgos, 2017; Masisak; Mayer, 2018), as well as the release of U SPORTS' newly edited policy 80.80 (addition of section 80.80.5) with added regulations for the participation of transgender athletes (released in September 2018), I believe this research to be timely and important because of the potential knowledge that can be drawn from it, and to

understand how coaches and ADs shape while concurrently are shaped by the boundaries set in place by transgender policy.

This research does not only attempt to address the gaps in the literature but also provides information for ADs and coaches on how they can be a resource for their athletes and staff. Looking at both U SPORTS and CCAA was beneficial as CCAA had a policy in place for seven seasons (S. Murray-MacDonnell, personal communication, November 29, 2018), whereas this is the first season for U SPORTS having a transgender inclusive policy. Ideally the strengths and resources expressed by the participants will help inform other sport administrators about how they can be a resource for others, including transgender athletes.

Theoretical Framework

My study is guided by Giddens' (1984) concept of 'duality of structure', and informed by Hope Theory and a Strengths Perspective, which underpin the Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013b). Duality of structure, which will be described in greater detail below, is foundational to adopting a Strengths and Hope perspective. Giddens' theory highlights how individuals exercise agency to create change, especially when in positions of power (i.e., ADs and coaches), making it relevant to my research.

Duality of structure. Individuals understand and navigate social structures (such as sport) within conditions that are continuously being created by ourselves and others. Victoria Paraschak (2000) quotes a passage by Karl Marx that describes how individuals create their own history: "[People] make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (p. 154). For instance, policy and/or rules potentially shape how people act within specific settings. Coalter (2017), when discussing sport

and social inclusion, explained that policy is created and delivered through the use of power. Despite policies and practices being shaped by individuals in positions of power, these individuals are not always knowledgeable, creating at times a disconnect between power and knowledge when policies are made (Coalter, 2017).

Giddens (1984) uses the concept of ‘duality of structure’ to describe the process by which individuals navigate social structures. This concept “rests on the assumption that the perceived world is a product of social construction” (Anderson, 2015, p. 8). Within this concept, Giddens explains how individuals shape, while being shaped by rules and resources as they exercise their agency; that is, their ability to create change (or not) through their actions (Giddens, 1984; Paraschak, 2000). Although individuals constantly exercise their agency, “social practices are [most often] reproduced by knowledgeable individuals” (Paraschak, 2000, p. 154). These individuals work within the socially constructed boundaries (rules) that have been predetermined for them through conventional values, and impact how they act (Paraschak, 2000; Suzuki, 2017). As individuals in positions of power use their agency to achieve their goal, they are simultaneously recreating the legitimacy of these structures (Paraschak, 2000). Paraschak (2000) explains that when individuals act to challenge the current structures, they are undermining the undisputed nature of the structure; this creates an opportunity for change to occur.

Certain individuals, for instance individuals at the center of the gender regime of sport (i.e., ADs and coaches of male high-status sports) (Messner, 2002) have the ability “to make the rules that govern behaviour within sport” (Paraschak, 2013a, p. 96). These individuals therefore reproduce a sport system that is ideal for them, through their ability to control desired resources (Paraschak, 2013a). In addition, through naturalized practices, agents act in conformity with their practical consciousness, which is the knowledge that individuals bring to the actions required in

everyday life that are so ingrained they often go unnoticed (Giddens, 1984). As people continuously reproduce these actions, the actions become naturalized and unquestioned (Paraschak, 2000), including the common belief that gender is a binary that underlies sex segregation in sport.

According to Paraschak (2000), Giddens' model for understanding the social world can be relevant to sport professionals (i.e., administrators and researchers) for many reasons, including the following:

- 1) The 'duality of structure' model includes the broader social context within which sport exists. Our choices are shaped by existing possibilities – rules and resources – that others have already put in place, with those possibilities benefitting some individuals more than others
- 2) The model also suggests that individual actions in sport matter. The actions people take, which are shaped by their social world, also have the possibility of shaping that world.
- 3) Finally, Giddens' model explains in what way the unconscious reproduction of 'naturalized' sporting practices, and their underlying assumptions, follows from our practical consciousness and has real consequences – especially for those who view 'sport' in different ways.

Individuals exercise their agency by either acting in accordance with or refraining from the boundaries set by existing social structures. Social structures are built through rules and resources that create the boundaries that individuals have to navigate. These boundaries shape the imagined possibilities of an individual's self-agency (Giddens, 1984).

There are two types of rules, internal and external. Internal rules are based on our own personal assumptions and ideologies that build our perception of the social world (Anderson, 2015). For example, a person may assume it is fair that sport is segregated by gender due to their common belief of binary gender and biological ‘advantage’, thus not taking into consideration transgender individuals. External rules include documented regulations (i.e., laws and policies) that dictate how individuals are to act within their social boundaries (Anderson, 2015). For instance, a transgender inclusive policy in sport explains how a transgender athlete is to navigate sport, which therefore, in some instances, impacts how they decide to medically transition (or not) and could influence how a coach or athletic director treats that individual.

Individuals’ actions are thus directed by internal rules – that is, their view of opportunities that exist in their social boundaries (i.e., structures). Individuals understand and respond to external rules based on the structure of their internal rules. External rules become a “formal manifestation” of internal rules, that assign meaning to the three types of resources available to them (Anderson, 2015; Ponc, 1994).

Individuals can use resources to work towards their preferred future (Anderson, 2015). Crossman and Scherer (2014) discuss three forms of resources: material, human, and financial. Financial resources refer to funding or money. Human resources refer to other individuals who can work as agents to assist you. Material resources include tangible items such as documents (Crossman & Scherer, 2014)

Hope theory. According to Snyder (2002), hope as a theory is a person’s “desire to reach out for positive goals” (p. 249). It is the way an individual’s thinking process relates to goal achievement. In a set of interviews Snyder (2002) found that individuals did not directly speak in terms of goals, but rather of tasks and what they needed to do to achieve those goals. He argued

that individuals are thinking in terms of goals (tasks) and often thinking about how to find ways to their goals (i.e., the path to complete the task) (Snyder, 2002). For Snyder, goals are key to Hope Theory. Hope is “the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways (Snyder, 2002, p. 249). In other words, an individual’s goal, mental pathway to the goal and his/her/their agency are all interconnected and cannot be examined independently (Anderson, 2015). Although individuals have the ability to envision their goals, and a pathway to it, a person’s past can influence the future outcome, and vice-versa (Snyder, 2002). The past can (and does) influence how we think about present goals and imagined futures (Snyder, 2002).

Unlike Snyder (2002), Jacobs (2005; 2008) views hope as fundamentally a relationship between individuals (social), rather than as individualistic. Hope is “wrapped up in the web of social relations that each of us inhabits” (Jacobs, 2005, p. 785). Jacobs’ (2005; 2008) conceptualization of hope extends Snyder’s (2002) Hope Theory because it conceptualizes hope in keeping with a shared future. Highlighting some of writer bell hooks’ work, Jacobs (2005) discusses hooks’ writings about a teacher and student relationship (similar to a coach and athlete relationship) from a hope-enhancing mindset. Jacobs (2005) argues that individuals have a shared responsibility to each other, noting: “Seeing oneself as part of a larger social fabric of responsibility provides the impetus for people to consider how the exercise of their individual agency affects the world and the people in it” (Jacobs, 2005, p. 788).

Jacobs’ (2005) conceptualization of hope enables us to move from individual wants (a hope for) towards hope in an imagined future that has been built together. Extending Snyder’s (2002) perception of hope, a person’s goals, pathways and agency can be supported or shared with others within a hope-enhancing environment (Anderson, 2015; Paraschak, 2013b). For a

hope-enhancing environment to occur, individuals have to be open to what others have to offer, as they bring different experiences and perspectives with them (Jacobs, 2008). Jacobs (2008) notes that guests (i.e., others) bring “precious gifts with them” (p. 568); that is, others bring with them their own set of strengths. Establishing what the participants’ preferred future or ‘hope’ is by asking them to describe what a successful team or athletic department looks like, provides a starting point within this exploratory study for participants to be able to describe their strengths in working to achieve their preferred future.

Strengths perspective. Originating in the field of social work, the Strengths Perspective (Saleebey, 1996) assumes that all individuals have inherent strengths. This approach challenges the traditional deficit perspective, in which professionals (i.e., policy makers) are understood as the experts working on behalf of the individual as opposed to working with the individual (Anderson, 2015). Instead, Saleebey’s (1996) perspective ensures that professionals focus on what a person is able to achieve (i.e., using their strengths), as opposed to what he/she/they is unable to achieve because of his/her/their circumstances (e.g., gender identity). While not denying that barriers exist, a strengths perspective reframes problems by focusing on the things that exist in the situation that are going well (Paraschak & Thompson, 2014). The strengths perspective “is not denying the verdict but it does defy and challenge the sentence these individuals face as the only possible outcome” (Saleebey, 1996, p.303). Under the Strengths Perspective (Saleebey, 2009) there are six key principles:

- 1) Every individual or group of individuals has strengths.
- 2) Obstacles and challenges provide an opportunity to develop strengths.
- 3) An individual’s full potential is unknown.

- 4) Practitioners (or researchers) help best by working with the client (or participants), rather than on them.
- 5) All situations are full of resources.
- 6) Relationships must involve caring, while valuing the context.

Throughout this thesis, the argument is made that coaches and ADs can shape, while being shaped by others through the implementing of transgender policy. I explored this process by highlighting the participants' strengths, in keeping with practices of hope (Paraschak, 2013b) which I expand on in Chapter 3 – Research Methodology. Drawing on Giddens' (1984) Duality of Structure framework provides an opportunity to examine the informal (and sometime formal) boundaries that have been constructed in modern sport surrounding gender, as well as how participants can use strengths while exercising their agency, while recognizing that we are constantly being shaped and re-shaped by the world around us (Giddens, 1984). Furthermore, drawing on practices of hope recognizes the concept of co-transformation (Paraschak, 2013b), and thus the possibility that engagement in this research process may challenge and/or expand participants' practical consciousness regarding the place of transgender athletes in sport.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Transgender Issues in Sport

Transgender and gender non-conforming individuals have been viewed in controversial ways in Western society since the 1950s (Anderson & Travers, 2017; Piper, 2017). In sport, controversy has focused predominantly on transgender individuals' participation in gender-segregated sport spaces, despite their participation for over 60 years (Anderson & Travers, 2017). Notable among these athletes is male-to-female (MTF) tennis player Renee Richard, who began competing in women's tennis in 1976 by sweeping past top-seed player Robin Harris, resulting in a 6-1, 6-1 victory in the La Jolla Tennis tournament (Pieper, 2017). Following this match Dick Carlson, a San Diego reporter, researched her background with the intent of writing a feel-good story about the impressive local who had emerged on the court (Pieper, 2017). This article took a turn when Carlson discovered that Renée Richards was in fact formerly a male professional tennis player, raising immediate concerns about eligibility (Pieper, 2017). Pieper's (2017) chapter, which outlines in detail the experience of Renée Richards, further demonstrates the long historical battle transgender athletes have been undergoing.

A struggle many transgender athletes face in sport is the question of eligibility – such as that of Richards (Pieper, 2017). This arises because sport is largely divided into categories of gender; when a transgender athlete enters this space, such as Renée Richards, their presence challenges beliefs surrounding the binary classification of men and women in sport (Andersen & Loland, 2015; Elling & d'Escury, 2017; Pieper, 2017; Travers, 2018).

Although access is a major barrier for these individuals it is not the only one. For instance, in a collaborative autoethnography McCormack and his advisor Hanold (2017) discuss

McCormack's journey throughout transitioning as a female to male transgender. McCormack explains the struggle of speaking with strangers about previous sporting experiences, for example discussing his experiences with softball as a "baseball" experience to not have his gender questioned (McCormack & Hanold, 2017). McCormack further discusses self-negotiation of his clothing choices for a run pre top-surgery². He notes:

I put on a men's XXL long sleeve shirt and basketball shorts that go past my knees. I make sure that the shirt I'm wearing isn't too tight for fear that my chest will be noticeable while running. I check myself in the mirror to confirm that the clues I'm putting forth are read as masculine [...] I still have to be careful. I make sure the t-shirt doesn't reference a past sport I played such as 'girls' basketball.' I do this to avoid the stares that go from my chest to my eyes and to prevent the sinking feeling of nostalgia as a team player.

(McCormack & Hanold, 2017, pp. 35–36)

McCormack and Hanold's (2017) ethnographic piece demonstrates' the struggle that structural barriers, such as the locker room, can cause a transgender individual within the world of sport. The taken for granted public-private spaces (Oakleaf & Richmond, 2017), which leave individuals such as McCormack under the gaze of others, could be a consideration when looking at creating inclusive and welcoming spaces for transgender individuals. He further discusses his experience in bathrooms being viewed as a woman in a men's only space, which can be a dangerous space for him (McCormack & Hanold, 2017).

As demonstrated by McCormack and Hanold (2017), public-private spaces can be a space that feels uncomfortable for many. These spaces are a site where transgender individuals

² Top-surgery for an FTM transgender often refers to a bilateral mastectomy with male chest reconstruction.

often need to weigh the potential risk of entering one washroom or locker room over the other (i.e., women or men) (Oakleaf & Richmond, 2017). Travers (2018) adds to this, noting locker rooms and bathrooms are spaces policed by binary gender structures which manage “access on the basis of intelligibility” (p.102). However, Travers (2018) goes a step further, pointing out the importance of using the same locker room as one’s team, thereby highlighting the importance of team bonding that happens in the change room. It is often suggested that transgender individuals use gender-neutral change spaces when first transitioning, which isolates them from their peers (CCES, 2016; Travers, 2018). As demonstrated by a participant in Travers’ (2018) study, he often needed to position himself as “fundamentally male” (p.102) to gain access to the change room his teammates used. However, this ‘fundamentally’ masculine appearance did not match the gender identity that best suits his identity (trans nonbinary) (Travers, 2018). The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES, 2016) suggests making available both the public change room that aligns with one’s gender identity, as well as when possible having a single use washroom/change room available for an individual to use at their own discretion, recognizing both the vulnerability and need for inclusion that might differ from individual to individual.

Locker rooms are often a space for team bonding. Despite this, it is important to recognize that they are also often a space for overt sexism and discrimination (Travers, 2018). Travers (2018), and Adams, Anderson and McCormack (2010) note that male locker rooms are often a space for the reproduction of orthodox masculinity. The reproduction of orthodox masculinity can be a toxic environment for gender and sexual minorities (Travers, 2018). Language in male locker rooms is often misogynistic, homophobic, and degrading to women, homosexuals, and gender minorities (Adams et al., 2010). This language has the ability to make some individuals feel uncomfortable and isolated from their team. Other transgender individuals,

such as a participant in Travers' (2018) study, use misogynistic and homophobic language in the locker room to divert attention away from himself when asked by others' questions about his scars and 'de-formed' nipples post top-surgery. Renée Richards downplayed her athletic ability while emphasizing her weaknesses to enact stereotypical beliefs around femininity (Pieper, 2017).

The Trans Pulse Project, an Ontario initiative, found that 44 percent of transgender individuals avoid gyms out of fear of being harassed, outed or viewed as transgender (MacKinnon, 2017). MacKinnon (2017) also found that in Victoria, Australia 58 percent of transgender individuals avoid some sports due to their gender identity. He then expands on why sport could be a beneficial activity for transgender individuals, stating "[for] trans people who already experience significant social isolation and health inequities, inclusion in sport may be an important facilitator to improving community connectedness, self-esteem, and long-term health outcomes" (MacKinnon, 2017, p. 43). Research in this area shows us the importance of having safe inclusive spaces for transgender individuals while also demonstrating the potentially unwelcoming elements that should be taken into consideration.

Transgender and gender non-conforming athletes are confronted with issues in sport that many athletes never have to face. Language in locker rooms that is misogynistic in nature (Adams et al., 2010), diverting questions about one's body (Travers, 2018), gender specific cheers from coaches (Burgos, 2017) and negotiating one's gender performance to protect oneself from comments or stares (McCormack & Hanold, 2017; Travers, 2018) are just a few issues these individuals face in the world of sport. In addition to these issues, some face barriers that make it near impossible for them to compete in organized sport (MacKinnon, 2017). The social issues discussed above make it uncomfortable and unwelcoming, however these issues do not

formally bar them from their activities. A lack of positive transgender inclusive policy (or policies), by omission limits opportunities to play sport to gender-conforming transgender individuals (i.e., medically transitioned) (MacKinnon, 2017). I next discuss barriers that are formal in nature, such as policy, that structurally regulate how a transgender athlete can compete (or not) in sport.

Transgender Policy in Sport

Transgender policies have been put in place in many sport organizations across the world. Despite this there are still many differences in the regulations from one policy to the next. For instance, the first largely recognized policy was the Stockholm Consensus of the International Committee (Kerr & Obel, 2018; Teetzel, 2014; Vilain et al., 2017). The Stockholm Consensus was originally directed at male-to-female transgender athletes and came out in 2003 prior to the 2003 Athens Games (Vilain et al., 2017). Questions have been raised in more recent years surrounding gender-segregation of sport and the fairness of such categories. Many of the questions surrounding these concerns have been brought to light with the case of Caster Semenya, a South African track and field athlete with hyperandrogenism (Kerr & Obel, 2018; Teetzel, 2014). Hyperandrogenism, a natural birth disorder, creates an ‘over’ production of testosterone in females, which is seen by many as producing an unfair advantage in the women’s category of sport (Kerr & Obel, 2018; Teetzel, 2014). Although this disorder is present in biological women, policies surrounding testosterone levels have been put into place, and often result (as in the NCAA transgender policy) in regulating transgender females’ participation in sport (Teetzel, 2014).

According to Teetzel (2014) the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) policy for the inclusion of transgender athletes is more inclusive than some other organizations’

policies. For instance, it does not mandate that athletes have reassignment surgery, as was done in the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Stockholm Consensus (Teetzal, 2014). The Stockholm Consensus policy, prior to 2015 (Vilain et al., 2017) outlined the conditions transgender athletes would need to follow to be permitted to participate upon qualifying for the Olympics (Kerr & Obel, 2018; Teetzal, 2014; Vilain et al., 2017). The Stockholm Consensus is directed at male-to-female transgender athletes and makes a distinction if the individual had reassignment surgery before puberty – these athletes should be seen as women and girls without question of advantage (Vilain et al., 2017).

Post-puberty athletes are required to have undergone surgical anatomical changes “including external genitalia change and gonadectomy” (as cited in Vilain et al., 2017, p.162). Their legal assigned gender must also indicate female, and hormone therapy must have occurred that is appropriate for the assigned gender in a manner that can be verified for an appropriate length of time, so that their biological sex hormones (testosterone) no longer give them an advantage (Vilain et al., 2017). Although this policy is limiting for many transgender individuals, a number of sport governing bodies have adopted the Stockholm Consensus (Magrath, 2017). Further, what has not been considered is the impact each governing body policy might have on the participation of an athlete. For instance, if an athlete is part of multiple governing bodies whose policies do not align, how might that individual navigate their transition?

Under the IOC guidelines prior to 2015 for female-to-male transgender individuals, an issue that arises is anti-doping policies as opposed to a biological advantage (Vilain et al., 2017). Anti-doping regulations are policed by WADA, which provides Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUE) for medically necessary banned substances. Exogenous androgens (i.e., artificial testosterone) is seen as critical for improving the quality of life for an FTM transgender

individual. WADA has permitted TUEs, as long as the method of administration of the artificial hormone is regulated and given under the supervision and recommendation of a physician with all records being made available for review at any time (Valain et al., 2017). The International Association of Athletics Federations' (IAAF) policy on gender verification of 2006 includes a section for transgender women who have had reconstructive/sex reassignment surgery.

(i) [if] sex change operations as well as appropriate hormone replacements therapy are performed before puberty then the athlete is allowed to compete as a female; (ii) if the sex change and hormone therapy is done after puberty then the athlete has to wait two years after gonadectomy before a physical and endocrinological evaluation is conducted (The crux of the matter is that the athlete should not be enjoying the benefits of natural testosterone predominance normally seen in a male).

(as cited in Valain et al., 2017, p.163)

Valain et al. (2017) note that the IOC Stockholm Consensus and the IAAF's gender verification policy were both considered to be making social progress although not perfect. These policies did not take into consideration the various laws in place in many countries that make it impossible for some individuals to legally change their name or have sex reassignment surgery, or acknowledge that there are other methods to lower testosterone that do not involve surgery (Valain et al., 2017). To make the policy more inclusive, in 2015 during the *IOC Medical & Scientific Commission on Sex Reassignment and Hyperandrogenism*, regulations were changed to include only one requirement, that testosterone levels be below 10 nmol/L (levels below biological male ranges); reassignment surgery requirements were removed (Valain et al., 2017)

Further, despite policies being in place in various organizations, Carroll (2017) notes that within NCAA schools, few ADs and/or coaches are ready to justly, systematically, and effectively facilitate a transgender student who wants to take part in athletics. Similarly, Teetzel (2014) poses the following question: if the IOC, IAAF and NCAA policies on the categorization of women are acceptable, then how can these policies be implemented in ways that are respectful, justifiable, and non-discriminatory to the athletes in question? Her question demonstrates the need for further research regarding the implementation of such policies.

Critical Policy Analysis

Sport managers have long been concerned with policy related issues (Chalip, 1996). Despite this concern with policy in sport, critical policy analysis has rarely been applied within sport policy. Chalip (1996) notes that sport policy issues have usually used mainstream analytic frameworks. Although traditional frameworks have been useful, critical policy analysis as a framework has been shown to be useful when researching sport policy (Chalip, 1995, 1996; Frisby, 2005). Critical policy analysis highlights socially constructed ideologies that direct and constrain policy, including in sport. (Chalip, 1996). Using critical theory to research policy can be useful for identifying and starting to more adequately deal with the negative sides of sport (Frisby, 2005), such as exclusionary practices. Additionally, policies – including those in sport – direct, redirect, or constrain social, political, and economic behaviours. For instance, the design and nature of sport programs are impacted by sport policies, and therefore shape the social impact of sport (Chalip, 1996). Policies continue to reflect mainstream ideas and beliefs (Chalip, 1996). Despite the strengths of using critical policy analysis, which will be discussed further below, Sam (2003) notes that it is through policy makers' discourses that policy is driven, given shape, and contested. Policy also reflects public values and concerns, while shaping the public's

expectations (Sam, 2003). The beliefs spread through policy are crucial to identify as they greatly shape an individual's knowledge or ignorance of issues related to policy (Sam, 2003).

Critical policy analysis provides insight into taken-for-granted knowledge that stems from the status quo. Further, it provides an understanding of the complex power relationships between local representations of power and the broader social context in which they are situated (Frisby, 2005). According to Chalip (1996) critical policy analysis, if done properly, should do four things:

- 1) Critique the assumptive bases of problem definitions
- 2) Explain why inadequacies of problem definitions continue.
- 3) Suggest how the assumptive bases of problem definitions should be corrected.
- 4) Identify those aspects of social circumstances that require change to rectify social problems.

According to Frisby (2005) the majority of sport management studies ultimately serve the interests of people in positions of power, addressing how wealth can be gained through better organizational performance. However, a critical lens puts emphasis on goals rather than profit and represents the interest of individuals (i.e., workers, athletes, volunteers) impacted by decision-making actions (by policy developers) (Frisby, 2005). In other words, using a critical lens to perform a critical policy analysis prioritizes the interest of those directly impacted by the policies under consideration over advancing the agenda for individuals in positions of power (i.e., decision-makers)(Anderson, Bolton, Davies, & Fleming, 2014; Frisby, 2005).

Policy Implementation

Although, to my knowledge, there currently exists no literature on university and college level sports administrators implementing transgender policy, there is a growing body of literature

on policy process and implementation within club sport (e.g., Adams, 2011; Donaldson, Leggett, & Finch, 2011; Fahlén, Eliasson, & Wickman, 2015; Garrett, 2004; Harris, Mori, & Collins, 2009; Jeanes et al., 2018; Kemp, Newton, White, & Finch, 2016; May, Harris, & Collins, 2013; Nichols, Padmore, Taylor, & Barrett, 2012; Skille, 2009, 2010, 2011; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). For example, Jeanes and colleagues (2018) discuss policy enactment directed at the inclusion of differently abled youth in community club sports. Other studies have focused on inclusion, health and increased participation (Fahlén et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2009; Howie & Stevick, 2014; May et al., 2013; Skille, 2011), as well as the implementation of safety specific policies (Donaldson et al., 2011; Kemp et al., 2016). Drawing on this literature, I gained insight on how participants might experience the process of implementing policy.

Policy process. First, to better understand failures or challenges that may occur when implementing policy in sport it is crucial to start by understanding the policy process from start to finish (Fahlén et al., 2015). This process is non-linear and may differ from one organization/governing body to another (Jeanes et al., 2018). Despite differing processes, the modernization of sport has shifted many sport organizations towards being more homogenous in nature (Fahlén et al., 2015; Harris et al., 2009). Modernization has caused National Governing Bodies (NGBs) to move from volunteer run organizations to hired staff. The hiring of staff has in turn created sport organizations that are increasingly specialized, formalized and bureaucratic (Harris et al., 2009).

Prior to the modernization of sport, policies were usually made and implemented by the same individuals. However, with NGB's hiring of staff, the organizational structure and associated roles were adjusted to more closely align with organizational objectives (Harris et al., 2009). This adjustment required further formalization through the creation of rules, regulations,

and guidelines (i.e., policies) to increase participation (Fahlén et al., 2015). The development of policies within modernized sport institutions occurs using a top-down approach; that is, NGBs develop policy, which is then introduced to sport clubs at various levels (Jeanes et al., 2018; May et al., 2013), from competitive to grassroots programs.

Policy making most often comes from NGBs (i.e., a top-down approach), however implementation happens from the bottom-up approach. That is, clubs or organizations act as implementers of policies put in place by their NGBs (Donaldson et al., 2011; May et al., 2013). However, the implementation stage of the policy process is often ignored (Howie & Stevick, 2014). It is an integral part of the success of a policy; that is, you can't separate policy from practice (Howie & Stevick, 2014). Similarly, Skille (2009) notes that with a top-down perspective of policy, "there is policy making at the top, but there is no plan for how the implementation phase should be conducted" (p.70). When trying to understand the success of a policy or initiative, only looking at how the policy was constructed does not give a holistic understanding of issues that may have occurred as part of policy implementation.

Implementation challenges. Implementing policies that are imposed on organizations from the top-down approach can come with a number of challenges, such as: policy interpretation (Donaldson et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016), values placed on policy (Kemp et al., 2016; May et al., 2013; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016), resource concerns (Donaldson et al., 2011; Howie & Stevick, 2014), and the homogenous nature of policy versus the heterogenous nature of implementing sport organizations (Donaldson et al., 2011; May et al., 2013; O'Gorman, 2011; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). Challenges discussed in the literature arise from community sport studies of policy implementation. Despite differences in the nature of community sport and university/collegiate sport, similar challenges

could be present at the university and/or collegiate level of sport, with policies being created at the top and implemented at the bottom. For example, U SPORTS and CCAA create the policies and procedures that are to be implemented by ADs and coaches of their member institutions.

The interpretation of policies can be a challenge for the implementer. When policies are developed by governing bodies and implemented by clubs (or other similar organizations) there can be a misalignment between what policy makers intended versus how policy implementers may understand the policy (Donaldson et al., 2011). An implementer's understanding of a policy will directly shape how he/she/they will implement the policy. Using symbolic interactionism theory, Donaldson and colleagues (2011) explored how safety related policy was put into practice within the Australian Football League (AFL). Donaldson et al. (2011) found that individuals act in accordance with the meaning they give to a policy – or how they interpret the policy. Additionally, how one individual construct meaning about a policy can differ from another person's interpretation of the same policy. This results in potentially different interpretations by implementers of the same policy, and can create policy outcomes vastly different from the policy-makers' purposes for the policy (Donaldson et al., 2011).

Interpretation or understanding of policy will thus impact how individuals implement or do not implement policy. Donaldson et al. (2011) found that although the intent of the policy was mostly accepted and seen as useful, the meaning participants gave to the document influenced how the policy was implemented. Some understood the document to be expressing a minimum standard, while others viewed the document as “to be used as objective reference instruments in times of disagreement or [when tempted] to not do something appropriately” (Donaldson et al., 2011, p.7). For some clubs, policy is seen as mandatory to achieve, while other clubs may see it as a resource that can be drawn on to help make decisions (Donaldson et al., 2011). Harris and

colleagues (2009) found in their study of English Sport and Voluntary Sport Clubs (VSCs) that only one or two of their 36 participants had a current understanding of policy objectives.

Misinterpretation of a policy objective is another area that should be addressed by sport policy makers, in order to improve the translation between policy making and practice (Harris et al., 2009). Furthermore, for policies such as transgender policies to be enforced effectively, all athletes would need to be subject to testing (Teetzel, 2014).

Translating policy into practice is also impacted by the values a sport club places on a policy. For instance, Stenling and Fahlén (2016) discuss organizational identity; that is, how an organization identifies itself based on their values. They note that the founders of an organization imprint the values and identity of the organization at its inception; however, organizational identity is an ongoing process being shaped through the actions of members within the organization. The values of a club, therefore, delimit what an organization can imagine doing, despite policies being imposed on them through a top-down process (Stenling & Fahlén, 2016).

Skille (2009), notes that the elements within a policy, in their case state policy, have an influence on the practices of a club, however this is done through how representatives within sport clubs interpret policy. As mentioned above, an organization's identity entails an ongoing process, which means it can be changed and influenced by actions of members within the organization (Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). When the intent of a policy is not clear, policy implementers must make their own interpretation of the policy, thereby acting in accordance with what they can imagine doing (Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). Top-down policy making fails to take into account the norms, behaviours, values and attitudes of implementers (May et al., 2013).

In this section, I first reviewed the literature on various barriers that transgender athletes may face to participate in sport, from informal barriers to formal barriers (i.e., policy). I then

reviewed literature on critical policy analysis and challenges to implementing policy. In the next section, I discussed the methodology used for the exploratory study, how data were collected, directional propositions, limitations and delimitations of the study, as well as an overview of who the participants were in this study.

Chapter 3

Research Methods

The main focus of this study is on how ADs and coaches might work toward their shared preferred future through the implementation of transgender policy. Specifically, my interest lies in exploring the ways by which ADs and coaches in U SPORTS and CCAA use or would use their strengths to implement transgender policy, to understand what resources (e.g., documents and human resources) are present that they can draw on to further their strengths, and how they might concurrently serve as a resource for others.

In this exploratory study, a multi-methods approach was used. According to Kirby, Greaves and Reid (2006) in social sciences there is considerable debate “about who can be a ‘knower’ and what counts as legitimate knowledge” (p.63-64). It is therefore important to try as much as possible to create a complete picture when answering a research question (Kirby et al., 2006). For this reason, I did a critical document analysis using reflective discourse analysis to understand the context for the study and how the U SPORTS and CCAA documents might be a resource for the participants (Kirby et al., 2006), as well as semi-structured interviews with sport administrators (i.e., ADs and coaches) for a broader understanding of how they shape while are shaped by the broader sport system, including the policies and structures that are formally in place within their NGB.

Data Collection

Documents. Emphasis for this was placed on documents pertaining to the inclusion of transgender athletes in U SPORTS and CCAA, specifically *U SPORTS Equity Policy, Section 80.80.5 Transgender Student-Athletes* and *CCAA Operating Code Article 5 – Eligibility Section 16. Policy on Transgender Student-Athlete Participation*. According to critical theorists,

documents such as policy are given meaning based on the “limited range of meaning embedded in a societal context” (Shehu & Mokgwathi, 2007) and help to shape that context, in this case through transgender policy in university and college sport. According to Misener (2001) “policies are used to direct, redirect, or constrain social, political, and economic behaviour, thus becoming an important tool of social change” (p.19).

The rationale for opting to conduct a critical policy analysis, and specifically a reflective discourse analysis was: policy analysis helps to pinpoint assumptions that are influenced by normative cultural values and norms; helps to critique these assumptions; and identifies significant considerations that have been left out or included in policy deliberations (Golob, 2007). Document analyses have the purpose of identifying unreasoned points, facilitating criticism of the motivating assumptions, and identifying considerations that have been omitted from policy deliberations (Chalip, 1995). Critical policy analysis further “aspires to improve the human condition by empowering people to ameliorate difficult or oppressive social circumstances” (Chalip, 1996, p. 311).

Semi-structured interviews. To further gather data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with coaches and ADs from U SPORTS and CCAA. Semi-structured interviews allowed participants “to explain their experiences, attitudes, feelings and definitions of the situation in their own terms and in ways that are meaningful to them” (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012, p. 78). According to Markula and Silk (2011) semi-structured interviews can be argued to be the most commonly used interview technique in qualitative research. Interviews can be conducted either face-to-face (e.g., in person), by telephone or electronically (e.g., via Skype); using this technique the questions are open-ended and in-depth (Markula & Silk, 2011). Interviews were conducted via phone, face-to-face and via Skype. The interview guides for this study (see

Appendix B), allowed participants to reflect on their understandings of gender and transgender, their strengths related to implementing policy, how they draw on these strengths to be a resource for others (i.e., administrators, coaches and their athletes), how others might be a resource for them and how they understand the transgender-related policy of their respective governing body.

I acknowledge that it might have been hard for participants to operationalize hope and to identify their strengths. For this reason, the interview guide was sent out to participants, both with the information letter (see Appendix C) recruiting him/her/them to the study (see Appendix D for recruitment email), as well as a week before his/her/their scheduled interview. This was done to allow participants to reflect on their possible responses prior to the interview. Before starting the data collection for this project, I conducted pilot interviews with a retired sport administrator and a coach of a varsity university team. These pilot interviews were not used as data; however, they gave me an idea of the appropriateness of the questions, with time to make changes to the guide where necessary.

Prior to starting the recruitment for this study, I obtained Research Ethics Board (REB) approval from the University of Windsor's Research Ethic Board. Upon receiving approval, I contacted potential participants via email with an information letter about the research being conducted, as well as the interview guide. I asked each participant for permission to audio-record the interview (See Appendix E - Consent for Audio Taping) and all participants signed a Letter of Consent form (See Appendix F). With his/her/their permission the interview was recorded for the purpose of later transcribing the interview verbatim. Following the transcription of the interview, the transcript was sent back to the interviewee to permit him/her/them to fact check, add comments/clarifications and amend any information they wished. To enable confidentiality to be maintained to the best of my ability, all non-relevant identifiable information was stripped

or changed (i.e., name, university/college where they work), with the exception of the governing body their team/university or college works within (U SPORTS or CCAA); all participants were given a pseudonym.

Participants. Participants were deliberately selected based on their status as Athletic Director or Coach of a university or college who are members of either U SPORTS or CCAA (or both). Participants were selected using convenience sampling with their emails being available via their athletic departments' website. Quebec conferences were left out due to translation requirements. Further, potential coach participants were selected based on being a coach in one of four sports (soccer, track and field, basketball and hockey). These sports were selected as each institution had a women's team competing in three of these sports and hockey was selected as three of the institutions have women's hockey competing in U SPORTS; as well, these sports have public documentation of transgender athletes or gender non-conforming athletes competing at some level in the past.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Interviews. First an a priori list of codes based on a Strength and Hope perspective was created (see Appendix G). Following the interview with each participant, interviews were transcribed. As mentioned above, participants were sent his/her/their interview transcript for review. Each participant was given one week to make edits to his/her/their transcript before I started the coding process. For this study, I used NVivo 12 Mac to aid in the coding of the transcripts. NVivo is a qualitative data analysis computer software that helps to organize datasets ("What is NVivo," n.d.). To start the coding process, I began by familiarizing myself with the data by reading and re-reading the transcripts. Once familiar with the data I started with open coding based on the a priori list. Open coding is the process of labeling the

themes without narrowing the themes/codes into specific categories (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012). Once the data was sorted into open codes, I grouped them into more specific themes using focused coding. Focused Coding is the process of going back through the open codes and reducing them by relating the broad themes into specific codes (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012). Focused coding helps with the elimination of less useful codes and the grouping of related themes (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012).

The data was analyzed first by sub-question (i.e., strengths and resources) with respect to the position of the participant (i.e., athletic director or coach). I then compared the three data sets to each other and to the document analysis of U SPORTS and CCAA policies.

Document Analysis. For the data analysis of the policies, I first became familiar with the two policies, by thoroughly reading and re-reading the content, prior to starting the interview process. During the interview process, each participant was asked to interpret the respective policy that corresponded to their NGB, and provide any comments they thought might be of importance – whether that was elements they did not understand, ways the policy may be lacking or comparing it to other such policies. Being familiar with the policies, I was able to determine where meaning within the policy was not clear for policy implementers. Finally, I was able to determine what was not incorporated into the policy. It was helpful to establish what areas of knowledge might be important to the policy problem, yet were left out (Chalip, 1995).

Researcher Positionality and Reflective Practice

Research cannot be done without bias created by the researcher; the position the researcher holds plays a role in the “study’s setting, the participants, the data collection, and how data are interpreted” (Orange, 2016). In addition, all individuals bring their “lived experience, specific understanding, and historical background” (Finlay, 2002, p. 534) to research. For this

reason, Finlay (2002) recommends continuously being reflective throughout the research process: from start to finish. Prior to the start of the research process, I sat down and wrote a conceptual baggage (see Appendix H) wherein I reflected on various elements and individuals that have shaped me as an individual wanting to pursue this research. Further, Finlay (2002) suggests that social constructionists, such as Mead, Giddens and Habermas, believe that research produces co-constituted accounts, or in other words are potentially co-transformational (Paraschak, 2013a).

Recognition of co-constituted accounts (along with the concept of co-transformation) acknowledges that researcher-researched relationships can shape research results (Finlay, 2002). Although it is impossible to avoid this, I built in precautions while doing my interviews. There were instances where conversations would start based on the participants asking me their own questions. Often, following the interview completion, conversation also continued on the topic. Although I believe this is part of the co-transformation process, to limit bias I provided the participants with a chance to review their transcript to help ensure that the participants agreed on this record of what they believed to be their ‘truth’.

Further, the identity of both the researcher and the participants may have had an impact on the process (Bourke, 2014). Individuals can hold multiple identities that may overlap in certain settings. For instance, I’m a white, cis-gendered lesbian woman, who also often presents in an androgynous manner (masculine style), former university athlete, graduate student and current employee for a provincial coaching organization. These various identities may have played a role in the researcher-researched relationship, which in turn may have impacted the response of the participants. For instance, being a former university athlete means that I could potentially be viewed as an insider who understands the university/collegiate sport system. Most

participants, with the exception of those that knew me before the interview often asked how I became interested in the topic; being transparent with the participants meant that my athletic career and experience having a transgender teammate came up in our discussion.

Additionally, some participants have been in positions of power over me in the past, either in a coach-athlete or AD-athlete capacity; we cannot simply remove the history that exists. In addition to my other roles/identities, I started a position working for a provincial coaching organization shortly after the start of the data collection process, where I have been in contact with a number of these participants outside of the research setting. This is a development that was not expected at the start of the research process. These participants agreed to the study before I applied for and received the job. However, they were not interviewed until after I began the new position. These participants were made aware of my new employment position prior to being interviewed and asked if they would like to continue with the process, as they are individuals that I would potentially encounter regularly for work.

Taking into account these further potential biases, I started journaling after every interview, writing session or coding session. Reflexive journals, according to Orange (2016), permits the researcher, in this case myself, to document decision making about methodology through the research process, track that analysis process, take into account one's emotions and "the roles they play in the process, document insights, and [to] consider researcher bias" (p.2177). In addition to the journaling, I would often go back and read the latest entry prior to my next research session, whether I was in the coding process or writing up results and discussion. This process helped me stay on the same track, and also to process the decisions I had made within my research.

Directional propositions. Prior to starting the data collection, I identified a series of directional propositions outlining where I believed the research might go based on my personal knowledge to this point, as well as the literature relevant to the sub-problems being explored.

First, the I expected that the document analysis would help to broaden my understanding of how gender inclusion has been included or excluded from documents provided by the two governing bodies of university and collegiate sport in Canada. Analyzing the policies using critical discourse analysis would further my understanding of how these governing bodies sanctioned their efforts to make these levels of sport more inclusive. I expected to find that social agendas (i.e., efforts for social inclusion for all) had influenced the development of the transgender inclusive policies. I also expected to find overlap in the documents made available by both U SPORTS and CCAA through their respective websites, as well as overlap in the transgender policies themselves.

Second I expected that interviewing ADs and coaches would permit me to explore: 1) how the governing body/bodies of sport may shape the actions of coaches or ADs, through the creating of policy, at his/her/their institution; 2) how they may create inclusion, including gender diversity on his/her/their team or in the department; 3) suggestions they may have about resources provided to them by their governing body/bodies; 4) how he/she/they act as resources for others at their institution/team, 5) and how they perceive others from their institution being a resource to them. I expected to gain a better understanding through the interviews of the policies and documents made available through the governing bodies' respective websites, in addition to how my participants implement or don't implement these policies, and specifically their transgender policy. I expected to find that ADs and coaches are aware of these policies.

However, I also expected that this may be the first time that they are asked to think about how they may be resources for their others and look to others as a resource for them.

Chapter 4

Results

Participants

In this study a total of nine participants were interviewed: three ADs and six coaches. Within the nine participants, two self-identified as women and seven as men. Two participants, both coaches, were from CCAA and seven from U SPORTS. Participants were given gender neutral names based on the letter that would be associated with the number of the interview (i.e., the assigned name of participant one starts with an A). Coaches included the following names: Blake, Chris, Ellis, Frankie, Gab and Idan. Three sports are represented amongst the coaches: hockey, soccer, and track and field (co-ed team). Blake and Frankie coach women's hockey. Ellis, Gab and Idan coach women's soccer and Chris coaches track and field. The three ADs included Alex, Danny and Henny. When reporting results, ADs and coaches were treated as one group except where unique answers emerged based on differences between their positions.

Self-selection bias may have been a factor in this sample. Amongst the nine participants, coaches and ADs had a range of experiences with transgender individuals. Four participants had directly coached or been an athletic director of a transgender athlete. One participant had close family ties with a transgender individual who they would turn to as a resource if a transgender athlete wanted to compete at their institution. Finally, one participant had both friends and former teammates who identify as transgender; this individual self-identifies as gay and is part of the Lesbian Gay, Transgender, Queer plus (LGBTQ+) community.

Participant Understandings of Gender and Transgender

Although I have operationalized gender and transgender as concepts being explored in this research (see pages 15-17) it was also important to ensure that I was not assuming what

participants meant when using terms such as gender, man, woman, male, female or transgender. For this reason, each participant was initially asked to clarify their understanding of gender and transgender. All but one participant described gender as being how we understand ourselves, and as possibly being different than our gender assigned at birth; they explained it as being “beyond the biological expression of sex” (Alex). Henny pointed out

... that there are multiple ways that people represent their gender; it’s not just male and female. In sport, they classify you in that area even when you are transgender or [] present a different way; you’re still on a male team or a female team, but my perspective is that gender can come in all different forms.

Two participants described gender as being socially constructed. Ellis stated: “My understanding of gender, is that it’s a social construct that we use to place people into. For the most part [it is] one of two categories: male and female”. Frankie went on to say:

Oh geez, gender is a social construct that has been basically constructed to put people in the... basically to put them in column A, column B and there are, now there are columns C, D and E kind of thing. I think it’s definitely a social construct that we put on one another and we unconsciously hold one another against or up to the standard of. You know, even public washrooms... But from my understanding, that’s the biggest thing, is that it’s just a social construct that we’ve been told to uphold our whole life.

One participant, Chris, acknowledged that gender is evolving but then went back to describing gender as being male or female, noting:

What’s my understanding of gender? That’s a loaded question. I don’t know how you answer that. What’s gender? I don’t know how you answer. I guess you

need to go back to gender being male or female. My guess is [that's] how you would look at it, right? But obviously now it's evolving. Right in time. Just like everything else in the world.

Although participants acknowledged the need to think beyond the gender binary of male and female (biological sex), their descriptions of these terms largely reinforced the gender binary rather than challenged it. Similarly, U SPORTS and CCAA documents supported the gender binary through the language used in the policy documents.

Sub-Problem 1 – Policies as Resources

In this chapter I discussed the results of both CCAA and U SPORTS participants together, unless otherwise indicated. In this section, I discussed the wording of each policy separately. Neither of the policies defined what is meant by the terms gender or transgender. Additionally, the choice of words differed between the two policies. U SPORTS used the terms male and female, while CCAA used the terms women and men (e.g., women's and men's team), in addition to using terms like trans female (MTF) and trans male (FTM).

U SPORTS. The *U SPORTS Equity Policy, Section 80.80.5 Transgender Student-Athletes* used language in the policy that aligned with the common understanding of gender as being associated with sex, evident through use of the terms male and female. Although the term gender is used throughout U SPORTS policy documents, the policy currently reads in accordance with sex (male and female) as opposed to gender (men and women). In other sections of their policy (e.g., *U SPORTS Equity Policy, Section 80.80.3*), however, U SPORTS used language noting women and men when making remarks about gender balance.

The *U SPORTS policy 80 section 80.5 Transgender Student-Athlete* did not clearly define who “classifies” as a transgender athlete. Its creators thus potentially assumed that individuals

who are interpreting the policy have one shared understanding of what it means to be transgender. Although the policy did not define any terms, it was written using binary assumptions of gender and gender identity, for example requiring student-athletes to identify for the purpose of sport under one of the two gender categories that currently exist in sport. On the other hand, the open-endedness that exists because the policy did not define terms left room for transgender athletes to be at any stage of transition (medical or non-medical), as long as they followed the anti-doping regulations that were in place.

CCAA. Similar to U SPORTS, *CCAA Operating Code Article 5 – Eligibility Section 16. Policy on Transgender Student-Athlete Participation* did not define the term transgender. Despite this similarity in not defining the terms, the language used throughout the policy document is less linked to biological sex (male/female); terms more commonly associated with gender (men/women) were used instead. In addition, CCAA used the terms trans male and trans female, followed in brackets with FTM and MTF, which are terms commonly used to distinguish the transition from male-to-female (MTF) versus female-to-male (FTM).

Along with using broader, more informative language, the CCAA policy went into subsections that defined the protocol to be followed for a biological female and for a biological male. The protocol was not the same for both due to the differing hormone treatments that an athlete might be on for their respective transition. Despite the extra use of terms in the CCAA policy, both policies reinforced the gender binary, as opposed to challenging it, because the policies directed how relevant athletes will be fit into the existing, unquestioned male or female sport system.

Perspective on policy as a resource. When asked, not all participants answered questions about the specific policy governing their actions. Two were driving while doing the

interview and therefore were unable to read the policy to answer the question. In the case of the third participant, the interview ran longer than expected; they were going to send me their comments later but did not and did not provide comments after verifying their transcript. One participant who did not respond was from the CCAA; a coach and athletic director from U SPORTS also did not respond. Given the differences in the two policies, I begin below with remarks from the CCAA participant who responded, followed by the coaches from U SPORTS and finally the two ADs.

As mentioned above, the CCAA policy used a broad range of terms, and outlined protocols based on the direction of transition (MTF or FTM). According to Ellis, the policy gave clear guidelines, although they believed that “[j]ust from a first glance it looks very clinical, the wording of it”. When asked to clarify what they meant by clinical, they added “like diagnosed gender identity disorder. Or gender dysphoria. They strike me as terms that I would have to look up to know exactly what they meant... and it just makes you wonder who else would understand”. These remarks about the policy were from a coach who had coached a transgender student-athlete. When looking at details concerning the length of time post-hormone therapy, Ellis continued with:

It also makes you wonder who decided that you could be competing for one calendar year. Like, was that an arbitrary number? or is that based on science? It just brings up some questions about how it was developed. But I appreciate that they had to start somewhere. And I'm sure it's not an easy policy to develop.

All interviewed coaches reinforced it was good that there was a policy they could fall back on. Despite this commonality, the participants who commented on the U SPORTS document believed it to be very broad. Blake believed that the policy is meant to be

“encompassing, that is [it] doesn’t want to really differentiate” and that is why “I think it’s very broad in terms of its wording”. They believed this to be the strength of the policy; they felt this made the policy inclusive. They added that the policy “just says that 'yes [there are] people who are transgender [that] exist and we are here to make sure that [they] have a positive environment [in which] to play and to compete”.

In addition to finding the policy broad, participants noted that the policy seemed unclear when describing who can play, where and when. For example, Frankie stated:

I think where it is super broad is the sex assigned at birth or their gender identity. So, I think that's where that's for sure. Where it gets muddy, because if a male wants to identify as a female, however, hasn't transitioned fully, then there's that question. Or they are a male identifying as a female and they have transitioned fully, and they have to be on certain medications and estrogen and all that kind of stuff. And while now that's that compliance part. So, like as a coach, you have a student-athlete who identifies as transgender and they forget a shot one day and then also they're being tested for [it] and then it just kind of throws everything off. Everything else, I think, is fine. It's just that 80.80.5.3, that is, just it's tough. It's, it's really tough. And like you hope that you act in the way that you want to. If someone wanted to play on your team and you hope that you want to provide an inclusive environment and that you don't want to see that person as being transgender.

Coaches were concerned about the U SPORTS policy that came right before the transgender policy, which discussed that in the absence of a women’s team, a female athlete is able to participate on a men’s team, but not the other way around. Chris believed that given this

preceding policy section, the transgender policy “just seems to contradict a lot of it”. Although not using the term ‘contradictory’, Frankie and Blake were also concerned about a MTF athlete playing on a women’s team without having medically transitioned. Frankie added to this, saying:

So you can basically choose what you want to be and then you can go play. I think it's a completely different animal on the female side to the male side, because there could be a possibility of a female identifying as a male not having transitioned, playing on a male team. There are so many other questions that are going to be completely different questions [on the] other side of the spectrum. So even there too, like, I wish there was some protections for these athletes too. It's kind of because it's so broad. It just leaves it up to someone getting hurt.

Although coaches seemed to have similar concerns about the policy being too broad, the two ADs who responded did not express that concern. These two ADs did not share similar comments about the policy. Alex compared it to other transgender policies such as the NCAA and IOC in how broad it was, stating:

I mean it's basically [a] complete rejection of other post-secondary policy, so the NCAA policy, the IOC policy. [U SPORTS] is basically if you come and tell me that ‘I'm going to try to go for the women's volleyball team because I am transgender and my biological sex is male' we must offer you the opportunity to at least compete for a spot on the team. But it's just, where it's short is how do we roll this out with the student-athlete population? I mean, because I guarantee you that because we have not been publicizing this to student-athletes and they will have a million questions and so I think that's the piece that needs to come next. How do we explain in a way that is understandable towards [a] population

of student-athletes, what this looks like and why is this the position that we've chosen?

The other athletic director, Danny, believed that it was good that the policy was broad.

They noted their only issue is:

80.80.5.4 student-athletes may only compete on sports teams of one gender during a given academic year. That might be too restrictive depending on where they are in their transition. I could see how that might be too prescriptive because someone may identify as one way, let's say male in September but by February identifying as female and that rule, as I read it, would prevent them from competing. And I don't know if that passes my ethical test. Umm you know if they're now living their life as female that rule prevents them. Yeah, I don't know... I just see that one not being fair to someone. Policy shouldn't be unfair to people. I can see that one.

Danny added that for team sports (i.e., soccer, hockey, volleyball, etc.) that part of the policy is clear. However, for sports such as track and swimming (individual events)

you compete early in the season [at] smaller meets. And then you finish your transition or you're far enough in your transition; you start living as the opposite gender. And we're saying that you can't compete. I don't know. I would hate for that rule. .5.4. [to] change an individual's schedule of transitioning so that they have to retain their eligibility [for that year].

With the individual event sports being most often co-ed teams, Danny believed that if you met the times to compete in your identified gender you should be able to compete in the same academic year in both categories if that is what applies to the athlete.

Amongst all participants from U SPORTS, it was understood that having the policy as a guideline was beneficial as a resource. However, the majority of the participants noted other resources (i.e., human) that they use, or would use when a transgender athlete joined their team which will be discussed further below.

Sub-Problem 2 – Hope for “Success” in a preferred future

In order to eventually explore the participants’ perceived strengths in terms of policy implementation, I first had to identify the preferred future or ‘hope’ that they imagined tied to their professional role in the sport field. Their strengths were then self-identified as a means to work towards this preferred future. Participants were therefore asked how they perceived success in their athletic department (ADs) or team (coaches). All participants, regardless of their position, believed that there could be three forms of success: athletic performance, academic achievement and most important to this research, intra/interpersonal well-being.

Athletic success. Athletic Success is measurable. As an example, for a team it can be measured by the number of games won, winning a championship, beating a personal best or the overall performance of the team in terms of its win-loss record. Ellis stated:

I try my best to have the players on the team make [goals] measurable so that we can find out if they got there or not. An individual goal could look like, wanting to score three goals this season or not wanting to get called offside. A team goal could be wanting to win every home game or make it to the playoffs or anything like that.

The success of an athletic department can also be measured, for example based on the number of top finishes in the conference it achieves in a year. “We had our most success[ful] winning season in department history, with more national top three finishes and conference top

finishes this year” (Henny). In addition to this, Henny noted that one of their teams, while at a national championship, received a comment from locals that they were rallying behind the university to win the championship game. “I told the team that after, and I told them you know that means more than a medal. The few short days you’re in someone’s hometown, you have that effect on them; that means a lot more than anything”.

Athletic Success, as demonstrated by Henny’s comment, was not the most important form of success identified by either ADs or coaches. Frankie added:

On the ice. I think it’s, you know, you always look at what we’re doing in terms of wins and all that. But at the end of the day, that really doesn’t define success for me. You know, winning is always nice and it definitely helps in terms of culture and buy in and people believe in me if we’re having success doing it... but I think [] success, for me, it’s to see people go on and become what they want to be in life... And, obviously we’re here to win and we want to win national championships. But at the end of the day, I think that’s what I measure myself to be in terms of success.

Discussed in further detail below, Coaches and ADs, while wanting to see their teams be successful on the playing surface, would rather their athletes achieve academically and grow as individuals.

Academic success. Academic Success could be interpreted as the athletes completing their degree in the expected time (4 to 5 years). This was important for both Coaches and ADs.

Alex noted:

The other measure [of success], you know, are students progressing academically and succeeding academically. Are they staying with us for the full

four or five years and are they completing, successfully completing the degree program within the [expected] time period? So that's another measure of success... We have an annual event to recognize our academic all Canadians [in] the athletic [department].

Gab expanded on this by explaining:

I feel like we compete in [terms of] sporting success; we want to win as best we can. But then it's also students, for us. [Students] do need to be successful in the classroom. They're growing on the field but also need to be growing off the field in terms of school, and completing their degree, whatever that might be... maybe some days being a student at university is enough; you have to be the student before an athlete. That's just part of it. We have to be successful. Absolutely.

Alex explained that they hold an event to celebrate those athletes recognized as Academic All-Canadians. U SPORTS (Academic All-Canadian Award) and CCAA (National Scholar Award) reward all athletes in their member institutions who achieve an academic standing of 80% or above while playing on a varsity team. Most CCAA and U SPORTS institutions, to my knowledge, recognize the awarded athletes during some form of celebration, demonstrating the importance that departments and teams place on the academic success of their athletes.

Student-athletes are often reminded about the fact that they are students before athletes, and emphasis on this point was made throughout interviews with the participants. Further, all participants emphasized the need for not only academic growth and success but for the well-being of athletes, thereby emphasizing the linking of success with both intrapersonal and

interpersonal well-being. Athletic directors additionally discussed the importance of staff well-being.

Intra/interpersonal well-being. The third form of success, viewed as the most important by all participants regardless of their position was Well-being, both individual and interpersonal. All participants' preferred future was tied to personal growth of the athletes during their time in a respective program, including their Interpersonal Well-being. That is, participants acknowledged the importance of athletic success and academic success but the most important form of success expressed by the participants was Well-being, achieved most often through a positive experience.

Intrapersonal well-being. Success can be envisioned in many ways within athletics, which was reinforced by the participants throughout their interviews. Intrapersonal Well-being was described as seeing athletes (and staff for ADs) be successful in achieving personal growth, whether that be through academic success, or how they give back to their community. Danny noted:

I think the biggest thing is that it [athletic department] provides positive experiences and meaningful opportunities to develop students at our institution. However, they can have that experience whether it's through an inter-university program or an intramural or recreation program. I think a successful athletic [experience] helps develop the individual.

Chris added:

I think for me the big success is: do you provide an experience and opportunity that somebody can look at years down the road and say that they really got something out of it? So as I've told previous administrators, winning a national

championship is great [but] having an athlete come back 10-15 years down the road and say you know what, when we had this conversation about such and such or such and such experience on the team that really changed my life; then I think we've accomplished something. That to me is success.

Intrapersonal Well-being was considered to be important and appeared to be a key element of success. Participants also highlighted that the experience of the athletes during their time at university/college is impacted by the relationships they have with their teammates and coaches. As Chris noted, it's conversations they had with their athlete, which proved meaningful to the athlete later in life, that truly represented success.

Interpersonal well-being. Interpersonal Well-being can be understood as healthy relationships between individuals. For many participants, this concept was operationalized as either team cohesion or inclusion, both of which were discussed in a similar manner; for a team to have cohesion they needed to be inclusive and to respect each other. For Blake and Ellis, a successful team is a group that works towards a common goal. Blake stated:

I think a successful team is a group that works together towards a common goal that has cohesion and acceptance within their group. [Despite] all the differences within a group they are taking steps together to work to[wards] that common goal and achieve a common goal. ...I think, for me, my definition of a successful team is a group that works well together, learns well together and progresses towards a goal together and at the end of a process become better people because of that.

Henny expressed that a successful department is one that "... I would say one that's inclusive. One that focuses on the student first and athlete second. The culture that is allowing someone to

come forward [if] they need to be listened to. Being supported in all means as a student-athlete”. This description tied together both interpersonal and intrapersonal well-being.

Although expressed in different ways, participants all believed that a team being inclusive and having cohesion was important for overall success, both on the playing surface and for the well-being of the athletes. Further, they believed team cohesion and inclusion contributed towards the athletes having a good athletic and university experience.

Perceived strengths for achieving ‘success’. Strengths are attributes individuals possess that help them achieve a goal. In other words, strengths are characteristics that participants have that help them to be successful. Above, I discussed the participants’ hope for ‘success’ in a preferred future, in order to explore their perceived strengths in working towards ‘successful’ policy implementation. Although I discussed above Athletic Success, Academic Success and Well-being as participant-identified characteristics of a ‘successful’ team or athletic department, the first two elements did not emerge in participants’ comments about strengths they brought to the successful implementation of policy. In other words, participants spoke of their strengths linked to Well-being and policy implementation but did not link their strengths to Athletic or Academic Success³.

Furthermore, before asking about their strengths, participants were asked for their perceptions about what the effective implementation of policy looks like to them. This was to gain an understanding of their preferred future linked to policy implementation. These responses then guided identification of their strengths and what they believed was necessary for the successful implementation of policy; for this reason, I discussed them together. All participants believed that the characteristics required for implementing general policies were the same as for

³ Participants were not probed to discuss their strengths in relation to Academic or Athletic success.

implementing transgender policy, with some believing that additional strengths could also be useful for implementing transgender policy such as prior experiences.

Participants were also asked which policies they were aware of, in their respective NGB (U SPORTS or CCAA) before discussing their perceived strengths. They were asked this question to confirm that they were aware of some policy that they might be responsible to implement and could therefore imagine their preferred future and strengths tied to implementing such policies. Various themes emerged in this section, which could all be linked back to policy implementation and intra/interpersonal well-being. The themes that emerged were as follows, in no particular order of importance: communication, openness and inclusion. Additionally, a strength that emerged solely for implementing transgender policy was prior experience.

Communication. The strength that seemed to have the most importance for implementation of policy is communication. This was described as the ability to communicate a policy effectively to others, whether that is as a coach to their athletes or as an athletic director communicating with coaches, staff and athletes. Idan highlighted that successfully implementing a policy is “making sure that the messaging is out”. Danny added, when speaking about transgender related policy, “I would go, I would go the same way as implementing other policy. Making sure everyone has a clear understanding of what it [the policy] means. Understanding any gray areas of interpretation and then communicate it to the key stakeholders that may be part of it”.

Frankie similarly noted “I just kind of tell them [players]. So, I think it's just I have good leadership, that I'm able to communicate well so that they understand why [a policy] is happening”. In addition to communication being a strength for implementing policy, all

participants believed it was important that they be able to gather the information necessary to be able to communicate a policy with whomever was impacted by that policy.

Coaches and ADs further expressed communication as being a strength they had for successfully achieving intra/interpersonal wellbeing. All participants voiced that communication was key to getting buy-in from their athletes/staff; they perceived this strength of being able to communicate as fostering a sense of belonging. Danny took the opportunity to really get to know their staff, indicating:

I have a monthly breakfast where anyone who is interested on my staff, you know, can come; they don't have to. I've had as few as two and as many as eight. I just feel like just having time with me and talking with me where we can just sit and chat. So I think that's viable in creating that openness and that we're all in it together. You know like I said I really spend a lot of time with staff. I know the name of the partner of everyone on my staff. Pretty much I know the names of everyone's children. You know. So [I] really invest time in supporting them.

Ellis, on the other hand had created a culture within their team where the players were [c]hecking in with each other, creating an environment where communicating is encouraged and okay. I think it's important that people are held accountable and OK with calling other people out in a supportive and positive way. So, we do that by creating an environment where communicating and holding each other to a standard is encouraged. Then we are successful...in being successful.

Ellis continued on this point of how they create this environment, by starting with the leaders on their team (captains, senior players) and having communication with these players. The leader role was to make sure the players are comfortable talking to them, and if players need to, they

have the ability to talk with Ellis about any issues that might need further attention or intervention. “From the start, all players know they can talk to me, but I work a full-time job and only see the girls at practice, so that’s why I established the sorta chain of command where players are encouraged to talk amongst each other first”.

Establishing relationships through communication seemed to be the strength that is most often used to get buy-in whether that is for policy or for creating a positive experience for the players. Gab expressed the above point well:

[T]he girls know they can come to me with whatever it be. Sometimes I find out things I [don’t] necessarily want to know, but at the end of the day that is how they know they can trust me. Players, as you know, will buy into whatever if they feel like they can ask questions, and come to me with their questions... I think that starts with them being able to communicate with me about whatever they want and not feeling judged... I think this helps me in all areas with the team.

Communication was a strength that further enhanced participants’ ability to demonstrate openness and create inclusiveness, which were other strengths highlighted by all participants in some form, and often mentioned together with communication.

Openness. Although communication was seen as a strength in itself, additional to it was openness. Openness was expressed in a few different ways. For instance, in terms of the open culture of women’s sports versus men’s sport, Blakes noted: “I think this might be a generalization or it might be naive of me to think but I think when you coach in female athletics and female sport you're more open to things like transgender policies because it's a safer environment.” They furthered this sentiment throughout their interview, stressing that because

they coach a women's team they are more open to topics of diversity in their team and to [having] this being communicated. Further, in terms of the implementation of transgender policy

Henny expressed:

You know, open minded, open to the individual. I mean, if you're actually implementing this policy and you are going through it with the student-athlete, you know, you need to be open to their concerns and their feelings and what they are going through at that particular time from the personal level, physically, mental health side of it. So, openness is critical, but I also think you can use that in very, very broad terms.

Furthering Henny's point that openness is critical along with being open to the concerns of the student-athlete, Chris stated that being open to listening is a strength that they have as a coach:

I mean I'm a listener right. It's listening to others. You know if I'm not comfortable [with] something I'll be honest with you. I'm not going to give you my two cents on it. Right. So it's, for me it's being open to listening to others and [connecting with] others that you [feel] are more certified in whatever role it may be. Right. Be it a transgender [athlete]. Be it in whatever it is, right? [...]
I'm going to get people on board to help me out.

Chris was expressing here the importance of recognizing that they aren't the expert in the case of implementing transgender policy, and that they are open to this and would get the individuals necessary to help them navigate the implementation of the policy if necessary. In addition, openness helped them be able to connect with others, and ensure positive experiences, which helps with intra/interpersonal well-being.

Inclusion. Further, all participants believed it was important to create an inclusive environment in order for individuals to have positive experiences. Blake noted that they: ...target good students and good leaders. So we try to attract good people that have good habits coming to university and so you know, on both the athletic and the academic side and we've done very, very well. But everyone experiences issues through their development as a young adult to [becoming an] adult. And so we still have those, those things. But I think we've been effective in helping that growth and development from young adult to adult and allowing them to feel comfortable in the setting that they can get the help that they need when they do need it. And so I think we've been effective in helping them be good students and good athletes and good people. By surrounding them with the supports and engaging them in that.

As Blake noted and all participants highlighted in some way, their ability to create a space where athletes have support and feel comfortable is what provided them with a good experience; at least that was their expressed hope.

As noted by Danny, taking their staff out for breakfast is a way that they feel part of something, where they feel included. Frankie added that “we've really begun to create a culture that is inclusive, welcoming and a place where you can come in every day. You feel like you have some friends in the room, which is really nice. So I think we're starting to find success that way, as a group”. Regardless of whether they were implementing the policy effectively, a strength they all believed was important was creating an inclusive space for their athletes/staff, where they can be themselves by selecting the right people to guide them, such as Ellis does with the selection of their leaders.

The perceived strengths that the participants possessed for implementing policy, whether that be transgender or other policy, were connected to getting buy-in from individuals on their teams/staff, which is done through fostering interpersonal connections and ensuring that individuals are having a good experience (i.e., intrapersonal wellbeing). In addition to these strengths, the participants who had prior experience with transgender individuals believed they could use their prior experiences as a strength specifically when implementing transgender policy.

Prior experiences. All participants who had a prior experience with transgender individuals in either their personal life or as an athlete on their team believed they could and would draw on this experience in the future. They believed that it could help them create a more inclusive and welcoming space for a transgender athlete.

Danny discussed how they would use their experience of having a close family friend who is transgender as a strength, stating:

When CIS [U SPORTS] started to discuss transgender policy, you know I took the draft policy to that family and said "Hey, what do you think? You've been through this". You know there's a lot of emotions involved, and I think you need to be sensitive to the individual because it is unfortunately very challenging still. You know, for transgendered individuals. So, I think you need to have a bit more [of a] hard line. What do I mean by that? If I was in a meeting and talking about a transgender policy and [if there was] someone who really opposed it... I would have been very firm because of their opposition to it. I would have very little tolerance for it.

Due to having this prior experience, Danny highlighted they would be less tolerant towards individuals who would not be willing to accept a transgender individual on their staff or as an athlete. Providing a space for conversation and discussion would not be as permitted, on this topic, as would happen with other policies.

Henny first expressed their experience of having lived in San Francisco California, which was considered early on as an inclusive and welcoming city; this experience helped them when they had a transgender athlete in their department. They noted:

I think, right or wrong, I think it's about the experience you have in life. I lived in my early 20s, I lived right near San Francisco, California. And I really got my ears and eyes open to the LGBTQ community. I had my first friends in that community and given that was one of the leaders in that, in states across the world and LGBT acceptance, I think I've got a very good understanding at a young age that helped me develop my understanding of what they go through. My understanding of how they interpret things, so I think some of my life experiences, especially in this realm, have helped me when I'm dealing with a situation that to me is, it's not more unique than any other one, it's just how you approach it. So, I think the sensitivity that I have towards it, the understanding, and having been around it in multiple different ways has led me to I think gain comfort when I sit down with that specific athlete. Whereas the coach had a lot more challenges, in dealing with it. Or was very, very concerned about what word [to] say and how to [say] them. And that was notable. The individual was really trying to do and say the right thing but was also really trying not to do the wrong thing and being very cautious of that.

Henny was able to draw on their personal experience of knowing people in the LGBT community from when they lived in San Francisco. Frankie, similarly, discussed their experience having transgender friends that started to transition after their athletic career, as well as being openly gay and how that could help a transgender athlete feel more comfortable within their team.

Two coaches discussed their experience with having an athlete come-out as transgender on their team prior to U SPORTS and CCAA having a policy in place. Idan stated:

As you know, I think my prior experience of having [name] on the team, you've heard I was in shambles trying to figure it out, and didn't know how to talk to him about it. And this was prior to CCAA having the policy; I wish they had it. It could have guided me, it wasn't a topic I knew... I would say that I can now draw on that experience ... if it was to happen again I [would] call him and ask what to do better to make his experience less rubbish. Hopefully I can draw on that experience, having a former athlete that will have a conversation with me.

Blake, who had their first experience coaching a transgender athlete 18 years ago, mentioned:

Yeah, I think you know one of the things just in having coach[ed] a transgender[] athlete was the fear of someone different and I think that was the biggest challenge that our student-athletes, the other student-athletes had. Was, you know, that person wasn't open either about you know and nor did they have to be, you know they were just who they were and that they should be fine. But I think that was one of the challenges 18 years ago, was that it was so different and that there was a lack of understanding from the student-athletes saying that this person is different and then really like they kind of sussed out

the difference like over time. And I think that was eye opening for me as an individual. Like to think back on it, did we support this situation to the best of our ability? And I think we did a really good job of just coaching individual athletes and trying to have an effective team. But I don't think that looking back on it we had an understanding of the challenges of a transgender athlete. And I think my perspective would be different if I had another transgender[] athlete on my team or in our league. It would be way different now about how to support an athlete. There would be a better experience for the next athlete than the first athlete.

Prior experiences of the participants, they believed, would help them to navigate implementing the policy in the event that a transgender individual approached them to try out for their team, or an athlete that was already on their team came-out. Despite this, all participants believed they could further their strengths by learning more, by gathering more information from others' experiences and acknowledging that they don't know everything. Ellis noted:

I have a general understanding, but not a lot of first-hand experience or accounts, so maybe more information on how things have gotten to where they are, like what led to policies even being developed. And learning what's happening in specific cases. So, hearing about more experiences of people who are navigating the policy.

Blake added that what they would like to develop further “is more openness to that [transgender athletes]”. To be able to do that they believed that you need “to break those barriers down sooner so that you have that openness to say I'm outside my depth here [and need] to gain perspective or I need more resources or expertise. And where do I get that from?”

Strengths are characteristics that participants currently hold that can help them achieve their goals, in this case strengths linked to implementing policy, including transgender policy. In addition to strengths, all individuals also have access to resources that can help them achieve success. Next, I discussed the resources participants have that can help them create a hope-enhancing environment through accessing resources and being a resource for other.

Sub-Problem 3 – Hope-Enhancing Environment

In addition to having strengths, participants can draw on other resources - material, human, and financial - to help enhance their ability to achieve the preferred future. Participants were asked how they could be a resource for others in relation to implementing policies. They were further asked what resources they had available to them to enhance their ability to implement policy. Unlike sub-problem two, there is a difference in the responses between ADs and coaches concerning how they are a resource for others, as well as the resources available to them.

Access to resources. There are three forms of resources that individuals can draw from: material, financial and human. All participants discussed that they had access to both material and human resources. Only one participant discussed financial resources potentially being able to help them implement policy, broadly stating: “You know we were fortunate that funding is often not as much of a challenge for us as it is for others, so you know that helps a lot. I mean we have money to do things when we need to do things”. This participant noted, however, that the financial resources are available because they are a federally funded institution (i.e., Royal Military College), and therefore they had more flexibility financially than other athletic departments.

Material resources. Participants noted that the policy of their respective NGB (U SPORTS or CCAA) is a resource they could access if they had a transgender athlete desiring to play on their team or athletic department. Despite this, participants from U SPORTS did not believe the policy is adequate in itself. Danny expressed their opinion on the policy being a resource, stating “oh boy oh boy. What? What do they have? Or what do they have that they consider is well done? Umm you know they have like two paragraphs in our policy document. I think two paragraphs on it. Umm I think it's something that we need to do a better job”. Alex added that they were told by U SPORTS they were “anticipating that that playbook, let's call it casebook, is going to come from the U SPORTS level. I mean it's been in the announcement; it was indicated that those additional resources would be forthcoming.”

In addition to the policy documents being made available by the NGBs, a few participants noted that there are other material resources that they would use to enhance their success in implementing policy. The Canadian Center for Ethics in Sport (CCES) was highlighted as a potential resource. Alex states: “if an individual presented themselves, I know that would be the first place where I would go today, to the CCES site to try and get some help and guidance from their resources”. Further, Danny, who strongly believed that the U SPORTS policy was not an effective resource, noted that they would turn to the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS, since renamed Canadian Women and Sport). “[T]hey have, I believe, it's still a webinar [...] on working with transgender athletes”.

Additionally, Henny added that during the time when they had an athlete in their department come out as transgender while playing on a women's team, the U SPORTS policy did not yet exist. Since that was the case for Alex as well, they became

more familiar with the policy of the IOC when there wasn't any existing policy in U SPORTS. When there wasn't an existing policy, I referred to the IOC being the lead body. I didn't find much; there is stuff from some NSOs [National Sport Organizations or NGB], but mostly they are adapting it from the International Federation.

Although the three ADs expressed that they are aware of other material resources being available, no coach mentioned additional material resources. Gab suggested that it's "[j]ust a policy that's on the [website]... is very short and sweet [and] to the point... I think they've kind of done whatever they can to cover their bases. But there's no support". Frankie added that they think "it's tough, it's very tough to follow. And you know, at the end of the day I'll fall back on the policy and it's nice that it's there. So, it is what we can fall back on"

Human resources. Participants expressed that human resources were most useful to them in implementing policy. Blake highlighted:

For me it's always about people first, the biggest problem solver. [T]hen you kind of look at all the different resources that you can kind of bring in that will help strengthen the foundation of what you're trying to do. So, I think I would always probably just try and reach out to the people, the network of people that I know to gain that unique perspective that I might be lacking.

As Blake mentioned, people within their network are who they would use as a resource. Human resources was the main area where ADs' and coaches' responses differed. Although they both would draw on human resources, coaches noted that resources within their athletic department are who they would draw on the most, along with individuals who have had former athletes who are transgender. These participants would use their former athletes who came out as transgender

as a resource. Human resources emerged in three different areas: resources within their institutions, personal resources, and other human resources.

Home institution. Participants noted that their institution would be one of the places where they would access human resources. Coaches, with the exception of Blake and Gab, only spoke of resources within their athletic department when speaking about their institution. The coaches all mentioned that they ask the relevant individuals in their athletic department when they have questions about something. Frankie remarked,

I think it does come back to communication, whether or not you know exactly what you're talking about because you never want to give poor information. I think our athletic department is very knowledgeable. Honestly, I get to send [a] text and they're getting an answer back right away or 'hey, I'll go figure that out' kind of thing. So, yeah, like I think that it [is very helpful].

Gab, on the other hand mentioned that they would draw on resources from the different departments at their institution, including the student counselling services.

I would, I don't know if others would or if it is my connections having been a student at [this institution]. I would contact profs that have knowledge in [these] areas. My [partner] also works as a counsellor for the university, you know, so I know the people down the hill and can easily use them as a resource if needed... I think my [partner] is a big one though, I talk to [them] whenever I am unsure of how I should approach the girls about a topic, so yeah, I think I would do the same.

Athletic directors, with the exception of one athletic director did not speak about other resources available at their institution. This participant, who operates within a military institution, explained the added resources that they have available to them:

You know I'm very fortunate. You know the military and college are both big institutions. And so we have, I'm not sure if you are familiar with the term SME, subject matter experts. So, you know when it's human resources I call my human resource manager and I can say to her, policy wise, what do I [do] here?

Personal resources. Despite the participants having access to individuals within their institution, the majority of participants discussed human resources that they would draw on from either personal experience or personal connection, who are not necessarily related to sport. As mentioned above, four of the participants have former experiences coaching transgender athletes. Three of these participants still have contact with these athletes and would use them as a resource to ensure that future potential transgender student-athletes have a positive experience. Idan noted “I still speak to [name] regularly, about three times in a year. So yea, like I said I would ask [name] what he thinks and potentially even talk to the girls [about] having a trans teammate”

Danny had access to family friends, to whom they presented the policy when it first came out. They used this personal resource of knowing someone with a transgender child as a way to potentially navigate any gray areas in the policy and to further inform themselves about the potential experiences of transgender-athletes. Alex similarly explained that they have connections with a family that has formed an LGBTQ+ education fund for high schools, who they would contact if student-athletes, coaches and staff needed to be educated, noting:

So we had her in here a year ago and a guy who's her colleague. So, he works with her. Helps her do a lot of this stuff. He's a gender [queer] man. He's out. And he was very compelling when he spoke to, you know, our student-athletes and you know in terms of ways to try and talk to people about it but it was very kind of grassroots, you know and obviously the family, you know, I mean I've had a closer [name], I've had a closer affiliation with [the husband] because [removed for anonymity...] so, we tried to engage them you know as a resource. So, I mean we do know that there are groups and organizations out there locally even that can help us with delivering that message.

Other human resources. In addition to human resources available in their personal network and institutions half the participants said that they would draw from individuals outside of these options. Two of the ADs noted a specific individual, who is the Athletic Director at another institution in their conference. Henny mentioned:

There is actually someone [name] at [institution name] that has a good background and knowledge in that area and lacking a firm policy in place I have spoken to that individual a lot and they were very helpful. They really laid out different options, which is great.

Henny added that “depending on the situation” they know where to reach out to for people “that have been there before. And I always make those calls just to make sure we are all on the same page. [I] think that’s the most important.” Blake similarly commented:

I think it is talking to people who have the knowledge, right? [...] talking to the other administrators, getting support from those that are above me. Maybe somebody within U SPORTS, maybe it’s a physician, whoever. But getting the

support from those people who are in the know, right? Those that have the experience.

Thus, while noting that the policy has been implemented, participants discussed that they would turn to individuals who have experiences on various topics, whether for the implementation of transgender policy or another policy like anti-doping. In addition to having access to resources for implementing policy, participants also have the ability to act as resources for others.

Acting as a resource for others. As previously discussed, strengths are attributes individuals possess that help them achieve a goal. These strengths can be enhanced with the help of resources as discussed above, but individuals can also act as a resource to help others in achieving a preferred future. Participants did discuss a number of strengths they have that would help them personally. However, they were further asked how they are or could be a resource for others when implementing policy. Participants discussed their strengths of communication, as well as prior experience as being strengths for their personal ability to achieve their preferred future. When asked about how they are or could be a resource to others, participants highlighted their openness and willingness to discuss prior experience with others.

Participants who had prior experience with transgender athletes noted that they would be able to use that experience to help others who might be in a similar situation. Blake stated “I think I have the human resources of having been through that before and knowing a transgender[] athlete. And I think that that would be huge for sure. Just to lean on that perspective”. Idan added “I hopefully learned something with [name], and would be open to telling people about what I learned and our team’s experience during that time”.

Frankie, despite not having coached a transgender athlete, believed that their experience being part of the LGBTQ+ community could be a resource for others:

So, you know, I think I don't know if this is a resource, but just being a part of a similar community... I think people who identify as transgender might feel a bit more comfortable with me because they know I understand what it's like to be marginalized. So, I think that that could be a resource for people to feel comfortable to be in an environment where they know that their best interests are going to be [protected] and that they're going to be in an environment that is inclusive and understanding.

Chris noted that with their team fostering an environment to ensure that everyone feels included

...ultimately, I mean it comes down to every single individual within that process; it comes down to that athlete. It comes down to the coaches; it comes down to the teammates and everybody being there to work and help. And I mean, you know, as I said we have athletes on our team who are gay and I mean they're just athletes on the team. They're no different. Nobody treats him any differently.

Further, all ADs believed that their work experience was a resource to others. Danny expressed:

you know, I've been around. I've been in interuniversity sport now for...God, 22 years. So I know a lot of people. So I guess I become just a resource; I'm just connecting people, you know for information. I think that that helps. I have done a lot in my career both domestically and internationally. So I'm able to draw on that.

Similarly, Alex who had been working in interuniversity sport for about 35 years, added:

I think it's experience. That in terms of openness, communication is one. But from a personal standpoint, I mean, I have been doing this for a while...Other than shortly after graduation, since 1985 every position and role that I've held has been in post-secondary sport. The CCAA level and through U SPORTS I've either been an administrator or coach in CCAA or CIS/U SPORTS since 1985.

So that's a long term.

In addition to the length of time that they have been working in the sport sector, Alex and Henny as well as one coach, Ellis, who works as a project manager for a provincial recreation association, believed they have experience with policy that can help them be a resource to others. Ellis explained, "I have an understanding of how policy is developed and why and how it is implemented. Just in general, in day to day life. So maybe that [would] be helpful". Henny went on to describe how they helped others understand policy:

Oh, a lot of the time, if someone is trying to understand a policy I will actually print off the document and sit down with them. Because a lot of times people can have different interpretations and I think that it is important that everyone has the same interpretation and understands certain things so there [are] no gray areas.

Finally, Alex went over the experiences they have with policy development going back to the start of their career:

...you know, in my work I've been, I've been fortunate that I've been an executive member of the [a CCAA conference] as an athletic director at [name of college], I've been involved in various committees, sport committee [at the

regional institution], governance committee [at regional institution]. So, I've been involved in creating this governance structure that we're rolling out as an organization. So, I mean I've got a fair amount of experience that I can bring to the table.

Throughout this chapter, I reported on the results of this exploratory study, discussing the results by sub-problem with the themes that emerged. When participants discussed themselves working towards their preferred future, they drew on their strengths of communication, openness, inclusion and prior experiences. These strengths would not only aid them in implementing transgender policy but also when implementing other policies while aiming towards interpersonal/intrapersonal well-being. Further, the participants valued human resources the most when working towards their preferred future. Individuals (i.e., human resources) were the main place they would turn to for help in creating an inclusive team. They noted themselves as being a resource to others through their effective communication and openness to answering questions, as well as being educated on a subject that others may need help to understand. They also saw the value of their prior experience and their ability to draw on that knowledge to help others. In the next chapter, I discussed these results within the context of previous research outlined in the literature, as well as within the theoretical framework.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine how ADs and coaches in U SPORTS and CCAA can create successful programs that are supportive while optimizing opportunities for transgender athletes and their teammates. This exploratory study extended current literature surrounding transgender policies and policy implementation more generally, transgender athletes' participation in sport, and literature from a Strengths and Hope perspective. As noted in previous chapters, much of the research on transgender participation in sport has been from the point of view of transgender athletes (Anderson & Loland, 2015; Anderson & Travers, 2017; Elling & d'Escury, 2017; McCormack & Hanold, 2017; Travers, 2018) or beliefs surrounding transgender athletes' advantages (Kerr & Obel, 2018; Teetzel, 2014; Vilain et al., 2017). I have yet to find any literature from the perspective of ADs or coaches, who play a major role in the administration of sport broadly, and specifically in the implementation of transgender policy (Carroll, 2017; Teetzel, 2014).

Participants

First off, it is valuable to identify who the participants were and how this could have had a potential influence on the results. Although with qualitative methods the goal is not to have generalizable results, I believe it is important to note that all participants shared a commonality – each person outlined either a personal connection they had to transgender individuals, or to others who were marginalized in sport or in life more generally. Efforts were made to recruit participants from eight conferences across the country; while recognizing that there were coaches and ADs whose emails were not made available online, in the end only nine individuals agreed to participate. Of these participants, a few have known me at some level throughout my athlete

career, and all but three participants had prior connection with a transgender individual either through coaching or in their personal lives. I am making this point to highlight and support the notion that the topic of transgender individuals in sport remains taboo, as I contacted ADs and coaches from across the country with the exception of the Quebec Conference and yet only received nine participants who seemed willing to discuss the topic. Other potential participants thus may not have felt comfortable discussing the issue of transgender policy. Further, they may have felt that they did not have sufficient knowledge to discuss the topic despite the interview being from a Strengths perspective, and thereby focused on identifying what administrative- or coaching-specific strengths they possessed that could be applied to this issue. These participants and their responses thus might be unique rather than reflective of USPORT and CCAA coaches and administrators more generally, specifically because they have insider connections to the topic.

Understandings of the Terms Gender and Transgender

As noted previously, participants were first asked to outline their understanding of the terms gender and transgender. Responses for ‘gender’ ranged from an understanding that gender is a social construct to how an individual understands themselves in relation to gender identity, to gender aligning with one’s biological sex. Participants’ understanding of ‘gender’ aligns with the belief that gender is socially constructed but also with the dominant assumption in sport that gender and sex are interchangeable. Despite the range of responses to this question, all participants noted that within sport, gender is classified according to a binary understanding of gender, which reinforces literature surrounding gender categorizations in sport (Butler, 1990; Stryker, 2017; Travers, 2018). On the other hand, although hesitant to describe their understanding of ‘transgender’, all participants’ understandings aligned with the definition

provided by Stryker (2017), that transgender individuals are people who transition (medically or not) away from their assigned gender at birth.

Further, the terms gender and transgender were not defined in either of the two policies analyzed for this exploratory study, thereby leaving unquestioned and not problematizing the dominant societal assumption that gender within sport is categorized as a binary (Messner, 2002; Stryker, 2017; Travers, 2018). The absence of the definition of these terms in the policies could be perceived three different ways: as an effort to be more inclusive of differing interpretations of these terms, as a compromise among differing perspectives, or as a further naturalizing of the binary categorization of gender within sport. The use of only four gender-related terms outside of gender and transgender in both policies – those being female, women, male, and men - reinforced the belief that sport is segregated by binary gender/sex (Messner, 2002; Stryker, 2017; Travers, 2018). In contrast to this approach, terms that could have been incorporated into the policy but were not include non-binary man, non-binary woman, transgender man, transgender woman, and agender.

Working Towards ‘Success’ Using Strengths and Resources

In this study, I explored how ADs and coaches do (or might) implement transgender-related policy by highlighting their strengths, as well as their preferred future or hopes related to such policy (Paraschak, 2013b). In keeping with the practices of hope (Paraschak, 2013a), I first looked at their preferred future, which was identified when participants were asked about how they would define a successful team/athletic department. According to a Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013a), individuals are able to work towards their preferred future by using their strengths and drawing upon available resources to further their strengths or build new strengths.

Although the perspective is called Strengths and Hope, to determine the perceived strengths of the participants and their available resources, it was important to first establish what their preferred future might be, towards which relevant strengths and resources might be applied. Determining how they defined a successful team/athletic department enabled me then to discuss which strengths they have, what resources are available to them and how they can be a resource to others when working towards that shared preferred future. In the previous chapter, three forms of success were outlined: athletic success, academic success, and intra/interpersonal wellbeing. Subsequent conversations that focused on their strengths and resources consistently were discussed by participants in relation to only one of those forms of success: intra/interpersonal wellbeing.

Academic and athletic success. Participants discussed three forms of success, with two forms being academic success and athletic success. Although participants believed these two forms of success to be obvious, they did not speak of them in relation to resources available or being a resource to other when implementing policy. Further, ADs and coaches did not directly identify strengths and resources linked to academic or athletic success. They discussed the importance of an overall good experience for their athletes that would push them in a direction to achieve their individual potential as humans rather than focusing on the athlete or student role of the players/teams. There could be various reasons for why this might be the case, although I believe, based on my experience within university athletics, that athletes are only with a team for a limited time (a maximum of five years). Additionally, within women's sport there is little opportunity to continue sport at a high level after university/college. For these reasons, I am assuming the goal of coaches and ADs is for their athletes to be successful outside of the sport

and university context as they will be in the ‘real’ world quickly after completing their university careers.

Intra/Interpersonal well-being. Participants linked the questions primarily back to intra/interpersonal well-being. Although the intent of the study was to understand how they would create a successful and supportive team while implementing transgender policy, I was careful when probing to ensure that they were expressing how they personally would define success and how they see support (inclusion) rather than to define it for them. The focus of the participants, when asked about strengths and resources linked to policy implementation, made it clear that for them, implementation is not black and white and rather that there are gray areas. Participants’ responses when discussing strengths and resources continuously connected to human well-being, both intrapersonal – an individual’s personal growth as a person; and interpersonal – the building of relationships. Intrapersonal and interpersonal well-being were themed together because it appeared that participants believed interpersonal well-being was needed to achieve intrapersonal well-being and the strengths identified were the same for both. The strengths that promoted well-being were communication, openness, inclusion and prior experience, which were also discussed for implementing policies in general. Those strengths are discussed below, including how they furthered or aligned with existing literature.

Strength of communication. As noted in the Review of Literature, there can be a number of challenges when implementing policies that are imposed on organizations from the top-down, such as policy interpretation (Donaldson et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). When speaking about implementing policy, both transgender and other general policies, all participants focused on their strength of communication. They believed it was important to effectively communicate the policy to their athletes, and in the case of ADs to

communicate effectively to athletes and staff. For example, Danny expanded on the notion of interpretation of policy by explaining how they communicate a policy, to the extent that they themselves understand it, to make sure that there are no grey areas; in other words, that the policy is not being misinterpreted by the athlete or coach.

Further, the coaches discussed how they make sure that their players are aware of the policies and communicate with them why certain policies are in place, thereby expanding on literature exploring the value placed on policy (Kemp et al., 2016; May et al., 2013; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). Stenling and Fahlén's (2016) study of organizational identities in Swedish voluntary sport found that the value placed on a policy can impact how it is implemented. May and colleagues (2013), whose study examined attitudes towards policy in voluntary club sports also pointed out that policy created from the top-down, such as U SPORTS' and CCAA's policies, often fail to take into account the norms, behaviours, values and attitudes of implementers.

Trying to ensure that everyone is on the same page, which was highlighted by participants Frankie and Ellis when discussing communication and leadership, could potentially make sure that there is no misalignment between the implementation of the policy and the intent of the policy. In their study on policy development and implementation in sport, Donaldson et al. (2011) found that an implementer's understanding of a policy will directly shape how he/she/they implement the policy. This exploratory study further extends Donaldson and colleagues' (2011) finding, with communication of a policy playing a key role in how the implementers (i.e., coaches and ADs) go about implementing policy. To ensure that they are implementing the policy as it was intended, participants believed that being open to asking questions, and finding out the needed information was important, which will be discussed next.

Strength of openness. Communication and Openness in terms of policy implementation appeared to go hand in hand. Policy needs to first be communicated in order for people to be aware of the policy. However, depending on the policy, participants noted that they needed to be open to answering questions to ensure that they get buy-in to the policy, whatever that policy might be. Further, participants noted that they have the strength of openness in the sense that when they are uncertain of the intent of a policy, they are open to asking questions to understand the intention that the policy makers had when creating the policy. In other words, they use the strength of openness to make sure that they are not misunderstanding the intent of the policy. As noted above, the misinterpretation of policy can hinder how effectively the policy is being implemented (Donaldson et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016).

Additionally, openness included being able to hear the concerns of the athletes about policies. Specifically referring to transgender policy, Henny discussed how you need to be open minded and open to talking with the athlete about where they are at mentally, physically and personally, which could play into whether or not the athlete feels included. MacKinnon (2017) discussed how trans people already face a number of social and health inequities; inclusion in sport could help improve the life of a transgender individual through enhanced community connectedness, self-esteem, and long-term health outcomes (MacKinnon, 2017).

However, it is also clear that sport is not always a welcoming environment for these individuals (Travers, 2018; Pieper, 2017; MacKinnon, 2017). Two participants, Henny and Chris, discussed how Openness to hearing about the experience of transgender athletes played a role in making sure that they felt included within the team environment, thereby demonstrating how they would try to shape team dynamics in a positive way to improve the experience of any transgender athlete they might have at their institution.

Strength of inclusion. Transgender athletes feeling safe and welcomed in a sporting space (i.e., locker rooms, playing field, gym) within a team has appeared to be a factor affecting if they continue sport, following the process of coming out to their teammates as transgender (McCormack & Hanold, 2017; Oakleaf & Richmond, 2017; MacKinnon, 2017). Specifically, MacKinnon (2017) found that sport being inclusive can help improve community connectedness, self-esteem, and long-term health, which links back to the participants' hope in achieving intra/interpersonal well-being for those in their care. Participants believed they had a strength of being able to foster an inclusive environment within their team/athletic department. The results of this exploratory study thus extends the literature surrounding the importance of an inclusive environment for well-being (MacKinnon, 2017).

On page twenty, I identified my assumption that coaches create the climate of a team by policing the behaviours of their athletes (Adams, et al., 2010). Adams and colleagues (2010), for example, spoke about coaches who are specifically searching out players with a warrior attitude. Participants in this exploratory study did not speak about selecting athletes based on a warrior attitude, but rather about recruiting athletes that share a common value of the team, which is one of inclusion. Participants therefore recognized the role they play as coaches and ADs in creating an environment that would be welcoming to transgender athletes, extending research by Adams and colleagues (2010) by expanding beyond the concept of policing to one of inclusion.

ADs similarly discussed the role they played in recruiting coaches and staff that share values common to the rest of their athletic department, and how they go about creating an environment where people feel like they have friends in the room and feel welcomed. Regardless of the policy, they emphasized the value of respecting their athletes as humans first and did not feel that having a policy in place (or not) would change this. For instance, some participants had

transgender athletes on their team before the policies were in place. Although they looked for guidance in this situation, the lack of policy did not stop them from having these players on their teams. In keeping with Giddens' (1984) 'duality of structure' framework, individuals in positions of power have the ability to create change through exercising their agency (Giddens, 1984; Paraschak, 2000; Coalter, 2017). This can be seen through the participants in this study, who rather than reproduce the status quo (when the policy was not in place) used their agency to create change that would permit a transgender athlete to participate on their team.

Strength of prior experience. Prior experience was not a strength that I expected to have emerge in the data set. From the initial institutions that were recruited, I knew that one potential coach had prior experience coaching a transgender athlete, but with no literature on the topic of transgender policy implementation from the perspective of coaches and ADs, I did not have any preconceived thoughts about this strength emerging. In keeping with the duality of structure framework (Giddens, 1984), however, it makes sense why participants who have prior experience with transgender individuals would see this as a strength in working towards their shared preferred future. As Paraschak (2000) highlights with a passage from Karl Marx, we make our own history, but that is not without other circumstances influencing our actions. We make our own history (or decisions) "under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (Paraschak, 2000, p.154). Keeping this in mind, the prior experiences of the coaches and ADs would have an influence on how they implement policy in the future.

For instance, policy interpretation has been found to be an issue within policy development (Donaldson et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). This exploratory study expands on the recognition that there are grey areas within policy, and room for some interpretation. Participants who had prior experience noted that they would use

the knowledge gained during that time to be able to navigate communicating with athletes and individuals who need to be informed about having a transgender athlete on their team. In addition to being able to draw on these experiences, participants also expanded by noting that they would have more sensitivity about, and less tolerance for the intolerance of others. Participants would therefore be using their prior experience to shape their reaction to the boundaries set by the policy (Paraschak, 2000). They have thus been shaped by their prior experience, aligning with Giddens (1984) Duality of Structure framework.

Resources. Saleebey (2009) points out in his discussion of the Strengths Perspective that all situations are full of resources. Individuals have access to resources and can be a resource for others. In this exploratory study, I examined how participants could be a resource for others and identified resources they have access to that can help them further enhance their ability to achieve their shared preferred future in relation to implementing transgender related policy. In the next section, I first discussed participants' access to resources, both material and human. While acknowledging that one participant noted that they have access to financial resources based on their position at RMC, I will not discuss further this type of resource since RMC is in a unique situation; other college and university athletic departments/teams would not have access to this form of financial support.

Human resources were the type of resource that participants would draw on the most in the event of having a transgender athlete on their team. Although human resources would be drawn on the most, individuals operate under boundaries that have been created for them (Paraschak, 2000; Suzuki, 2017), both formal and informal, such as policies. For this reason, I start by discussing participants' access to material resources, as these could be interpreted as

formal boundaries that have been put in place and could potentially help to explain the reason why human resources, the participants' primary form of resource, would be accessed.

Access to material resources. Individuals operate within social structures, such as the sport system, that have socially constructed boundaries which have been created for them (Paraschak, 2000; Suzuki, 2017). Policy documents such as the U SPORTS Transgender Policy and the CCAA Transgender Policy, are formal rules that have been put in place for members (i.e., universities/colleges, ADs, coaches, athletes, etc.). In keeping with Giddens (1984) and the Strengths Perspective (Saleebey, 2009) I explored resources that the participants had available to them, and how these resources might help them achieve their preferred future. All participants identified the policy of their respective governing body as being a material resource for them. Although this was to be expected from the start of the exploratory study, it was unclear how the participants might interpret the policy and the extent to which it would be considered a resource for them when striving to achieve their preferred future.

Donaldson and colleagues (2009) found that for some clubs, policy is seen as mandatory to achieve, while others view it as a resource providing a minimum standard. The finding of this exploratory study aligns with Donaldson et al. (2009), in terms of how participants discussed their understanding of the organization's transgender policy. U SPORTS coaches found that this policy was minimal and therefore more of a guideline that they would use to inform their personal judgement in terms of implementation. This approach further reinforces Donaldson and colleagues' (2009) finding that policy is sometimes used merely as a guideline for use when making decisions. However, the CCAA policy was further detailed in how an athlete can participate, with clearer guidance based on where an individual might be in their transition, potentially making the policy be seen as more mandatory than that of U SPORTS.

Stenling and Fahlén (2016) noted that the organization's identity can also play a role in how a policy is implemented. Although not specifically referring to their organization's identity, Danny noted that how they would discuss the policy with certain people would depend on their openness to transgender issues, which extends Stenling and Fahlén's (2016) belief that an organization's identity or values can influence how they implement policy. Danny specifically noted that their values surrounding transgender individuals' rights would influence how they would implement the policy or explain the policy to others.

Access to people as resources. We are constantly being influenced by the world around us and the individuals within it (Giddens, 1984; Paraschak, 2013a). According to Paraschak (2013a) individuals are able to work towards reproducing their ideal sport system (i.e., their preferred future) by drawing upon necessary resources. In terms of legitimating transgender policy, ADs and coaches imagined furthering their strengths by drawing on resources they are aware of that could help them implement policy. For instance, participants who had prior experience with individuals in the LGBTQ+ community would connect with those individuals for guidance about how they could create a more inclusive environment for transgender athletes.

Although there is no current literature on coaches' and ADs' implementation of transgender policy, McCormack and Hanold (2017), in their ethnographic paper discussed how Hanold supported while learning from McCormack during his time as her student. This is similar to how some participants who had transgender athletes were able to learn from that experience, and therefore expressed that they would draw on that experience and the individual in the future to better their ability to foster a welcoming environment for other transgender individuals.

Other participants noted that they would draw on people from other institutions who they know are very familiar with the policy. The participants' biggest resources when/if implementing

transgender policy were the human resources that they have available to them, whether that was former athletes, colleagues at other institutions or connections in their personal lives. Clearly, human resources were perceived to be the most valuable resource available to them in their efforts to be able to successfully implement transgender policy while creating an inclusive environment.

Participants as a resource for others. As discussed previously, Giddens (1984) duality of structure framework highlights that individuals are continuously creating the social world around them through their use of agency. Further, when drawing on Hope Theory (Snyder 2002) and a Strengths Perspective (Saleebey, 1996) individuals are able to work towards their preferred goals by being a resource for others. The participants in this study believed they would be able to be a resource for others in order to achieve a shared preferred future by being open and willing to talk with others about their prior experience and by drawing on their prior work experiences to help others. The use of prior experiences aligns with Giddens' (1984) duality of structure framework, as their current actions are shaped by previous experiences (Paraschak, 2000).

Further, participants who had prior work experience with policy said that they would use their knowledge of policy development to help others interpret the transgender policy, which was noted as an implementation challenge in the literature review (Donaldson et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Skille, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). Participants did not discuss issues around the question of policy being developed from the top-down and implemented from the bottom-up, which often creates an issue tied to policy implementation (Skille, 2009). ADs who participated in this exploratory study solely described that they served as a resource for others by having brought the U SPORTS Transgender Policy 80.80.5 to the attention of their staff and coaches. The ADs are in a position of power over the coaches; however, the policy is being developed by

the NGB, U SPORTS. One participant, who did take part in the process of developing the U SPORTS policy, noted that they would draw on their experiences doing so to help others understand why the policy was put into place by U SPORTS.

In this section, I discussed the findings of the exploratory study. This research was framed within a Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013; Paraschak and Thompson, 2014), which is underpinned by Giddens' (1984) duality of structure framework. To answer my research questions, I discussed the participants' use (or potential use) of their current strengths and available resources to create a supportive (i.e., inclusive), successful program, as part of implementing transgender inclusive policies. First I highlighted who my participants were, followed by their understandings of the terms gender and transgender. I continued the discussion using themes tied to the duality of structure framework (Giddens, 1984), which recognizes that individuals, when exercising their agency, shape while concurrently are shaped by the socially constructed boundaries they perceive, such as policy. The participants in this exploratory study therefore have the ability to proactively work towards preferred goals through the use of their agency yet can often end up also reinforcing the legitimacy of the structures they operate within (Paraschak, 2000; Suzuki, 2017). This occurs because people work towards their preferred future within the perceived constraints that have already been put in place for them.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The purpose of exploratory research is to understand a topic that has not been studied (or thoroughly studied) in the past. There has been no research done on the topic of the implementation of transgender policy by coaches or ADs. The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine how coaches and ADs might implement transgender related policy. Through using a Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013b) I was able to establish the shared preferred future of the participants (Jacobs, 2005) as well as understand how they shaped and concurrently were shaped by others, while drawing on material and human resources in order to effectively implement transgender policy in U SPORTS or CCAA.

In this study, a total of nine participants: three ADs and six coaches, were interviewed using a semi-structured interview guide. The interviews consisted of both in person and virtual interviews, that were either via phone or Skype. Interviews were coded using NVivo 12 Mac, taking an open coding approach followed by focused coding (Van Den Hoonaard, 2012). The policies were coded using reflective discourse analysis, which looks at how documents can be recontextualized (Spratt, 2017). Participants were also asked to have a look at the policy and discuss their impressions of it.

Summary of Findings

In keeping with a Strengths and Hope perspective, participants were asked to discuss what success meant to them in relation to their position as an athletic director or coach. This was done to establish what their preferred future looked like for their teams. Participants discussed interpersonal/intrapersonal well-being as being the most important outcome, with academic and athletic success following in importance. Interpersonal/intrapersonal well-being pertained more

specifically to the growth as humans that the athletes would experience during their university/college career. Participants were then asked to talk about their strengths in relation to implementing policy and transgender policy to see if there was a difference between the two. The strengths identified by participants were linked back to interpersonal/intrapersonal well-being; with communication, openness, inclusion and prior experiences emerging as the main themes.

Finally, participants were asked about the resources they could access that would help them further an ability to achieve their preferred future when implementing transgender policy. Participants discussed having access to material resources such as the U SPORTS or CCAA transgender policy. However, they focused especially on individuals being available as resources. All participants believed they could benefit from others as human resources to implement transgender policy. To truly be inclusive, they would need to draw on other individuals, colleagues, former players, and friends to ensure that the athletes have the best experience possible and are growing as individuals outside of sport.

Additionally, individuals were asked how they could be a resource to others in implementing transgender policy. They discussed being open and willing to talk about their prior experiences (i.e., communication). As well, they spoke about using their knowledge of policy development to help individuals interpret the transgender policy.

Limitations and Delimitations

1. This study only included policies and documents from U SPORTS and CCAA for the 2018-2019 athletic season.

Although there are many governing bodies of sport at all levels of competition, I have delimited this study to examining the university and college level of sport, specifically U SPORTS and CCAA. I delimited this study to these two governing bodies and the 2018-2019

season because of the time constraints for completing my master's thesis. I have also delimited this study to focus on the policies and documents in these two leagues based on prior knowledge about and experiences of policies in these leagues, in addition to the close proximity of such institutions to both my residence in Windsor and family home in Atlantic Canada.

My decision to solely focus on U SPORTS and CCAA has potential limitations. I recognize that participants of other governing bodies of sport or institutions may have a different experience with transgender policy and may have different ways of operating. For these reasons my thesis will not be generalizable to all governing bodies of sport and institutions with respect to transgender policies. Instead, this study will contribute to an understanding of ADs' and coaches' use of strengths in implementing transgender policy, framed within a Strengths and Hope perspective.

2. *This study was delimited to only include participants from four institutions within U SPORTS and CCAA⁴.*

Despite there being 56 institution members of U SPORTS and 94 institutions members of CCAA, I initially delimited this study to include ADs and coaches from four universities/colleges. Participants for this study were initially recruited from two regional leagues within U SPORTS and CCAA. Four institutions were identified, with two being members of both U SPORTS and CCAA and the other two being only members of U SPORTS or CCAA respectively. As a result, my ability to generalize from the results of my study was limited from its inception. However, this is a master's thesis that I wished to complete in a realistic amount of time. I believed that data collected from participants of these four institutions would permit me to

⁴ In the end, I needed to expand my choice of institutions to achieve the required number of interviews.

reflect on how ADs and coaches shaped and were shaped by others when exercising their agency to implement policy.

3. This study was delimited to four sports.

This study was delimited to four sports: soccer, basketball, track and field, and women's hockey. I delimited this study to four team sports as the four initial institutions to be selected for this study had a women's team in three of these sports (soccer, track and field, and basketball) competing within U SPORTS or CCAA. I also selected Women's hockey on the basis that three of the four institutions currently had Women's hockey teams competing in U SPORTS, and transgender athletes had competed in women's hockey professionally in North America. With women's professional hockey having out transgender players competing since Harrison Browne's coming out publicly in 2015, I assumed that coaches may be aware of these players and thus have a different perspective on transgender athletes' participation as compared to coaches of other sports. Within the other three sports, transgender athletes and gender non-conforming athletes have competed at some level of sport which has been covered in the media, enhancing public knowledge about transgender participation in those sports.

Further Recommendations

In this section I first provided practical recommendations based on the findings of this study and finished by giving some theoretical recommendations for future research in the area.

Practical recommendations. Transgender policy within U SPORTS has only existed for two seasons to date, while CCAA policy has been in place for over eight years. Two major recommendations arise from this study: 1) Establishment of a network, and 2) clarity in the wording.

1. *Establishing a network* – Although each university/college operates independently, the findings of this study demonstrated that individuals are willing to help each other navigate the topic of having a transgender individual on a team or in a league. The findings also demonstrated a reliance on human resources for achieving one's preferred future. Establishing a network of sport administrators (coaches and ADs) and athletes (former or present) who have knowledge or prior experiences with transgender athletes would thus be beneficial, since there are likely ADs and coaches who do not have these experiences or know people in their immediate network who could act as a resource. Such a network would provide individuals who need it the resource of having access to communicating with people who can share their relevant prior experiences.
2. *Clarity in the wording* – When discussing the policy, participants noted that there were elements that were unclear, and terms that they did not understand. As individuals responsible for implementing a policy, they first need to be able to understand the policy. For this reason, I would recommend ensuring that these policies are clear, and when a term may be misinterpreted that there is a definition that goes along with it. This will ensure both proper interpretation and a better ability to use the policy as a resource for implementing the policy. For instance, the absence of defining the terms gender and transgender leaves room for (mis)interpretation, and thus these terms should be defined to make sure that all implementers have a clear and consistent understanding of both concepts.

Theoretical recommendations. In future research I would increase the study's sample size to explore if similar themes emerge within U SPORTS and CCAA amongst individuals who

may not be allies on the topic of transgender participation in elite sport. I would also increase the sample to include policy makers to broaden the scope to include individuals that have shaped the policy. This may additionally provide insights on whether there is a misalignment between policy makers' intent and how the implementers (i.e., coaches and ADs) understand the policy (Donaldson et al., 2011). Further, conducting the research again within U SPORTS a few years following the release of the policy may result in different themes emerging.

Future research could include players in the sample, as well as other staff within an athletic department to further understand potential resources and strengths that exist in creating a supportive and inclusive university/collegiate team or department. This would enable researchers to explore multiple perspectives of individuals who are directly and indirectly involved in shaping an inclusive environment for transgender athletes. It would also be beneficial to look at other methods for collecting data, including methods that would potentially limit self-selection bias; this could be done through conducting a qualitative questionnaire or a survey.

There are vast possibilities for future research in this area when one takes into consideration that this is possibly the first study looking at transgender policy from the coaches' and ADs' perspective, as well as from a Strengths and Hope perspective. Although the Strengths and Hope perspective could be used to study any group of individuals and topics, I believe it is a powerful framework to use when looking at transgender individuals' participation in sport, whether it be from the perspective of the transgender individual themselves, their teammates or the individuals in positions of power (i.e., coaches and ADs), because it focuses on the strengths being developed and used, rather than solely the barriers in place.

As a researcher, I focused on strengths and hope as they pertained to implementing a policy that is still relatively taboo to discuss. For future research, I recommend looking further

into the current literature about the goals that ADs and coaches have pertaining to their department or team. I would also examine how academic and athletic success might be linked to interpersonal/intrapersonal well-being, and to effective implementation of transgender policy.

There is still much research that needs to be done to understand how individuals in position of power, such as coaches and ADs, would implement transgender related policies while trying to achieve their preferred future. For future research, I recommend looking at all individuals involved within a team (i.e., coach, coaching staff, health staff, ADs, players, etc.) to understand how they would create (or not create) an inclusive environment for marginalized individuals. This would help to gain a better understanding of the various roles that help create a dynamic within a team that is inclusive and supportive, while still working towards their preferred definition of success.

Furthermore, I recommend that future researchers perform a comparative analysis of two different governing bodies' implementation of transgender policy using a Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013b). It would be interesting to see if there is any difference in emerging themes from one governing body to another.

Finally, I recommend that practices of hope (Jacobs, 2005, 2008; Snyder, 2002) continue to be integrated into a Strengths Perspective (Saleeby, 1996) for future research that examines marginalized groups or taboo topics. My study highlights how participants' strengths of communication, openness, intra/interpersonal well-being and the human resources available to them are linked in order to achieve one's preferred future. A Strengths and Hope perspective (Paraschak, 2013) enables participants and researchers to be co-transformed as they gain a greater understanding of how individuals' collective interactions matter when they are connected through 'hope in' a shared preferred future.

REFERENCES

- Adams, A., Anderson, E., & McCormack, M. (2010). Establishing and Challenging Masculinity: The Influence of Gendered Discourses in Organized Sport. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 29*(3), 278–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X10368833>
- Adams, Andrew. (2011). Between modernization and mutual aid: the changing perceptions of voluntary sports clubs in England. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 3*(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2010.544663>
- Andersen, W., & Loland, S. (2015). Sport and the Obligation of Solidarity. *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy, 9*(3), 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17511321.2015.1065432>
- Anderson, E., & Travers, A. (2017). Introduction. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 1–9). New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, J. (2015). *Strengths and Hope within Adaptive Sailing: Narratives from the Queen's Quay Disabled Sailing Program*. University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.
- Anderson, M., Bolton, N., Davies, B., & Fleming, S. (2014). Local implementation of national policy: a case-study critique of the Free Swimming Initiative for the 60 plus population. *Managing Leisure, 19*(2), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2013.859456>
- Bennett, D. (2018, February 6). Hockey is for Everyone: The Jessica Platt Story [Sport]. Retrieved from <https://www.sportsnet.ca/hockey/nhl/hockey-everyone-jessica-platt-story/>
- Bergsgard, N. A., Houlihan, B., Mangset, P., Nødland, S. I., & Rommetvedt, H. (2007). *Sport Policy: A Comparative Analysis of Stability and Change*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Ltd.
- Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the Research Process. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(33), 1-9.

- Branch, D. (1990). Athletic Director Leader Behavior as a Predictor of Intercollegiate Athletic Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4(1), 161–173.
- Burgos, M. J. (2017, July 11). Transgender athletes thwarted in pursuit of university sports. *CBC News New Brunswick*.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, H. J. (2017). Including transgender students in United States' school-based athletics. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 156–170). New York: Routledge.
- CCES (2016). Creating Inclusive Environments for Trans Participants in Canadian Sport: Guidance for Sport Organizations. *Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport*. Retrieved from <https://cces.ca/sites/default/files/content/docs/pdf/cces-transinclusionpolicyguidance-e.pdf>
- Chalip, L. (1995). Policy Analysis in Sport Management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9(1), 1–13.
- Chalip, L. (1996). Critical Policy Analysis: The Illustrative Case of New Zealand Sport Policy Development. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(1), 310–324.
- Chris Mosier on Trans Athletes. (2017, September 19). Chris Mosier on trans athletes: “Sport is a vehicle for social change” [News]. Retrieved October 15, 2018, from <https://www.sportsnet.ca/magazine/chris-mosier-trans-athletes-sport-vehicle-social-change/>

- Christy, K., Seifried, C., & Pastore, D. L. (2008). Intercollegiate Athletics: A Preliminary Study Examining the Opinions on the Impact of the Academic Performance Rate (APR). *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 1*, 1–10.
- Coalter, F. (2017). Sport and Social Inclusion: Evidence-Based Policy and Practice. *Social Inclusion, 5*(2), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i2.852>
- Cooper, K. H., Greenberg, J. D., Castelli, D. M., Barton, M., Martin, S. B., & Morrow Jr., J. R. (2016). Implementing Policies to Enhance Physical Education and Physical Activity in Schools. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 87*(2), 133–140.
- Côté, J., Young, B., North, J., & Duffy, P. (2007). Towards a Definition of Excellence in Sport Coaching. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 3*-17.
- Crossman, J., & Scherer, J. (2014). Perspectives on the social dimensions of sport and physical activity in Canada. In J. Crossman & J. Scherer (Eds.), *Social dimension of Canadian sport and physical activity* (1-18). Toronto, ON: Pearson Canada Inc.
- Donaldson, A., Leggett, S., & Finch, C. F. (2011). Sports policy development and implementation in context: Researching and understanding the perceptions of community end-users. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 1*–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690211422009>
- Elling, A., & d’Escury, K. C. (2017). Between stigmatization and empowerment: Meanings of Physical Activity and Sport in the Lives of Transgender People. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 54–67). New York: Routledge.

- Fahlén, J., Eliasson, I., & Wickman, K. (2015). Resisting self-regulation: and analysis of sport policy programme making and implementation in Sweden. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7(3), 391–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2014.925954>
- Finlay, L. (2002). “Outing” the Researcher: The Provenance, Process, and Practice of Reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(4), 531–545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973202129120052>
- Frisby, W. (2005). The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Critical Sport Management Research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(1), 1–12.
- Garrett, R. (2004). The response of voluntary sport clubs to Sport England’s Lottery funding: cases of compliance, change and resistance. *Managing Leisure*, 9(1), 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360671042000182973>
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Golob, M. I. (2007). *Recreation Policies and Programs for Recent Immigrants to Canada: A Case-Study of Spanish-Speaking Immigrants in Windsor, Ontario* (Proposal). University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.
- Harris, S., Mori, K., & Collins, M. (2009). Great Expectations: Voluntary Sports Clubs and Their Role in Delivering National Policy for English Sport. *Voluntas*, 20, 405–423.
- Hoar, S. (2003). *Social support and coping with interpersonal sport stress during early adolescence*. University of British Columbia. Vancouver, BC.
- Howie, E. K., & Stevick, D. (2014). The “Ins” and “Outs” of Physical Activity Policy Implementation: Inadequate Capacity, Inappropriate Outcome Measures, and Insufficient Funds. *Journal of School Health*, 84(9), 581–585.

- Jacobs, D. (2005). What's Hope Got to Do With It? Toward a Theory of Hope and Pedagogy. *JAC*, 25(4), 783–802.
- Jacobs, D. (2008). The Audacity of Hospitality. *JAC*, 28(3), 563–581.
- Jeanes, R., Spaaij, R., Magee, J., Farquharson, K., Gorman, S., & Lusher, D. (2018). “Yes we are inclusive”: Examining provision for young people with disabilities in community sport clubs. *Sport Management Review*, 21(1), 38–50
- Jones, B., Arcelus, J., Bouman, W., & Haycraft, E. (2016). Sport and Transgender People: A Systematic Review of the Literature Relating to Sport Participation and Competitive Sport Policies. *Sports Medicine (Auckland)*, 47(4), 701–716.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0621-y>
- Kemp, J. L., Newton, J. D., White, P. E., & Finch, C. F. (2016). Implementation of concussion guidelines in community Australian Football and Rugby League - The experiences and challenges faced by coaches and sports trainers. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 19, 305–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2015.03.010>
- Kerr, R., & Obel, C. (2018). Reassembling sex: reconsidering sex segregation policies in sport. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 10(2), 305–320.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2017.1406976>
- Kirby, S., Greaves, L., & Reid, C. (2006). *Experience Research Social Change: Methods Beyond the Mainstream* (2nd ed.). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- MacKinnon, K. (2017). An Introduction to Five Exceptional Trans Athletes from Around the World. In *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 43–53). New York: Routledge.

- Magrath, R. (2017). Media Accounts of the First Transgender Person to Work in the English Premier League. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 116–128). New York: Routledge.
- Markula, P., & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative Research for Physical Culture*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Masisak, C. (2018). Looking forward: Harrison Browne, first openly transgender pro hockey player, retiring to take next step in his transition [Sport]. Retrieved October 15, 2018, from <https://theathletic.com/333877/2018/04/30/looking-forward-harrison-browne-first-openly-transgender-pro-hockey-player-retiring-to-take-next-step-in-his-transition/>
- May, T., Harris, S., & Collins, M. (2013). Implementing community sport policy: understanding the variety of voluntary club types and their attitudes to policy. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 5(3), 397–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2012.735688>
- Mayer, R. (2018, June 13). Transgender Track Athlete Wins CT State Championship, Debate Ensues [News]. Retrieved October 15, 2018, from <https://newyork.cbslocal.com/2018/06/13/transgender-track-athletes-win-connecticut-state-championship-debate-ensues/>
- McCormack, R., & Hanold, M. (2017). Becoming me: transitioning, training and surgery. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 32–39). New York: Routledge.
- Messner, M. (2002). *Taking the Field: Women, Men and Sport*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Misener, L. (2001). *Exploration of federal sport policy on youth elite sport in Canada: A case study of Gymnastics Canada Gymnastique*. University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.

- Nichols, G., Padmore, J., Taylor, P., & Barrett, D. (2012). The relationship between types of sports club and English government policy to grow participation. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 4(2), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2012.662693>
- Oakleaf, L., & Richmond, L. P. (2017). Dreaming About Access: The Experiences of Transgender Individuals in Public Recreation. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 35(2), 108–119.
- O’Gorman, J. (2011). Where is the implementation in sport policy and programme analysis? The English Football Association’s Charter Standard as an illustration. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 3(1), 85–108. doi:10.1080/19406940.2010.548339
- Orange, A. (2016). Encouraging reflexive practices in doctoral students through research journals. *Qualitative Report*, 21(12), 2176-2190.
- Paraschak, V. (2000). Knowing Ourselves Through the “Other”: Indigenous People in Sport in Canada. In R. Jones & K. Armour (Eds.), *Sociology of Sport: Theory and Practice* (pp. 153–166). Essex: Longman.
- Paraschak, V. (2013a). Aboriginal Peoples and the Construction of Canadian Sport Policy. In J. Forsyth & A. R. Giles (Eds.), *Aboriginal Peoples & Sport in Canada: Historical Foundations and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 95–123). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Paraschak, V. (2013b). Hope and strength(s) through physical activity for Canada’s Aboriginal people. In C. Hallinan & B. Judd (Eds.), *Native Games: Indigenous Peoples and Sports in the Post-Colonial World* (pp. 229–246). Bingley, UK: Emerald Press.
- Paraschak, V., & Thompson, K. (2014). Finding strength(s): insights on Aboriginal physical cultural practices in Canada. *Sport in Society*, 17(8), 1046–1060.

- Pieper, L. P. (2017). Advantage Renée? Renée Richards and women's tennis. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 13–22). New York: Routledge.
- Ponic, P. L. (1994). *Herstory: The Structuring of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch's Women's Program: 1970-1988*. University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.
- Saleebey, D. (1996). The strengths perspective in social work practice: Extensions and cautions. *Social Work, 41*(3), 296–305.
- Saleebey, D. (2009). Introduction: Power in the People. In *The Strengths Perspective in Social Work Practice* (5th ed., pp. 1–23). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Sam, M. P. (2003). What's the Big Idea? Reading the Rhetoric of a National Sport Policy Process. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 20*, 189–213.
- Shehu, J., & Mokgwathi, M. (2007). A discourse analysis of the National Sport and Recreation Policy for Botswana. *Sport, Education and Society, 12*(2), 193–210.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701287544>
- Skille, E. Å. (2009). State Sport Policy and Voluntary Sport Clubs: the Case of the Norwegian Sports City Program as Social Policy. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 9*(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740802461736>
- Skille, E. Å. (2011). The conventions of sport clubs: enabling and constraining the implementation of social goods through sport. *Sport, Education and Society, 16*(2), 241–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.540430>
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*(4), 249–275. <https://doi.org/137.207.120.173>

- Spratt, J. (2017). *Wellbeing, Equity and Education: A Critical Analysis of Policy Discourses of Wellbeing in Schools*. Springer International Publishing.
- Stenling, C., & Fahlén, J. (2016). Same same, but different? Exploring the organizational identities of Swedish voluntary sports: Possible implications of sports clubs' self-identification for their role as implementers of policy objectives. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 51(7), 867–883. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690214557103>
- Stryker, S. (2017). *Transgender History: The Roots of Today's Revolution* (Second). New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Suzuki, N. (2017). A Capability Approach to Understanding Sport for Social Inclusion: Agency, Structure and Organisations. *Social Inclusion*, 5(2), 150–158. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i2.905>
- Teetzel, S. (2014). The Onus of Inclusion: Sport Policies and the Enforcement of the Women's Category in Sport. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 41(1), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2013.858394>
- Theberge, N. (1998). "Same Sport, Different Gender": A Consideration of Binary Gender Logic and the Sport Continuum in the Case of Ice Hockey. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22(2), 183–198.
- Thornton, J. S. (2020). Athlete autonomy, supportive interpersonal environments and clinicians' duty of care; as leaders in sport and sports medicine, the onus is on us: The clinicians. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 54(2), 71. [doi:http://dx.doi.org.ledproxy2.uwindsor.ca/10.1136/bjsports-2019-100783](http://dx.doi.org.ledproxy2.uwindsor.ca/10.1136/bjsports-2019-100783)
- Travers, A. (2018). *The Trans Generation: How Trans Kids (and Their Parents) Are Creating a Gender Revolution*. New York: New York University Press.

Van Den Hoonaard, D. K. (2012). *Qualitative Research in Action: A Canadian Primer*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Vilain, E., Betancurt, J. O., Bueno-Guerra, N., & Martinez-Patiño, M. J. (2017). Transgender Athletes in Elite Sport Competitions: Equity and Inclusivity. In E. Anderson & A. Travers (Eds.), *Transgender Athletes in Competitive Sport* (pp. 156–170). New York: Routledge.

What is NVivo. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/what-is-nvivo>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Additional Definitions

Agender:

Term used by individuals who feel they have no gender identity. “Rather than a gender identity at odds with the gender one was assigned at birth” (Stryker, 2017, p. 12), agender folks move away from gender as a binary (female/male) and do not identify with either one or the other.

AMAB and AFAB:

Acronyms for *assigned male at birth* (AMAB) and *assigned female at birth* (AFAB). These acronyms demonstrate “that when we come into the world, somebody else tells us who they think we are” (Stryker, 2017, p.12). Individuals who use these terms are trying to show that assigned gender at birth puts people on a life path, however that path doesn’t need to determine everything about them, and they have the ability to change their path, including reassigning their gender identity.

Binary Gender:

“The idea that there are only two social genders – man and woman – based on two and only two sexes – male and female” (Stryker, 2017, p.12)

Cisgender:

Term used to identify individuals who identify with their assigned at birth gender. In other words, individuals who would not be categorized under the umbrella term *transgender*.

MTF and *FTM*:

Acronyms for *male-to-female* (MTF) and *female-to-male* (FTM) and indicators of the gender assigned at birth of a person to their transitioned gender identity.

APPENDIX B

Interview Guides



Interview Guide – Sport Administrators’ Use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective (ADs) (DRAFT)

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study about implementing transgender policy. As we discussed previously, and you have agreed to, I will be recording this interview. The recording of our interview will ensure that I have an accurate record of the information that you share with me. Please let me know if at any point you would like me to stop recording. Do you have any questions before we start? Please do not hesitate to ask me questions at any point throughout the interview.

Before I continue, I want to ask what your understanding of gender is?
Further, what is your understanding of transgender?

Section One – Effective/Successful Athletic Department

- 1) Can you describe what a successful athletic department looks like to you?
- 2) How would you describe the successful characteristics of the athletic department at your university?
 - a. Can you describe what success for your athletic teams looks like?
- 3) How is your athletic department effective in creating this success?
 - a. How are your coaches effective in creating this success?
- 4) Are there different roles involved in creating a successful department?
 - a. If yes, can you describe these roles?
- 5) Can you tell me about your involvement in creating a successful athletic department?
- 6) In your opinion what does the effective implementation of policy look like?
 - a. Do you believe this is the same for implementing transgender policy?
 - b. Is there other factors to take into consideration when implementing transgender policy?
 - i. If yes, can you elaborate on these factors?

Section Two – Strengths

Now I would like to talk about strengths. Strengths are personal assets/characteristics that can be used to be effectively work towards a specific goal. In other words, a strength is an attribute that you possess that helps you do something (i.e., implement policy) effectively.

- 1) What policies are you aware of? If any can you tell me about your understandings of them?
- 2) When implementing policy what strengths do you use to effectively implement the policies?
- 3) How do/would you use these strengths to implement transgender related policies?
- 4) What strengths do you have that help (or could help) others (i.e., coaches, players, staff) facilitate the success of your department in relation to the implementation of policies?
 - a. Would these strengths be the same for the successful implementation of transgender policy?
- 5) Is there strengths that you wish to develop that you believe could be useful to increase your success in implementing transgender policy?

Section Three – Resources

Your strengths can be considered personal resources; however, you can also draw upon human resources (i.e., people), material resources (i.e., policies, documents, books), and financial resources (i.e., funding). Resources help you in your ability to carry out actions. Therefore resources are elements that help you do your job effectively.

- 1) How are you a resource for others when implementing policy?
- 2) What resources (i.e., people, funding, documents) do/could you draw on to further your strengths to implement policy?
 - a. What resources can you draw on to implement transgender policy?
- 3) What resources (i.e., people, funding, documents) does U SPORTS or CCAA make available to you that can facilitate the implementation of transgender policy?
- 4) Are there additional resources you believe could be beneficial in furthering your efforts to implement policy that are not currently available?

Closing Statement

Thank you for your time. Is there anything that you would like to clarify or add? If you think of anything later, feel free to contact me.



University
of Windsor

Interview Guide – Sport Administrators’ Use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective (Coaches) (DRAFT)

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study about implementing transgender policy. As we discussed previously, and you have agreed I will be recording this interview. The recording of our interview will ensure that I have an accurate document of the information that you share with me. Please let me know if at any point you would like me to stop recording. Do you have any questions before we start? Please do not hesitate to ask me questions at any point throughout the interview.

Before I continue, I want to ask what your understanding of gender is?
Further, what is your understanding of transgender?

Section One – Effective/Successful Team

- 1) Can you describe what a successful team looks like to you?
- 2) How would you describe the successful characteristics of the team you coach?
 - a. Can you describe what success for your team looks like?
 - b. Is your athletic department effective in fostering this success?
- 3) How is your team effective in creating success?
 - a. What role does your athletic director play facilitating this success?
- 4) Are there different roles involved in creating a successful team?
 - a. If, yes can you describe these different roles?
- 5) Can you tell me about your involvement in creating a successful team?
- 6) In your opinion what does the effective implementation of policy look like?
 - a. Do you believe this is the same for implementing transgender policy?
 - b. Is there other factors to take into consideration when implementing transgender policy?
 - i. If yes, can you elaborate on these factors?

Section Two – Strengths

Now I would like to talk about strengths. Strengths are personal assets/characteristics that can be used to effectively work towards a specific goal. In other words, a strength is an attribute that you possess that helps you do something (i.e., implement policy) effectively.

- 1) What policies are you aware of? If any can you tell me about your understandings of them?

- 2) When implementing policy what strengths do you use to effectively implement the policies?
- 3) How do/would you use these strengths to implement transgender related policies?
 - a. Is there other strengths that you have that you use/would use to implement transgender policies that might be different than other policies?
- 4) What strengths do you have that help (or could help) others (i.e., athletes, staff, athletic director) facilitate the success of your team in relation to the implementation of policies?
 - a. Would these strengths be the same for the successful implementation of transgender policy?
- 5) Is there strengths that you wish to develop that you believe could be useful to increase your success in implementing transgender policy?

Section Three – Resources

Your strengths can be considered personal resources; however, you can also draw upon human resources (i.e., people), material resources (i.e., policies, documents, books), and financial resources (i.e., funding). Resources help you in your ability to carry out actions. Therefore resources are elements that help you do your job effectively.

- 1) How are you a resource for others when implementing policy?
- 2) What resources (i.e., people, funding, documents) do/could you draw on to further your strengths to implement policy?
 - a. What resources can you draw on to implement transgender policy?
- 3) What resources (i.e., people funding, documents) does U SPORTS or CCAA make available to you that can facilitate the implementation of transgender policy?
- 4) Are there additional resources you believe could be beneficial in furthering your efforts to implement policy that are not currently available?

Closing Statement

Thank you for your time. Is there anything that you would like to clarify or add? If you think of anything later, feel free to contact me.

APPENDIX C

Information Letter



LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective (ADs)

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Chelsey Leahy (Master's Student), from the department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will be contributing to my thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact me at email or phone # OR my advisor Dr. Victoria Paraschak at parasch@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 2445

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how ADs and coaches shape while being shaped by their athletes in relation to implementation of transgender policy in U SPORTS and Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA).

Since you are an athletic director at an institution governed by U SPORTS and/or CCAA, I intend to outline your efforts as an athletic director using a strengths and hope perspective. This perspective will document your strengths as an athletic director in implementing policies. Through an interview I hope to explore the strengths you draw on to implement policy, specifically transgender policy. Further, I hope to explore the human, financial and/or material resources that facilitate your strengths and that may help you further develop your strengths. My intention is to document the ways ADs and coaches play a role in shaping the university/college sport system through their efforts in implementing policies, specifically transgender policy and the resources they can use to further their strengths. Your perspective will help broaden current literature about transgender policy in sport, by providing the perspective of sport administrators.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Participate in a 45-75 minute interview with the researcher to address a series of questions about transgender policy and implementation. With your permission the interview will be audio recorded.
- 2) Following the interview, a transcript will be generated, and a copy will be forwarded to you to check the details and make any edits you please within two weeks. Your edited and approved transcript will be used for the results and analysis in my masters thesis.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Psychological risk – There is a potential risk that reflecting on the ways in which you have implemented policy might trigger feelings of vulnerability. It is my hope that by focusing on a strengths perspective, the positive aspects of implementing policies will be highlighted for you along with the barriers you may have faced. Also, you are free to opt out of answering any interview questions and will be given the opportunity to edit the transcript to align it with your preferred answers to the question.

Social risk – Having you speak about your failures as well as successes as an athletic director might highlight your inability to effectively implement policy at times in comparison to other ADs. I will manage this risk by allowing you to make changes to the transcript to ensure your perspective is prioritized. Since I am using a strengths and hope perspective, which focuses on the strengths of the individuals involved and the resources (e.g., human) that have supported you during your career, I do not expect to have specific comments recorded that would be potentially derogatory towards others (bystanders). However, in the writing of my thesis I will aim to speak in general terms about individuals who created potential challenges for you, rather than provide a specific name in order to minimize bystander risk, if such information should be provided. Further, transcripts will be stripped of all names (i.e., bystanders names will be changed to position title, athlete, coach, ADs of another institution), and you will be given a pseudonym to try and ensure confidentiality.

Data risk – Although measures will be taken to protect data, technology can fail despite the measures taken. To ensure that data is protected to the best of our ability, all audio recording and transcripts will be saved as password protected encrypted files on a password protect laptop that only I can access.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Your participation in this research will provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the strengths you have drawn upon that may have helped you become a more effective athletic director; this may provide you with an awareness of your capabilities in navigating the sport system while also helping others to successfully navigate this system.

Your participation in this research will also help to broaden existing literature on transgender policies, and on policy implementation more generally.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

No compensation will be provided for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

All written records (i.e., signed consent forms) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor to which only my advisor, Dr. Victoria Paraschak and I will have access. All electronic records will be password protected and only I will have access to these. Audio records will be deleted from the recording devices as soon as the files are transferred to a password-protected laptop. Participants will be permitted to review their audio recording upon request. Interviews will be transcribed following the interview and saved on a password-protected laptop, that only I can access. The transcripts will be encrypted and password protected.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question and/or withdraw without consequence from the study until you have given approval for your edited transcript, after which point you cannot withdraw.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

A copy of your transcript will be provided to you following the interview. Further, a summary of all research findings will be made available to you.

Web address: <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results>

Date when results are available: June 1st, 2019

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Signature of Investigator

Date



University
of Windsor

**LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of
Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope
Perspective (Coaches)**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Chelsey Leahy (Master's Student), from the department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will be contributing to my thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact me at email or phone # OR my advisor Dr. Victoria Paraschak at parasch@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 2445

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how ADs and coaches shape while being shaped by their athletes in relation to implementation of transgender policy in U SPORTS and Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA).

Since you are a coach at an institution governed by U SPORTS and/or CCAA, I intend to outline your efforts as a coach using a strengths and hope perspective. This perspective will document your strengths as a coach in implementing policies. Through an interview I hope to explore the strengths you draw on to implement policy, specifically transgender policy. Further, I hope to explore the human, financial and/or material resources that facilitate your strengths and that may help you further develop your strengths. My intention is to document the ways ADs and coaches play a role in shaping the university/college sport system through their efforts in implementing policies, specifically transgender policy and the resources they can use to further their strengths. Your perspective will help broaden current literature about transgender policy in sport, by providing the perspective of sport administrators.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Participate in a 45-75 minute interview with the researcher to address a series of questions about transgender policy and implementation. With your permission the interview will be audio recorded.
- 2) Following the interview, a transcript will be generated, and a copy will be forwarded to you to check the details and make any edits you please within two weeks. Your edited and approved transcript will be used for the results and analysis in my masters thesis.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Psychological risk – There is a potential risk that reflecting on the ways in which you have implemented policy might trigger feelings of vulnerability. It is my hope that by focusing on a strengths perspective, the positive aspects of implementing policies will be highlighted for you along with the barriers you may have faced. Also, you are free to opt out of answering any interview questions and will be given the opportunity to edit the transcript to align it with your preferred answers to the question.

Social risk – Having you speak about your failures as well as successes as a coach might highlight your inability to effectively implement policy at times in comparison to other ADs. I will manage this risk by allowing you to make changes to the transcript to ensure your perspective is prioritized. Since I am using a strengths and hope perspective, which focuses on the strengths of the individuals involved and the resources (e.g., human) that have supported you during your career, I do not expect to have specific comments recorded that would be potentially derogatory towards others (bystanders). However, in the writing of my thesis I will aim to speak in general terms about individuals who created potential challenges for you, rather than provide a specific name in order to minimize bystander risk, if such information should be provided. Further, transcripts will be stripped of all names (i.e., bystanders names will be changed to position title, athlete, coach, ADs of another institution), and you will be given a pseudonym to try and ensure confidentiality.

Data risk – Although measures will be taken to protect data, technology can fail despite the measures taken. To ensure that data is protected to the best of our ability, all audio recording and transcripts will be saved as password protected encrypted files on a password protect laptop that only I can access.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Your participation in this research will provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the strengths you have drawn upon that may have helped you become a more effective athletic director; this may provide you with an awareness of your capabilities in navigating the sport system while also helping others to successfully navigate this system.

Your participation in this research will also help to broaden existing literature on transgender policies, and on policy implementation more generally.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

No compensation will be provided for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

All written records (i.e., signed consent forms) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor to which only my advisor, Dr. Victoria Paraschak and I will have access. All electronic records will be password protected and only I will have access to these. Audio records will be deleted from the recording devices as soon as the files are transferred to a password-protected laptop. Participants will be permitted to review their audio recording upon request. Interviews will be transcribed following the interview and saved on a password-protected laptop, that only I can access. The transcripts will be encrypted and password protected.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question and/or withdraw without consequence from the study until you have given approval for your edited transcript, after which point you cannot withdraw.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

A copy of your transcript will be provided to you following the interview. Further, a summary of all research findings will be made available to you.

Web address: <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results>
Date when results are available: June 1st, 2019

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Signature of Investigator

Date

APPENDIX D

Recruitment Email (Sample)

Subject line: Research recruitment for Masters' Thesis

Hi (name of potential participant),

My name is Chelsey Leahy and I am a graduate student in Sport Management at the University of Windsor, currently completing my master's thesis. I am contacting you today as you are a <athletic director or coach> that is member of <U SPORTS and/or CCAA>.

The purpose of this study is to examine how ADs and coaches shape while being shaped by their athletes in relation to implementation of transgender policy in U SPORTS and Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA).

Since you are a <athletic director or coach> at an institution governed by U SPORTS and/or CCAA, I intend to outline your efforts as an athletic director using a strengths and hope perspective. This perspective will document your strengths as an athletic director in implementing policies. Through an interview I hope to explore the strengths you draw on to implement policy, specifically transgender policy. Further, I hope to explore the human, financial and/or material resources that facilitate your strengths and that may help you further develop your strengths. My intention is to document the ways ADs and coaches play a role in shaping the university/college sport system through their efforts in implementing policies, specifically transgender policy and the resources they can use to further their strengths. Your perspective will help broaden current literature about transgender policy in sport, by including the perspective of sport administrators.

Please find attached the letter of information, and if you are interested in participating in the study I can be reached at this email address.

Thank you,

Chelsey H. Leahy

MHK Candidate, Sport Management
University of Windsor

APPENDIX E

Consent for Audio Taping



University
of Windsor

CONSENT FOR AUDIO TAPING

Title of the Project: Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective.

Research Participant Name: _____

I consent to the audio-taping of interviews.

I understand these are voluntary procedures and that I am free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. I also understand that my name will not be revealed to anyone and that taping will be kept confidential. Tapes are filed by number only and stored in a locked cabinet.

The destruction of the audio tapes will be completed after transcription and verification by you.

I understand that confidentiality will be respected and that the audio tape will be for professional use only.

This research has been cleared by the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board.

(Research Participant)

(Date)

APPENDIX F -
Letters of Consent



CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective (ADs)

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Chelsey Leahy (Master's Student), from the department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will be contributing to my thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact me at [EMAIL](#) or PHONE # OR my advisor Dr. Victoria Paraschak at parasch@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 2445

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how ADs and coaches shape while being shaped by their athletes in relation to implementation of transgender policy in U SPORTS and Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA).

Since you are an athletic director at an institution governed by U SPORTS and/or CCAA, I intend to outline your efforts as an athletic director using a strengths and hope perspective. This perspective will document your strengths as an athletic director in implementing policies. Through an interview I hope to explore the strengths you draw on to implement policy, specifically transgender policy. Further, I hope to explore the human, financial and/or material resources that facilitate your strengths and that may help you further develop your strengths. My intention is to document the ways ADs and coaches play a role in shaping the university/college sport system through their efforts in implementing policies, specifically transgender policy and the resources they can use to further their strengths. Your perspective will help broaden current literature about transgender policy in sport, by providing the perspective of sport administrators.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Participate in a 45-75 minute interview with the researcher to address a series of questions about transgender policy and implementation. With your permission the interview will be audio recorded.
- 2) Following the interview, a transcript will be generated, and a copy will be forwarded to you to check the details and make any edits you please within two weeks. Your edited and approved transcript will be used for the results and analysis in my masters thesis.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Psychological risk – There is a potential risk that reflecting on the ways in which you have implemented policy might trigger feelings of vulnerability. It is my hope that by focusing on a strengths perspective, the positive aspects of implementing policies will be highlighted for you along with the barriers you may have

faced. Also, you are free to opt out of answering any interview questions and will be given the opportunity to edit the transcript to align it with your preferred answers to the question.

Social risk – Having you speak about your failures as well as successes as an athletic director might highlight your inability to effectively implement policy at times in comparison to other ADs. I will manage this risk by allowing you to make changes to the transcript to ensure your perspective is prioritized. Since I am using a strengths and hope perspective, which focuses on the strengths of the individuals involved and the resources (e.g., human) that have supported you during your career, I do not expect to have specific comments recorded that would be potentially derogatory towards others (bystanders). However, in the writing of my thesis I will aim to speak in general terms about individuals who created potential challenges for you, rather than provide a specific name in order to minimize bystander risk, if such information should be provided. Further, transcripts will be stripped of all names (i.e., bystanders names will be changed to position title, athlete, coach, ADs of another institution), and you will be given a pseudonym to try and ensure confidentiality.

Data risk – Although measures will be taken to protect data, technology can fail despite the measures taken. To ensure that data is protected to the best of our ability, all audio recording and transcripts will be saved as password protected encrypted files on a password protect laptop that only I can access.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Your participation in this research will provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the strengths you have drawn upon that may have helped you become a more effective athletic director; this may provide you with an awareness of your capabilities in navigating the sport system while also helping others to successfully navigate this system.

Your participation in this research will also help to broaden existing literature on transgender policies, and on policy implementation more generally.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

No compensation will be provided for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

All written records (i.e., signed consent forms) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor to which only my advisor, Dr. Victoria Paraschak and I will have access. All electronic records will be password protected and only I will have access to these. Audio records will be deleted from the recording devices as soon as the files are transferred to a password-protected laptop. Participants will be permitted to review their audio recording upon request. Interviews will be transcribed following the interview and saved on a password-protected laptop, that only I can access. The transcripts will be encrypted and password protected.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question and/or withdraw without consequence from the study until you have given approval for your edited transcript, after which point you cannot withdraw.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

A copy of your transcript will be provided to you following the interview. Further, a summary of all research findings will be made available to you.

Web address: <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results>

Date when results are available: June 1st, 2019

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study *Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective* as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.



University
of Windsor

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of
Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope
Perspective (Coaches)

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Chelsey Leahy (Master's Student), from the department of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor. The results of this study will be contributing to my thesis.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact me at _____ or _____ OR my advisor Dr. Victoria Paraschak at parasch@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 2445

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how ADs and coaches shape while being shaped by their athletes in relation to implementation of transgender policy in U SPORTS and Canadian Collegiate Athletic Association (CCAA).

Since you are a coach at an institution governed by U SPORTS and/or CCAA, I intend to outline your efforts as a coach using a strengths and hope perspective. This perspective will document your strengths as a coach in implementing policies. Through an interview I hope to explore the strengths you draw on to implement policy, specifically transgender policy. Further, I hope to explore the human, financial and/or material resources that facilitate your strengths and that may help you further develop your strengths. My intention is to document the ways ADs and coaches play a role in shaping the university/college sport system through their efforts in implementing policies, specifically transgender policy and the resources they can use to further their strengths. Your perspective will help broaden current literature about transgender policy in sport, by providing the perspective of sport administrators.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

- 1) Participate in a 45-75 minute interview with the researcher to address a series of questions about transgender policy and implementation. With your permission the interview will be audio recorded.
- 2) Following the interview, a transcript will be generated, and a copy will be forwarded to you to check the details and make any edits you please within two weeks. Your edited and approved transcript will be used for the results and analysis in my masters thesis.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Psychological risk – There is a potential risk that reflecting on the ways in which you have implemented policy might trigger feelings of vulnerability. It is my hope that by focusing on a strengths perspective, the positive aspects of implementing policies will be highlighted for you along with the barriers you may have faced. Also, you are free to opt out of answering any interview questions and will be given the opportunity to edit the transcript to align it with your preferred answers to the question.

Social risk – Having you speak about your failures as well as successes as an athletic director might highlight your inability to effectively implement policy at times in comparison to other ADs. I will manage this risk by allowing you to make changes to the transcript to ensure your perspective is prioritized. Since I

am using a strengths and hope perspective, which focuses on the strengths of the individuals involved and the resources (e.g., human) that have supported you during your career, I do not expect to have specific comments recorded that would be potentially derogatory towards others (bystanders). However, in the writing of my thesis I will aim to speak in general terms about individuals who created potential challenges for you, rather than provide a specific name in order to minimize bystander risk, if such information should be provided. Further, transcripts will be stripped of all names (i.e., bystanders names will be changed to position title, athlete, coach, ADs of another institution), and you will be given a pseudonym to try and ensure confidentiality.

Data risk – Although measures will be taken to protect data, technology can fail despite the measures taken. To ensure that data is protected to the best of our ability, all audio recording and transcripts will be saved as password protected encrypted files on a password protect laptop that only I can access.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Your participation in this research will provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the strengths you have drawn upon that may have helped you become a more effective athletic director; this may provide you with an awareness of your capabilities in navigating the sport system while also helping others to successfully navigate this system.

Your participation in this research will also help to broaden existing literature on transgender policies, and on policy implementation more generally.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

No compensation will be provided for your participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

All written records (i.e., signed consent forms) will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor to which only my advisor, Dr. Victoria Paraschak and I will have access. All electronic records will be password protected and only I will have access to these. Audio records will be deleted from the recording devices as soon as the files are transferred to a password-protected laptop. Participants will be permitted to review their audio recording upon request. Interviews will be transcribed following the interview and saved on a password-protected laptop, that only I can access. The transcripts will be encrypted and password protected.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question and/or withdraw without consequence from the study until you have given approval for your edited transcript, after which point you cannot withdraw.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

A copy of your transcript will be provided to you following the interview. Further, a summary of all research findings will be made available to you.

Web address: <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results>
Date when results are available: June 1st, 2019

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study *Sport Administrators' use of Strengths in Implementing Policy: A Study of Transgender Policies in U SPORTS and CCAA from a Strengths and Hope Perspective* as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant

Signature of Participant

Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Signature of Investigator

Date

APPENDIX G

A Priori Codes

Statement of the Problem

- Support
- Success
- Inclusion

Sub-Problem 1:

- Material Resources
- Interpretation

Sub-Problem 2:

- Strengths
- New Strengths
- Preferred future

Sub-Problem 3:

- Material Resource
- Human Resource
- Financial Resource

APPENDIX H

Conceptual Baggage

My Experiences with Sport and Gender

For as long as I can remember I have been involved in sport in some way or another. Having two older siblings play organized sport meant that from the time I was born I was in a rink or in the bleachers at a baseball game. I started CanSkate at four years old and transitioned to ice hockey when I started kindergarten. Having a twin brother, Colin, I never questioned the fact that I was the only girl on the team and in the league. I had my brother by my side and to be honest I probably did not realize ice hockey was a gendered sport; this likely explains why I was the only girl in the league. Going into grade two my family moved, and for the first time I remember being introduced to gender norms. Having previously always been with Colin (everywhere we went, we went together), I was fortunate to have both dolls and trucks to play with; playing with the boys at recess was never questioned. In kindergarten and grade one I was in the same class as Colin, but when we moved something changed. My parents made the decision to separate Colin and I for classes so that we would not be so dependent on each other.

For the first time in my life and at a new school, I had to make friends on my own. I recall the first day of grade two like it was yesterday. Before morning recess Mme. Giselle introduced me to Chloé, a girl from my class. Chloé was to show me around and introduce me to the other kids. I don't remember much about that fifteen minutes of recess, except for her asking if I did gymnastics or any sports. Without thinking I said I played hockey, and was ridiculed by the other girls because "only boys play hockey". I never put my hockey gear on again, trading in my skates for gymnastic slippers briefly, before turning to dance.

My sister also left hockey that year. I have never asked her why but I would not be surprised if it was for the same reason I had. In the small town we lived in only high school girls played hockey, and girls most definitely did not play on boys' teams for any sport. After I danced for a few years, Colin started playing baseball during the summer. Not having dance in the summer, I decided to play baseball as well. I put aside getting laughed at and being called names. At the time I had no clue what these names even meant, but it was very clear that I was not supposed to be playing with the boys. In grade five, being an athletic girl, I was asked to try out for the girls' grade 6-7 soccer team. I did not dance that year and started playing soccer, which is where my true love for sport participation lies.

Following grade five, my family moved once again, and with that move I quit another sport. At twelve years old, I had to decide if I would go competitive with soccer or play multiple sports during the summer; I opted to play soccer, a sport that brought me both great joy and hardship. From middle school to grade 10 I played every sport my school had to offer (soccer, volleyball, basketball, softball and track). I was the school's jock, and proudly so, but with that title also came questions from others about my sexuality. Although I was playing all the sports my school offered, volleyball, a hyperfeminine sport, became an issue. Teammates spoke behind my back about them thinking I was a lesbian, and the coach was well aware of these comments and never intervened. In grade ten I left a sport that I was passionate about, because I presented as being too masculine for my teammates (and likely the coach) to be comfortable having me on the team. I continued to play soccer and basketball throughout the rest of high school, and in grade eleven came out to everyone about my sexuality. I remember for the first couple of weeks after teammates found out that I am a lesbian, being anxious being in the locker room – with that

feeling never completely going away but having it fade slightly when my basketball coach pulled me aside to reassure me that I was welcome on the team regardless.

The insecurities that I felt have influenced my academic life greatly. I cannot remove my identity completely from my work, but it has also given me opportunities that I am sure I would have never had otherwise. I probably never would have considered researching issues that LGBTQ+ individuals face in sport. Once high school ended I started at a small liberal arts university, where I played on their varsity women's soccer team. I became aware, because of my connection to the LGBTQ+ community, that there were transgender individuals, but it did not seem possible or fair to me that these individuals could play competitive sport. I was always an ally for transgender friends throughout high school but if a question about where they could play sport had arisen, I probably would have thought it to be unfair for other players. I arrived for my first year university training camp, with short hair and presenting as very androgynous. My androgynous style brought with it questions from my teammates about my gender identity. As a confused first year, I did not understand why they were asking me this question. I later learned that my teammates wanted to make sure I was comfortable being myself. At this time I was still unaware that the previous season a senior had come out as a transgender man and finished the season. I started to understand why they were asking me about my gender identity and for the first time in my athletic career, I heard about a transgender athlete competing at a high level, opening my eyes to a whole new world.

On the way home from our first road trip, the captain of the team thought I was being shy, so she decided to sit with me on the bus. This is when I found out about the transgender player from the previous season; it was also the first time someone knowing I am female bodied asked me whether I identify with that body. I do, which is why I cannot understand the

experience of transgender athletes fully, but having presented as androgynous for many years, I am able to be compassionate about questions they may receive. I later found out that the transgender player on my team was told by the coach that he was not welcomed back, despite the league being governed by CCAA, with a policy in place that allowed him to play.

Throughout my five years as a varsity soccer player we had three coaches, all excellent and for the most part very welcoming. In my undergraduate program I did an honours in Sociology, with my thesis research on the experiences of female ice hockey players. Reflecting now, I understand why I chose ice hockey over another sport. It was the first sport I was ever pushed away from because of my gender, being a female athlete in a male environment. Doing that research, I started to understand the struggle that cis-women have faced in sport but was also very aware of what was going on in the world of women's professional hockey. Harrison Browne came out publicly that year, which reaffirmed to me that transgender athletes can play competitive sport. Through my literature review I came across the name Chris Mosier and again was surprised that a transgender man was competing with cis-men. These names made me start to wonder; why are we not seeing more transgender athletes playing sport, and how can we make sport a welcoming place for them? The news surrounding Mack Beggs started circulating and my heart hurt for this young man, who had to continue competing with women if he wanted to continue wrestling. The rules in his State for high school sport requires individuals to compete in their assigned gender at birth category. Rules and regulations; WADA anti-doping policy; it all started to come together. During this project, I also did an analysis of the policies and regulations within U Sports. I analyzed policy 80.80 during this project, which pertains to equity. At the time, it did not include a section for the inclusion of transgender athletes.

Moving forward to the final semester of my undergraduate degree, my honours thesis was completed and behind me. I just wanted to put my head down and play my last season of varsity soccer. A rookie arrived at training camp; they tell us that they have a girlfriend. I'm thinking "okay, great I finally have a teammate that understands my relationship". Although I felt that this rookie was hiding something and not being authentically themselves, I did not feel like it was my place to ask questions. The longer the season went on, the more I started being able to tell that HE wanted me to ask him the tough question. He had shown me transformation Instagram pages, and was really excited when I would show him articles about transgender athletes in sport. So I went against my gut, and asked him if he identified as a man. That night he cried on my shoulder and explained that he had been out for two years prior to attending university but wanted to play university soccer. It was his dream, so he hid his gender. He was unaware that the governing body for our league has a transgender policy; he was afraid he would no longer be welcomed on the team. He did not know if the coach would support him, or if the athletic director would tell him he could not play on a women's team. It was during this season, a season where I had zero intention to think more deeply about what research I wanted to do in my masters, that I realized that coaches and ADs have the ability to make or break a transgender athlete's university athletic career.

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Chelsey H. Leahy

PLACE OF BIRTH: Summerside, PE

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1994

EDUCATION: École Sainte-Anne, Fredericton, NB, 2012

St. Thomas University, B.A. (Hons.),
Fredericton, NB, 2017

University of Windsor, M.H.K. Sport
Management, Windsor, ON, 2020