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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate male athletes' perspectives pertaining to socially constructed "masculinities". This was accomplished using a two-phase protocol combining Q-methodology with open-ended interviews. In Phase 1, 42 Q-sort items were developed representing the components of hegemonic masculinity as identified in the literature. In addition, an exploratory component dealing with the mesomorphic body type was included.

Fifty male athletes from the University of Windsor, representing a variety of sporting activities at both the varsity and club levels, sorted the 42 items in a manner that best represented their own subjective values and opinions. The Q-sorts were then analyzed using the p.c.q. or Factor Analysis Program for Q-Technique. Three types of "masculinities" emerged within the sample. Phase 2 consisted of twelve open-ended interviews, including four athletes from each emergent type of "masculinity".

The "Integrationist" masculine identity included athletes who participated in both Type "A" or team oriented, collision sports and Type "B" or individually oriented, non-collision sports. These athletes are not afraid to challenge male authority, and support equal opportunity for both female athletes and gay male athletes within organized sports.
The "Segregationist" masculine identity consisted primarily of athletes who participated in Type "A" sports. These athletes support deference to male authority and challenge the presence of females within organized sports. In addition, they also condone aggressive and violent behaviour and support the social isolation of female from male athletes.

The "Individualist" masculine identity consisted primarily of athletes who participated in Type "B" sports. Like the athletes within the "Integrationist" masculine identity, these athletes support equal opportunity in sport for both female athletes and gay male athletes. However, they also condone aggressive but not violent behaviour, and are not willing to sacrifice their physical well-being for participation when injured.

The athletes from these three types of "masculinities" all indicated that the mesomorphic body type is not a significant component in the social construction of their masculine identities. Rather, they agreed that an athlete's body type is dictated by the sporting activity in which he participates.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Masculinity is a socially constructed, ideologically driven behaviour. The social construction of an individual's masculine identity is largely based on his ability to both "objectively" and "subjectively" interpret social reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.129). Accordingly, as a male athlete matures within the institution of organized sports, his masculine identity is continuously being challenged and re-shaped.

Existing literature includes an abundance of studies which assert that the hegemonic masculine identity is associated with organized sports (Hantover, 1978; Dunning, 1986; Rakow, 1986; Bryson, 1987; Kidd, 1987; Connell, 1990; Kervin, 1990; Kimmel, 1990; Sabo & Panepinto, 1990). Further, it has been postulated that the institution of organized sports was created by men, for men, as an arena for the reproduction and re-affirmation of the traditional hegemonic masculine identity. Therefore, hegemonic masculinity consists of ideologies which are representative of the institutionally approved masculine ideal, as constructed by the dominant male ruling group (Connell, 1990). Central to this masculine ideal is the patriarchal relations which support the existence of the male-female gender dichotomy. The male-female gender dichotomy, which
reinforces and maintains the unequal power relations between men and women, typically favours men.

The hegemonic masculine identity discussed in the literature includes six different components. These components include deference to male authority, the devaluation of women, the sanctioned use of aggression and violence, social isolation, the exclusion of pain, and the marginalization of homosexuals. Each of the components have been linked, through the literature, to the proliferation of the hegemonic masculine identity within the institution of organized sports.

The literature review supports the existence of hegemonic masculinity as the exclusive masculine ideal within the institution of organized sports. However, it seems reasonable to question whether or not the hegemonic masculine identity should be regarded as the singular form of masculinity within organized sports. Is there a latitude of variance for the existence of other masculinities? Sabo & Runfola (1980) concur, speculating that the traditional hegemonic masculine identity has given way to new, more modern variations of masculinities (p.39).

The principal focus of this study is an examination of male athletes' adherence to, or rejection of hegemonic masculine components. The subsequent construction of additional masculinities, and their support or rejection of hegemonic masculinity within the institution of organized
sports, is also examined.

Previous research has characteristically ignored the significant role that the mesomorphic body type may play in the social construction of the hegemonic masculine identity. This has resulted in a deficiency of research, offering few conclusive results in the area of body image and masculinity as it relates to male athletes (Davis, Elliott, Dionne, & Mitchell, 1991, p.689; Mishkind, Rodin, Silberstein, & Striegel-Moore, 1986, p.554). A growth in the preoccupation with body image has created a need, however, to further examine hegemonic masculinity and its inclusion of the mesomorphic body type (Loosemore & Moriarty, 1990, p.15).

To date there have been few attempts in sports settings to incorporate the mesomorphic body type as an integral component of hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, as a sub-problem, this study will examine the inclusion of the mesomorphic body type as a hegemonic component in the social construction of an athlete's masculine identity, as reported by the same sample of athletes.

The following section will provide a brief summary of the theoretical perspective of Social Constructionism as advocated by Berger & Luckmann (1966). It will also outline the process through which an athlete "objectively" and "subjectively" constructs his masculine identity.
CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

According to Kimmel (1990) the social construction of masculinity is so diverse in nature that it is best approached as a problematic gender construct (p.52). Therefore, the task at hand entails "shedding some light" on this eclectic phenomenon by further investigating beyond the "obvious" issues in order to reach the nucleus of such an enigmatic concern.

This study will investigate the social construction of masculinity, utilizing the Social Constructionist Theory as previously indicated. This theory prescribes that the social construction of masculinity is based on both objective and subjective components of reality. "Objective" reality is representative of what is "real" and beyond the control of the individual (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.133). Objective components of reality are created by human and environmental influences which are representative of a particular society or institution (i.e. the institution of organized sports). Therefore, a male's sense of masculinity is constructed from the definition offered to him by influential human and environmental influences.

For example, if a young male is born into an environment which is heavily influenced by sports, the construction of his masculine identity will be heavily
influenced by the preferred hegemonic masculine identity which is supported and reinforced by the institution of organized sports. This institutionally established ideal of appropriate masculine behaviour is firmly entrenched within the male's environment as objective reality. The male individual may choose to accept this objective interpretation as "real", making it his own, or he may choose to deny its relevance, not including it in his own individualized subjective reality. Therefore, objective reality exists to be acknowledged and interpreted in a subjective manner.

"Subjective" reality is based on the internalization of objective information or events. An individual has the ability to interpret "fixed" objective reality at "face value", basing the construction of his social world on various mediated, objective realities. He may also interpret objective reality in a subjective manner, re-modifying the intended objective meaning based on his own subjective interpretation.

For example, a young male may be born into a society where the vilification of women is promoted as desirable masculine behaviour. Upon acknowledgement of this objective behaviour, the young male has the capacity to interpret this behaviour in a subjective fashion. He may choose to include this component of behaviour into his own "subjective" definition of masculinity or he may choose to exclude it.
Either way, the young male has subjectively interpreted an objectified behaviour in order to construct his own, subjectively based reality.

It is the interrelationship between objective and subjective reality that establishes and moulds the male individual's masculine identity. This relationship is a dialectical one that is composed of three specific "moments" referred to by Berger & Luckmann (1966) as externalization, objectivation, and internalization (p.129).

"Externalization" as described by Berger & Luckmann (1966), is the ability of an individual to act within or upon his environment, based on his subjective interpretation of objective reality (p.52). It is a process which is initiated by an individual in an attempt to create and maintain social order within his environment. However, one must be aware that social order exists only as long as an individual's behaviour or activity produces it.

Externalization also permits older individuals to "act" upon the less socialized members of society (i.e. children), in a mediatory fashion. This interaction promotes the mediation of objective information by these individuals which is effectively communicated for the purpose of internalization. Therefore, externalization promotes the development of societal opinions and values, which in turn, creates an order and/or structure which becomes dialectical in nature as society successfully creates and reproduces it.
It becomes evident that the individual actively constructs his nature, or more simply, individuals are in charge of their own construction as masculine beings (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.49).

"Objectivation" is the second moment which consists of the process where externalized products of human activity attain an "identity", which becomes characteristic of a particular ideology (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.60). As humans living in a social world, we are constantly surrounded by objects that declare the subjective intentions of influential institutions and human beings. These "objects" heavily influence individual behaviour within the various institution within society.

"Signification" may be perceived as a unique form of objectivation (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.35). A particular "sign" may be distinguished from other objectivations by its explicit intention to serve as an index of subjective meaning. For example, the human body is often used to signify masculine behaviour when it is used in especially aggressive, forceful, or violent ways (Messner, 1990, p.205). Therefore, the aggressive body can be used as a "sign" which becomes embodied as a symbol of masculinity.

Internalization is the third and final moment introduced by Berger & Luckmann (1966). "Internalization" is the interpretation of objective information or events which express meaning that is a direct manifestation of
another individual's subjective translation (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.129). It is important to realize that this type of manifestation often becomes subjectively meaningful to other individuals who come into contact with it.

For example, a young boy's father may subjectively interpret a "fixed" objective event, mediating it to the young boy who acknowledges it as objective information. The young boy may then decipher this objective information as useful, internalizing it in order to develop or re-structure his subjective reality, or instead may discard the information as insignificant, thus not relevant to his own, individualized social reality.

In understanding the relationship between these three "moments" one must be aware that they do not occur in any sort of temporal sequence (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.129). The social construction of masculinity is a process which "never sleeps", where the simultaneous interaction between these three "moments" is continuously challenging and/or re-affirming existing beliefs and values, thus shaping or moulding a young boy's or man's masculine identity.

The focus of this study will concentrate on the examination of how male athletes interpret objectified hegemonic ideologies and whether they choose to incorporate them or ignore them from the social construction of their masculine identities. In order to accomplish this task,
this study will specifically concentrate on the two "moments" referred to as internalization and objectivation. Internalization and objectivation play significant roles in the social construction of masculinity. Internalization permits an individual to construct a knowledge base in order to create and define the ideal, socially endorsed, masculine identity. Objectivations, meanwhile, are critical to the development of masculinity as they are representative of the subjective realities imposed by significant others. Therefore, it is this interaction between young, less experienced boys and older more experienced individuals that is responsible for the subsequent shaping and moulding of these young boys' subjective interpretation of what it means to be masculine.
CHAPTER 3

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following literature review will outline current studies in order to validate the researcher's fundamental assumption that the institution of organized sports is a central site for the social construction of hegemonic masculinity. Careful theoretical examination of the integral components which constitute the hegemonic masculine identity will be provided. However, before examining hegemonic masculine ideologies, it is necessary to first explore hegemony and masculinity separately.

Hegemony:

"Hegemony" directs us to recognize specific interests underlying the active practice of socialization (Whitson, 1984, p.67). In other words, it is the capacity of groups of individuals within society to maintain their interests related to a specific distribution of power and influence.

Hegemony is an ongoing process where there is an active division between existing dominant or ruling groups and various subordinate groups. Critical to the maintenance of the dominant, ruling group is its ability to remain forceful by extending its influence to the whole area of lived experience within society (Whitson, 1984, p.68). Further, it becomes important to understand that hegemony extends
beyond ideology and operates at the level of feeling as well as thought.

Traditionally, men have maintained many of the dominant positions within the institution of organized sports. Their position of relative power has enabled them the privilege of defining and establishing what is acceptable behaviour, based on their own values and beliefs. Therefore, the resultant hegemonically based definition of desired behaviour is usually not representative of the values and beliefs maintained by the majority of "subordinate" or less powerful individuals within the institution.

Masculinity:

The traditional masculine ideal was viewed by many as a product of the experiences found in both the workplace and everyday life (Kimmel, 1990, p.56). The traditional male was easily identifiable based on his position as the breadwinner, and thus head of the family and the household. He was forceful, full of power, independent, self-reliant, competitive, risk taking, and in control of his life (Hantover, 1978, p.186). Therefore, the acts a man performs and how he does them is what truly makes a male a man (Hantover, 1978, p.185).

However, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries the dominant male establishment began to waver as social changes began to erode the foundations and the livelihood of
the North American ideal of masculinity (Kimmel, 1990, p.57; Hantover, 1978, p.186). Along with the advent of the industrial revolution were momentous social and economic changes, which prompted contemporary society to begin the progression through a transitional phase which adversely affected the traditional masculine ideal.

According to Hantover (1978) urbanization had begun to obliterate and eliminate the pre-existing conditions for the once unwavering "natural" production of the masculine identity (p.189). Therefore, the once traditional masculine ideal was giving way to new, more modern ones (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p.39; Kimmel, 1990, p.57). In essence, the masculine ideal symbolized by the traditional "frontiersman" or "soldier" archetype was slowly giving way to a more civilized identity of maleness.

To counteract the effects of urbanization, men actively sought to revitalize and nurture the "traditional" masculine ideal in order to return the vitality and strength that was being slowly eroded from their culture (Kimmel, 1990, p.58). Based on this response it seems that men related more easily to old masculine ideals and did not want to adapt to the newer, civilized masculine ideologies.

However, urbanization was not solely responsible for the perceived breakdown of the traditional masculine ideal. The increased entry of women into the male dominated work force also attributed to the erosion of traditional forms of
masculinity (Kimmel, 1990, p.57). Consequently, men began to publicly express their concern over the rise of feminism which was, for the first time, gaining enough momentum to effectively challenge the male position of dominance and power within society.

In retaliation to the increasing challenge from feminism, men began to re-create and reinforce a hegemomically based "symbolic order" where their position of dominance in society was consciously maintained and reproduced (Rakow, 1986, p.14). It was this type of influential "power" that allowed men to legitimize and maintain their established reign over the majority of society in order to initially marginalize the rise of feminist power but not for long.

Men were becoming fearful that they, and more importantly male adolescent "initiates", would face increasingly limited opportunities for masculine validation, eventually undermining the development of the traditional masculine identity. This would eventually downplay the role of masculinity as a cultural construct which allowed men the opportunity to perform normatively appropriate male behaviour (Hantover, 1978, p.185) in order to reproduce desirable masculine ideologies.

Men began to involve themselves in activities which were indicative of the traditional male role (Kervin, 1990, p.54). Characteristics such as dominance over others,
situations, and oneself, the sanctioned use of violence, and competitiveness were being reintroduced and reaffirmed within the male sector of society as desirable masculine qualities. This was an attempt to further establish male dominance while simultaneously downplaying the role of the female within society. Therefore, specific characteristics became synonymous with the ideal masculine identity as they ensured the legitimation and maintenance of the dominant male ruling position by reinforcing patriarchal relations, and thus the subsequent establishment of the male-female gender dichotomy.

Further, it was this transformation which increased the likelihood of an equalising shift, favouring women, in the balance of power between men and women (Dunning, 1986, p.83). Here as well, men began to feel the challenge from women to their dominant position within the institution of organized sports¹, feeling a need to increase the masculinizing power of sport in order to "recharge" and re-establish their dominant position. This "reclaiming" of sport as a male preserve also re-established the beliefs and values inherent within the hegemonic masculine ideal in order to support patriarchal relations and the male-female gender dichotomy which seems central to hegemonic power.

¹ An institution is an extensive assortment of groups of people which are characterized by conscious or unconscious repetition of specific behaviours and actions. These actions or behaviours are representative of the various ideologies maintained and reproduced by the members of the institution (Berger & Luckmann 1966, p.34). For further information about the role of the institution in the social construction of masculine ideologies refer to P.L Berger & T. Luckmann (1966). The Social Construction of Reality. New York, NY: Doubleday.
Men began to use the institution of organized sports as an arena where they could reaffirm the differences between what it is to be masculine and feminine. Therefore, the institution of organized sports was used by the dominant male group as an all male preserve where they took pride in emphasizing the fact that females were actively discouraged from participating (Kidd, 1987, p.253). This was a conscious attempt by the male ruling group(s) within society to reinforce patriarchal relations, and thus the male-female gender dichotomy.

The institutionalization of organized sports effectively provided men with a forum where they could actively express and validate their masculinity without the disruption seemingly caused by the feminine presence (Hantover, 1978, p.189). They believed that the active participation by men in the institution of organized sports bred virility, while simultaneously downplaying characteristics that are representative of the feminine ideal.

*Hegemonic Masculinity:*

Based on their acquired power, men have become the major creators of the gendered world as we currently experience it (Rakow, 1986, p.14). Therefore, "hegemonic masculinity" refers to a specific set of characteristics or ideologies which are representative of the socially approved
masculine ideal, as defined by the dominant group of males within institutions such as organized sports (Connell, 1990, p.94). According to Rakow (1986) men have become the major creators of the gendered world as we currently experience it (p.14) for both men and women.

Society has perceived and promoted the institution of organized sports as an agent for the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity among male youth (Hantover, 1978, p.185). Organized sports have provided an environment where young boys could begin and eventually complete the social transformation from boyhood to manhood. Therefore, the ability to successfully internalize and actively support the objectified hegemonic ideal is the key to developing the desired hegemonic masculine identity.

According to Bryson (1987) the institution of organized sports has a ritual element which continually strengthens the hegemony and the dimensions of male solidarity, not just for teams, but for men in general (p.357). Hegemonic behaviour is thus not only restricted to the institution of organized sports but is also evident within everyday life. This would seem to portray sports as a "breeding" ground for the development and subsequent practice of hegemonic

---

2 The "significant other" is an individual who is characterized by the mediatory action he may take to reinforce the socialization process of younger members within the institution. It is often the "man-boy" relationship, within the institution of organized sports, that establishes the ongoing association between the significant other or "officiate" and the young male or the "initiate" (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.116). For further information about the role of the significant other in the socialization process please refer to D. Sabo & J. Panepinto (1990). Football ritual and social reproduction of masculinity. In N.A. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, Men, and the Gender Order. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; A. Lehtinen & A. Tihonen (1990). Narratives of men's experience in sport. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 25(3), 183-199.
masculinity.

This ritual element is exemplified through "initiation rites", most often mediated by the "officiant", which young "initiates" internalize in order to develop the desired characteristics which constitute the preferred hegemonic masculine identity endorsed by the institution (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.116). The man-boy relationship and deference to male authority are examples of "initiation rights" used to emphasize the male-female gender dichotomy which is integral to the patriarchal relations inherent in hegemonic masculinity. The significant other(s) further emphasizes conformity to these types of behaviours which become embedded in the social construction of the young male's masculine identity.

Deference to male authority is a component of hegemonic masculinity which is critical to the successful construction of the hegemonic masculine identity. It effectively establishes a "power" hierarchy where the officiant maintains the most power and the initiate is the less powerful, subordinate member within the hierarchy. This permits the officiant to establish his role as a "mediatory" force in the subsequent internalization, by the initiate, of the desirable ideological components pertaining to hegemonic masculinity. Other components which compose the hegemonic masculine identity include the devaluation of women, the sanctioned use of aggression and violence, the use of social
isolation, the exclusion of pain, and the marginalization of homosexuals. All of these components support patriarchal relations which in turn further establish and highlight the male-female gender dichotomy which has become central to the salience of hegemonic masculine ideology.

Deference to Male Authority

According to Kidd (1990) an extremely fertile field for the reassertion and legitimation of male power and privilege has been sports (p.32). Critical to the maintenance of this position of power within organized sports is deference to male authority. It is deference to male authority that introduces young boys to the wider male status hierarchy, acclimating them to male authority (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.117).

The generational or cyclical nature of male attitudes to and privileges in sports was evident in the manner that initial contacts with particular sports were made principally through the influence of fathers (Young, White & McTeer, 1993, p.9). Here we see evidence of the initial impact that fathers have on their young sons, introducing them to deference to male authority and power which is further enacted upon by the coach.

It is most often the coach who occupies the highest status in the social hierarchy of the team within organized sports. The coach-athlete relationship is a vehicle for
young boys to learn about and adjust to masculine life within the institution of organized sports (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.122). The onus on authority legitimates and maintains the coach's position, within the institution, as the supreme mediator or instructor of what it means to be masculine.

In some instances, the coach may seem "god-like" to the male athletes (Pronger, 1990, p.10). In this case the athlete acknowledges that the coach arbitrarily presides over his athletic future and what the coach says goes, even if it has little to do with athletic enterprise. This is based on the respect that the male athlete maintains for or towards his coach and his position of power.

Respect is a critical element in the development of deference to the appropriate authority. As reported by an athlete interviewed by Mike Messner (1992) "...an athlete gets his respect - but he has to earn it" (p.89). This is reflective of the common ideology that respect is an integral component of authority and must be earned from coaches and/or teammates. Therefore, part of the ritual of moving from boyhood to manhood involves developing and exhibiting the proper deference to older males who maintain positions of power.

**The Active Devaluation of Women**

One of the most common ritualistic means used by men to
ratify hegemonic masculine ideology is the active
devaluation of women. Women are routinely portrayed by men
as inferior in order to establish a power invoking male-
female gender dichotomy. Masculinity is viewed as superior
to femininity as men possess the strength and courage which
effectively establishes their manliness (Dunning, 1986,
p.82). Meanwhile, females are commonly viewed as timid,
weak, and dependent all characteristics which contradict
masculine ideologies.

This influential ideology was initially developed and
reinforced primarily by men, for men. The active
devaluation of women, within the institution of organized
sports, is a integral component of the preferred hegemonic
masculine identity which is developed and reinforced in
order to maintain patriarchal relations.

Women are traditionally depicted by men as the
"weaker", less physical of the two existing genders. This
conscious differentiation between men and women effectively
reinforces the male-female gender dichotomy. By
trivializing the role of women within organized sports, men
are able to secure the institution of sport as a
masculinizing male preserve.

For example, the institution of organized sports has
developed the belief that all sports are inherently
competitive. This competitiveness has effectively fostered
and legitimized physical aggression in support of the
preferred hegemonic masculine ideal (Dunning, 1986, p.81). Therefore, as a means of differentiation men routinely exemplify physical inferiority of female athletes as well as the lack of power associated with their limited roles within sport.

Pronger (1990) agrees stating that "the masculine development and display of physical strength by men, in conjunction with its lack in women, embody the perception of power" (p.144). In other words, hegemonic masculinity is a strategy of power relations between men and women which can be seen by the dominant and subordinate positions of each, respectively, within organized sports. Therefore, hegemonic masculinity is in fact a signification of patriarchy.

This patriarchal relationship is based on the premise that men should act masculine and women should act feminine (Pronger, 1990, p.144). The conscious devaluation of women is an integral component to the salience of hegemonic masculinity as it allows men and boys to bond, at least symbolically, as a separate and superior group to women (Messner, 1992, p.19).

Quite simply, men view themselves as superior in at least an athletic sense in an attempt to establish superiority within the institution of organized sports. Therefore, it has become more socially acceptable for a woman to be masculine than for a man to be feminine because it is more tolerable to take power than it is to relinquish
it (Pronger, 1990, p.58).

In order to reduce the feminizing influence of women, men have maintained organized sport as a male preserve by actively discouraging females from equal participation (Kidd, 1990, p.35; Bryson, 1987, p.350). It is this differentiation that is critical to the maintenance of the dominant position held by the men and the ensuing subordinate position delegated, by these men, to women.

The increase in the "manly" effects of sport has arisen as a response to the rising voice of women within the institution of organized sports (Kidd, 1990, p.36). Various sporting activities are introduced to young boys or "initiates" as a means of overcoming existing feminine influences. Therefore, the institution of organized sports was effectively cast as a central site by men for the fight against feminization (Kimmel, 1990, p.60).

A breakdown of this segregation would be damaging to the salience of male privileged power within the institution of organized sports, and thus the social construction of masculinity. It is commonly believed that the increased induction of women in organized sport will reduce the opportunity for men to "initiate" boys into masculine traditions which they have customarily shared and enjoyed (Whitson, 1990, p.25).

The salience of hegemonic masculinity is strengthened when men have their own social institutions and women are
excluded or effectively marginalized as is often the case within organized sports. For example, the following media portrayal of women is a prime example of the active devaluation of female athletes.

Female sporting activities are often illustrated as less important and innately different from men's sporting endeavours. The production quality is lower and the commentators often use gender biased language reinforcing negative attitudes of ambivalence about women's sports and women's athletics (Messner, 1992, p.165).

A further example can be found in the rugby subculture which is riddled with songs which were specifically created to emphasize the subordinate position of women in sport. This type of vilification is likely resultant from the previously mentioned fear of increased feminization which is growing commensurately with the factual increases in women's power (Dunning, 1986, p.84).

The devaluation of women effectively incorporates the repression of all the desirable traits that society has defined as negatively passive or as characteristic of the subordinate, female group. Therefore, older men or "officiates" routinely mediate to young boys or "initiates" that masculinity is anything but feminine (Messner, 1985, p.37).

The young boy is prompted to internalize masculine ideologies that promote the privileges of being male and the
lack of power associated with being female (White & Vagi, 1990, p.68). The male "officiate" sees the need to downplay the role of the female as a means of introducing the young "initiate" to a more masculinizing environment in order to begin the social construction of the young boy's masculine identity. This often leads to the development of hypermasculine pursuits in sport and attendant antifemale rituals.

Even when women are granted equal opportunities to compete in organized sports, men often feel a sense of relief to find, when given the opportunity, women just don't have the "physical skill" to measure up to their performances (Messner, 1992, p.166). The devaluation of women, as a component of hegemonic masculinity, advocates that female athletes should be limited to competition within their own sex.

However, academics such as Brian Pronger (1990), argue that when women are afforded the same opportunities as men have become accustomed to, they are rapidly coming to parallel men's performances (p.17). This is a good example of the direct threat that women have against the salience of sports as a male preserve.

The Sanctioned Use of Aggression and Violence

There are two very distinct fundamental dimensions that support the ideology that the institution of organized sport
provides an arena for the construction of hegemonic masculinity (Bryson, 1987, p.350). The first dimension links masculinity to highly valued and visible physical skills. Secondly, it links maleness to the positively sanctioned use of aggression and violence within the vast spectrum of organized sport.

Certain sports are more centrally located in hegemonic maintenance than others (Bryson, 1987, p.350), expressing the aggression and violence characteristics of the ideal hegemonic masculine identity. For example, football, rugby, hockey, basketball, and soccer are sports which place an emphasis on aggressive and sometimes violent behaviour. Sports such as volleyball, swimming, long distance running, bodybuilding, and golf are activities which rely on aggressive behaviour but much less on violent behaviour, if at all.

The most intense form of masculinity is represented by power which commonly surfaces as aggression, of which the most radical expression is violence (Pronger, 1990, p.131). Therefore, as an expression and exercise of masculine power, organized sports have become a form of stylized aggression where the more collision and team oriented Type "A" sports are viewed as appropriately masculine.

---

3 These sports will be referred to as Type "A" sporting activities which tend to be representative of the team oriented, physically aggressive, collision sports.

4 These sports will be referred to as Type "B" sporting activities which tend to be representative of the individually oriented, less physically aggressive and/or aesthetic sports.
The legitimacy of violent sports emerges in opposition to less aggressive and thus less "masculine" sports (Young, et al., 1993, p.4). The less violent, Type "B" sporting activities replete with their "softer" masculine imagery, tend to be less valued in male sport cultures.

According to Pronger (1990) athletics, in some important ways, has become a stylized expression of masculine power that, in strictly a sporting context, is more socially acceptable than beating people up or murdering them (p.135). In order to conform to the masculine ideal, young boys must be competent at reproducing aggressive, and even violent behaviour which is supported within organized sports but is not generally condoned within mainstream society. It should be no surprise that in sporting activities where physical strength and force are highly valued, men naturally admire aggressiveness and endorse violent behaviour as desirable masculine conduct (Rotundo, 1990, p.225).

Ultimately, aggressive and violent sports such as football and rugby are often used by the dominant male ruling group, within the institution of organized sports, as a means of further supporting the male-female gender dichotomy. Men support and maintain the ideology that they are more suited to these types of "combative" sports as they are bigger and stronger and more suited to them than women (Dunning, 1986, p.80). This is, therefore, an active
attempt by men to reinforce their position of power over women by effectively reducing or marginalizing female participation in a male defined institution.

Social Isolation

Sex segregation (the exclusion of females from male defined activity) is the primary form of social isolation commonly practised within the institution of organized sports. This type of isolation is routinely used to emphasize the need for the maintenance of the male-female gender dichotomy which has become so integral to the salience of hegemonic masculine ideologies. Therefore, throughout manhood, men's physical and cultural worlds are conventionally separated from that of women's (Rotundo, 1990, p.7).

The structured exclusion of women is often used to exaggerate masculine values and beliefs while simultaneously devaluing feminine ones (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.121). For example, the role of the mother is often targeted for increased vilification by "officiate" males in order to reduce the level of feminine influence in the socialization process of the young boy's masculine identity.

The major tasks of child rearing have been typically performed in the home by women who have established themselves as the key influential force behind the socialization process of the young boy (Kidd, 1990, p.39).
In addition, Pronger (1990) adds that "the lack of masculine influence at home was exacerbated by the fact that schools were dominated by female teaching staffs" (p.17). Therefore, the dominant ruling group of males was becoming concerned that young males were having difficulties identifying with their fathers and/or older "officiate" males.

In order to develop a stronger "masculinizing" bond with older males, young boys were being convinced to isolate themselves from women, especially their mothers. Therefore, males began to rehearse and strengthen their positional masculinity in activities which effectively excluded the participation of women.

An extreme example of this type of isolation occurs in young Sambian boys (Pronger, 1990, p.84). Seven to ten year old boys are taken from their mothers when first initiated to the male cult, and thereafter experience the most powerful and seductive homosexual fellatio activities. Elders teach that semen is absolutely vital; it should be consumed daily because the creation of biological maleness and the maintenance of masculinity depend on it. Hence, from middle childhood until puberty, boys should perform fellatio on older males.

During early childhood, the institution of organized sports is often used as a central site for the active isolation of young boys from women (White & Vagi, 1990,
p.68). This is believed to "rid" the feminizing influence which is fostered in the home by the young boy's mother. The segregation of men and women in sport is a technique for maintaining a socially constructed difference between men and women, symbolically preserving through sport, the power of men over women (Pronger, 1990, p.18).

Many coaches instill the belief in their athletes that excessive interaction with females will begin to erode their masculine identity, "softening" them, making them more effeminate. Although sexual segregation may seem less apparent within today's society, the active devaluation of women is still very prevalent, as previously noted, reinforcing the male-female gender dichotomy.

The Exclusion of Pain

Pain is another means of conformity used by the dominant ruling group of males, within organized sports, as a means of establishing and maintaining the hegemonic masculine ideal. Pain has become synonymous with courage and the ability to endure pain not only sets initiates apart from uninitiated boys, but also from women (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p.40). Young boys are often instructed, by older males, to "toughen up" or to "learn to take the pain" in order to uphold and magnify their masculine identity which has become synonymous with power over women.

In fact today's culture seems to valorize the concerns
of heterosexual masculinity over femininity and non-hegemonic masculinity, prompting male athletes to learn to physically and psychologically develop an expansive pain zone (Smith, 1989, p.191). Therefore, because a hegemonic ideal of masculinity is the suppression of affect, continuing to play with pain is viewed as appropriate masculine behaviour (Young, et al., 1993, p.11). The injured athlete is often implored by teammates and/or coaches to "suck it up" and continue playing for the benefit of the team.

There is a powerful motivating force working in conjunction with external factors, that makes it likely that the athlete will "choose" to play hurt, which is viewed by Messner (1992) as an internal structure of masculinity (p.74). The majority of male athletes wear their scars and permanent injuries with pride, as badges of masculine status. At the same time, they routinely exhibit a grudging acknowledgement that one's healthy body is a heavy price to pay for athletic success.

The tolerance of physical risk carries with it an enormous symbolic weight in the exhibition and evaluation of masculinity (Dubbert, 1979, p.164). Athletes who play in more aggressive and violent team sports, who are often portrayed as the epitome of good physical conditioning and health, often suffer a very high incidence of permanent injury or disability (Messner, 1992, p.71). Therefore, when
the body is used as a weapon, as in organized sports, it ultimately results in violence against one's own body.

Athletes who demonstrate pain or remove themselves from competition due to injury run the risk of being stigmatized by peers as less than fully masculine, particularly if the injury is not perceived as serious (Young, et al., 1993, p.21). Therefore, an athlete's masculinity routinely comes into question when he does not conform to the "exclusion of pain" principle.

Acknowledging injury, except in its most traumatic forms, indicates that the athlete is succumbing to affect, has not developed sufficient disrespect for pain, or is no longer prepared to sacrifice his body for the team (Young, et al., 1993, p.21). Messner (1992) agrees concluding that "athletes who refuse to play injured, by leaving the game for good, reject the dictates of the pain principle and deliver a searing critique about sports" (p.82). Ultimately the athlete may risk being seen as less masculine and more feminine by his coaches and/or teammates.

The Marginalization of Homosexual Males

To be a "man" in contemporary North American society is to be homophobic, that is to maintain an irrational fear or intolerance of homosexuality or homosexual persons (Herek, 1987, p.68; Connell, 1990, p.94). Homophobia, or "heterosexual masculinity" as it is sometimes referred to,
is characteristic of the hegemonic ideal of masculinity which attempts to marginalize or ignore the presence of homosexuals within society. This is a prime example of how hegemonic masculinity is not solely relegated to male-female relationships. It also occurs between men, where homosexual males are seen as a subordinate subculture which should be marginalized within the institution of organized sports.

Homosexual males are perceived as deviating from the masculine ideal, and portrayed as exhibiting feminine characteristics (Herek, 1987, p.70). These men are seen as similar to rather than different from the subordinate female group within society. They are perceived as lacking the desirable characteristics which are emblematic of the masculine ideal supported within the institution of organized sports.

**Deviance from Hegemonic Masculinity**

Although it will not be examined, deviance to the hegemonic masculine norm within the institution of sports warrants brief mention. It is important to understand why individuals would deviate from the hegemonic ideal, as well as what they define as a replacement for the hegemonic masculine identity.

Within the institution of organized sports the hegemonic masculine identity becomes somewhat problematic to some as there is little to no room to explore other possible
options (O'Leary & Donoghue, 1978, p.17; Stein & Hoffman, 1978, p.137). Therefore, many individuals will stray from the definition of the hegemonic masculine identity.

This often occurs as the role of the athlete demands a substantial commitment, sometimes to the point of exclusion of other potential interests (Stein & Hoffman, 1978, p.144). It is these other interests which prompt the athlete to begin to notice the limitations and constraints within the institution of organized sports. Eventually, for some individuals, the costs begin to outweigh the benefits and the athlete begins to "deviate" from the rigid confines of the hegemonic masculine ideal.

It is these individuals, who realize that they are not big enough, strong enough, or fast enough to make a career out of sports, who opt for/into other institutions which may entail the re-definition of their masculine ideal (Messner, 1989, p.76). These individuals often look to educational or career based institutions as alternatives to organized sports. However, sports often remain a high priority, although no longer their number one priority.

Becoming a "man" within today's society brings with it a myriad of life shaping experiences which an individual must "sift" through in order to build upon his subjective interpretation of what constitutes his masculine identity. Individuals who voluntarily "stray" from the hegemonic norm of masculinity maintained within the institution of
organized sports, risk marginalization or even institutional rejection.

Men have responded to the increase in feminism by establishing the institution of organized sports as a male preserve where they can symbolically mock, objectify, and vilify women who pose a direct threat to their dominant status (Dunning, 1986, p.89). The hegemonic masculine ideal has effectively allowed men to maintain their position of dominance within the institution of organized sport. In other words, the institution of organized sports has served to bolster a sagging ideology of male superiority (Bryson, 1987, p.349; Hall, 1988, p.335; Messner, 1988, p.199; Theberge, 1981, p.341).

There has been no mention, thusfar, of a component dealing with the body image of masculinity within the definition of the hegemonic identity. Therefore, the mesomorphic body type warrants examination to establish if it is, in fact, representative of the hegemonic masculine identity.

The Mesomorphic Body Type

In a period where almost obsessive attention has been paid to the female body, the male body has often seemed invisible, to the point of unimportance (Duroche, 1990, p.172). This occurrence may be based on the presumption that assigned value for women, moreso than men, has
traditionally been evaluated in relation to their physical appearance. Perhaps because of this, researchers have ignored the significant role that the mesomorphic body ideal plays within the social construction of the hegemonic masculine identity (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.545). To address the imbalance, this study will examine the suitability of the mesomorphic body type as an integral component within the social construction of the preferred hegemonic masculine identity.

Society's perception of the human body has changed enormously over time and in accordance with its preoccupation with it (Duroche, 1990, p.171). The desirable body type is an image that is defined for re-affirmation based on specifications constructed by the dominant ruling group within the institution of organized sports. The dominant group fulfils the role of "officiant" mediating the desirable specifications of the ideal body type to the "initiates" or individual members within the institution. This desirable ideal is then internalized by institutional members and used to gauge "acceptable" physical appearance.

Men desire a muscular, mesomorphic body shape now more than ever before, as cultural attention is increasingly being directed towards their physique (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.554; Tucker, 1982, p.1059; Cash, Winstead, & Janda, 1987, p.30). This may be accredited to the fact that the institution of organized sports has effectively promoted and
actively endorsed the "mesomorphic" body type as the preferred somatotype to which all men should aspire.

The mesomorphic body build is usually well proportioned and accentuated by broad shoulders, large bicep muscles, and a thin waist (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.547). In addition, many individuals will pursue the "hypermesomorphic" or "muscular mesomorphic" ideals which are symbolic of the "muscleman" physique characterized by overdeveloped arm and chest muscles (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.547).

The mesomorphic body type is indicative of a series of expressive and visual components. It deals with the expressive components of empowerment, mastery over the body, and physical condition. Upper body development and physical attractiveness compose the two visual components. It is these components which have become integral to the development of the mesomorphic component of the hegemonic masculine identity.

The first expressive component dealing with "empowerment" is crucial to the development of the mesomorphic body type and body language that is suggestive of force and skill. It is this component which is especially important to the adolescent male and the subsequent construction of his masculine identity (Whitson, 1990, p.23). According to Mishkind et al. (1986) representations of the muscular body as strong, virile, and powerful have taken on increasingly important ideological
and symbolic significance in existing gender relations (p.549). It is the empowering behaviour of men which "fuels" patriarchal relations and further establishes the male-female gender dichotomy.

Men use the body in aggressive and violent ways to further adhere to the masculine ideal endorsed within the institution of organized sports (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.549). Again, this is another method men use to differentiate what is appropriate masculine behaviour and what is appropriate feminine behaviour. Consequently, the mesomorphic body ideal is one of the few remaining "tools" which men can use to differentiate themselves from women (Kimmel, 1986, p.525; Rotundo, 1983, p.32; Whitson, 1990, p.21), as well as other men.

This type of empowerment is essential to the reproduction of gender relations where boys are encouraged to experience their bodies, and therefore themselves, in forceful, space-occupying, even dominating ways (Whitson, 1990, p.23). Therefore, empowerment is a masculinizing practice which is located at the heart of the social construction of hegemonic masculinity and the physical appropriation of one's body.

"Mastery over the body" is another expressive attribute which composes the mesomorphic component of hegemonic masculinity. With such a heavy emphasis on the mesomorphic body ideal the athlete becomes caught up in practices that
centre on his body and its performances (Connell, 1990, p.90). Mastery over one's body is often referred to as a trait characteristic of the masculine ideal. Therefore, the athlete appropriates his body through training, and turns it into an "engine" of competitive success (Connell, 1990, p.90), in order to fulfil his aspirations of becoming the epitome of the masculine ideal. Finally, "physical condition" is the last expressive component which is reflective of stamina, strength, and agility which are all characteristics reminiscent of the athletic ideal (Franzoi & Shields, 1984, p.178). These attributes are symbolic of athletic prowess and also of the masculine ideal which is embodied through the mesomorphic body.

All of the aforementioned components are integral to the establishment of the expressive components of the mesomorphic body type as a component of the hegemonic masculine identity. Visual components also play an integral role in the salience of the mesomorphic body component of hegemonic masculinity. It is the addition of the visual components of the mesomorphic ideal that have the most profound effect on its inclusion in the definition of the hegemonic masculine identity. It is these components that are the physical or aesthetic indicators of masculinity within the institution of organized sports.

"Upper body strength" refers to the ability of the individual to "make himself bigger and more broad" in the
chest, arms, and shoulders (Franzoi & Shields, 1984, p.177). This component of the mesomorphic ideal is critical as it is often the physical appearance of the body which is associated with society's view of manly vitality and often used as a measure of an individual's masculinity.

Franzoi's & Shields' (1984) research supports this belief stating that "it is important to realize that a man's masculinity is often judged by others as a static object, represented by the mesomorphic body type" (p.178). Studies conducted by Montemayor (1978, p.49) and Lerner & Korn (1972, p.919) concluded that mesomorphic males were treated differently than their "less masculine" ectomorphic (skinny) or endomorphic (obese) counterparts. It has become common for mesomorphic males to be rated consistently more masculine than ectomorphic males, who in turn were ranked more masculine than endomorphic males, based on physical appearance. Both of these studies were based on the premise that body-behaviour association is the result of social stereotypes that link body images with certain social behaviours, as is the case with hegemonic masculinity.

As a result, most males have experienced pressure from an early age to behave in a "masculine" manner and to prove their masculinity in a variety of ways, including through the body (Loosemore & Moriarty, 1990, p.15). As an individual develops his masculine identity the influence from this existing stereotype will have a direct effect on
his social behaviour (Lerner & Korn, 1972, p.909).

The second and final visual component deals with physical attractiveness. "Physical attractiveness" is the aesthetic appearance as defined and regulated by the dominant ruling group(s) within society. This component deals mainly with facial features but also deals with certain aspects of physique related to the mesomorph body ideal (Franzoi & Shields, 1984, p.177). These are features which largely determine the degree to which a man is judged as handsome or "good looking".

Therefore, the preoccupation with the body image component of masculinity in males has effectively provided support for the mesomorphic body type as an integral component within the institutionally defined hegemonic ideal. In addition to the established components of hegemonic masculinity, the inclusion of the mesomorphic body type has become central to the social construction of the hegemonic masculine identity, within the institution of organized sports.

Although it will not be examined in this study, some males within the institution of organized sports feel too much pressure to emulate the mesomorphic ideal, while their attainment of this component of masculinity may be unrealistic (Mintz & Betz, 1989, p.186; Loosemore & Moriarty, 1990, p.15). Failure to obtain this ideal has been documented to lead to an increase in the development of
ill psychological and physical effects which often lead to
the development of body image disturbance in males.

Men who do not meet the prescribed institutional body
image standard often feel inadequate and question their
identity as masculine individuals (Mishkind, et al., 1986,
p.550). It is these men, who become "trapped" in a cycle
that is fuelled by their failed attempts to attain the
mesomorphic ideal, that risk the possibility of exhibiting
adverse side effects through body image disturbance.

It has become evident that the mesomorphic component of
masculinity has established a role in the hegemonic
masculine identity endorsed within the institution of
organized sports. Masculinity is not an innate
characteristic with which all humans are born. Instead, the
construction of the desirable masculine ideal is an ongoing
social process that ranges over the existence of an
individual's lifetime.

This study will examine a sample of male athletes who
are representative of an assortment of sporting activities.
Each athlete's individual subjective interpretation of his
own masculine identity will be examined. The results will
be used to establish whether or not hegemonic masculinity is
indeed the preferred ideal within the institution of
organized sports.

In addition to the standard components of deference to
male authority, devaluation of females, sanctioned use of
aggression and violence, social isolation, acceptance of pain, and the marginalization of homosexuals, the mesomorphic body component will be included in order to determine its relevance to the hegemonic masculine identity as exhibited by the same sample of male athletes.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

The methodological foundation of this study was built on a "two-phase" protocol consisting of Q-methodology and semi-structured personal interviews. The combination of these two research techniques will effectively increase reliability and validity, strengthening overall methodological rigour. Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers (1985) further support this combination stating that "these measures are often combined, within research, based on the premise that they effectively cross-validate one another as they act in a mutually exclusive fashion" (p.171).

Q-methodology was developed in order to integrate the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research strategies, thus devising a more thorough methodology. However, Q-methodology is not a "true" integrated application as it tends to remain more quantitative than qualitative in nature (Brown, 1986, p.57). Patton (1990) expresses concern over the fact that "quantitative measures, in a particular instance and in a particular variable are useful, valid, and reliable, they are often a matter of individual investigator judgement" (p.130). Therefore, the combination of Q-methodology and qualitative, open-ended interviews establishes stronger methodological rigour.

To say that Q-methodology is biased is a strong
accusation; however, the Q-sort is highly influenced by the researcher, as he constructs the statements based on his own subjective interpretation of objective information. Therefore, the results of Q-methodology are acceptable on their own, but there is often a number of outcome measures that elude precise quantitative measurement as established by the researcher.

The deliberate combination of Q-methodology and semi-structured personal interviews creates a more rigorous methodology by drawing on the complimentary strengths of each specific measure. Therefore, open-ended personal interviews were used in order to elicit more, descriptive information from the athletes, in order to further expound on the results of the Q-sort portion of Q-methodology.

This study was based on the premise that within the institution of organized sports there is no single, correct interpretation of the hegemonic masculine identity. Therefore, the primary focus of this study concentrated on the examination of underlying interpretations of the hegemonic masculine identity as exhibited by a diverse sample of male athletes. The subjects were selected from a wide assortment of sporting activities which vary concerning their perceived adherence, or lack thereof, to the components of the hegemonic masculine identity.

The secondary focus examined the incorporation of the mesomorphic body characteristic into the established
components which compose the hegemonic masculine identity. This proposed body image component was represented in the Q-sort along with the other established components of hegemonic masculinity.

The first phase of the study consisted of the administering of the Q-sort portion of Q-methodology in order to establish various interpretations of the preferred hegemonic masculine identity. The variance in interpretation was based on the varying degrees to which individual athletes incorporate into their masculine identity the hegemonic components of deference to male authority, the devaluation of females, the sanctioned use of aggression and violence, social isolation, the exclusion of pain, the marginalization of homosexuals, and the mesomorphic body type.

The second, interview phase further explored the social construction of these various interpretations in order to examine why masculinity may differ between various athletes. The interview phase was also used to examine whether or not the mesomorphic body was representative of the hegemonic masculine identity as exhibited by the same sample of male athletes.

Q-Methodology

While examining the literature on masculinity it has become evident that organized sports has been portrayed as a
possible "breeding ground" for the social construction of the hegemonic masculine identity. However, researchers may have accepted the preferred hegemonic masculine ideal, when in actuality the latitude of masculine interpretation may be immense and in need of further clarification.

Physicist and psychologist William Stephenson (1953) developed Q-methodology in order to move the objective domain of science into the broader realm of subjectivity (Brown, 1986, p.57). The importance of Q-methodology resides in the fact that it operates within an internal frame of reference in an empirical sense as experienced from an individual's own, distinct point of view. In other words, Q-methodology focuses on the subjective meanings that people generate as they attempt to make sense out of real life situations (Airey, 1993, p.29). Therefore, Q-methodology can be used to examine how various male athletes construct divergent interpretations of what masculinity means to them.

This study did not attempt to create or establish a "correct" or "umbrella" interpretation of hegemonic masculinity. Rather it set out to examine how hegemonic masculinity is differentially interpreted by male athletes and what it means to male athletes who participate in various sporting activities.

Q-methodology was chosen as it is easily incorporated within the social constructionist framework which underlies
this study (Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers, 1985, p.170). It should not be interpreted as a means of prediction or hypothesis testing, but rather as a means of discovery (Brown, 1986, p.74). Quite simply, Q-methodology will provide a reflection of the existing subjective interpretations of masculinity based on the opinions, views, and values displayed by the participating male athletes.

When using Q-methodology as a means of discovery, the researcher becomes more interested in determining how individuals classify themselves rather than the categorical attributions often instituted by the researcher (Goldman, 1991, p.345). For example, in this study the components of hegemonic masculinity compose a set of categorical characteristics which have been established within the academic literature. Rather than examining the effects of each specific component in a solitary fashion, this study investigated the cumulative incorporation of the established hegemonic components of masculinity used to develop a masculine identity. It will be the reported combinations of these various components which will develop the various interpretations on masculinity to be further examined.

In order to discover new relationships, Q-methodology aims to select a high level of representation (i.e. breadth and diversity). Conformity to this requirement was accomplished by selecting athletes from a wide selection of sporting activities rather than doing so on a random basis.
The Q-sort sample consisted of 50 male athletes representing such sporting activities as football, rugby, hockey, soccer, basketball, volleyball, swimming, golf, long distance running, and bodybuilding. These athletes were selected from the varsity athletics program at the University of Windsor in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. However, based on the lack of varsity programs in some sports, University of Windsor athletes representing bodybuilding were recruited from accessible club programs in Windsor. Five athletes were chosen from each sporting activity in order to construct the aforementioned study sample of 50 male athletes.

It seems obvious, in some cases more than others, that athletes from certain sports may be more representative of the desirable components of the hegemonic masculine identity. Male athletes from Type "A" sports such as football, rugby, hockey, soccer, and basketball were examined because of their representation of one or more of the desirable hegemonic masculine components. For example, rugby subculture is famous for the songs the players sing as a means of devaluing the presence of women in sport. Also, football players tend to exhibit highly aggressive and sometimes even violent behaviour while on the "gridiron".

In contrast, some of the athletes were chosen specifically because they did not participate in sporting activities which are characteristically representative of
the hegemonic masculine identity. These athletes were found in such Type "B" sporting activities as volleyball, swimming, golf, bodybuilding, and long distance running. For example, the aggression exhibited by long distance runners is not the same as the physical aggressiveness exhibited by football players. In addition, there is no need for violent behaviour in long distance running which football players confront in practice and game situations.

Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities are most easily differentiated by the necessity of physical aggression or contact required for successful participation. The Type "A" sports are team oriented, physically aggressive and collision oriented. Type "B" sports are more individually oriented, with the lone exception of volleyball, non-collision or less physically aggressive in nature. The researcher is aware that the best way to categorize these sporting activities is on a continuum ranging from the most physical, collision oriented, Type "A" activity to the most aesthetic Type "B" activity. However, in order to effectively reach the goal of this study the sports have been grouped as reported.

These Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities have been chosen in order to increase the breadth and diversity desired to obtain a high level of representation in order to "draw upon" the full potential of Q-methodology. However, the success of Q-methodology is also dependent on the
establishment of a viable and applicable concourse.

The "concourse" is the establishment of an assortment of statements, based on opinion, about any concept, event, idea, or object, all having referent possibilities (Goldman, 1991, p.347; Stephenson, 1978, p.58). It is important to realize that the statements used in the Q-sort are not always based on fact, but more often on individual perception and opinion.

A small pilot study was conducted in order to clarify the language that is commonly used when describing masculinity. A total of six individuals, including both athletes and non-athletes, were informally interviewed and asked to comment on all of the components which compose hegemonic masculine identities. It was the combination of these pilot interviews and the existing literature that enabled the researcher to create statements that would be both representative of the issue being studied, as well as easily understood by the actual male athletes. These statements were then refined with the assistance of academics familiar with both the area of masculinity and interviewing as a research methodology.

It is important to realize that Q-statements do not impose an a priori structure of meanings on participating respondents (Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers, 1985, p.170). For example, the Q-statements will attempt to elicit subjective opinions pertaining to hegemonic masculinity "structure" and
"form" for further observational and study purposes. The selection of these statements is critical as the salience of the study depends on them.

Furthermore, these statements must both be "representative" and "user-friendly" (Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers, 1985, p.170). "Representative" refers to the ability to create statements that are indicative of the hypothesized identity types. In other words, the statements must be expressive of what the study is attempting to examine.

"User-friendly" dictates that the statements are to be written in a language that will be easily understood by the participating respondents. Theoretically, the number of statements in the Q-sort may be infinite, but for matters of practicality it will be necessary to reduce the number of statements to a functional level, typically between 40 and 60 (Brown, 1986, p.59).

Forty-two statements comprised the Q-sort and were typed on normal size "recipe" cards which were each assigned a number, for identification purposes. The Q-statements represented all of the established components of the hegemonic masculine identity, including the proposed mesomorphic body component.

The Q-statements were divided into two groups of 21 positively (see Appendix A.1) and 21 negatively phrased (see Appendix A.2) statements. Phrasing the statements in both
positive and negative manners was not used to "trick" the subjects but rather to reduce the occurrence of chance and increase the reliability of each of the subjects' point of view. All of the Q-statements included in the Q-sort were sorted by each individual athlete based on his level of agreement or disagreement with them.

Prior to the primary Q-sort, a pre-test was conducted consisting of 5 male graduate students from the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. The purpose of this pre-test was twofold. First, the pre-test enabled the researcher to determine if the Q-sort statements could be easily sorted and were "user friendly". Secondly, insight from the pre-test participants was helpful in identifying any possible "shortcomings" in procedural protocol of the actual Q-sort task. Once this had been completed the intended athletes were recruited for participation in the study.

Participation by the athletes was strictly voluntary and each athlete was required to complete a written consent form before participating in the Q-sort (Appendix B). Each group of athletes completed the Q-sort during separate sessions for reasons of practicality.

Prior to the commencement of the Q-sort a verbal explanation of the proposed study as well as written instructions (see Appendix C) were provided. In addition, a brief demographic questionnaire (Appendix D) was included
with the Q-sort package in order to elicit some general information about the athletes. At this point all of the respondents were given the opportunity to ask any relevant questions before engaging in the Q-sort task.

Each respondent was provided with a package containing the entire sample of 42 randomly ordered Q-sort statements. They were instructed to "rank order" the statements according to a forced-choice, 11 point quasi-normal, distribution continuum which was provided (Appendix E).

The scale on the continuum ranged from -5 (most disagree) to 0 (neutral) to +5 (most agree). The result of this extensive gradation system was a Q-sort that was highly representative of each individual respondent. This enabled each respondent to provide the necessary data in his own subjective fashion, thus performing the Q-sort on his own terms (Airey, 1993, p.34).

This type of "hands on" participation in the Q-sort effectively puts the athlete in the centre of all meaning (Brown, 1986, p.73). There is no influence from the respondent's immediate environment that can effect his subjective interpretation of the statements at hand. Therefore, the ranking of the statements is indicative of the respondent's individual opinion about the importance of the proposed components of the hegemonic masculine identity.

Once the Q-sort had been completed the accumulated results underwent factor analysis. The computer program
"p.c.q. (Factor Analysis Program for Q-Technique), version 2.1" (Striklen, 1992) was used to factor analyze the data. Based on N respondents or 50 athletes, the p.c.q. created a correlation matrix of the order N x N, or 50 X 50.

A high positive correlation between any two respondents indicated that they had arranged the statements similarly as a reflection of a commonly held viewpoint (Brown, 1986, p.59). Therefore, factor analysis was used to determine the number of attitudinal groupings implicit in the correlation matrix which can be referred to as "Factors".

"Factors" indicate clusters of people who rank order the Q-sort statements in essentially the same manner (Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers, 1987, p.170). The number of existing Factors is a purely empirical matter as determined by the extent to which the subjects are actually divided on the issue at hand (Brown, 1986, p.60). Once the Factors were established they were "rotated", using varimax rotation. This type of rotation allowed for the further pursuit of hunches and examination of the data from a stronger, more theoretical standpoint (Brown, 1986, p.60).

Lastly, factor scores were calculated for each of the statements in each of the established Factors. According to Brown (1986) this will result in a single Q-sort, "Factor Array" for each Factor (p.60). Ultimately, each Factor Array becomes a representative composite of those individual Q-sorts constituting the established Factor, solidifying the
various opinion based attitudes exhibited by the athletes.

Q-methodology enables each respondent the opportunity to provide a synthetic picture of what his individual value preferences are (Brown, 1980, p.53). This process gives substance to the logic of preference by recognizing the central role of subjectivity involved in the examination and understanding of the hegemonic masculine identity. In more simple terms, the Q sort allows the respondent to provide a "model" of his point of view pertaining to his interpretation of his own masculine identity.

The established "Factors" allowed the further interpretation of subjective information based on individual perceptions of what masculinity means to the different athletes. Secondly, the factors aided in the discovery of whether the athletes include or disregard the mesomorphic body type in their interpretation of the ideal hegemonic masculine identity.

Critical to the success of Q-methodology and the results of this study was the opportunity for the male athletes to voice their opinions pertaining to the issues at hand. Therefore, the Q-sort is a viable forum where the male athletes could voice themselves, ultimately establishing their views and values, pertaining to hegemonic masculinity as well as their own interpretation of masculinity.

The development of these existing "Factors" was
critical to the next phase, or open-ended personal interviews. The researcher interviewed male athletes according to the existing "Factors" in order to create an understanding of the various interpretations of hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, these established "Factors" granted the researcher a certain freedom to choose subjects who were representative of the various interpretations of hegemonic masculinity, for the interview process.

Open-Ended Personal Interviews

Open-ended personal interviews were utilized to further investigate the various interpretations of masculinity represented by the resultant "Factors" of the Q-sort. The subsequent examination of the subjective interpretations of the masculine identities were conducted in order to develop a better understanding of the social construction and consequent development of each within the institution of organized sports.

Further, the interview phase enabled the researcher to immerse himself directly into the respondent's subjective world, evoking candid responses pertaining to the athlete's masculine identity. Therefore, the interview phase successfully constructed a forum where the respondent could freely expound on his reasoning for ranking the Q-sort items in his own, unique way (Brown, 1980, p.200).

The secondary focus of the interviews was to establish
whether or not the proposed body image component of muscular mesomorphy was incorporated within the athletes' interpretation of hegemonic masculinity. Ultimately, the interview enabled the researcher to establish a more relaxed rapport with the athlete which became vital to examining the issues at hand. It allowed for first hand encounters of the athletes' opinions and perceptions of the hegemonic masculine identity, as well as the incorporation of the mesomorphic body somatotype in this identity.

It is important to acknowledge that subjects for the interview phase could not be determined until after the factor analysis of the Q-sort data was complete (Airey, 1993, p.36), determining the number of resultant "Factors". Therefore, upon completion of the Q-sort, respondents who were interested in participating in the interview phase were asked to provide their home telephone number for contact at a later date.

Subjects who volunteered to participate in the second, interview phase were required to sign an additional consent form before proceeding (Appendix F). This consent form stressed that participation in the open-ended interviews was strictly voluntary and that the subjects were at no risk of being penalized for exercising their right to withdraw from the study at any time they may have felt it was necessary. Four athletes from each "Factor" were interviewed in order to examine all existing subjective interpretations of
hegemonic masculinity.

According to Patton (1990) the purpose of open-ended personal interviews is to assess the perspective of the person being interviewed, in order to determine opinions and views that cannot be directly observed (p.278). The results of Q-methodology are somewhat limited as they are not fully representative of the athletes' feelings, thoughts, intentions, and behaviours which are the basis of the various interpretations of hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, qualitative interviewing would allow the researcher the opportunity to enter into the athlete's own, individualized subjective reality (Patton, 1990, p.278). This would allow for the further examination of the social construction of hegemonic masculinity and whether or not the athletes regard the mesomorphic body type as an integral measure of their own masculine identity.

Patton (1990) points out that the quality of the information obtained during an interview is largely dependent on the interviewer (p.279). The way that an interview question is worded is critical in determining how the interviewee will respond. Therefore, all interview questions should be open-ended, neutral, singular and clear (Patton, 1990, p.295). A truly "open-ended" question allows the interviewee the ability to respond in a manner that is representative of his full repertoire of possible responses (Patton, 1990, p.297). The interviewee may use whatever
words he wants in order to represent what he has to say.

It is up to the interviewer to maintain a "neutral" position throughout the entire interview. Dichotomous questions (questions which elicit "yes" or "no" responses) often create an uncomfortable atmosphere as the interviewee becomes confused as to whether the interviewer wants a simple "yes" or "no" answer, or a more elaborate response (Patton, 1990, p.297). The avoidance of dichotomous questions often lends to a more comfortable atmosphere, and establishes a positive rapport between the interviewer and interviewee. This also helps to avoid situations where the interviewer begins to "lead" the responses of the interviewee, reducing the subjective responses desired of the interviewee.

It is also important to ensure that all of the interview questions are "singular" in nature. A singular question is a question which has no more than one idea within its internal structure (Patton, 1990, p.305). Questions which contain multiple ideas often create tension and confusion because the person being interviewed does not easily understand the question, becoming confused about what is being asked.

Finally, all interview questions should be "clear" and contain "language" which is easily understood by the interviewee (Patton, 1990, p.309; Converse & Pressor, 1986, p.12). By phrasing the questions in a "language" which the
interviewee easily understands, the interviewer can be reassured that the questions will be clearly understood by the subject. "Clear", easily understood questions often evoke lucid and easily furnished answers.

"Control" of the interview is essential to assure that the interview procedure elicits the type of data that is desired (Patton, 1990, p.332). In order to further create a positive rapport, all aspects of the personal interview should be conducted with the utmost respect and sensitivity for the interviewee.

The open-ended interview format was used in order to elicit subjective opinions and views in an open-ended and flexible way. Each athlete was required to verbalize his views, values, and opinions pertaining to each of the components of hegemonic masculinity. In addition each athlete was also asked to comment on the mesomorphic body type and its role in their lives. At necessary points throughout all of the interviews the researcher used "random probes" to evoke further response when necessary (see Appendix G). At no time was any direction given to the athletes about the significance of their responses.

All of the open-ended personal interviews were conducted in a mutually agreed upon and private location. All of the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for further, in-depth evaluation. On average the interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes in length.
The goal of the interview process was twofold. The primary focus was to establish an in depth understanding of how the hegemonic masculine identity is constructed and developed by different male athletes who participate in a variety of sporting activities. Secondly, it attempted to establish whether or not the mesomorphic body type is representative of the hegemonic masculine identity supported within the institution of organized sports.

It seems obvious that Q-methodology and open-ended, personal interviews do, in fact, work in a mutually exclusive fashion as supported by Kitzinger & Stainton-Rogers (1985). Q-methodology is effective at establishing the existing subjective interpretations or "Factors" of hegemonic masculinity but it cannot expound on why there are different interpretations of an identity which is based on a "core" cluster of components. Therefore, the use of interviews, as a follow up to Q-methodology, enabled the researcher the ability to probe further into the examination of how the various hegemonic masculine identities were socially constructed and developed.

The various combinations of the established components of the hegemonic masculine identity (deference to male authority, the devaluation of females, the sanctioned use of aggression and violence, social isolation, the exclusion of pain, and the marginalization of homosexuals), including the mesomorphic body ideal, and their role within the
construction of the hegemonic masculine identity were examined. This was possible as the interview process allowed the researcher to clarify points which could not be explained from the results of the Q-sort, by itself.

This study enabled the researcher to create some semblance of order out of a seemingly chaotic issue, establishing an understanding of the various interpretations of hegemonic masculinity exhibited across a large variety of sporting activities. The interviews further enabled the researcher to examine the role of the mesomorphic body type, and whether or not it is an integral component of the hegemonic masculine identity as interpreted by various athletes within the institution of organized sports.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Analysis of Q Sorts:

Q-methodology is a modified rank-ordering procedure in which Q-sort statements are placed in an order that is significant based on the subjective standpoint of the persons involved in completion of the task (Brown, 1980, p.195). Instead of identifying groups of items that cluster together, as commonly executed in R Technique³, Q-methodology identifies the groups of athletes who sort the Q-statements in a similar fashion.

For example, R-method is typified by the conventional questionnaire-survey approach which is designed to cover characteristics which are presumed to be objective for a person (Brown, 1980, p.44), in this case, masculinity. It is on the basis of the relationships among traits, pertaining to masculinity, that inferences are made about preferences and values, which are subjective.

In Q-methodology the subject matter under investigation is represented by objective statements of opinion which are subjectively interpreted by the subject. It is one thing to "put" something to a subject, as in the form of scale items;

³ Most of the data applications familiar to social scientists examine relationships among the columns of the data matrix, that is, among attributes. This familiar type of analysis, termed R-mode, is distinguished from Q-mode analysis, which focuses on the relationships among the rows of the data matrix. For a more in depth differentiation between Q-methodology and R-mode refer to S.R. Brown (1980), Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q-Methodology in Political Science. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
it is quite another to allow the subject to speak for himself (Brown, 1980, p.45). R-methodology provides the instrumental basis for the former, Q-methodology for the latter. Therefore, Q-methodology permits the researcher to examine the specific relationships between the participating athletes who rank-ordered the Q-statements in the same, subjective fashion.

**Technical Details:**

The study sample was comprised of 50 male athletes who participated in a variety of sporting activities. The majority of the athletes were selected from the varsity athletics program at the University of Windsor. Due to the non-existence of a varsity bodybuilding team the bodybuilders, who were enrolled at the University of Windsor, were recruited from a local club program. The athletes ranged in age from 19 to 29 years with an mean age of 21. The typical height and weight of the athletes was 5 feet 10 inches and 182 pounds, respectively. As a group the athletes described their body type as ectomorphic yet indicated that they desired a mesomorphic body type. Finally, the athletes reported participating for an average of 7.8 years in their specific sporting activity.

Each individual athlete was responsible for rank-

---

6 The athletes in the study reported participating in the following sporting activities: football, rugby, hockey, soccer, basketball, volleyball, golf, body building, swimming, and long distance running.
ordering all of the statements which comprised the Q-sort. The 42 Q-sort statements were rank-ordered according to the parameters established by the frequency distribution of the forced-choice, quasi bell shaped continuum provided to each athlete (Appendix E). The forced-choice continuum dictated that a small number of statements were to be placed at the extreme ends while a greater number of statements would fall somewhere in the middle. It is to these extreme items that close attention will be paid as they are most representative of each athlete's distinctive, subjective point of view as it pertains to masculinity.

The 50 Q Sorts were analyzed using the computer program "p.c.q. (Factor Analysis for Q Methodology) version 2.1" developed by Michael Striklen in 1992. The "p.c.q." was responsible for factor analyzing all 50 of the Q sorts in order to establish correlations between individual subjects rather than between traits and/or Q-sample items (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p.13).

A 50 x 50 correlation matrix was generated by the "p.c.q." where 50 was representative of the number of athletes who participated in this study (see Appendix H). From this matrix it was possible to observe the extent to which individual Q sorts resembled, or differed from one another. Similar Q sorts were then grouped together in order to establish what were referred to as Factors. A "Factor", as defined by McKeown & Thomas (1988), is a
conglomeration of subjects who all share a similar, subjective point of view pertaining to the issue being examined (p.13). The association of each athlete with each point of view is indicated by the magnitude of his loading on that Factor.

Based on the above analysis five initial Factors were extracted from the matrix, accounting for 46% of the total variance, and further correlated using varimax rotation. Varimax rotation is an additional means of correlation which subsumes and reduces all of the Factors in order to create the simplest possible structures (Stephenson, 1953, p.41). This will maximize the purity of saturation of as many variates (Q sorts) as possible on one or the other of the corresponding number of extracted Factors (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p.52). In other words, varimax rotation establishes Factors in their simplest form in order to enhance further interpretation (see Appendix I).

However, the creation of these Factors does not automatically warrant their inclusion, and thus subsequent examination. Established parameters dictate that Factors must possess eigenvalues which are greater than or equal to 1.00, in order to be regarded as statistically

---

significant\textsuperscript{8}. Factors with eigenvalues less than 1.00 are considered insignificant and of too little interest to warrant further examination (Brown, 1980, p.40). Based on this criterion, "Factor D" was "dropped" from further examination as its corresponding eigenvalue was .14, considerably less than the designated 1.00 benchmark.

In addition, Factors which possess loadings which are all negative represent spurious findings and relationships and are consequently viewed as insignificant. Therefore, "Factor E" was also "dropped" from subsequent examination as all of its significant factor loadings were negative.

In addition to being statistically significant, each Factor must also be deemed pure. A "pure" Factor consists of at least one significant loading that is exclusively representative of that Factor alone (Brown, 1980, p.229; Senn, 1993, p.325). Therefore, for the sake of interpretation, the important focus was on how many "pure" loadings there are on each Factor, with confounded or non-pure Factors removed from further analysis. A "confounded" or "non-pure" Factor is one which shows significant loadings (greater than or equal to .39) on more than one Factor, contaminating its purity and thus negating its inclusion in further investigation (see Appendix J). Therefore, the

\textsuperscript{8} Eigenvalues are the sum of squared factor loadings for each Factor; the percentage of total variance accounted for by each Factor is equal to the eigenvalue divided by the number of variates in the matrix. In Q-methodology, the variates are the n persons whose responses have been factored (Brown, 1980, p.40).
remaining statistically significant and pure Factors A, B, and C will be further examined and interpreted (see Appendix I).

Next, the scores of the subsets of subjects for each Factor were merged (weighting them according to factor loadings), converted to Z scores, and then renumbered to reapply the template features (in the +5 to −5 pattern) to arrive at a representative sort for each Factor, or Factor Array (Senn, 1993, p.326). The resulting Factor Arrays illustrate the common information among the male athletes who loaded purely on each Factor. This approach ensures that, within any Factor, idiosyncratic responses, or responses not held in common with other athletes will drop out into the neutral (Z scores of approximately 0) zone of the sort (Senn, 1993, p.326).

Factor Reliability was calculated using the formula outlined by Brown (1980)\(^9\) (Appendix K). The principal behind this formula prescribes that the more persons defining a Factor, the higher the reliability (Brown, 1980, p.245). For example, the more athletes who render a common viewpoint, the more confidence we have in the scores of the items composing it. In other words, the higher a Factor's reliability, the lower the magnitude of error associated with that Factor's scores.

\(^9\) Factor Reliability \(r\) can be calculated as follows: 
\[ r = \frac{0.80p}{1+(p-1)0.80} \]
where \(p\) = the number of persons defining a Factor (Brown, 1980, p.244).
The subjects' whose profiles were "pure" representations of each established Factor (i.e. they must not be confounded) were selected and further examined. Using a significance level greater than or equal to .39\(^{10}\), Factors A, B, and C accounted for 39\% of the total variance, and thus were further examined\(^{11}\). The Factor loadings for each subject are presented in Table 1.

**Basic Interpretation of Factors:**

The Factor Arrays were created in order to enhance the examination of each of the three Factors (Appendix L). Each Factor Array is presented in the format of a single Q-sort, representing the union of the individual Q Sorts which compose each individual Factor (Airey, 1993, p.39).

Each Factor Array exemplifies the average sorting position of the 42 Q-sort statements in the forced-choice, quasi bell shaped, Q-sort continuum. In addition, a listing of the average, rank-ordered scores for each Factor are provided for quick reference (see Appendix M).

\(^{10}\) Standard Error (SE) Can be calculated as follows: SE = \(1/\sqrt{n}\). Where \(n\) = the number of statements in the Q-sample. Therefore, for 42 statements the \(SE = 1/\sqrt{42} = .15\) and thus loadings in excess of 2.58(SE) = .39 are significant at the 0.01 level (Goldman, 1991, p.351; McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p.50).

\(^{11}\) The variance is a measure, expressed as a percentage, expressing the total variability of a Factor in correlation to the variability in the correlation matrix (Brown, 1980, p.222). For example, in the case of Factor A, the total variance of 15\% of the total variability in the correlation matrix is accounted for by Factor A. The three Factors when combined account for a total variance of 39\%, accounting for the maximum amount of variance. Therefore, variance analysis remains a possibility for purposes of examining individual Q sorts from a theoretical standpoint (Brown, 1980, p.201).
Table 1  
**Varimax Rotation for Sorts with Significant and Pure Loadings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>+62</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>+58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>+58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+41</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+76</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>+76</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>+69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+66</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+63</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+63</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Boxed loadings are those of participants that showed no significant loadings on any other factor and thus were selected for further analysis.

**This negative factor weight designates Factor C as "bipolar".**
Further analysis was conducted in order to interpret the subjective world of the athletes who individually constructed each unique Factor (Stephenson, 1953, p.45). Special attention was paid to the statements which exhibited factor scores which were at least three "piles" away from the corresponding factor scores of the other Factors (Zheng, 1993, p.105). The statements which fit this criterion are referred to as "discriminating items" which can be lined up, from -5 to +5, in order to emphasize the differences and implicit meanings of each individual Factor.

The remaining task at hand was to interpret and explain the similarities and differences among each unique Factor (Brown, 1986, p.60). Following Senn's (1993) protocol, the representative sort for each Factor was the principal data used for the first stage of interpretation (p.326). Q-sort statements and their representative sort positions are accordingly presented in the text for interpretation where appropriate.

The second stage of interpretation utilizes the results of the qualitative, personal interviews\(^\text{12}\). Excerpts from these interviews are used to support or contradict the

\(^{12}\) In total, twelve of the 50 athletes were recruited to participate in Phase 2 or in the open-ended personal interviews. None of the varsity athletes reported participating in more than one varsity sport. The bodybuilders also reported that bodybuilding was their primary sporting activity. In addition, all ten of the sporting activities incorporated within the scope of this study were represented in the interview phase.
results of the first, Q-sort stage.

The Q-sort can thus be considered the skeleton of the athletes' attitudes pertaining to masculinity, as best they can express it given the limited resources\(^{13}\) (Brown, 1980, p.200). The personal interviews permitted the athletes to expound on their reasoning for ranking the Q-statements in their own unique, subjective manner. The interviews thus provided the investigator with an opportunity to clarify points that may have been obscured to him otherwise (Brown, 1980, p.200). For example, the interviewer's logic may tell him that items a and b belong together logically, yet the athlete may have scored the one +4 and the other -2. When asked about this, the subject may reveal a logic of his own which immediately resolves the apparent discrepancy and deepens the investigator's understanding of the way the athlete thinks.

The 42 items of the Q-sort fall into seven specific categories based on traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies as reported in the literature review. Again, the components of hegemonic masculinity consist of deference to male authority, devaluation of women, the sanctioned use of aggression and violence, social isolation, the exclusion of pain, marginalization of homosexual males, and the mesomorphic body type. The existence of three

\[^{13}\text{A complete model of the athlete's attitude pertaining to masculinity may be somewhat restricted by the "forced-choice", rank ordering format of the Q-sort.}\]
"masculinities", generated by a combination of Q-methodology and personal interviews, will be discussed. Each Factor, representing a different masculinity, will be analyzed according to the traditional masculine components it supports or contradicts as reported by the various athletes comprising each of the established Factors.

**Factor A:**

Factor A consisted of fourteen of the 50 male athletes who participated in this study\(^{14}\). Each of the fourteen athletes loaded significantly under this Factor, exhibiting factor weights greater than or equal to the predetermined benchmark of .39 (see Table 1). Using the formula outlined by Brown (1980) the reliability estimate for this Factor was calculated to be .98 (see Appendix K).

The athletes who compose Factor A do not exhibit or reinforce characteristics that are expressive of the traditional hegemonic masculine identity. Their lack of support for hegemonic ideologies will become more evident as the results of the Q-sort and personal interviews are further examined.

The athletes who compose Factor A represent both Type

---

\(^{14}\) The athletes who compose Factor A participate in football, rugby, hockey, soccer, basketball, volleyball, golf, long distance running, and bodybuilding (see Appendix K). Other athletes also loaded significantly on this Factor but were eliminated from further examination as they represented non-pure or confounded sorts (see Appendix I).
"A" and Type "B" sporting activities\(^{13}\). Eight of the 14 athletes in Factor A represented all of the Type "A" sporting activities: rugby, football, hockey, soccer, and basketball.

The remaining six athletes reported participating in volleyball, golf, bodybuilding, and long distance running, all Type "B" sporting activities. Swimming, the remaining Type "B" sporting activity was not represented by any of the athletes in Factor A. Therefore, Factor A is represented significantly by both Type "A" and Type "B" athletes.

As indicated by the combined factor loadings generated by the p.c.q. (Striklen, 1992), the athletes representing Factor A do not support the characteristics outlined in the literature review, which are expressive of the hegemonic masculine ideal. In fact, these athletes downplay the significance of male authority, are strong advocates of equality for women in sports, are not homophobic, and do not incorporate the mesomorphic body type in their masculine identity. The following is a commentary of each of the previously outlined distinguishing components, which when combined compose Factor A.

Factor A athletes argue that unchallenged conformity to male authority will reduce the amount of control they wish

\(^{13}\) The sporting activities have been grouped into two separate categories, Type "A" sports and Type "B" sports. The Type "A" sports are more team and collision oriented, exhibiting obvious acts of physical aggression. Type "B" sports tend to be more individually (with the exception of volleyball) and non-collision oriented, void of intentional physical contact. Therefore, Type "B" sports consist of football, rugby, hockey soccer, and basketball. Type "B" sporting activities include volleyball, swimming, golf, long distance running, and bodybuilding.
to maintain over their own lives. These athletes express a strong desire to maintain an active role in the development of their own potential as athletes.

In order to maintain an active role in their own athletic development, these athletes maintain that it is often necessary to challenge the authoritative capacity of male authoritative figures, most often coaches.

2. I always follow directions or orders even if I don't agree with them.
3. My coach has power over my future.

The significant factor weights\textsuperscript{16}, reported by the preceding Q-sort statements, reflects the athletes' reluctance to permit authoritative individuals (i.e. coaches) to maintain exclusive control over their athletic development.

Factor A athletes' main concern is with the abuse of power which they claim can accompany positions of authority. This concern becomes more evident in the following interview passages\textsuperscript{17}:

Authority can be abused and the guys who have the authority [coaches] often abuse it.

People in the power positions [coaches] can abuse their power by taking advantage of their subordinates [athletes].

\textsuperscript{16} Q-sort statements are considered to be significant if the factor weight is \pm 3 to \pm 3. Factor weights of \pm 2 or \pm 1 will be considered directional rather than significant.

\textsuperscript{17} These quotations are taken directly from the transcribed, personal interviews and reflect the athletes' subjective opinions in their own terminology. The quotations do not reflect the general consensus of the athletes as a group. Rather, they are reflective of each athlete's own subjective opinion about the issue at hand.
I have talked to a lot of people who have done what the coach has demanded even though they don't agree with it and the situation usually gets out of hand. I don't think it is right for a coach to use his authority to make a person do something he doesn't want to do.

These athletes are not willing to adhere to a coach's demands if they deem those demands to be detrimental to their well-being as athletes. Factor A males maintain that they are not easily intimidated and thus are not afraid to challenge the authoritative position of coaches if they feel that their own best interests are being compromised.

If I had reason to believe that what he [the coach] was teaching or trying to get across was negative and I disagreed with that, I wouldn't have a lot of trouble saying that this is wrong and that we should change our methods or whatever.

These athletes are hesitant to enter into a situation where coaches can take advantage of them by abusing their position of power.

The athletes who compose Factor A contend that respect, leading to support for male authority, must be mutually developed and reinforced between the athlete and the coach in order to establish a successful partnership. Factor A athletes thus agree that respect is not automatic but must be earned.

Respect is the key. The coach must earn respect from his players and through his actions will receive it. It is a mutual relationship [athlete-coach] and not a dictatorship.
Furthermore, Factor A athletes indicate that they are not overly concerned about earning the respect of authoritative figures. The factor weight reported by the following Q-sort statement suggests that Factor A athletes are slightly opposed to following orders:

1. In order to earn respect I must be able to follow orders from coaches and/or veteran teammates.  

Factor A athletes are inclined to comply with the authority demanded by female coaches. The positive factor weight reported by the following Q-sort statement indicates the athletes' moderate level of agreement with this statement:

24. I respond to male and female coaches in the same manner.  

This behaviour contradicts the traditional position of authority and power maintained by male coaches within the institution of organized sports.

In conjunction with their egalitarian attitude, Factor A athletes typically do not support the common stereotypic representations which women continually encounter. The following Q-sort statements exemplify some of the types of stereotypical representations of women that these athletes do not support:
4. Women athletes are too emotional.   A   B   C
5. Men are athletically superior to   +2   -1   -1
   women.                           -4   +3   -2
27. Female athletes are just as      +3   0   +3
   feminine as other women.

The negative factor weight reported by Q-sort statement
4 indicates that Factor A athletes tend to agree that female
athletes are not overly emotional. In addition, the
negative factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 5
represents the athletes' significant level of disagreement
with the common stereotypic representation of women as
athletically inferior to men. Factor A males contend that
female athletes could eventually challenge the athletic
performances of their male counterparts if afforded the same
opportunities and privileges that men have traditionally
received.

Factor A athletes also recognize that participation in
organized sports does not masculinize female athletes. The
positive factor weight reported on Q-sort statement 27
significantly reflects Factor A athletes' belief that female
athletes can participate in organized sports while still
maintaining a desirable feminine identity.

Factor A athletes reported that they are not threatened
by the presence of women within the institution of organized
sports.

26. Women with equal ability should be   A   B   C
    allowed to compete with men.   +2   -3   -1
The positive factor weight reported by the preceding Q-sort statement indicates that Factor A athletes tend to agree that women have the potential to successfully compete with or against men. Factor A athletes claim that they have few problems competing with or against female athletes. However, these athletes agree that it is only fair that women must earn the right to participate, just as other men must. Therefore, Factor A athletes agree that some women will undeniably have the ability to successfully compete with or against men. The following interview passages reflect their views pertaining to equality:

I played [●●●●●]18 with and against women and it didn't bother me at all. I saw them as athletic equals and teammates. I don't care about a person's sex or race or whatever. The bottom line is that it is athlete versus athlete.

They [women] are there for the same reasons as men are...to compete, to win and have fun, make relationships, and to be the best that they can be in whatever sport they decide to participate in.

The fear of losing to a woman in athletic competition does not seriously threaten the athletes who compose Factor A. The positive factor weight of the following Q-sort statement supports this claim:

25. I do not feel threatened when a female beats me in sports.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 The specific sporting activity has been deleted in order to ensure respondent anonymity as promised, in advance, by the researcher.
Further, Factor A athletes claim that men who do not support equality for women in organized sports may actually have a problem with their own masculine identity, feeling threatened by the mere presence of female athletes.

Maybe they [some male athletes] are afraid that if a woman beats them that their masculine status is somehow being challenged.

Therefore, the athletes in Factor A do not believe that the mere inclusion of women into their various sporting activities will negatively affect their masculine status as athletes.

Factor A athletes assert that they are not homophobic, and thus do not display hatred or fear towards gay men. These athletes believe that gay male athletes are viable opponents and teammates just as are "straight" male athletes. The corresponding factor loadings of the following Q-sort statements are representative of the varying support that Factor A athletes exhibit towards the inclusion of gay male athletes within the institution of organized sports:

16. Gay male athletes can be harmful to sports.  
37. There are gay men playing in every sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athletes in Factor A agree that the presence of gay male athletes in their various sporting activities does not harm the integrity of their sports. This is reflected in
the significant factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 18.

Factor A athletes argue that an athlete's sexuality is not a legitimate criterion for the evaluation of athleticism or commitment to organized sports. Gay athletes have to make the same type of commitment decisions to participate in sports as do heterosexual athletes. Therefore, competing with or against gay men is not an issue for Factor A athletes as is indicated in the following interview passages:

You know, some people are born heterosexual and some people are born homosexual. I really don't have any problem with that [homosexuality] because it is just their [gay athletes'] being.

Too many people are making an issue out of it [homosexuality]. Everyone has their own sexuality and we should be able to accept people for who they are.

According to the parameters of the Q-sort continuum, a factor weight of -5 represents the highest level of disagreement that any athlete could report on any one Q-sort item. Therefore, based on the reported factor weight, Factor A athletes express their adamant disagreement with the following Q-sort statement:

18. Gay male athletes are less athletic. A B C

-5 -3 -3

Quite simply, Factor A athletes argue that gay male athletes are no less athletic than their heterosexual male
counterparts. Most importantly, Factor A athletes respect gay men as athletes first and foremost, while their sexual orientation is a secondary concern. This belief is further illustrated in the following interview excerpts:

You shouldn't even hold their sexuality as an issue because they [gay athletes] are athletes first and foremost.

Like I said, it is all from an athletic point of view. They [gay athletes] are just other individuals on the other side of the field who want to win and want their opponents to lose.

Factor A athletes tend to agree, although somewhat tentatively, that the presence of gay men within the institution of organized sports does not bother them or detract from their sporting experience. This is reflected in the following Q-sort statements and interview passage:

17. I would feel uncomfortable competing with or against gay men.  
38. Gay male athletes are welcome in the gym.

Further:

Just because one day a person says they are heterosexual and the next day the same person says that they are homosexual, I don't think that the person has changed that much. It is just a new part of their personality that you never knew before and that shouldn't affect your relationship as teammates.

In addition, they feel it is irrational to fear the possibility of contracting "gay" related diseases through intense physical competition with gay male athletes.
Competing against them [gay athletes]...I guess there are certain risks which really are not all that risky. If you worry about these ridiculous risks, then you might as well stop living life.

Factor A athletes agree that these fears are largely unfounded concerns that do not warrant the exclusion of gay male athletes from competing in mainstream, heterosexual sporting activities.

Further, Factor A athletes tend to agree that the mesomorphic body type is not an integral component in the attainment of athletic success. Obtaining and maintaining the mesomorphic body type is not a priority and does not carry much credence in the lives of the athletes in Factor A. This attitude is reflected by the factor weights of the following Q-sort statements which tend to downplay the aesthetic advantages of the mesomorphic body type:

19. I "work out" or play sports to get bigger and look better. $\begin{array}{ccc} A & B & C \\ -1 & +3 & +2 \end{array}$

20. Body builders look more athletic than long distance runners. $\begin{array}{ccc} A & B & C \\ -1 & -1 & -3 \end{array}$

Factor A athletes do exhibit a concern that too many people within today's society are overly concerned about how others perceive their own physical appearance. Looking "muscular" or "big" does not really concern the athletes in Factor A.

This is my philosophy in life; You must be happy with what God gave you. No one is perfect and that is the way life works and you can't change time or genetics. Work with what you have got.
They argue that it takes more than a muscular body to be a successful athlete and that characteristics such as intelligence, heart, and determination are also needed in order to become a successful athlete.

In addition, Factor A athletes recognize that the muscular body is not an accurate measure of an individual's athletic ability. The significance of this view is reflected in the positive factor weight of the following Q-sort statement:

40. Muscular appearance is not an accurate measure of athletic ability.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These athletes contend that athletic skill and ability are not dependent on an athlete's genetic or physiological makeup. The following interview passage further supports this argument:

It all depends on the type of sport you play. In most cases some men have the ability to be on the field yet their physiological makeup may not allow them to conform to the mesomorphic body type. But their athletic ability warrants their presence on the field.

The athletes in Factor A are inclined to argue that it is important to develop the body type that is best suited for success in their respective sporting activities. This is supported by the positive factor weight of the following Q-sort statement:
42. It is important to develop the body type that best suits the sport.

Further, when interviewed they are much more adamantly about this claim:

In sports the body type is completely related to the type of sporting activity.

It depends on the type of sport you play. Different types of bodies can influence the types of sports you play. For example, a high amount of fat can benefit the performance of some athletes and hinder the performances of others.

The athletes comprising Factor A indicate that they are not overly concerned about their physical appearance and its conformity to the mesomorphic ideal. They are more concerned that their body type is compatible with their sporting activity in order for them to achieve the kind of athletic success they desire.

Factor B:

In total, twelve of the 50 males who participated in this study, composed Factor B\(^\text{19}\). Each of the twelve athletes loaded significantly on this Factor, exhibiting factor weights greater than or equal to the predetermined benchmark of .39 (see Table 1). Using the formula outlined

\(^{19}\) The athletes who compose Factor B participate in football, rugby, hockey, soccer, basketball, and swimming (see Appendix K). Other athletes also loaded significantly on this Factor but were eliminated from further examination as they represent non-pure or confounded sorts (see Appendix K).
by Brown (1980) the reliability estimate for this Factor was calculated to be .97 (see Appendix K).

The athletes who compose Factor B relate to and exhibit characteristics which maintain and reinforce the majority of the hegemonic components of masculinity outlined in the literature review\(^{20}\). Therefore, for the athletes who loaded purely on this Factor, hegemonic ideologies surrounding masculinity have played a central role in the social construction of their current masculine identities.

Factor B athletes are representative of both Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities. Ten of the twelve athletes who compose this Factor represent Type "A" sporting activities such as rugby, soccer, hockey, football, and basketball. The remaining two athletes reported participating in swimming, a Type "B" sporting activity. Therefore, Factor B is primarily represented by the team oriented, physically aggressive, collision dependent, Type "A" sporting activities.

As indicated by the combined factor loadings generated by the p.c.q. (Striklen, 1992), the athletes who compose this Factor support deference to male authority, devalue the presence of female athletes, condone the use of aggressive and violent behaviour, and support the deliberate segregation of male and female athletes, all within the

\(^{20}\) Refer to the following references for further explanation of the representative characteristics of the hegemonic masculine identity: Connell, 1990; Sabo & Paneginto, 1990; Sabo & Nunfolia, 1990; Bryson, 1987; Herek, 1987; Mishkind et. al., 1986; Rakow, 1986; Messner, 1985.
institution of organized sports. The following is a commentary on each of these components, which when combined, compose Factor B.

Respect is an integral component in both the development and acceptance of male authority according to the athletes who compose Factor B. The respect component of male authority is further reflected by the significant factor weight of the following Q-sort statement:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In order to gain respect I must be able to follow orders from coaches and/or veteran teammates.

Factor B athletes contend that it is crucial for authoritative figures, such as coaches, to obtain and maintain a minimum level of respect from their athletes. These male athletes further support the doctrine that respect for these authoritative figures or coaches is automatic.

Respect is automatic. A coach has earned the right to be the coach because he understands what it takes to deal with the players.

Even though you may think that your coach is the biggest asshole, you still have to listen to him because he deserves the respect. You know, if the coach says to do this and you don't want to do it, you do it anyway.

Factor B athletes argue that authority is central to the effective functioning of the team as a cohesive and successful unit. Ultimately, these athletes agree that lack
of respect leads to lack of authority. Moreover, without the authority provided by the coach the "team" will become misguided due to the lack of much needed guidance that comes with authority.

Many of these athletes feel that the coach is the most visible authoritative figure within the hierarchy of the team. The coach's authority is important as it commands the attention of the athletes, enabling him to instill a good work ethic, discipline, motivation, and a sense of right and wrong in the athletes.

However, the coach is not the only authoritative figure that Factor B athletes openly acknowledge within the team structure. They assert that veteran teammates or "captains" also deserve a certain amount of respect from the junior or rookie players, establishing these senior teammates as authoritative peers. This strong allegiance to the authoritative influence of veteran teammates or captains is evident in the following interview comment:

The team captain on my [●●●●●●] team has more authority than the coach. If I want an opinion on what I may be doing wrong, I go to the captain. I believe that my peers are the most authoritative people.

Factor B athletes admit that they routinely endorse and respect the role of men as authoritative figures while consciously downplaying the role of women who hold the same types of authoritative positions as men.
This attitude may be attributable to their contention that women do not maintain influential positions within the institution of organized sports as well as in their personal lives. This belief is further reflected in the significant factor weight of Q-sort item 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Women have been more influential in my life than men.

24. I respond to male and female coaches in the same manner.

Factor B athletes tentatively contend that they are not willing to respond to female coaches in the same responsive manner that they usually reserve for male coaches. They believe that female coaches do not maintain enough authority to significantly influence them in any way.

If I had a female coaching me in ['], it wouldn't have worked. She would have to prove to me that she was good enough to coach me. I would rather be coached by a man.

Factor B athletes also argue that maintaining an inferior or subordinate role to women will detract from their masculine status. This becomes more obvious in the following interview passage:

I think that they [men] may feel threatened. As far as masculinity...I think a lot of players' masculinity would be threatened taking orders from a woman.

Factor B athletes consider the roles of women, within the institution of organized sports, to be insignificant and
secondary in comparison to the roles that men maintain.

This argument is further supported by their belief that they are athletically superior when compared to their female counterparts, as indicated below:

5. Men are athletically superior to women. A B C
   -4 +3 -2

Factor B athletes argue that they could not play up to their maximum potential if forced to compete with or against women. They contend that there are physiological differences which exist between the sexes. They maintain that it is a well known fact that female athletes cannot equal the strength and skill levels that men have established as the acceptable norm, as is supported by the following interview excerpt:

It is just a physical thing, women can't successfully compete with men.

Factor B athletes maintain a stance against equality for females within the institution of organized sports. They believe that aspiring female athletes should not be permitted to infiltrate male dominated sporting organizations, and thus should establish their own leagues where women compete against other women. The significant factor weight reported by Factor B athletes on the following Q-sort statement effectively reflects this outlook:
26. Women with equal ability should be able to compete with men. 

In their estimation, integration of the sexes would undoubtedly compromise the current level of competition and seriousness to which they have become accustomed. This attitude is supported by the following interview quotation:

You are brought up not to play tough against girls...you just goof around and be funny. So you can't get serious and so I think that would be a main thing that you would lose some of the competitiveness and seriousness.

As indicated by the negative factor weight reported on the following Q-sort statement, Factor B athletes may feel somewhat threatened with the notion of competing with or against female athletes:

25. I do not feel threatened when a female beats me in sports. 

Factor B athletes agree that both aggressive and violent behaviours play necessary roles within the institution of organized sports, as well as in the formation of their identities as successful athletes.

9. In order to be successful, athletes have to act in aggressive and sometimes violent ways.

The following interview passage indicates the importance Factor B athletes place on aggressive behaviour:
Aggression is evident in almost every sport. It may not be physical aggressiveness but every athlete has to have that frame of mind to be able to play the game at the best of his ability.

Furthermore, they believe that athletes who lack aggressiveness also lack the desired intensity and subsequent motivation needed in order to be a successful athlete.

Factor B athletes maintain that violent behaviour is also integral to their success as athletes. The following Q-sort statements exhibit the athletes' acceptance of violent behaviour within the institution of organized sports:

8. It is OK to injure an opponent during competition as long as it is within the rules.  
   28. Violent behaviour is unacceptable in sport.

Factor B athletes agree, although somewhat sceptically, that violent behaviour resulting in injury is acceptable as long as it occurs within the governing body of rules as maintained by the various sporting activities.

As long as it is within the rules and it is a clean hit, it doesn't really matter if he intends to hurt the other guy...it is legal and within the rules of the game.

Injury, occurring as a result of violent behaviour, as long as it was perceived to occur as the result of a "clean" hit, is a part of the game. This becomes more obvious as during
an interview one of the athletes remarked:

When you are in a game it is like being in a war...everything counts.

In addition, another athlete commented:

Some violence is good. Like in [☆☆☆☆☆] when you bang a guy's head and twist it around a little bit, it allows you to show the guy that you are in charge.

Therefore, the results from the interviews reinforce the tentative relationship established by the Q-sort indicating that Factor B athletes agree that violence is necessary and often warranted behaviour within organized sports.

Factor B athletes condone and support the isolation and segregation of the sexes (male and female) within the institution of organized sports. These athletes confess that they feel most comfortable participating in all-male sporting environments, completely void of any female influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athletes who compose Factor B would rather see males competing with or against males and females competing with or against females. They claim that this would allow men to preserve their athletic standards (i.e. skill, competition, etc.) which they feel would be compromised with the
induction of women into their athletic domain.

As indicated by the positive factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 12, Factor B athletes question the benefits of competing with or against female athletes. They contend that co-ed sporting activities often reduce the levels of competitiveness and seriousness to which they have become accustomed. Playing with or against women, in their estimation, often forces them to "take it easy" in order to lower themselves to the athletic level of their female counterparts.

If you do well on an all-male team, the rest of the guys will respect you for your accomplishments. But when competing with girls, the competition is gone.

Factor B athletes contend that it is in their best interest, as athletes, to compete with or against other men, in all-male environments. This view is reflected in Q-statement 32, as previously stated. This attitude becomes more apparent in the following interview passage:

For the guys to play with girls...if one of his friends was on an all-male team, he would probably say what are you doing playing with girls?...are you a wimp or wuss or something? I think that guys playing with girls would be stereotyped as more feminine than masculine.

Therefore, Factor B athletes agree that competing with or against female athletes might make male athletes "soft", turning them into "wimps" or "wussies".
Factor C:

Factor C included seven of the 50 male athletes who participated in this study\(^{21}\). Each of the seven athletes loaded significantly under this Factor, exhibiting factor weights greater than or equal to the predetermined benchmark of .39 (see Table 1). Using the formula outlined by Brown (1980) the reliability estimate for this Factor was calculated to be .97 (see Appendix K).

Athletes who loaded purely on Factor C did not support the behavioral characteristics which are traditionally linked to the hegemonic masculine identity. Rather, these athletes display attributes which directly contradict some of the more traditional, hegemonic masculine components outlined in the literature review.

The athletes in Factor C represent both Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities. Five of the seven athletes represent such Type "B" sports as swimming, long distance running, and bodybuilding. The remaining two athletes participated in hockey and football, both Type "A" sporting activities. Therefore, Factor C is the only Factor which is composed mainly of athletes who participate in the more individually oriented, less physical or non-contact Type "B" sporting activities.

\(^{21}\) The athletes who compose Factor C participate in football, hockey, swimming, long distance running, golf, and bodybuilding (see Appendix K). Other athletes also loaded significantly on this Factor but were eliminated from further examination as they represent non-pure or confounded sorts (see Appendix L).
As indicated by the combined factor loadings generated by the p.c.q. (Striklen, 1992), the athletes representing Factor C are advocates for the equality of female athletes, believe that aggressive behaviour is positive but do not condone the use of violent behaviour, will not jeopardize their physical well-being while playing injured, are not homophobic, and do not believe that the mesomorphic body type is a central component of masculinity. The following is an account of the previously reported attributes, which when combined, compose Factor C.

When referring to the significant factor loadings in Table 1, which delineate the athletes who significantly load on this Factor from those who do not, it becomes apparent that one of the athletes reported a negative factor weight. Therefore, Factor C is considered to be "bipolar" while Factors A and B are "unipolar".

Unipolar Factors, such as A and B, consist of significant factor weights which do not appear to oppose one another, that is they all support the same point of view. However, a bipolar Factor or Factor C is represented by one or more significant factor weights which oppose the majority of views and values maintained by the other individuals who construct that Factor. However, this does in no way discredit the results of the bipolar Factor.

In fact, the bipolar Factor consists of two distinct points of view rather than one, which is traditionally the
case in Q-methodology. According to Brown (1980) "the opposite of one opinion may be another viable opinion rather than a mere negation of the original opinion" (p.134). Therefore, negatively loaded factor weight is in fact indicative of a dissimilar attitude. In abiding to the objective of this study, to examine similarities, the athlete who represented the bipolar factor loading was not included in the open-ended, personal interviews.

As previously stated, the goal of Q-methodology is to establish similar opinions about specific subject matter, not to establish differences. The purpose of this study was to establish similar opinions about the social construction of masculinity within the institution of organized sports. Therefore, the opposite opinions maintained by the athlete who loaded negatively on Factor C will be noted but not further examined.

The athletes who compose Factor C agree that female athletes should be granted the same opportunities and privileges to which male athletes have become accustomed. These athletes do not support the representation of women as inferior or second-rate athletes, when compared to men.

For example, the athletes representing Factor C voice no concerns when confronted with the possibility of competing with or against female athletes. Factor C athletes are willing to accept the presence of women in organized sports. This attitude becomes more evident in the
following interview passage:

I think that it is wrong that women are discriminated against in sports. It is about time that this [behaviour] stopped.

It is natural to me for women to be in sports. Other than gender there is no difference between male and female athletes. Just because of sex you can't tell them [women] that they cannot compete.

Factor C males acknowledge that female athletes have not been afforded the same opportunities that men have within the institution of organized sports. These athletes suggest that in order to increase equal opportunity for female athletes, the inaccurate stereotypic representations that women currently encounter must be erased.

For example, Factor C athletes tend to agree that female athletes are not as overly emotional as they are often portrayed to be. This belief is supported by the negative directional factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Women athletes are too emotional.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Men are athletically superior to women.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Female athletes are just as feminine as other women.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Factor C athletes do not believe that women should be regarded as physically inferior to men. Factor C athletes are inclined to agree that women should be treated as men's physical equals, based on the negative directional factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 5.
Factor C athletes also contend that women who participate in sports are no less feminine than women who do not participate in sports. They argue that female athletes can compete while still maintaining feminine qualities which society considers desirable. Therefore, these athletes agree that women should not be restricted to "feminine" type sporting activities, but should be able to participate in any sporting activity they desire without the fear that they may be perceived as less feminine.

Sometimes the controversy surrounding the feminine role in sports is stupid. If a woman wants to shot put, then she should shot put and not be expected to be something feminine like a figure skater.

Factor C athletes acknowledge that it is these types of stereotypic representations of women which directly discourage any headway that female athletes may achieve towards equal rights within organized sports.

The athletes who compose Factor C acknowledge a difference between aggressive and violent behaviour. They comprehend violence to be an act of over-aggression in which the athlete has lost control. Therefore, while they perceive the role of aggression in a positive manner, they simultaneously perceive violent behaviour in sport in a more negative fashion. Factor C athletes have the ability to differentiate aggressive sport behaviour from the more negatively regarded, violent behaviour.
Factor C athletes agree that controlled aggressive behaviour plays an integral role in the positive development of their athletic personality. This type of controlled aggression is meant to be entirely mental as Factor C athletes do not condone the display or presence of physical violence.

Aggression is where you are into playing the game. You become so intense and the game has become such a part of you that you go out and play as hard as you can but are not willing to hurt someone in the process.

More precisely, Factor C athletes acknowledge that mental aggression is the ability to "introvert" aggressive behaviour, as a means of self-motivation. This self-motivation permits an athlete to produce an "adrenaline high" enabling him to develop the necessary competitive edge he needs in order to be successful.

Factor C athletes agree that aggressive behaviour, when used in a positive manner, can also be an effective form of strategic behaviour. Aggression can be used to "push" opponents in order to bring out the best in their performance, thus enhancing their competitive ability. This type of strategic aggression is meant to be mental and not physical as is reported in the following interview passage:

Aggression is good to a certain extent. Aggression makes the game or competition more intense, but should not go beyond the point where people get hurt.
Factor C athletes argue that if introverted, aggressive behaviour is not controlled it can ultimately lead to a more extroverted, physical aggression or violent behaviour.

These athletes maintain that violent behaviour is unacceptable within organized sports and should not be equated with athletic success. Factor C athletes argue that it is fundamentally and morally wrong to intentionally injure another athlete, even if it occurs within the rules of the game. This becomes more obvious when examining the significant factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. It is OK to injure an opponent during competition as long as it is within the rules.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In order to be successful, an athlete must act in aggressive and sometimes even violent manners.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Factor C athletes reported a significant factor loading on Q-sort statement 9, indicating their disagreement with the notion that violence and success are somehow correlated within organized sports. Their contempt for violent behaviour in organized sports becomes even more evident in the following interview passages:

I guess aggression is getting to the [······] and pulling him down where violence allows the athlete to knock the crap out of him. It is morally incorrect to intentionally hurt another athlete during a game especially if it can be avoided. It is just a game.
If you know a guy is halfway down on the [ field and your teammate has him hung up, I wouldn't go in full force and try to knock his head off. That's crazy because you will just end up hurting him. If an athlete knows he is going to hurt someone; he should ease up a bit. If not that becomes over-aggression or violence. The game is not meant to be played where you can go out and intentionally hurt someone, that just takes away from the meaning of the game.

Ultimately, Factor C athletes contend that violence within organized sports is both unacceptable and unnecessary.

I do not believe that violence should be a part of sport. It is not acceptable to hurt people, possibly hurting someone to the point of ending their career as an athlete.

However, Factor C athletes are quick to recognize that violent behaviour in sports is extremely appealing and exciting to "spectators" who spend considerable amounts of money to attend various sporting events.

I think that the media influences fighting [violence] which has become really hyped up. Bottom line is that violence makes money.

Factor C athletes argue that the media influences and ultimately reproduces violent behaviour within organized sports. Therefore, the athletes who compose Factor C would like to see this trend reversed by the development of more stringent regulations in order to attempt to reduce the level of violence which they feel has currently overrun organized sports.
Further, Factor C athletes are not willing to jeopardize their physical well-being for the benefit of their teammates or for the sake of competition. These athletes will not allow themselves to become coerced or intimidated by coaches and/or teammates into feeling obligated to continue competing while injured. They acknowledge that continued participation while injured increases the risk of developing a more serious, possibly debilitating injury and therefore, they are alert to recognizing pain as an indicator which is the body's way of telling them to stop.

13. I would rather play hurt than be called a "wimp":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I would play injured if it would help my teammates win:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. I think that my health is more important than my team winning or losing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive factor weight of Q-statement 13 indicates that the athletes who compose Factor C refuse to participate if seriously injured. They refuse to play "through" pain regardless of the effect that it may have on their reputation as athletes or the subsequent ridicule to which they may be subjected. In other words they agree that "to play hurt is crazy".

As indicated by the significant factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 36, Factor C athletes are willing to safeguard their physical health even at the expense of the
success of their team. As indicated by the factor weight of 
Q-sort item 14, Factor C athletes do exhibit signs of 
influence by teammates to play injured. However, they still 
tend to maintain that they would not.

Furthermore, Factor C athletes contend that it is 
mostly a personal decision whether an athlete chooses to 
compete while injured. The positive directional factor 
weight of the following Q-sort statement further supports 
this attitude:

35. It is my decision whether or not I play injured.  

   A  B  C
   +5  +3  +1

Most often, this choice is influenced by the extent of 
pain or injury the athlete is experiencing.

There is a point when an athlete can say that he 
is not seriously injured and can play. But the 
chronic pain that can lead to further damage 
should not be ignored.

Therefore, Factor C athletes acknowledge that the decision 
to play or not play is often based on their ability to 
distinguish acute pain from chronic, more damaging pain.

Further:

There are a lot of [●●●●●] on the varsity team and 
they can't differentiate between good pain and bad 
pain. They don't have any respect for their 
bodies.

According to Factor C athletes "good" pain is the type 
of pain that an individual experiences during a workout that
indicates that he is working hard. An example of a "good" type of pain, provided by the athletes in Factor C, is the build-up of lactic acid in their muscles. They acknowledge that it hurts but they are also aware that they are not doing any permanent damage to their muscles or bodies. Any time these athletes experience "bad" pain which is more intense, often resulting from a sharp "stabbing" or "shooting" sensation, they will stop in order to reduce further damage, therefore beginning the recuperation of the damaged area.

The athletes of Factor C argue that it may be inappropriate behaviour to pressure teammates and demand that they continue to compete while injured.

34. I would never hassle a teammate who refused to play injured.

Factor C athletes contend that it is an athlete's decision if he wants to sit out and rest his injury. The following interview passage provides more substantive support of this behaviour:

Q: Would you expect a teammate to compete while injured?  
A: It would have to be his personal decision and I would never apply any pressure because it is not fair to do so. Who are we to decide for them?

Factor C athletes positively acknowledge the presence of gay male athletes within the institution of organized sports. These athletes report that they are not homophobic,
and thus do not exhibit any hatred towards gay male athletes. This attitude is further supported by the significant factor weights reported by the athletes on the following Q-sort statements:

37. There are gay men playing in every sport.  
   A  B  C  
   +1  0  +4
38. Gay male athletes are welcome in the gym.  
   +1  -2  +3
39. Homophobia (hatred of gays) hurts sports.  
   0  -1  +3

When asked the following question, one of the athletes interviewed responded in the following manner:

Q: How do you feel about homosexuality?
A: To each his own. I have no problems with it and I am not homophobic. In sports...I don't even think that it should be an issue. I am not like 90% of the other athletes who are homophobic.

Factor C athletes agree that gay athletes should not be discriminated against within the institution of organized sports. Factor C males support equality for gay male athletes and do not attempt to exclude them from participating in their various sporting activities. These athletes agree that it is wrong to downplay or ignore the positive and contributory role that gay men maintain within the institution of organized sports.

Factor C athletes recognize and accept gay males as athletes first and foremost. The gay athlete's sexual orientation is not an important measure of his athletic ability.
I see gay male athletes as athletes first and gay men second. When you are on the playing field it doesn't matter who or what or where the athlete has come from, it is the athlete himself that is important.

This is further supported by the significant factor weight reflective of the athletes' disagreement with the following Q-sort statement:

18. Gay male athletes are less athletic.  
   \[ A \quad B \quad C \]
   \[-5 \quad -3 \quad -3 \]

Factor C athletes contend that gay male athletes are not athletically inferior and should not be treated as such. Therefore, Factor C athletes assert that the presence of gay men in organized sports is in no way detrimental to the institution, itself. This claim is further supported by the significant factor weight reported by Q-sort statement 16:

16. Gay male athletes are harmful to sports.  
17. I would feel uncomfortable competing with or against gay men.  
   \[ A \quad B \quad C \]
   \[-3 \quad -1 \quad -3 \]

In addition, Factor C athletes are somewhat comfortable, displaying no major concerns towards competing with or against gay male athletes. This behaviour becomes much more evident in the following interview passage:

Competing against gay men does not bother me at all. It is basically their sexual preference which has no real effect on sports. It shouldn't hinder them at all because homosexuality and sports are two different things. Gay athletes have personal lives and sporting lives which are two different environments.
Finally, Factor C athletes tend to agree that the mesomorphic body type is not a "foolproof" measure of athletic ability.

40. Muscular appearance is not an accurate indicator of athletic ability. 

A B C  
+4 +1 +2

The athletes who compose Factor C agree that the mesomorphic body type is not the universal athletic somatotype.

Further:

If you see someone who is really overweight trying out for the [??????] team, we usually think that he won't make it because he is too fat. But who really knows, he could be really fast.

Instead, Factor C athletes contend that if an individual's athletic performance is skilful, thus competitive, his somatotype is not as important. His contribution is the major factor relevant to his acceptance as a successful athlete.

Factor C athletes argue that men often develop the muscular, mesomorphic body type for aesthetic reasons more so than to enhance athletic ability. This viewpoint becomes more evident, based on the factor weights reported by the following Q-sort statements:

41. Men build big muscles because they are insecure about their masculinity. 

A B C  
-1 -3 +1

20. Body builders look more masculine than long distance runners. 

A B C  
-1 -1 -3
Factor C athletes argue that the whole appearance "thing" is an issue that exists outside of the institution of organized sports. Mainstream society is too engrossed in how others perceive their physical appearance and how they perceive themselves. These athletes denounce that this behaviour is a part of organized sports.

It is strictly for appearance sake. There is no real proof that the mesomorphic body type is better for sporting activities when compared to other body types.

Factor C athletes also agree that the mesomorphic body type is not an accurate indicator of an individual's masculine identity. This attitude is further reflected in the following interview passage:

If I had to compare a football player to a long distance runner I don't think that one is more masculine than the other. You can't measure masculinity by body shape.

The athletes who compose Factor C agree that the mesomorphic body type does not automatically signify masculinity.

Factor C athletes are all in agreement that it is most important to develop the body type that best suits a particular sporting activity. The mesomorphic body type is not regarded as the most desirable physique by all athletes, as reflected in the following Q-sort statement:

42. It is most important to develop the body type that best suits the sport. A B C

+2 +2 +2
In fact, Factor C athletes argue that there are certain body types that are better suited for certain sports.

The next section will further discuss the masculinities represented by the three established Factors addressing how they support, contradict, or further extend the literature reviewed on sport and masculinity.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

In the preceding literature review, the hegemonic masculine identity has been presented as the socially approved masculine ideal within the institution of organized sports (Connell, 1990, p.94). The literature supports six different components which comprise the hegemonic masculine identity: deference to male authority, devaluation of women, sanctioned use of aggression and violence, exclusion of pain, social isolation, and marginalization of homosexuals. In addition to these components, the researcher has proposed the inclusion of an additional component, suggesting that the mesomorphic body type is the somatotype most commonly equated with hegemonic masculine ideologies.

Despite differential factor weights, as outlined in the previous section, all of the male athletes who were interviewed were required to discuss each of the components of hegemonic masculinity to some extent, including the proposed component of muscular mesomorphy. Therefore, the following discussion will address how the various Factors support, contradict, or further extend the existing literature.

Each of the types of masculinities\(^{22}\) established

---

\(^{22}\) For information pertaining to the development of masculinities refer to A.M. Klein (1993), Little big men. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
within the sporting context in this study will be discussed at some length in this section. By no means is this meant to suggest that there are only three masculinities, but rather that male athletes from this study were grouped into three unique perspectives concerning their masculinity. With a different study sample (i.e. non-athletes) the same Q-sort items could, no doubt, generate additional masculinities.

Further, the majority of athletes who participated in the Q-methodology portion of this study commented somewhat critically about the forced-choice rank ordering procedure. In most instances, the athletes found that their subjective interpretation of the Q-statements was restricted by the forced-choice rank ordering assignment. Most felt that the items that were eventually rank-ordered in the "0" or neutral column were not accurately reflective of a "neutral" opinion.

In fact, the athletes would have felt more comfortable ranking these "neutral" statements under a more significant column in the Q-sort continuum. Therefore, the results of Q-methodology more accurately reflect commonalities established between all of the athletes, and not each athlete's own subjective opinion. Allowing the athletes to rank-order the Q-statements freely may have also generated additional types of masculinities.
Factor B: The "Segregationist" Masculine Identity

Of the three Factors established in this study, Factor B most resembles the traditional "Hegemonic Masculine" identity supported within the literature review. Factor B athletes adhere to male authority, do not support equality for female athletes, support aggressive and violent sporting behaviour, and support the active segregation of male and female athletes, all within the institution of organized sports. Although Factor B athletes did not load significantly on all of the components of hegemonic masculinity\textsuperscript{23}, Q-methodology suggests that these athletes do have a strong affinity towards hegemonic masculine behaviour. Therefore, Factor B will be referred to as the "Segregationist" masculine identity.

Integral to the salience of hegemonic masculine ideology is the development of and subsequent maintenance of the socially constructed male-female gender dichotomy. It is this relationship which is responsible for the perpetuation of the imbalance of power that exists between men and women. This imbalance in power characteristically strengthens the position of men as the more dominant, ruling group within organized sports. Connell (1990) concurs stating "hegemonic masculinity is representative of the socially approved masculine ideal, as defined by the

\textsuperscript{23} The components of hegemonic masculinity that Factor B athletes did not load significantly on consisted of the exclusion of pain, marginalization of homosexuals, and the mesomorphic body type as the hegemonic ideal.
dominant ruling group of males within the institution of organized sports" (p.94).

In order to maintain this male-female gender dichotomy, the institution of organized sports has been used as an arena where men could reaffirm the difference between what it is to be masculine versus feminine. In essence, the institution of organized sports continues to be used by the dominant male ruling group as an all-male preserve where the presence of women is routinely prohibited (Kidd, 1987, p.253). Therefore, the athletes comprising Factor B represent the claims made in the literature review that organized sports is a "breeding" ground for the development and subsequent practice of the "Hegemonic Masculine" ideal.

In the ensuing discussion, commentary from both the literature review and excerpts from the personal interviews will be used to exemplify the "Segregationist" masculine identity illustrated by Factor B.

The first hegemonic component identified within the results of this study suggests that Factor B athletes regard deference to male authority as integral to the social construction of their "Segregationist" masculine identity. Further, Sabo & Panepinto (1990) contend that within the institution of organized sports, deference to male authority acclimates young males to male authority by introducing them to the wider male status hierarchy (p.117).

Factor B athletes have become aware of the importance
of this male status hierarchy, and thus are eager to embrace their rightful place as males within it. These athletes are supportive of their role as "subordinates" or "initiates" to older, more authoritative males. Factor B athletes believe that their presence and subsequent advancement within this male status hierarchy is a necessary process, in the development of the desirable masculine identity.

Within the institution of organized sports it is often the coach who maintains the highest position of authority in the status hierarchy of the team. Therefore, it is not uncommon for the athletes to worship the coach in an almost "god-like" fashion (Pronger, 1990, p.10). This is not surprising considering that it is Factor B athletes who participate in the Type "A" or team oriented sporting activities. Therefore, the athletes in Factor B support the coach-athlete relationship as an appropriate vehicle to learn about and adjust to appropriate masculine behaviour within organized sports (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.122).

Although not supported by the literature, the athletes of Factor B also acknowledge the presence of veteran teammates as additional authoritative figures within the team hierarchy. Factor B athletes contend that both coaches and veteran teammates have developed a more expansive foundation of lived experience than themselves, and are thus deserving of respect. Therefore, it would seem as though experience is a prerequisite of authority within organized
If experience cultivates wisdom, and wisdom breeds authority, then Factor B athletes' onus on authority legitimates and further supports Sabo's and Runfola's (1980) claim that coaches and veterans are effective mediators of what it means to be masculine (p. 42). This belief is further substantiated within the following interview passage:

I learned about being masculine from my coach and my dad. Like when I was younger and played a lot of scrub [☆☆☆☆], I learned a lot about being a man from my coach.

Therefore, these athletes often "look up" to the guidance of older males who they feel contribute to the social construction of the desirable "Segregationist" masculine identity, which they support as the preferred ideal, within the institution of organized sports.

Furthermore, Factor B athletes agree that respect plays a significant role in deference to male authority. Factor B athletes insist that respect for men in positions of authority should be automatic. This claim is further supported in the following interview excerpts:

For me it [respect] is automatic. The coach is the coach and he deserves the respect that automatically comes with his position.

From my perspective my mother and father...my father has more authority. I have more of a...I wouldn't say fear...but my father commands more respect from me.
This automatic respect is extended to older males, or "officiates", who often demand it from the younger male "initiates". In order to maintain a credible role within the male status hierarchy these athletes support the respect component of authority. They feel that it is necessary to automatically respect men of authority in order to facilitate the development of the desirable "Segregationist" masculine identity, and thus their position in the male status hierarchy.

In order to support the patriarchal position of power and domination to which men have become accustomed, Factor B athletes do not accord equivalent respect towards women who maintain authoritative positions within the institution of organized sports. These athletes fail to demonstrate the automatic respect towards female authoritative figures which they display towards male authoritative figures.

It is hard to say how many of the [male] players would actually respect them [female coaches] enough to give them the respect they need to be a successful coach. It has been a standard that men coach men and women stay with female coaches.

Factor B athletes are not afraid to acknowledge a lack of respect for female authority, often openly exhibiting disbelief that female coaches can be authoritative and influential figures in their lives. This could be attributed to the athlete's possible fear of women who have the power to challenge the male status hierarchy, and thus
the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity:

I think that they [male athletes] may feel threatened. As far as masculinity I think that a lot of players would feel threatened taking orders from a woman.

Factor B athletes have constructed a subjective world which epitomizes the role of older men as central to the social construction of masculinity. Acknowledging the authoritative potential of women would challenge the male status hierarchy, ultimately supporting the erosion of the traditional "Segregationist" masculine identity. Therefore, the active devaluation of women within the institution of organized sports is the next component of the "Segregationist" masculine identity to be discovered.

One of the fundamental components of hegemonic masculinity is the active devaluation of women. Factor B athletes routinely portray female athletes as inferior in order to further establish the power invoking male-female gender dichotomy.

These athletes habitually view masculinity as superior to femininity, supporting Dunning's (1986) claim that "men possess the strength and courage which effectively establishes their manliness" (p.82), and thus power. Factor B athletes are influenced by authoritative males within the male status hierarchy to internalize hegemonic masculine ideologies that promote the privileges of being male and the lack of power associated with being female (White & Vagi,
1990, p.68). In other words, Factor B athletes have come to support the belief that anything that is masculine is not feminine (Messner, 1985, p.37). Therefore, Factor B athletes interpret the presence of women as feminizing, and thus threatening to the masculinizing power of organized sports.

Paramount to the ratification of the "Segregationist" masculine identity is the uncompromising position that Factor B athletes maintain in the fight against equal rights for women within the institution of organized sports. Factor B athletes argue that women have no right to invade their organized sporting activities demanding equality. Therefore, these athletes seemingly support Kimmel's (1990) claim that "The institution of organized sports was created for men, by men, as a central site for the fight against feminization" (p.60). Therefore, in order to support and maintain the male-female gender dichotomy which is so central to hegemonic masculinity, women are routinely portrayed by Factor B athletes as physically inferior to men.

Factor B athletes are quick to reinforce the stereotypic representation of women as the "weaker" and "less physical" of the two sexes. This behaviour is further exemplified in the following interview passages:
It just doesn't seem right to have men and women combined. I think that because of our different body structures women can't be in the same leagues with men. Men have bigger muscles and all that and are usually rougher.

There are certain sports that women should not be a part of. Physical contact sports such as football or hockey...women should not be a part of. They will definitely get hurt.

If women want to play men's sports, then they should create their own leagues where women can compete only against other women. If they play against each other, then that is OK. But if they play against men they will just get hurt.

According to Messner (1992) men are often relieved to find that women just don't have the "physical skill" to measure up to their performances (p.166).

Pronger (1990) claims that the masculine development and display of physical strength by men, in conjunction with its lack in women, reinforces the perception of male power and dominance (p.144). In the same vein, Factor B athletes support the concept that feminine influence is detrimental to the preservation of sport as a central site for the social construction of "Segregationist" masculinity and must be eradicated. This may be accomplished by the active devaluation of female athletes in organized sports, thus actively discouraging equality between male and female athletes (Kidd, 1990, p.35; Bryson, 1987, p.350).

The third hegemonic masculine component which Factor B athletes loaded significantly on deals with the sanctioned use of aggression and violence. Factor B athletes reported
that both aggression and violence play an integral role in the social construction of their "Segregationist" masculine identities. These athletes recognize an interrelationship between aggression and violence which is supported by Pronger's (1990) claim that "the most intense form of masculinity is represented by power which commonly surfaces as aggression, of which the most radical expression is violence" (p.131). To these athletes manliness is linked to both aggressive and violent behaviour.

Certain sports are more centrally located in the hegemonic maintenance of masculinity than others (Bryson, 1987, p.350). The athletes who compose Factor B are largely representative of the Type "A" sporting activities which centre around team, collision oriented, and physically aggressive sporting activities.

Aggression is a behaviour that Factor B athletes maintain is necessary to their performance as successful athletes. The following interview excerpts support this belief:

Aggression makes you motivated.

Aggression is like an adrenaline rush. It is a necessity in sports to be aggressive.

I believe in aggression. If you are not aggressive, people will walk all over you. Like if you go after a [ţţţţţ], you will always go in full force and that is part of the game. Unless you are willing to play that hard [aggressively], then you shouldn't be playing...it's the competitive nature of sports.
Therefore, Factor B athletes believe that in order to be successful they must develop an adrenaline rush which allows them to become motivated in order to compete and perform at their optimum level.

This behaviour can be attributed to the cultivation of hegemonic masculine ideologies which seem to be correlated with Type "A" sporting activities. According to Young et al. (1993) the legitimacy of aggressive or violent sports emerges in opposition to less aggressive and thus less masculine sports (p.4). Therefore, Factor B males view passive athletes, who participate in Type "B" sporting activities, as less masculine and more feminine in nature.

Aggression and violence are highly valued behaviours that men "naturally" attribute to desirable masculine conduct (Rotundo, 1990, p.225). In keeping with this premise, Factor B athletes contend that violence maintains a legitimate role within the institution of organized sports. This view is further supported by the following interview passages:

Q: How do you feel about a coach telling you to specifically hurt someone?
A: I like that type of stuff when you get a little crazy. Like when you are in a game, it is like a war and everything counts.
In most instances I agree with violence in sports. Like when I used to play [●●●●●], I used violence for a specific individual that I didn't like. One time my coach told me to go out and level a guy on the other team. That really got me going. After I tackled the guy on the other team, I grabbed his facemask and started jerking his head around a little. This type of violence is good because you show the other guy who is in charge.

Accordingly, Factor B athletes condone violence as they claim that it can be employed as a means of establishing a position of dominance over others, within the institution of organized sports. These athletes seem to thrive on violent behaviour especially when it is demanded of them by male authoritative figures, at the expense of other individuals. Therefore, violence in athletics in some important ways, has become a stylized expression of masculine power that, in strictly a sporting context, can become socially acceptable (Pronger, 1990, p.135).

Power seems to be the driving force behind violence and the subsequent approval of violent behaviour by Factor B athletes. Perhaps Factor B athletes act in violent ways in an attempt to further solidify their position in the established male status hierarchy within both the team structure and organized sports. Therefore, both aggressive and violent behaviour are condoned by Factor B athletes and further viewed as desirable components in the social construction of their "Segregationist" masculine identity.

The last hegemonic component of Factor B, or the "Segregationist" masculine identity, incorporates the
conscious segregation or the social isolation of male and female athletes. Hegemonic ideologies contend that "men's physical and cultural worlds are to be conventionally separated from that of women's" (Rotundo, 1990, p.7). In keeping with this, Factor B athletes support the practice of social isolation or "sex segregation". This active segregation is widely used by the dominant male ruling group, or members of the male status hierarchy, to further emphasize and reaffirm the male-female gender dichotomy which is so central to the salience of the "Segregationist" masculine identity.

In further support of this institutionally endorsed male-female gender dichotomy, White & Vagi (1990) contend that "organized sport is repeatedly used as a central site for the active isolation of young boys from the feminizing influence of women" (p.68). Therefore, hegemonic masculine ideologies dictate that men should compete with men and women should compete with women. Factor B athletes' adherence to this claim becomes more obvious in the following interview passages:

Men should play with men and women should play with women. It's just...the way that I have come up in sports. I have never had to play against a girl unless I was fooling around or something.

I think that if you keep boys with boys and girls with girls then the boys get better and more serious. They will achieve better results than if they played in co-ed sports.
Social isolation, as archaic as it might seem to some, is still an integral component in the social construction of Factor B athletes' "Segregationist" masculine identity. Factor B athletes do not recognize positive benefits to the integration of male and female athletes. They are only aware of the inherent complications which arise as a result of integrating the two sexes in organized sports. This attitude is further exemplified by the following interview quotes:

Sport should be isolated by sex because of the changerooms and stuff...just a bunch of complications will happen. Like many parents complain that girls are too weak to play with the boys.

Most men just feel that women don't belong in sports. So the only way that they have of getting the women off the team is by violence. This is what ends up happening in sports and women just end up getting hurt and quitting. They can't take it.

This behaviour can possibly be attributed in part to their innate fear of becoming overly influenced by the feminine presence of women. This fear of becoming more feminine, thus less masculine, is exemplified in the following interview excerpt:

It [social isolation] is a masculinity thing too. They [men] feel threatened if a woman gets more playing time than they do and they are afraid of what other people will think of them playing behind a woman in a man's sport.

The structured exclusion of women is often used to
exaggerate masculine values and beliefs while simultaneously devaluing feminine ones (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.121). Factor B athletes have been socialized that in order to develop a strong "masculinizing" bond with other males, they must isolate themselves from the feminizing influence of women. Therefore, "Segregationist" masculine ideologies dictate that the deliberate segregation of men and women in sports is a technique for maintaining a socially constructed difference between men and women, thus symbolically preserving, through sport, the power of men over women (Pronger, 1990, p.18). Once again, the behaviour of Factor B athletes is thus directed as reinforcing and maintaining the male-female gender dichotomy which is central to the maintenance of "Segregationist" masculinity.

To this point, the focus of this discussion has centred around the components of hegemonic masculinity upon which the athletes in Factor B reported significant factor loadings. However, Factor B athletes did not load significantly on the exclusion of pain, marginalization of homosexual males, and the mesomorphic body components of the hegemonic masculine identity\(^\text{24}\). Therefore, the exclusion of these components in the preceding "Segregationist" masculine identity will be briefly addressed.

Q-methodology was responsible for the delineation of

\(^{24}\) It is important to acknowledge that the significance of the reported factor weights of the hegemonic components, or lack thereof, is dependent on the accurate portrayal of each established component in their corresponding statements in the Q-sort.
the components of hegemonic masculinity which Factor B
athletes, as a group, support as central to the social
construction of their "Segregationist" masculine identity.
It is important to understand that Q-methodology was
developed as a means of deciphering subjective similarities
between individuals. Therefore, differences between the
individuals who participate in Q-methodology are usually of
no concern.

However, close examination of the factor weights of the
Q-statements representing these "non-supportive" components
revealed that Factor B athletes were inconsistent regarding
the subjective interpretation of these components. This
inconsistency warranted the subsequent exclusion of these
components as "supportive" of the "Segregationist" masculine
identity.

After examining the factor weights of the positively
phrased Q-sort items, it was apparent that Factor B athletes
supported the hegemonic ideologies surrounding the exclusion
of pain. They agreed that athletes should be able to endure
pain to the point of sacrificing their physical well-being
for the success of the team. They also indicated that they
were willing to play while injured if it would benefit the
team. This comes as no surprise as the athletes in Factor B
are "team oriented" individuals who participate in the more
physically aggressive, collision Type "A" sporting
activities.
However, when examining the negatively phrased Q-sort statements pertaining to the exclusion of pain component, Factor B athletes alter their position concerning the pain component and its role in their masculine identity. These athletes appear to contradict their initial claims, arguing that their health is more important than their team's win/loss record. In addition, these athletes indicate that they may be somewhat predisposed to "hassling" a teammate who refuses to play while injured. As well, they indicate that it is a personal decision whether or not an athlete decides to play injured.

The same types of contradictions emerge when examining the marginalization of homosexual males component. Initially Factor B athletes claim that the presence of gay male athletes is not detrimental to organized sports and that they have no fear of participating with or against gay males within the institution of organized sports. In addition, Factor B males did not support the belief that gay male athletes were physically inferior to heterosexual athletes.

However, they seemingly contradict this stance by simultaneously indicating that gay male athletes were not welcome in organized sports and that their presence was, in fact, detrimental to the legitimacy of the institution.

The final, "non-supportive" component, the mesomorphic body type, is also filled with contradiction. Factor B
athletes initially agree that the mesomorphic body type is the most desirable and attractive somatotype. Further, they believe that looking bigger is better and more sexually appealing. Therefore, these athletes indicate that the mesomorphic body type is the ideal somatotype, signifying their manliness in an aesthetic manner.

However, they seemingly contradict this position when viewing the mesomorphic body type in an athletic context. Factor B athletes agree that it is most important to develop the body type that best suits the sporting activity. They also argue that the mesomorphic body type is not an accurate indicator of athleticism or masculinity. Therefore, once in the context of organized sports, the athletes no longer support the mesomorphic body type as the ideal somatotype.

Based on the contradictions exhibited by these athletes, as outline above, the previously outlined components cannot be included as "supportive" of the "Segregationist" masculine identity.

**Factor A: The "Integrationist" Masculine Identity**

Unlike the more traditional "Segregationist" masculine identity outlined in the literature review and supported by the athletes comprising Factor B, Factor A athletes are less traditional about their beliefs and values concerning masculinity. In fact, these athletes condone masculine behaviour which does not support hegemonic ideologies, thus
undermining the patriarchal relations between men and women within the institution of organized sports. Therefore, traditional masculine ideologies do not seem to play an integral role in the social construction of Factor A athletes' masculine identities.

In direct contradiction of the athletes of Factor B, the athletes who compose Factor A do not exhibit automatic respect to male authority, they believe in equal rights for female athletes, and do not support homophobic behaviour. Therefore, the personalities of the athletes in Factor A contradict some of the components of the more traditional "Segregationist" masculine identity.

The athletes of Factor A are more open-minded than the athletes in Factor B and bring this approach to the social construction of their masculine identities. Therefore, Factor A has been labelled the "Integrationist" masculine identity. The components which compose this Factor will be further exemplified through excerpts from the conversations with the four males who participated in the personal interviews.

Unlike Factor B, the literature review offers little to support the findings associated with Factor A. The athletes who compose Factor A are not as subservient to male authority as are Factor B athletes. Factor A athletes exhibit an inherent desire to maintain a primary role in their development as both athletes and men. This attitude
is further supported by the following interview passage:

I take people's advice but I do things in my own way. I like to take in all of the information and decide things in my own way. I don't like other people telling me what to do and I don't think that a coach has the ultimate authority.

These athletes wish to maintain the majority of control over their own future, often to the point of downplaying male authority as a necessary component in their lives. Factor A athletes are not overly concerned with their role in the male status hierarchy. In addition, these athletes are not as affected by the "wisdom" and "experience" that Factor B athletes associate with positions of authority. Therefore, unlike Factor B athletes, Factor C athletes agree that male authority plays a somewhat more limited role in the social construction of their masculine identity.

Unlike Factor B athletes who contend that respect for authority is automatic, Factor A athletes argue that respect for authority must be mutually developed. This belief is further supported by the following interview passage:

For an athlete to obey a coach [authority] there has to be mutual respect. You must respect your coach and your coach must respect you. It is a mutual relationship and not a dictatorship.

Contrary to the "Segregationist" masculine ideological belief that authoritative figures, such as coaches, are "god-like" (Pronger, 1990, p.10), Factor A athletes are somewhat leery of the abuse of authority that often
corresponds with positions of power. When asked the following question one athlete responded:

Q: Do you think that people tend to abuse their position of authority?
A: Definitely. People in power positions can abuse it [their authority] by taking advantage of their subordinates. Making them do things that they feel uncomfortable doing just because they [the coach] know the athlete will do it and follow his orders.

Further, an athlete reports his hesitancy when discussing male authority:

I am somewhere sitting on the fence as to whether I really believe firmly in authority. I believe that authority can be good but it can also be abused. You should stand up and challenge the authority.

Unlike Factor B athletes, the athletes who compose Factor A are not afraid to challenge the authoritative position of the coach if they feel that their well-being is being compromised in some way. Therefore, Factor A athletes routinely exhibit an intrinsic suspiciousness of the motives of authoritative figures who are not addressing their best interests as athletes. This active questioning of male authority is further exemplified in the following interview excerpt:

I personally don't have that many experiences with the abuse of authority because I won't allow myself to get abused by that position. I can stand up for myself and say that this isn't right and that I won't do that or I don't think that is ethical or whatever.
Factor A athletes argue that women maintain the right to equal positions of authority as men, within the institution of organized sports. Unlike Factor B athletes who attempt to downplay the role of women in organized sports, Factor A athletes argue that women can be respected authoritative figures.

I respect both male and female authority equally. If I had a male or female coach, I would listen to each equally. I would respect them both.

Q: Why do you show the same respect for male and female coaches?
A: If there is a female coaching and she knows the sport as well as a male coach, and probably moreso because she is there instead of a male. As far as sports go you respect their [the coach's] knowledge and if a female coach has the knowledge, she deserves to be the coach. It makes no difference to me whether the coach is male or female.

Factor A athletes' acknowledgement of the authoritative potential of females does not support hegemonic ideologies, thus directly undercutting the conventional power relationship established by the male-female gender dichotomy. Therefore, Factor A athletes support the perspective that the legitimation of male power and privilege through patriarchal relations is giving way to a more integrated masculine environment.

Factor A athletes do acknowledge that the athlete-coach relationship (here the power is wielded by the athlete, unlike the coach-athlete relationship in "Segregationist" masculinity) can still positively benefit them. Therefore,
the coach-athlete relationship can still be used as a vehicle for males to learn about and adjust to masculine life within organized sports (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990, p.122). However, they do not support the role of the coach as the supreme mediator or instructor of what it means to be masculine. Instead, Factor A athletes strive to maintain a more equal partnership, taking a more active, less subordinate role in the social construction of their "Integrationist" masculine identity.

It should come as no surprise, coinciding with their integrationist nature, that the athletes who compose Factor A support equal opportunity for female athletes within the institution of organized sports. The equal treatment of female athletes is supportive of their choice not to automatically reassert and legitimize the male-female gender dichotomy which has become so central to the salience of the more traditional "Segregationist" masculinity. Instead, Factor A athletes are advocates for the equal treatment of female athletes within the institution of organized sports:

I see them [women] as athletic equals and teammates. I don't care about a person's sex, race, or whatever. It is always just athlete versus athlete.

They [women] are athletes too and everyone in the world should be treated as equals. They are there [in organized sports] for the same reasons as men are...to compete, to win and have fun, to make relationships, and to be the best that they can be in their chosen sport.
I wouldn't have a problem competing against women at all. If a woman was to come out, I would treat her as an equal and just like any other guy on the team.

Factor A athletes are not the types of males to "...actively discourage females from equal participation in sports (Kidd, 1990, p.35; Bryson, 1987, p.350). Factor A athletes are not threatened by the presence of female athletes and the feminine influence that they may bring to organized sports, unlike the athletes in Factor B. Factor A athletes contend that the presence of women in the traditionally male dominated institution of organized sports, does not effect the social construction of their masculine identity in any sort of derogatory manner.

This equal treatment of female athletes, supported by Factor A athletes, is not found in the sport specific literature pertaining to masculinity. However, this attitude supports Pronger's (1990) argument that when women are afforded the same, equal opportunities and privileges as men have possessed, they will undoubtedly come to parallel men's athletic performances (p.17). Perhaps it is this fear that drives Factor B athletes to support and reinforce the male-female gender dichotomy, thus further differentiating themselves from the more "Integrationist" masculine perspective of the athletes in Factor A.

According to traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies, to be a man in today's society is to be
homophobic (Herek, 1987, p.68; Connell, 1990, p.94). Based on the literature review, which outlines the traits of the hegemonic masculine ideal, one could surmise that there is a direct link between homophobia and masculinity. In contradiction to this belief, Factor A athletes do not support homophobic behaviour and accept the presence of gay men within the institution of organized sports. These athletes perceive gay men as athletic equals. This attitude is further supported in the following interview excerpts:

I think that when I was younger I felt that something was wrong with it [homosexuality]. But now that I have grown up and become more educated, I think that I have broken down the negative stereotype. Some people are born heterosexual and some people are born homosexual.

In the context of sport...if I was playing against gay male athletes I wouldn't care. You know people talk about the locker room and showers and stuff but I don't care about that. It is not as though they [gay males] are going to be making advances at everyone. If they [gay men] want to play, then the choice is theirs.

I also respect them as homosexual [gay] individuals as well as athletes. I don't have a problem with homosexual [gay] athletes when competing against them.

Homosexual males are often perceived as deviating from the masculine ideal, and portrayed as exhibiting feminine characteristics (Herek, 1987, p.70). It becomes obvious from the preceding interview passages that Factor A athletes' do not conform to the hegemonic masculine mode of reasoning. Rather, Factor A athletes make a conscious
effort to downplay the common representation of gay men as overly feminine, and thus less masculine. The "Integrationist" masculine individual attempts to treat the gay male athlete with the same respect and equality with which he affords the "straight" or heterosexual male athlete.

Within the institution of organized sports the hegemonic masculine identity becomes somewhat problematic to some as there is little to no room to explore other possible options (O'Leary & Donoghue, 1978, p.17; Stein & Hoffman, 1978, p.137). The "Integrationist" masculine identity represented by the athletes in Factor A is proof that life does indeed exist apart from hegemonic masculine ideologies.

Thusfar, the focus of this discussion has centred around the components of hegemonic masculinity which the athletes in Factor A indicated were central to the development of the "Integrationist" masculine identity. However, Factor A athletes did not load significantly on aggression and violence, the exclusion of pain, and social isolation components of the hegemonic masculine identity25. Therefore, the exclusion of these components from the "Integrationist" masculine identity will be briefly

---

25 It is important to acknowledge that the significance of the reported factor weights of the hegemonic components, or lack thereof, is dependent on the accurate portrayal of each established component in their corresponding statements in the Q-sort.
addressed26.

The reported factor weights pertaining to the hegemonic component of aggression and violence were indicative of contradictions highlighted by Factor A athletes. Initially, these athletes did not support the hegemonic ideologies pertaining to aggression and violence. They supported the beliefs that men were not inherently more aggressive than women and that aggression and violence were not central to their attainment of success as an athlete.

However, Factor A athletes were discriminating concerning the role that aggression and violence maintained in their lives. They contradict their initial claim that aggression was not necessary in sport when they acknowledge that athletes must approach their sporting activities with an aggressive predisposition. In addition, while they claimed that it was okay to injure an opponent as long as it was within the rules, they seemingly contradict themselves when they agree that violent behaviour is unacceptable and unnecessary in organized sports.

The exclusion of pain component of hegemonic masculinity is also filled with contradiction, thus excluding it as a "supportive" component in the

26 It is important to recall that Q-methodology was developed to delineate similar views and values amongst a group of individuals, based on their subjective opinions pertaining to the issue being studied. Therefore, Q-methodology is not used to establish differences between groups of people, based on their subjective opinions as they pertain to the issue at hand.
"Integrationist" masculine identity. Like the athletes of Factor B, Factor A athletes agree that in order to be a successful athlete an individual must be able to endure pain. They also agree that they would play injured if it would benefit their team in any way. This becomes more interesting when considering Factor A athletes compete in both team oriented Type "A" sports and the more individually oriented Type "B" sporting activities. However, the athletes subsequently appear to contradict this position, arguing that their health is more important than the team winning or losing.

In addition, they seemingly contradict themselves when they agree that they are willing to "hassle" a teammate to play while injured but at the same time acknowledge that it is an individual choice whether or not someone plays while injured. Therefore, it is obvious that these athletes, similar to those in Factor B, maintain contradictory perceptions pertaining to the role that pain plays in the social construction of their masculine identities.

Finally, the athletes who compose Factor A seem to contradict themselves when interpreting the hegemonic component pertaining to social isolation. They support hegemonic masculine ideologies while arguing that there are benefits to participating in an all-male environment. However, they also agree that there is no need for boys and girls to train separately, thus seemingly supporting
integration.

Based on the contradictions seemingly exhibited by Factor A athletes, as outlined above, the inclusion of the previously mentioned components in the "Integrationist" masculine identity cannot be warranted.

**Factor C: The "Individualist" Masculine Identity**

In addition to Factor A, Factor C or the "Individualist" masculine identity, has yet to be discussed in the existing literature. Unlike Factor B, or the "Segregationist" masculine identity, Factor C athletes do not support traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies in the social construction of their own masculine identities.

Much like Factor A, or the "Integrationist" masculine identity, Factor C athletes do not support the hegemonic components outlined in the literature. It is important to recognize that the defining characteristics of the "Individualist" masculine identity are similar to those of the "Integrationist" masculine identity, but they should not be perceived as identical types of masculinities.

Much in the same manner as Factor A, the athletes who compose Factor C are also advocates of equality for both women and gay men within the institution of organized sports. However, Factor C differs in its athletes' significant factor loadings on the components of aggression and violence and the exclusion of pain.
The athletes of Factor C are more open-minded than Factor B athletes, and liberal towards the social construction of their "Individualist" masculine identity. The components which distinguish this Factor will be further discussed and exemplified through excerpts from the personal interviews previously conducted.

Critical to the maintenance of organized sports as a central site for the fight against feminization is the preservation and reassertion of the male-female gender dichotomy. According to Dunning (1986) it is this male-female gender dichotomy which routinely portrays women as inferior to men (p.82). However, the athletes comprising Factor C do not support the existence of the male-female gender dichotomy and the unfair balance of power which is further supported by this dichotomy. These athletes support women as their athletic equals within the institution of organized sports.

I have no problem with women competing with or against men. If they can make the team, just like other men have to prove, then why not? It is wrong that women are discriminated against in sports. What difference does it make if you are playing against a man or a woman?

This type of equal acceptance of female athletes is indicative of Factor C athletes' progressive attitude. Their acceptance of female athletes directly challenges the established power relations which currently favour the dominant male ruling group within organized sports.
Therefore, these athletes support equal treatment of female athletes within the institution of organized sports.

Integral to the maintenance of this imbalance of gendered power is the continual representation of female athletes as inferior and secondary to their male counterparts. In accordance with hegemonic masculinity, the development and display of physical strength by men, in conjunction with its lack in women, fortify the unequal power relations that exist between men and women (Pronger, 1990, p.144). However, Factor C athletes do not routinely render or portray female athletes as the "weaker" less physical of the two sexes.

In addition, hegemonic ideologies dictate that women are too emotional and that they routinely become masculinized through their participation in organized sports. It is these types of common misrepresentations which Factor C athletes do not support, which are used by the dominant ruling group of men to relegate the role of women, within organized sports, as secondary. Further, Factor C athletes have suggested that once these misrepresentations are eradicated and women are truly afforded equal opportunity in sports, female athletes will eventually rise to the point of being men's athletic equals.

This type of equal or progressive attitude towards female athletes, exhibited by Factor C athletes, is significant as it directly challenges the power relations
established between men and women as instituted by the male-female gender dichotomy. Therefore, it seems as though the athletes comprising the "Individualist" masculine identity agree that the existing power relations between men and women must become more "balanced" in order to achieve equality.

There is an acceptance of both aggression and violence by the athletes who compose the "Segregationist" masculine identity. However, the athletes of Factor C differentiate between positive aggressive behaviour and the more detrimental, violent behaviour which is often observed in organized sports.

Factor C athletes contend that aggressive behaviour is beneficial to their development as athletes and males. According to Rotundo (1990) "Men naturally admire aggressive behaviour as desirable masculine conduct" (p.225). Therefore, the less aggressive sports, such as the activities previously outlined which constitute Type "B" sports, are often interpreted as being less masculine. The ability to act in an aggressive manner, within the institution of organized sports, allows athletes to act in desirable masculine ways without the fear of being reprimanded by the rest of society. It would seem that it is their inherent right as men to act in aggressive, manly ways, especially within the institution of organized sports.

Although Factor C athletes argue that introverted,
aggressive behaviour is acceptable masculine conduct, the more extroverted extension of aggression to violence is not acceptable masculine behaviour to these athletes. According to Rotundo (1990) "Men admire and endorse violent behaviour as desirable masculine conduct" (p.225). This may be true of Factor B or the "Segregationist" masculine identity but the athletes of Factor C do not support this statement. To these athletes violent behaviour is unnecessary. This becomes more obvious in the following interview passages:

Violence is aggression that has been extroverted. This type of over-aggression is when you inflict your aggression on someone else instead of just "pumping" yourself up.

As a player I would like to see a point where violence is stopped because people are getting hurt. For example, when I was playing [●●●●], guys routinely went out and hurt opponents on purpose because they were good players. They end up taking cheap shots and that's not right because people end up getting hurt and losing their careers just because someone was being violent.

Therefore, the "Individualist" masculine identity deals with the eradication of violent behaviour. Being masculine, for Factor C athletes, does not include acting in violent ways. To these athletes violent behaviour is a sign of weakness, as it represents an individual's lack of control over aggressive behaviour. Unlike Factor B athletes who condone violence in organized sports, Factor C athletes devalue its role in direct contradiction to hegemonic masculine ideologies.
The athletes who compose Factor C do not support Sabo's & Runfola's (1980) claim that "pain has become synonymous with courage and the ability to endure pain not only sets initiates apart from uninitiated men but also from women" (p.40). Factor C athletes claim that the ability to endure pain is not integral to the social construction of their masculine identities.

The literature suggests that within the institution of organized sports, continuing to play with pain while injured is desired masculine conduct (Young, et al., 1993, p.11). However, Factor C athletes maintain that playing injured does nothing to enhance an individual's masculine identity. These athletes assert that they retain more respect for their own physical well-being than the more hegemonically oriented athletes who wear their scars and permanent injuries with pride, as badges of masculine status. Further, Factor C athletes agree that playing while injured is irresponsible and a heavy price to pay for athletic success.

According to Young et al. (1993) the injured athlete is often implored by athletes, coaches, or both to "suck it up" and continue playing for the benefit of the team (p.7). Quite simply, Factor C athletes claim that they will not be coerced by anyone to play injured. This behaviour becomes more evident in the following interview excerpts:
Some of my coaches have told me to deal with it [pain] as it is part of playing sports and I would literally tell him where to go because I am not sacrificing any part of my body for sport.

I think a lot of athletes are "chicken shits" and are afraid to challenge the coach and tell him that they are not willing to compete anymore because they are hurt. We are adults now and I don't think another adult should be telling me about how my body feels or what I should do about it.

However, hegemonic masculine ideologies contend that athletes who demonstrate pain or remove themselves from competition due to injury run the risk of being stigmatized by their peers as less than fully masculine, particularly if the injury is not perceived as serious (Messner, 1992, p.21). Factor C athletes are not concerned with this type of pressure to perform at all costs. They contend that the decision to play or not to play while injured is theirs alone.

If a person can play, then he should play. The choice is his to make. If he doesn't feel that he can run...maybe he could run...but if he doesn't feel that he can...it is his choice. Who am I to decide for him?

Factor C athletes do not support Messner's (1992) claim that "athletes who refuse to play injured...risk being seen as less masculine and more feminine by their coaches and/or teammates" (p.82). These athletes do not feel as though their masculine identity is challenged because of their inability to play due to an injury. Rather, the athletes
comprising the "Individualist" masculine identity agree that it is more desirable masculine behaviour to be able to refrain from playing through an injury, risking no further damage.

Factor C athletes also actively refute Dubbert's (1979) claim that "the tolerance of physical risk carries with it an enormous symbolic weight in the exhibition and evaluation of masculinity" (p.164). In other words, Factor C athletes agree that to purposely or knowingly injure yourself is not masculine but just irresponsible.

In much the same manner as the athletes who compose Factor A, or the "Integrationist" masculine identity, Factor C athletes are not homophobic. They do not exhibit any hatred or fear towards gay men, but rather are strong advocates for the equality of gay male athletes within organized sports. Instead, Factor C athletes are more open-minded or progressive, than traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies dictate, in their acceptance of gay men.

It [homosexuality] is a natural process and I have no problems with it.

The only time that it [an athlete's sexual orientation if he is gay] should be of any interest is to educate other athletes that gay male athletes can be successful in sports.

One athlete reflects on his change of attitude towards gay men:
Last year a good friend of mine became gay...you know he found his sexuality...and that changed my view on the whole thing because I used to think that they [gay men] were all sick perverts. Now I know I was wrong because it touched my life and now I know that they are normal people just like you and me.

Factor C athletes do not see gay male athletes as more feminine, thus less masculine. In fact they view gay male athletes as formidable athletes first and foremost, while their sexuality is secondary. Competing with or against gay male athletes is not a problem or a concern to the athletes of Factor C. The acceptance of gay male athletes, within the institution of organized sports, does not threaten the masculine status of the athletes in Factor C.

So far this discussion has centred around the hegemonic components which were indicated by Q-methodology as central to the social construction of the "Individualist" masculine identity". The hegemonic components of deference to male authority and social isolation were "non-supportive" components of the "Individualist" masculine identity. Accordingly, the subsequent exclusion of these two components will be briefly addressed.

When examining the deference to male authority statements, Factor C athletes appear to exhibit a

---

27 It is important to acknowledge that the significance of the reported factor weights of the hegemonic components, or lack thereof, is dependent on the accurate portrayal of each established component in their corresponding statements in the Q-sort.

28 It is important to recall that Q-methodology was developed to delineate similar views and values amongst a group of individuals, based on their subjective opinions pertaining to the issue being studied. Therefore, Q-methodology is not used to establish differences between groups of people, based on their subjective opinions as they pertain to the issue at hand.
contradictory attitude pertaining to this hegemonic component of masculinity. In terms of deference to male authority, Factor C athletes on the one hand claim that in order to gain respect they must follow orders from authoritative figures. They subsequently claim, however, that they do not always feel that it is necessary to follow directions from these authoritative figures. In a similar manner, they agree that women have not significantly influenced them in any way, yet they are willing to respond to female authority in the same manner that they respond to male authority, thus downplaying the role of male authority.

In addition, when examining the social isolation component of hegemonic masculinity, Factor C athletes exhibit contradictory responses. These athletes claim that men who compete in all-male environments receive certain benefits, are more comfortable in this atmosphere and receive positive benefits from doing so. They seemingly contradict this position however, when they state that there is no need to isolate male and female athletes from competing with one another, therefore downplaying the significance of the all-male environment.

Based on above noted contradictions the inclusion of the previously outlined components in the construction of the "Individualist" masculine identity cannot be warranted.
The Mesomorphic Body Type: A Proposed Component of Hegemonic Masculinity

According to Mishkind et al. (1986) researchers have ignored the significant role that the mesomorphic body ideal plays within the social construction of the hegemonic masculine identity (p.545). This has become problematic as attention has been paid almost exclusively to the female body; thus the male body has often seemed invisible to the point of unimportance (Duroche, 1990, p.172). It was a combination of these assumptions that prompted the researcher to further examine the mesomorphic body type as a possible component of the hegemonic masculine identity.

The sparse amount of literature dealing with the mesomorphic body type and masculinity prescribes that men desire a muscular mesomorphic body shape and cultural attention is increasingly being directed towards the male physique (Mishkind et al., 1986, p.554; Tucker, 1982, p.1059; Cash et al., 1987, p.30). Therefore, it was proposed that the mesomorphic body type was effectively promoted as the preferred somatotype within the institution of organized sports, supporting hegemonic masculine ideologies.

However, athletes from Factors A, B, and C disagree, insisting that they do not support the proposed mesomorphic body component as the preferred somatotype within the institution of organized sports. Instead they tend to support the opinion that an athlete's body type is sport
specific. The following interview passages indicate a strong conviction to this claim:

It depends on the sport you play. Also your body type can affect the type of sport you play. For example, the tall lean body is good for basketball. A swimmer may have a higher percentage of body fat which benefits him more, than say a runner. Now playing rugby it is beneficial to the athlete to be a strong person because of the nature of the game.

I think for every sport there is a specific body build that an athlete needs to be successful.

Every body type has its place in sports. As long as the skill is there it is OK.

Factor A, B, and C athletes agree that the mesomorphic body type is not central to their attainment of success as athletes. These athletes contend that having the mesomorphic body build may, in fact, be detrimental to successful performance in certain sporting activities. These athletes are not completely discounting the significance of the mesomorphic body type, but contend that it is not the only body type to which competitive athletes aspire. Therefore, it would seem as though these athletes do not automatically attempt to develop or maintain the "hypermesomorphic" or "muscleman" physique to which the literature alludes.

Further, athletes from all three Factors are not concerned with the expressive or visual components of the mesomorphic body type. These athletes support Connell's (1990) statement that "athletes appropriate their bodies
through training, and turns them into "engines" of competitive success" (p.90). Therefore, the type of body which will enhance the athletes' success in their sporting activity is paramount to these athletes.

Franzoi & Shields (1984) claim that the physical appearance of the body is associated with society's view of manly vitality and often is used as a measure of an individual's masculinity (p.178). The athletes comprising the three Factors do not support this claim, maintaining that an individual's masculine identity cannot be measured by physical appearance alone.

In sum, the athletes who compose Factors A, B, and C agree that the mesomorphic body type is not an accurate measure of an athlete's masculine identity. Although Loosemore & Moriarty (1990) claim that "most males feel it is important to prove their masculinity through their bodies" (p.15), these athletes do not support this contention. It does not seem as though the mesomorphic body type is a central component in the social construction of their masculine identity as maintained within the institution of organized sports. Therefore, the mesomorphic body type is not an integral component in the social construction of these athletes' masculine identities, as developed within the institution of organized sports.
The Role of Type "A" and Type "B" Sporting Activities

As previously stated throughout this document, Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities vary, emphasizing different components in their fundamental makeup. Type "A" athletes characteristically participate in team and collision oriented sports which support a high level of physical aggressiveness. The Type "A" sports incorporated in this study consist of football, rugby, hockey, soccer, and basketball.

Type "B" sporting activities are more individually oriented, void of intentional physical contact, and more aesthetic in nature. The Type "B" sports used in this study consisted of volleyball, swimming, long distance running, golf, and bodybuilding. The inclusion of volleyball in this group may be questioned. Although it is a team oriented sport, it is not a "true" collision sport and any physical contact is largely unintentional. For the purpose of this study, however, the individual sporting activities were grouped in this manner. An examination of each of the masculinities in turn, will address the roles of Type "A" and Type "B" sports in the establishment of a particular type of masculinity.

The "Segregationist" masculine identity is composed mainly of athletes who participate in Type "A" sporting activities. These athletes are very team oriented, and thus are more accepting of deference to male authority. The male
status hierarchy is important to these athletes as they become surrounded by both the team hierarchy and the established hierarchy within the institution.

Considering that Type "A" sports are collision oriented and physically aggressive, they cannot be played in the absence of physical contact. Therefore, it should not be surprising that the athletes who compose the "Hegemonic" identity accept aggressive and sometimes violent behaviour in sport.

These athletes maintain that organized sports should be an all-male environment where they can come to learn what it is to be masculine, in the absence of women. Therefore, the athletes of Type "A" sports adhere to hegemonic masculine ideologies which dictate that women should compete with women and men should compete with men. This behaviour effectively reaffirms and maintains patriarchal relations, and thus the male-female gender dichotomy, which are both central to hegemonic masculine ideologies.

However, it becomes more interesting when examining the combination of Type "A" and Type "B" athletes who compose the "Integrationist" masculine identity. According to the literature, Type "A" athletes should support traditional hegemonic ideologies. Instead, the assortment of Type "A" athletes who compose the "Integrationist" masculine identity do not support traditional hegemonic ideologies.

It is less surprising to notice that Type "B" athletes
deviate from hegemonic masculine ideologies. It is this visible deviance from the institutional norms which elicits the type of behaviour that portrays Type "B" athletes as "less masculine" in nature, based on their lack of conformity to the hegemonic masculine ideal.

Could it be that these Type "A" and Type "B" athletes bring to sport an already established "Integrationist" masculine identity from outside the institution of organized sports? Both types of athletes are active advocates of equality for female athletes in organized sports. It would thus seem reasonable to assume that women may play an influential role in the "Integrationist" identity that the these athletes have socially constructed. The significant role that a woman may maintain in an athletes' life is illustrated in the following interview passage:

My mother is a very dominant figure. My dad was always working and he wasn't around much. But my mother was always around because she didn't work. Frequently, she was the one to discipline me and my brother when we needed to be disciplined. She played a big part in who and what I have become.

This feminine influence may have been acknowledged by the athlete without any fear of the negative effects it may have on the social construction of their masculine identities. Type "A" and Type "B" athletes feel no less masculine because they do not support dominant hegemonic masculine ideologies. Therefore, it would be reasonable to surmise that the athletes' sporting environment does not
instill the "Integrationist" type of masculinity, but rather that it is developed outside of the institution of organized sports, and subsequently brought to sport.

When examining the "Individualist" masculine identity one becomes aware that the majority of athletes comprising this type of masculinity participate in Type "B" sporting activities. These athletes do not support the majority of the hegemonic masculine components. However, they do support the aggression component, but claim an ability to draw the line at violence, acknowledging that it is a negative behaviour.

The "Individualist" masculine identity seems to promote Type "B" athletes as open-minded and liberal individuals who support equality for female athletes, condone aggression but not violence, will not sacrifice their body for sport, and support equality for gay male athletes. However, it may be that their "loner" type sporting activities eradicate the need for unquestioned acceptance of the male status hierarchy. These athletes often experience one-on-one coaching; thus they do not have to "fight" for attention from the coach as is often the case in team oriented, Type "A" sporting activities. This may reduce their inherent need to broadcast their masculine status through the male status hierarchy, which has become so central to the hegemonic masculine identity within organized sports.

Perhaps by practising and competing in a more secluded
atmosphere or within oneself has prompted Type "B" athletes to become more self-sufficient, and thus less submissive to traditional masculine "peer" pressure. Therefore, Type "B" athletes would seem more apt to oppose traditional hegemonic ideologies.

These Type "B" athletes support the equal treatment of female athletes within the institution of organized sports. In support of this claim, it became evident that the athletes were willing to acknowledge the benefits of co-ed sporting activities. They also contend that they are not willing to jeopardize their physical well-being as an athlete. Not surprisingly, these athletes thus tend to participate in the individual, aesthetic Type "B" sports, avoiding the more hegemonic team oriented, collision sporting activities. Finally, the athletes support the inclusion of gay male athletes within mainstream sporting society. These athletes view gay male athletes as athletes first and foremost. While the gay athlete's sexual orientation is only a secondary concern and does not affect the legitimacy of their presence in organized sports.

In conclusion, it becomes more obvious that Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities do, in fact, play integral roles in the construction of the "Integrationist", "Segregationist" and "Individualist" masculine identities. The "Integrationist" identity is primarily characterized by the presence of women in the social construction of their
masculine identities. These athletes, who participate in both Type "A" and Type "B" sports, seem to bring a more "open-minded" attitude, concerning the role of female athletes and gay male athletes, to organized sports.

The "Segregationist" identity is comprised primarily of athletes who participate in Type "A" sporting activities. These athletes support hegemonic ideologies which seem to be represented by the Type "A" team and collision oriented activities which maintain an inherent need for physical contact.

Finally, the "Individualist" identity is composed primarily of athletes who participate in Type "B" sports. These athletes do not support traditional hegemonic ideologies as they pertain to the social construction of their masculine identities. Instead, these athletes are heavily influenced by the individuality of Type "B" sports, and are more open-minded than the athletes who participate in the team oriented, Type "A" sports.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

As previously outlined, the existing literature suggests that the hegemonic masculine identity is the preferred ideal within the institution of organized sports. This type of masculinity refers to specific ideologies which are usually reinforced by the dominant ruling group of males within organized sports (Connell, 1990, p.94). Further, this identity dictates that athletes exhibit deference to male authority (Sabo & Panepinto, 1990), devalue the presence of women (Bryson, 1987; Kidd, 1990; Messner, 1992), condone aggressive and violent behaviour (Bryson, 1987), support social isolation (Rotundo, 1990), ignore pain (Young, et al., 1993), and actively participate in the marginalization of homosexual males (Herek, 1978; Connell, 1990). An individual's masculine identity can be very important, as it may influence the manner in which he is perceived within the institution of organized sports.

At the beginning of this study it was speculated that the hegemonic masculine identity was not the only form of masculinity at work within the institution of organized sports. The existing sports literature has become heavily biased, supporting the claim that male athletes are often " pressured" into supporting traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies in order to maintain a favourable position within
the male status hierarchy. Therefore, these ideologies often become problematic as there is little room to explore other possible masculinities that may exist within organized sports (O'Leary & Donoghue, 1978, p.17; Stein & Hoffman, 1978, p.137). This study set out to determine if hegemonic ideologies pertaining to masculinity were, in fact, preferred or whether there were other masculinities at work within organized sports.

In addition, an exploratory component dealing with the mesomorphic body type was included with the aforementioned components of the hegemonic masculine identity. This inclusion was based on the speculation that male athletes would be predisposed to the attainment of the mesomorphic body type (Mishkind et al., 1986) as a means of expressing masculinity through the body. Therefore, as a sub-problem the role of the mesomorphic body type in the social construction of an athlete's hegemonic masculine identity was additionally examined within the institution of organized sports.

These goals were accomplished by combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies or Q-methodology and open-ended, personal interviews, respectively. Q-methodology was responsible for initially distinguishing "Factors" which were representative of subjective views, values, and opinions pertaining to different types of masculinities. This particular methodology was used as a means of
disclosing how this specific sample of male athletes view their own masculine identity. The open-ended, personal interviews were used as a forum where the athletes could comment further on the "Factors" pertaining to masculinity which emerged through the results of the Q-sort.

The Social Constructionist theory, as advocated by Berger & Luckmann (1966), was adopted as the theoretical orientation for this study. The researcher believes that masculinity is a socially constructed phenomenon which is continuously being challenged and re-shaped as an individual matures. Athletes are continuously being influenced by both their environment and significant others who establish or mediate appropriate masculine behaviours. Therefore, it is up to each individual athlete to subjectively interpret objective information, either acknowledging or negating its presence in the social construction of his masculine identity.

As previously stated, the components of hegemonic masculinity are pervasive throughout the existing literature. This bias can be attributed to the types of sporting activities which have been routinely examined in masculinity research. Traditionally male dominated or team and collision oriented Type "A" sports such as football, rugby, and basketball are repeatedly examined throughout the masculinity literature. It is often these types of male dominated sports which effectively support and reinforce
patriarchal relations, and thus the male-female gender dichotomy.

However, the results of this study effectively challenge this inherent bias in the literature. The examination of the athletes who participate in the individual and non-collision oriented, Type "B" sports such as golf, volleyball, swimming, bodybuilding, and long distance running provided the results needed to challenge this bias. Examination of athletes from these sports as well as the team oriented, collision sports has successfully introduced the emergence and salience of different types of masculinities which exist within the institution of organized sports.

Based on the subjective interpretations provided by these athletes the "Integrationist", "Segregationist", and "Individualist" types of masculinities emerged. Each of these types of masculinities are based on their adherence to, or challenge of the established components of the hegemonic masculine ideal.

Of the three types of emergent masculinities the "Segregationist" masculine identity most supports traditional hegemonic masculine ideologies as established in the literature. The athletes who compose this type of masculinity characteristically support patriarchal relations, and thus the male-female gender dichotomy within the institution of organized sports. They all supported
deference to male authority, the active devaluation of women, the sanctioned use of aggressive and violent behaviour, and social isolation within the institution of organized sports.

The "Integrationist" masculine identity is most easily identified by its composing athletes' apparent conviction towards equality. Unlike the athletes who compose the "Segregationist" masculine identity, these athletes do not support any of the components which comprise the hegemonic masculine ideal. These athletes support the equal treatment of both female athletes and gay male athletes within the institution of organized sports. In addition, these athletes are not afraid to challenge male authority. They contend that the "athlete-coach" relationship should not be a dictatorship. They feel that it should be constructed on a foundation of mutual respect for one another. Therefore, they agree that respect is not automatic, but must be earned and developed by both the athlete and the coach.

Finally, the athletes who compose the "Individualist" masculine identity challenge the majority of the established components which compose the hegemonic masculine ideal, the lone exception being the component dealing with aggression which they maintain is integral to the attainment of athletic success. Like the athletes who compose the "Integrationist" identity, these athletes support equality for female athletes and gay male athletes, thus actively
undermining the role of the heterosexual male as the dominant ruling figure within the institution of organized sports. At the same time this also challenges the legitimacy of patriarchal relations, and thus the male-female gender dichotomy.

Further, these athletes challenge the inclusion of violence as necessary behaviour within the institution of organized sports. They also agree that playing while injured is not a responsible method of professing their masculinity. They argue that they have more respect for their bodies than other male athletes, who are willing to sacrifice their physical well-being for the benefit of the team or other individuals.

The traditional hegemonic masculine identity should not be portrayed as the only credible masculine identity which exists within the institution of organized sports. The emergence of the "Segregationist", "Integrationist", and "Individualist" types of masculinities supports the previous claim that there are, in fact, other types of masculinities at work within organized sports.

It is interesting to reflect on the social construction of specific athletic identities, linked to various sports, and how they may each influence the emergence of the aforementioned types of masculinities. Athletes who compose both the "Integrationist" and "Individualist" masculinities contend that their acceptance of both female athletes and
gay male athletes does not threaten the integrity of the institution or their development as masculine individuals. Therefore, these athletes downplay the importance of gender in the social construction of their athletic identities.

When more closely exploring the subjective opinions of the athletes who compose the "Segregationist" identity, however, it becomes evident that gender is an integral element in the social construction of their athletic identity. For example, these athletes who participate in primarily Type "A", team and collision oriented sporting activities, profess that they feel most comfortable competing in all-male sporting environments. Therefore, the exclusion of women is integral to the salience of the "Segregationist" athletic identity.

The athletes who compose the "Segregationist" identity are strong advocates against integrated sport. These athletes voice their support that the all-male sporting environment which provides them with an environment that enhances their development as both athletes and men. While they concomitantly condemn an environment integrated by sex within sport, as not being conducive to serious athletic endeavours.

This contrasts with the opinions of the athletes who compose the "Integrationist" and "Individualist" identities. They maintain that there are positive benefits which accompany both the all-male sporting environment and
integration of female athletes with male athletes. Therefore, from their perspective it is important to acknowledge that within the institution of organized sports the benefits of all-male and integrated sporting environments both exist; one environment is not automatically portrayed as being more beneficial to the social construction of masculinity than the other.

It seems possible that Type "A" and Type "B" sporting activities may differentially influence attitudes towards gender, and its subsequent role in the social construction of an athlete's masculine identity. There seems to be a relationship between gender and sporting activity, with the more progressive "Integrationist" and "Individualist" athletes maintaining more liberal views pertaining to gender. Conversely, the athletes who compose the "Segregationist" masculine identity, participating in the more male dominated Type "A" sports, are less open-minded to issues concerning gender. Therefore, they attempt to marginalize both female athletes and gay male athletes within organized sports.

The results of this study in terms of the sub-problem on the mesomorphic body image, suggest that within the institution of organized sports, the mesomorphic body type is not an integral component in the social construction of hegemonic masculinity. The athletes in this study, representing all three emergent masculinities, contend that
an athlete's body type is sport specific. Therefore, they all agree that it is most important to attain and maintain a somatotype which will ensure a high level of success in their individual sporting activities.

However, when examining the results of the body silhouette portion of the demographic questionnaire, all 50 of the athletes ranked the mesomorphic body type as the most desirable. Therefore, it seems as though the mesomorphic body type is desired by athletes within the institution of organized sports, as well as in mainstream society. It is important to examine how these two seemingly contradictory positions might exist within athletics.

It would seem possible that the athletes' perceptions of the mesomorphic body type and its interrelationship with masculinity, within organized sports is very specific. They agreed that the mesomorphic body type is not an accurate measure of an individual's masculine identity. These athletes put a greater emphasis on characteristics such as "heart", "desire", and "commitment" when evaluating masculinity. The athletes' main concern is to appropriate the body as a means of achieving athletic success. Therefore, within organized sports, societal pressures to achieve the mesomorphic body image may be reduced. To these individuals, the fact that they are perceived by mainstream society as athletes "naturally" amplifies their masculine status.
Within mainstream society, it seems as though the pressure to achieve a mesomorphic body type is a social phenomenon that deals more with aesthetics than athletics. Thus, the athletes in this study contend that the mesomorphic body type is not integral to masculinity in a sporting context, they contradicted themselves when they indicated that they most desired to attain the mesomorphic body type. Therefore, in keeping with broader societal expectations, it seems possible that these athletes unconsciously acknowledge the mesomorphic body type and its role in the construction of a more socially acceptable, aesthetic form of masculinity.

In conclusion, it is important to realize that this study was conducted entirely within the institution of organized sports. The emergent types of masculinities effectively challenge the inherent bias towards hegemonic masculine ideologies which exist in the literature examining organized sports. Accordingly, those who participate in, organize or study sport need to begin acknowledging the latitude of masculine expression that exists within the institution of organized sports. This will hopefully facilitate the social construction of masculine identities which will allow athletes to reach their full potential, providing a small step in the lengthy journey which will ultimately lead society out of the grips of patriarchal relations and into a new era of equality for all.
Recommendations for Future Studies

After completion of this study, I would have to agree with the various Q-methodology experts that the combination of Q-methodology and personal interviews was an excellent means of examining the social construct of masculinity. Q-methodology served its purpose well, establishing the types of masculinities that existed within the sample of male athletes. The establishment of the different types of masculinities enabled the development of a more focused approach to the open-ended personal interviews.

Knowing beforehand what types of masculinities were at work within the institution of organized sports made possible a more directed set of interviews. However, I would hesitate to support the results of Q-methodology on its own. During the interviews, I found that what the athletes had reported in the Q-sort was somewhat different than how they expounded on the same issues in the interviews. In most instances the results from the Q-sort were not indicative of the athletes' true, more adamant convictions pertaining to the component at hand. The interviews were critical in establishing a forum where the athletes could expound on their original opinions. Therefore, I would suggest the use of Q-methodology as a "directional" tool that should be automatically followed up with qualitatively based interviews.

The components of hegemonic masculinity, as supported
within the literature, provided an excellent "sketch" of hegemonic ideologies. In retrospect the component dealing with aggression and violence should have been separated into two separate components. The athletes in this study all agreed that aggression is integral to an athlete's success. However, when examining violent behaviour it becomes obvious that there is a difference of opinion across types of masculinities. Therefore, both aggression and violence should be examined as separate components of hegemonic masculinity.

As previously stated, the primary directive of Q-methodology is to establish similarities within a group of specific individuals, thus forming a "Factor". Characteristically, Q-methodology is not concerned with the investigation of the differences within that "Factor", or similarities across the "Factors". Such examination might, however, prove insightful in future research. This became evident when the contradictions within a "Factor" component were examined.

These contradictions centre around the established components of the hegemonic masculine ideal and their subsequent interpretation. In this study the components were analyzed in such a manner that the contradictions were examined within each of the three emergent "Factors", or types of masculinities, rather than across the same "Factors". The emergent factor weights of each of the Q-
sort statements were examined and further compared within each specific component of the hegemonic masculine identity. The inherent contradictions represented by inconsistent factor weights were, therefore interpreted as a form of internal component contradiction. These internal "Factor" contradictions initiated the eventual exclusion of specific components as "supportive" elements of the emergent types of masculinities.

Future studies should, however, examine these types of contradictions across "Factors" as well as within "Factors". Again, when examining the sanctioned use of aggression and violence component of the hegemonic masculine ideal, it appears that these behaviours would have been more accurately represented as two distinct and separate components. Athletes who compose the three types of emergent masculinities agree that aggression is an integral characteristic of the successful athlete. However, only the athletes who compose the "Segregationist" identity condone the use of violent behaviour within the institution of organized sports. Therefore, when examining components across "Factors" it becomes more apparent that what were initially considered contradictions within "Factors" may in fact be legitimate "supportive" components when examined across "Factors".

This study is only a very small piece in the overall interpretation of masculinities. The possibilities for
future studies using this methodology are endless. No segments of society should be left unexamined. An individual's masculine identity is a socially constructed phenomenon which is constantly influenced by the environment and the people in it.

In order to more fully understand the types of masculinities which are at work within organized sports, further studies should be conducted. Such studies should include an examination of the various "subsets" of people who co-exist within the institution of organized sports. For example, these studies could examine professional athletes, "true" amateur athletes, female athletes, or pre-pubescent male athletes, just to suggest a few.

The mesomorphic body type and its role in the social construction of masculinity is still somewhat unclear. It is interesting to note that the majority of athletes who participated in this study indicated in the demographic questionnaire that they wished to have the mesomorphic somatotype. However, the results of this study indicate the within the institution of organized sports, the mesomorphic body type does not play an integral role in the athletes' reported masculine identities. Further studies should examine the mesomorphic body and compare the roles it plays within both mainstream society and the institution of organized sports.
APPENDIX A.1

Q Sort Statements: Positive

Following are 21 statements based on the available literature and several informal interviews with male and female athletes and non-athletes. These statements are representative of the components of the hegemonic masculine identity, which is depicted in the literature as being the preferred ideal within the institution of organized sports. These statements are meant to elicit a positive ranking if the respondent agrees with that particular hegemonic masculine ideology.

All Q sort statements will be randomly ordered and shuffled before being given to the respondent. In addition, respondents will not be aware of the component headings of hegemonic masculinity as listed below.

Deference to Male Authority:

1. In order to earn respect I must be able to follow orders from coaches and/or veteran teammates.

2. I always follow directions or orders even if I don't agree with them.

3. My coach has power over my future.

Devaluation of Women:

4. Women athletes are too emotional.

5. Men are athletically superior to women.

6. My status as an athlete makes me more sexually appealing.

The Sanctioned Use of Aggression, Force, and Violence:

7. Male athletes are more aggressive than female athletes.

8. It is OK to injure an opponent during competition as long as it is within the rules.

9. In order to be successful, athletes have to act in aggressive and sometimes violent ways.
Social Isolation:

10. Young boys must interact with older males in order to become a man.

11. Boys become better athletes if they train separately from girls.

12. There are benefits from participating in an all-male sporting environment.

Exclusion of Pain:

13. I would rather play hurt than be called a "wimp".

14. I would play injured if it would help my teammates win.

15. Athletes must learn to endure mental and physical pain to be successful.

Marginalization of Homosexuals:

16. Gay male athletes can be harmful to sport.

17. I would feel uncomfortable competing with or against gay men.

18. Gay male athletes are less athletic.

The Mesomorphic Body Ideal:

19. I "work out" or play sports to get bigger and look better.

20. Body builders look more athletic than long distance runners.

21. A muscular body is the most sexually attractive type for men to have.
APPENDIX A.2

Q Sort Statements: Negative

Following are 21 statements based on the available literature and several informal interviews with male and female athletes and non-athletes. These statements are representative of the components of the hegemonic masculine identity, which is depicted in the literature as being the preferred ideal within the institution of organized sports. These statements are meant to elicit a negative ranking if the respondent disagrees with that particular hegemonic masculine ideology.

All Q sort statements will be randomly ordered and shuffled before being given to the respondent. In addition, respondents will not be aware of the component headings of hegemonic masculinity as listed below.

Deference to Male Authority:

22. I do not like other people telling me what to do.

23. Women have been more influential in my life than men.

24. I respond to male and female coaches in the same manner.

The Devaluation of Women:

25. I do not feel threatened when a female beats me in sports.

26. Women with equal ability should be allowed to compete with men.

27. Female athletes are just as feminine as other women.

The Sanctioned Use of Aggression, Force, and Violence:

28. Violent behaviour is unacceptable in sport.

29. Male figure skaters have to approach their sport just as aggressively as football players.

30. An athlete can be successful without being aggressive.
Social Isolation:

31. I can get a good "work out" playing against women.
32. All-male sporting clubs make me uncomfortable.
33. Female role models have been important in my life.

The Exclusion of Pain:

34. I would never hassle a teammate who refused to play injured.
35. It is my decision whether or not I play injured.
36. I think my health is more important than my team winning or losing.

The Marginalization of Homosexuals:

37. There are gay men playing in every sport.
38. Gay male athletes are welcome in the gym.
39. Homophobia (hatred of gays) hurts sport.

The Mesomorphic Body Ideal:

40. Muscular appearance is not an accurate measure of athletic ability.
41. Men build big muscles because they are insecure about their masculinity.
42. It is important to develop the body type that best suits the sport.
APPENDIX B

Participant Consent Form

My name is Chris Uchacz and I am a Masters candidate at the University of Windsor. I would like to request your permission to participate in a study to be conducted for the completion of a Master of Human Kinetics degree. This study will examine the various interpretations of masculinity as displayed by various male, varsity athletes at the University of Windsor.

You will be required to sort 42 different statements about masculinity on a scale which ranges from "most disagree" to "most agree". All of the information and data collected will be kept highly confidential and anonymous. Results of this study will be available directly from myself or through the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You may feel free to withdraw at any time without the fear of being penalized in any way. This study has been approved by the appropriate departmental ethics committee at the University of Windsor. If there are any problems with my professional conduct or the designed protocol of the study, please contact Dr. G. Olafson, Department Head within the Faculty of Human Kinetics, at 253-4232 ext. 5089.

____________________
Chris Uchacz
University of Windsor

I, ____________________________, understand the above information and voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I am also aware that I hold the right to withdraw from this study at any time.

____________________       __________________
(signature)                (date)
APPENDIX C

Verbal instructions for the Completion of the Q Sort

All subjects will receive a "Q Sort Package" which will include appropriate consent forms for voluntary participation in this study, 42 randomly ordered Q-Statements, the Q Sort Scoresheet, and written instructions for the completion of the Q sort. The following are the verbal instructions for the Q sort which be delivered prior to the Q sort task.

1. After completing the required consent forms the subject will be asked to remove the Q-statements and the Q sort scoresheet from the package. The subjects will be asked to sort all of the 42 statements into three separate piles. One pile of the statements they "agree" with. A second pile of the statements they maintain a "neutral" position on. Finally, a third pile of the statements they "disagree" with. This will make it easier for the subjects to "rank order" the statements in accordance with the Q sort scoresheet.

2. Next, the subjects will be required to refer to the provided Q sort scoresheet in order to familiarize themselves with its gradation system. They will be informed that "-5" should correspond with the statement that they most disagree with, "0" reflects the statements that they maintain a neutral position on, and "+5" should correspond with the statement that they most agree with. Further, they will be instructed that the remaining statements should be rank ordered as specified by the Q sort scoresheet.

3. Finally, the subjects will be informed of the identification number assigned to each statement which will be located on the upper right hand corner of each recipe card. The subjects will be directed to record the statement ID number in the corresponding box on the Q sort scoresheet. This will be a reflective of the subjects' subjective opinion pertaining to each individual statement. This will be representative of the level of agreement, disagreement, or neutrality towards each individual statement. Only one ID number can be entered into any single box and no boxes should be left empty. Once all 42 statements have been successfully rank ordered the subjects will be required to return the contents of the Q sort package to the researcher.
APPENDIX D

General Information Questionnaire

*** Note: DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME anywhere on this questionnaire. Each package has been allotted an ID number for identification purposes.

1. Age _______ years

2. Height _______ inches  Weight _______ lbs.

3. Marital Status ____________________________

4. Primary Sporting Activity __________________

5. How long have you participated in this sport? _____ yrs.

6. Position (if applicable) ____________________________

7. Please circle the body type which best represents your own physical build:

8. Please circle the body type which you would most wish to obtain:
APPENDIX E

Q Sort Continuum Scale

Most Disagree

Most Agree

A.  -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

B.  (1) (2) (4) (5) (6) (6) (6) (5) (4) (2) (1)

*** Please make sure that no statement ID numbers have been used more than once.

*** Please make sure that there are no empty boxes.

A. The eleven point quasi-normal distribution scale from most disagree (-5) to most agree (+5).

B. The number of statements to be sorted in each point.
APPENDIX F

Personal Interview Consent Form

As you are aware, my name is Chris Uchacz and I am a Masters candidate within the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. Upon completion of the first phase of this study I would like to take this time to appeal to you to participate in the second phase.

I will use interviews as the primary means to further examine and obtain an understanding of how male athletes interpret masculinity. Interviews will allow me to interact with subjects in order to create an understanding of feelings and attitudes about masculinity, first hand.

It is very important that you, the subject, are aware that all interviews will be kept strictly confidential. Under no circumstances will any information obtained from the interview be discussed outside of our private discussion to ensure anonymity.

The interview will be tape recorded, however your name will not be used, further assuring anonymity. The taped interviews will be identified by an individually assigned identification number. Upon completion of this study the interview tapes will be destroyed along with any information that could possibly link your participation in this study.

Participation in the interview is strictly voluntary. Some of the questions may be personal in nature and you will always be free to refrain from answering these questions if they are too invading. You will be permitted to withdraw from the study at any time that you feel it may be necessary. If at any time you have any questions in regards to this study please feel free to contact me at home (253-9302) or at school (253-4232 ext.2452). Please leave a message at either number if I am not in.

Results of this study will be available upon its completion from either myself or through the Faculty of human Kinetics, at the University of Windsor.

I, ____________________________, understand this information and voluntarily agree to participate in the interview stage. I am aware that I always hold the right to withdraw from the interview process at any time.

_________________________ (signature)  ___________________ (phone number)  __________ (date)
APPENDIX G

Sample Probes Used in the Open-Ended, Personal Interviews

Deference to Male Authority:

- How do you feel about authority?
- What does authority mean to you?
- How has authority affected your life?
- Who are the authoritative figures in your life?
- Why is it important for a coach to be an authoritative figure?
- Is respect for a coach automatic?
- What makes an authoritative coach successful?
- If you respect your coach will you do anything he/she asks of you?
- Do you think that coaches abuse their authority?
- Who has the most authority within the team structure?
- How do you deal with authoritative figures in sport?
- Do you have the same amount of respect for male and female coaches?
- Is there a difference between male authority and female authority?
- Is authority different between team oriented and individual oriented sports?
- Can you recall any instances when you challenged authority? Were you punished?
- Is it okay to challenge authority?

The Active Devaluation of Women:

- Have women been influential in your life?
- Did your mother play a more significant role than your father in your upbringing?
- Was any woman able to teach you about being a man?
- Who was responsible for introducing you to sports?
- How do you view female athletes?
- Do you draw a line when competing against female athletes?
- Do you support equality for female athletes?
The Sanctioned Use of Aggression and Violence:

- How do you feel about aggression and violence in sports?
- Do you equate aggression with success?
- How do you act in aggressive ways?
- Is aggression different for different types of athletes?
- What characteristics are emblematic of an aggressive athlete?
- Does violence maintain an important position in organized sports?
- Could sports survive without violence?
- Do you feel fighting is an act of aggression or violence?
- Do you believe that violence within the rules is okay?

Social Isolation:

- How do you feel about social isolation in sports, that is men against men and women against women?
- Do you think that there are disadvantages to integrating men and women in sports?
- Do you feel that co-ed sports are less competitive?
- If women were allowed to compete with men, would it detract from your sporting experience in any way?
- Do you think men feel threatened by the presence of women in sports?
- Would the integration of boys and girls in organized sports have any effect on masculine and feminine development?

The Exclusion of Pain:

- As an athlete, what has pain meant to you?
- What are your inner motivations to continue playing while injured?
- How do you feel towards other athletes who might decide to sit out while injured?
- What would you do if you were injured and the coach demanded that you play anyway?
- Who has the final say as to when an athlete should remove himself from participation due to an injury?
- Would you play injured for reasons other than your own?
- Isn't pain a good indicator to stop participating?
- Are you afraid of being called a "wimp"?
The Marginalization of Homosexual Males:

- How do you feel towards homosexuality?
- Are you homophobic?
- How do you feel about competing with or against gay male athletes?
- Does it make you uncomfortable to compete with or against gay male athletes?
- Is your attitude towards gay male athletes different on and off the field?

The Mesomorphic Body Type:

- How do you feel towards the muscular body?
- What body type do you wish to have and why?
- Why do you think it is so important to develop the mesomorphic body type?
- Does the mesomorphic body type have a role in sports?
- Should all athletes attempt to achieve the mesomorphic body type?
- If you attain the mesomorphic body type, who are you doing it for?
- How do you feel towards non-mesomorphic men?
- How do you feel towards overweight people?
### APPENDIX H

**Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>-462</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-165</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>-2143</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>-1513</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>2899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4958</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>3103</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>4916</td>
<td>5924</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>-1092</td>
<td>-2269</td>
<td>-2143</td>
<td>-2269</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>-336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>-504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>3666</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>-1513</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>5126</td>
<td>5714</td>
<td>3487</td>
<td>3666</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>-252</td>
<td>9277</td>
<td>3782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>4285</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>3908</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-546</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>-924</td>
<td>1513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-1681</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>2563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>4958</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>3519</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>2479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4956</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>3866</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>-1765</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>-204</td>
<td>-1261</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>5210</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>5578</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>4412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1765</td>
<td>-1723</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td>-1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6345</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>7227</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>3739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>4202</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>-336</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-630</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>-1513</td>
<td>-1050</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>-546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>-672</td>
<td>-1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>3992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>6755</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>-798</td>
<td>-1261</td>
<td>-1975</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>4076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>3908</td>
<td>6134</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>-252</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>3235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>5084</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-1891</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3571</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>3866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>4958</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>-588</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>-1723</td>
<td>2847</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>-422</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>-798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1849</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>-2647</td>
<td>-1765</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>-1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-1392</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>-1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>3908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>-588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3655</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>5982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>5966</td>
<td>4028</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>5940</td>
<td>-924</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>5336</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>2437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>-924</td>
<td>4118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>-3193</td>
<td>-1891</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td>-588</td>
<td>-1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1261</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-840</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5336</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>4958</td>
<td>3513</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>-714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>4916</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3866</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-294</td>
<td>6639</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>3571</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>5966</td>
<td>-1975</td>
<td>-672</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>6261</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>3571</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>2935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>9151</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>4958</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>3529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-882</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>-1555</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>-252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>5378</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>-1092</td>
<td>-376</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>-1681</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>2683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3666</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>6176</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>-756</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>3681</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>5882</td>
<td>-1261</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td>-714</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>-1345</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-252</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>-2605</td>
<td>-2437</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>5294</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>-966</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>2995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2953</td>
<td>5882</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>2731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>-1176</td>
<td>3866</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>3193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>4916</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>-840</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>-336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-1471</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>-1749</td>
<td>2719</td>
<td>-1304</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>3201</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>3609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>-2741</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>-2101</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>3866</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>-336</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>-1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-1975</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>3997</td>
<td>2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>5630</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>8193</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>-756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td>4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>4858</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>-924</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>-2563</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>-1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-1092</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4202</td>
<td>3665</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>3967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>5252</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>5882</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>-2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>5252</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>5714</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>-1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>3961</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>4496</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>4664</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>-1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>-1092</td>
<td>-2983</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td>-1799</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>4979</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>-320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>3655</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>-782</td>
<td>-894</td>
<td>3872</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3529</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>-598</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>3739</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-756</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>5530</td>
<td>4412</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>-336</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>-672</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6251</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>2815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>-1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>-1176</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>-1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>3977</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>6387</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>3702</td>
<td>-504</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>3824</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>-2341</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>2437</td>
<td>-1471</td>
<td>3277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>4916</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>-336</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>-546</td>
<td>5714</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>-2690</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>2469</td>
<td>-135</td>
<td>4392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>-790</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2697</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX I**

*Varimax Rotation Factor Loadings for Five Factors*

Varimax Factor Loadings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>h^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sort 1</td>
<td>59*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-57*</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-63*</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-43*</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-47*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>48*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-73*</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>62*</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-57*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

eigens 7.67 6.5 5.4 .14 3.31 23.03
% var. 15 13 11 0 7 46

* denotes a loading significant at .39

*** Note: h^2 refers to communality where h^2 is the sum of squared factor loadings, but for rows. Therefore, h^2 is the percentage of a subject's response that is common with all of the generated Factors, or, alternatively, is in common with all of the other subjects (Brown, 1980, p.224). For example, a subject with a low h^2 has responded in a relatively unique way, hence has little in common with the other subjects.
APPENDIX J

Factor Summary

Summary of Rotated Factors:

Factor:  Sort
A:    1  9 11 15 16 18 22 30 35 38 43 44 45 46
B:    7 10 13 14 17 21 23 31 32 34 36 48
C:    4  5 19 27 28 42 49
E:    3  8 26 39 47

Confounded Sorts:  2 12 20 25 29 33 41

Not Significant:  2 24 37 40 50

Significance
Level:  .39
APPENDIX K

Factor Reliability Calculations

As indicated by Brown (1980) the formula which enables the researcher to calculate the Factor Reliability (r) for each of the established Factors is:

\[ r = \frac{0.80p}{[1 + (p - 1) 0.80]} \]

\( p \) = The number of athletes defining a Factor.

The following are the respective calculations of Factor Reliability for each of the three Factors (A, B, and C) established by this study:

**Factor A: p = 14**

\[ r = \frac{(0.80)(14)}{[1 + (14 - 1) 0.80]} \]

\[ = 11.2 / 11.4 \]

\[ = 0.982 \text{ (98%) } \]

**Factor B: p = 12**

\[ r = \frac{(0.80)(12)}{[1 + (12 - 1) 0.80]} \]

\[ = 9.6 / 9.8 \]

\[ = 0.979 \text{ (98%) } \]

**Factor C: p = 7**

\[ r = \frac{(0.80)(7)}{[1 + (7 - 1) 0.80]} \]

\[ = 5.6 / 5.8 \]

\[ = 0.965 \text{ (97%) } \]
APPENDIX L

**Individual Factor Arrays**

Factor Array for Factor A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
<th>+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sporting Activity**

Long Distance Runner  
Bodybuilding  
Volleyball  
Football  
Volleyball  
Hockey  
Basketball  
Rugby  
Rugby  
Volleyball  
Golf  
Soccer  
Soccer  
Football
Individual Factor Arrays (cont'd)

Factor Array for Factor B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
<th>+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sporting Activity

Soccer
Rugby
Hockey
Football
Hockey
Basketball
Basketball
Swimming
Swimming
Soccer
Rugby
Football
**Individual Factor Arrays (cont'd)**

Factor Array for Factor C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor C is bipolar</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
<th>+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sporting Activity**

- Swimming
- Long Distance Runner
- Hockey
- Swimming
- Bodybuilding
- Football
- Golf
APPENDIX M

Q-Sort Statements Rank-Ordered by Factor Group
(Average Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q Sort Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In order to earn respect I must be able to follow orders from coaches and/or veteran teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I always follow directions or orders even if I don't agree with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My coach has power over my future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Women athletes are too emotional.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Men are athletically superior to women.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My status as an athlete makes me more sexually appealing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Male athletes are more aggressive than female athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is OK to injure an opponent during competition as long as it is within the rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In order to be successful, athletes have to act in aggressive and sometimes violent ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Young boys must interact with older males in order to become a man.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Boys become better athletes if they train separately from girls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There are benefits from participating in an all-male sporting environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would rather play hurt than be called a &quot;wimp&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would play injured if it would help my teammates win.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors | A | B | C
---|---|---|---
15. Athletes must learn to endure mental and physical pain to be successful. | +3 | +5 | +1
16. Gay male athletes can be harmful to sport. | -3 | -1 | -3
17. I would feel uncomfortable competing with or against gay men. | -1 | +2 | -2
18. Gay male athletes are less athletic. | -5 | -3 | -3
19. I "work out" or play sports to get bigger and look better. | -1 | +3 | +2
20. Body builders look more athletic than long distance runners. | -1 | -1 | -3
21. A muscular body is the most sexually attractive type for men to have. | 0 | +2 | 0
22. I do not like other people telling me what to do. | 0 | 0 | 0
23. Women have been more influential in my life than men. | -2 | -5 | -1
24. I respond to male and female coaches in the same manner. | +2 | -2 | +4
25. I do not feel threatened when a female beats me in sports. | +2 | -1 | 0
26. Women with equal ability should be allowed to compete with men. | +2 | -3 | -1
27. Female athletes are just as feminine as other women. | +3 | 0 | +3
28. Violent behaviour is unacceptable in sport. | +1 | -4 | -1
29. Male figure skaters have to approach their sport just as aggressively as football players. | +3 | -2 | +2
30. An athlete can be successful without being aggressive. | 0 | 0 | +3
### Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. I can get a good &quot;work out&quot; playing against women.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. All-male sporting clubs make me uncomfortable.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Female role models have been important in my life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I would never hassle a teammate who refused to play injured.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. It is my decision whether or not I play injured.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I think my health is more important than my team winning or losing.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. There are gay men playing in every sport.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Gay male athletes are welcome in the gym.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Homophobia (hatred of gays) hurts sport.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Muscular appearance is not an accurate measure of athletic ability.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Men build big muscles because they are insecure about their masculinity.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is important to develop the body type that best suits the sport.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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