National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

HEGEMONY, CAAWS, AND THE HEGEMONY OF CAAWS

by

MARY BETH PONGRAC, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August 16, 1991

©copyright

1991, Mary Beth Pongrac

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70946-4

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

"HEGEMONY, CAAWS, AND THE HEGEMONY OF CAAWS"
submitted by Mary Beth Pongrac, B.A.
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "C. Sefton", written over a horizontal line.

Thesis Supervisor

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "S. Rich", written over a horizontal line.

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
September, 1991

ABSTRACT

The Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS) is the only national feminist organization in Canada with the mandate to advocate on behalf of girls and women for social change in sport and physical activity. This thesis provides a critical analysis of some of the major activities of the organization. It shows how CAAWS unintentionally supported masculine hegemony in sport and how this support was influenced by the hegemonic power of the state. Some specific ways in which feminists are seeking to deconstruct and "redefine" masculinist sport are discussed briefly in order to illustrate a counter-hegemonic approach to sport.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Dr. Caryll Steffens, my thesis supervisor, for her advice and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis and especially for her support at times when my confidence waned. Thanks also to Dr. Jared Keil for his reading of and suggestions for the thesis. Many thanks to the former and current Board members of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport for their forthright responses to my many questions. Thanks also to the former member of the Canadian women's field hockey team and the representative from the Pink Turf Soccer League for their invaluable information.

Special thanks to Sybil Plank for her encouragement, and for her useful ideas and insights. Thanks to my parents for their support and particularly for their financial assistance. Thanks also to my sister, Ann, for her support as a sister and as a friend.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to Dr. Dusky Lee Smith, who first sparked my interest in power relations and critical analysis and who inspired me with his intellect, his friendship, and his humour to study sociology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Introduction	1
1.1 Methods	3
1.2 Endnotes	5
Chapter One - Masculine Hegemony, Women and Sport	6
1.1 Introduction	6
1.2 Hegemony, Women and Sport	8
1.3 Summary	25
1.4 Endnotes	26
Chapter Two - The History and Hegemony of CAAWS	29
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Historical Overview	29
2.3 The Board and General Membership of CAAWS	34
2.4 The Role of Fitness and Amateur Sport	36
2.5 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS	39
2.6 Summary	45
2.7 Endnotes	47
Chapter Three - CAAWS Hegemonic Praxis	48
3.1 Introduction	48
3.2 The Justine Blainey Case	50
3.2.1 Historical Overview	50
3.2.2 Review of the Process	51
3.2.3 Hegemony, the State and CAAWS	56
3.2.4 Summary	64
3.3 The Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport	68
3.3.1 Historical Overview	68
3.3.2 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS	71
3.3.3 Hegemony and the Role of the State	79
3.3.4 Summary	86
3.4 The Breakthrough Awards	88
3.4.1 Introduction	88
3.4.2 The Winners	88
3.4.3 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS	91
3.4.4 Summary	93

3.5 The CAAWS Newsmagazine	96
3.5.1 Introduction	96
3.5.2 Coaches, Lesbians and CAAWS	97
3.5.3 The Coach	97
3.5.4 The "Lesbian Issue"	104
3.5.5 Summary	109
3.6 Endnotes	111
3.6.1 The Justine Blainey Case	
3.6.2 The Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport	111
3.6.3 The Breakthrough Awards	112
3.6.4 The CAAWS Newsmagazine	112
Chapter Four - Alternatives	114
4.1 Introduction	114
4.2 Feminist Redefinition/Transformation of Sport	114
4.3 The Pink Turf Soccer League	119
4.4 Feminist Challenges to Six Masculinist Assumptions in Sport	121
4.5 Summary	132
4.6 Endnotes	134
Summary and Conclusions	135
References	139
Appendix A: Interview Questions Submitted to Former and Current Board Members	144
Appendix B: Interview Questions Submitted to Member of the Pink Turf Soccer League	146

INTRODUCTION

Feminists have begun to seriously consider the ways in which sport as a social institution serves to reinforce the oppression of women.¹ Investigation into the social relations in sport, and in particular, gender relations, as they exist in and through sport, is one focus of feminist sport research which, I contend, will facilitate the development of alternatives to the way sport is presently constructed in North American society.²

In this thesis, I will critically analyze some of the major activities of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS). The purpose of this critique is not merely to put forth a "negative statement"; instead, it will serve as "an attempt to define an alternative" (Smith, 1987: 78).

CAAWS is a national, non-profit organization which advocates on behalf of girls and women for their increased participation in sport/physical activity and "for progressive change" (1988a: 5). In critically analyzing some of the major "practices" of CAAWS, I hope to expose some of the difficulties feminists face in attempting to create social change in an overwhelmingly male/masculine dominated institution. Furthermore, my hope is that this analysis will establish the fact that not only are there

alternatives to the way sport is presently constructed, but that there are alternatives to the ways in which we, as feminists, have attempted to change sport.

Four major activities of CAAWS will be analyzed. These include involvement in the Justine Blainey case, the development of the Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport, and the organization's own Breakthrough Awards and Newsmagazine. CAAWS' involvement in provincial policy development and the Justine Blainey case exemplifies the organization's hegemonic perspective, its reformist approach to social change and its unintentional support for dominant masculinist ideologies in sport. The Breakthrough Awards and Newsmagazine demonstrate CAAWS' hegemonic perspective and specifically their lack of connectedness to the "grassroots", both of which contribute to the organization's inability to engage in counter-hegemonic practices.

In Chapter One, hegemony is defined and it is shown how this concept can be useful in an analysis of gender relations in the context of sport. Chapter Two gives an historical overview of CAAWS and describes the objectives of the organization which were, for the most part, not attained because of the organization's hegemonic perspective. Chapter Three encompasses an examination and critique of CAAWS involvement in the Justine Blainey case, provincial policy development, the Breakthrough Awards and the CAAWS

Newsmagazine. Finally, in Chapter Four, alternatives to a liberal feminist/reformist approach to social change in sport are discussed.

1.1 Methods

Interviews were conducted with eight former and current CAAWS Board members. (Appendix A)³ Minutes from CAAWS Board meetings, workshops and conferences were reviewed as well as the CAAWS newsmagazine, Action Bulletins, brochures, and memos and letters of the organization. From this information, I selected the four activities outlined above as these were foremost in CAAWS' work. Other major activities of the organization include the annually held CAAWS conference and Annual General Meeting and the organization's involvement in the Coaching School for Women. A critical analysis of these activities would yield a similar problematic to the four activities discussed in this thesis, that is, CAAWS' hegemonic perspective and the organization's unintentional collusion with dominant masculinist ideologies in sport.

For the Justine Blainey case, information in the form of letters and memos to and from the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation were reviewed as well as the final Hearings of the Ontario Human Rights Commission. For the Ontario policy, memos and letters to, from and within the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, as well as the various drafts of the policy were reviewed. Information for the

Breakthrough Awards came primarily from CAAWS brochures and the newsmagazine. For the section dealing with the newsmagazine, I relied upon the contents of the newsmagazine itself, as well as Board meeting minutes, memos and an interview with a former member of the Canadian women's field hockey team. Resources for the "Alternatives" chapter of the thesis included literature on the subject as well as an interview with a former coach/player/collective member of the Pink Turf Soccer League. (Appendix B)

1.2 Endnotes

(1) Unless specified otherwise, the use of the term "sport" in this thesis will include organized sport, physical activity and fitness.

(2) See also Hall, 1984.

(3) Throughout the thesis, in order to ensure confidentiality, I have not specified whether an interviewee is a former or current Board member. Appendix One includes the questions posed to the Board members interviewed and does not include questions which arose in the process of interviewing.

CHAPTER ONE

MASCULINE HEGEMONY. WOMEN AND SPORT

1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss how masculine hegemony¹ in sport is established and maintained. The following question will be addressed: How is masculine hegemonic control in sport established and what are some of the factors contributing to its continuation?

Hegemony is a process of social control in which power relations are articulated. Antonio Gramsci (1971: 57) maintained that there are two ways in which a social group or class can exercise its power: 1) through domination or coercion, and 2) through "intellectual and moral leadership". Hegemony, according to Gramsci, is domination through "intellectual and moral leadership," whereby subordinate groups are not forced, but rather "consent" to their being dominated. Hegemonic control therefore, is based on who has ideological power.

Hegemony can be defined as a "culture"; a system of values and beliefs which become accepted as commonsense "reality" because they entail the experienced "reality" of everyday life (John Hargreaves, 1982a: 114).

(I)t is a lived system of meanings and values - constitutive and constituting - which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally

confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality....(R. Williams, cited in John Hargreaves, 1982a: 115).

Helen Lenskyj (1983: 18) argues that hegemony:

...encompasses the processes by which a dominant group achieves consensus on cultural and ideological issues; the result is the maintenance of class and gender inequality manifested in unequal economic, social and political relations between the dominant and subordinate groups.

One of the central questions in Gramsci's analysis is why subordinate groups define their interests or beliefs in the way that they do (Femia, 1981: 41). For instance, why does the working class "consent" to the exploitation of their labour power, or in the interests of this thesis, why do women "consent" to the ideology and practice of "patriarchy"? (O'Brien, 1984: 98).

Sustaining hegemonic control is not entirely unproblematic however, in that hegemony is never complete and a hegemonic class or group must work diligently and constantly to maintain its control. In other words, power relations cannot at all times be defined as one class or group always dominating another. For example, if the exercise of power is blatant, there is opportunity for opposition and resistance (John Hargreaves, 1986: 5).

Hegemony is never guaranteed to a class and it must work hard for it: by making genuine concessions to other classes and groups; by accommodating imaginatively and positively to opposing pressure; by forming alliances with potential enemies; by being able to foresee and preempt alternatives to its hegemony; and assessing what combination of coercion and persuasion to use (John Hargreaves, 1982a: 115).²

Although hegemonic control is not guaranteed to a group, control may still be maintained through a process whereby

...potential resistance is anticipated, organized opposition is overcome and disarmed by broadening and deepening the base of support (John Hargreaves, 1986: 7).

This "broadening and deepening" of support is achieved through the hegemonic group's ability to win the "consent" and support of subordinate groups and by its ability to thwart and disorganize the opposition.

Whether hegemonic control is achieved or not is evident when the question of the potential for the emancipation of subordinate groups is posed (John Hargreaves, 1986: 220). Simply put, if emancipation is not imminent, the hegemony of one group over another is successful.

Gramsci's theory therefore, allows us to escape simple notions of "false consciousness," that is, that the oppressed are merely passive receptors of dominant ideologies. We can be aware or conscious of our oppression vis a vis dominant ideologies, and we can react to this oppression. Consequently, Gramsci's theory can account for human agency in terms of social movements such as the women's movement and the peace movement.

1.2 Hegemony, Women and Sport

A commonly held notion is that sport is relatively "neutral" because it is manifested in "commonsense" terms; as a "taken for granted" activity. Sport is considered to

be enjoyable, satisfying, and at times, can enable us to "forget" ordinary life, hence it is an activity which is often left unquestioned (Jennifer Hargreaves, 1982: 16). Sport is problematic however, in terms of the way ideology becomes manifested and legitimized within it and how the contradictions, such as those within power relations, become concealed and therefore ignored. Lenskyj (1983: 24) maintains that because sport is perceived to be neutral,

...it constitutes an ideal context for the legitimation of female inferiority, and, not surprisingly, has been exploited for that purpose as long as women have been engaged in physical activity.

Because sport is a cultural institution, it is connected to a number of other institutions such as the educational system, the media, economics, politics, and class and gender relations within these. Consequently, sport is not neutral. For this reason, it is important to investigate the ways in which gender and class power differentials become "commonsense" and thus legitimized in and through sport (John Hargreaves, 1982a: 121).

In an analysis of hegemony, ideology must be studied in terms of how it is used to conceal the interests of certain groups and classes. Ideology, in this case, is the articulation of a particular set of social relations in which the contradictions of these relations are concealed (John Hargreaves (1982b: 5). For example, a prevailing practice in sport is to focus on the differences between

women and men (Willis, 1982). The argument commences with biological difference; women's biology renders it impossible for women to compete on equal terms with men. Because women's biology is different from men's and because in this culture we attach social meaning to biological difference, an ideological view (different, therefore inferior) becomes "commonsense" understanding (women's biology is different from men's and is therefore also inferior).³

The fact that no one can deny female difference becomes the fact of female sport inferiority, becomes the fact that females are innately different from men, becomes the fact that women who stray across the defining boundary are in a parlous state (Willis, 1982: 130).

Extending the biological argument further, appeals are often made to the "natural" superiority of men over women. Because feats of strength, speed and skill can be measured and measured differences are real (Willis, 1982: 117), an appeal to the "natural" (biological difference) is also an appeal to "reality" (the measured differences in performance due to biological difference). The contradictions to this "reality" become concealed by directing attention away from sports in which women outperform men (Bryson, 1987: 354), and the fact that many women are stronger, faster and more skillful than many men. Nevertheless, it makes "sense" to individuals that, due to biological differences, women must be inferior to men physically, and in many cases, socially as well.

Ideology, in this case, conceals the fact that the "defining boundary" of which Willis speaks could be construed as the biological/ideological distinction of female/male, feminine/masculine. Nowhere is this "boundary" more apparent than in the "sex test" administered to elite women athletes. Since 1968, the International Olympic Committee has submitted every woman who competes in an Olympic Games to a buccal smear, or sex test.⁴ While this procedure is known to have many technical flaws, its social flaw comes from the ideological/commonsense presupposition: "If she's that good, she must be a man." Ideology in sport is easily legitimized if sport is seen in commonsense terms only, particularly if sport is also perceived as being neutral. Sport then appears to have independent social meaning from what the powerful in society dictate, thus rendering the contradictions in and through sport invisible.

Not surprisingly, the media plays a significant role in formulating and disseminating certain ideologies with respect to women and sport.

In their working assumptions and practices - the type of commentary, the use of verbal and visual imagery - the media re-dramatize and re-present what are already potent dramatic spectacles within a framework of interpretation, which facilitates the passing of ideologically encoded messages, that is, preferred ways of seeing sport and society (John Hargreaves, 1986: 127), (and the relations between women and men) (my parentheses).

At the 1987 Pan Am basketball games, as Jennifer Gillom, a player on the U.S. team, took possession of the ball, the commentator remarked:

Doesn't Gillom remind you of a lady who someday is going to have a nice large family and is going to be a great cook? Doesn't she look like that? She's got just a real pleasant face (Billy Packer, cited in Halpert, 1988: 36).

According to Lois Bryson (1987: 335), the ignoring of women's sports by the media, even when women achieve what men see as significant performances, is not accidental or inadvertent, but a "dynamic process" which serves to protect masculine hegemony. Furthermore, when the media does recognize women's sport, it is often "trivialized", by shifting the focus to the woman's appearance, her marital status and family relationships (Bryson, 1987: 356). Margaret Murdock, 33, the first woman ever to win a silver medal in the mixed-sex shooting competition in the Olympics, was described in Sports Illustrated as

nunnish...a shambling figure in a faded orange sweatshirt and baggy jeans, with short graying hair curling around orange ear protectors and silver-rimmed glasses, she showed the beginnings of a double chin (Sports Illustrated, cited in Halpert, 1988: 39).

John Hargreaves (1982a: 127) claims that the media presents sport as a "symbolic representation of a particular kind of social order." What better way to maintain a social order in which women are viewed primarily as sex objects or mothers (or both), or, as in the case above, unattractive and therefore nonsexual, than by trivializing anything women might do to contend these notions, particularly within the male/masculine-dominated realm of sport.

While the power of ideology to legitimize fallacies concerning women's abilities is evident, individuals can

hold at least "partially" independent beliefs within society (Willis, 1982). Although "visible reality" confirms that not all men possess greater strength, speed and skill than all women, the ideology maintaining that men are stronger, faster and more skillful than women holds because of real differences in women's and men's biology. Even visible reality or "counter-ideologies" are, at times, not strong enough to completely resist the dominant ideological/commonsense forces (Willis, 1982: 124).

Individuals may attempt to articulate counter-ideologies but run the risk of unintentionally giving "new life" to the underlying definitional power of the dominant ideology (Willis, 1982). Willis (1982: 127) cites the example of trade union opposition to employers in that by asking for more money, they are, at the same time, accepting the legitimacy of the notion of wage labour and giving "new life" to the concept of "wages" in general. In other words, the ideology that one must work in order to obtain a wage in order to live is left unquestioned. Furthermore, power relations in terms of who owns and controls the means of production and whose labour power is exploited, are also left intact. In a sense, this is a form of unintentional collusion with a prevailing ideology.

In terms of women and sport, Willis (1982: 130) cites the challenge of Bobby Riggs, to a tennis match with Billie Jean King in order to prove his "superiority" over her. By

taking up the challenge, King was actually giving new life to the dominant ideology, which, in a broad sense states that the masculinist standard, in terms of sport performance, is the standard to which everything must be judged, compared, or reached (Willis, 1982). Bobby Riggs exemplified this "standard" and Billie Jean King took up the challenge in order to prove her equivalence, or perhaps superiority to that "standard". The dominant ideology therefore, remains intact. The existence of the standard itself is not challenged; it is merely accepted as "commonsense", something that need not be questioned.

Jennifer Hargreaves (1986: 117) discusses how the entry of women into "masculine" sports such as soccer, rugby, boxing, wrestling and so on, appears as a weakening of masculine hegemony in sport. She contests however, that what is actually happening is that women are merely being incorporated into masculinist models of sport which are characterized by fierce competition and aggression:

Instead of a redefinition of masculinity occurring, this trend highlights the complex ways male hegemony works in sport and ways in which women actively collude in its reproduction (1986: 117).

In other words, Hargreaves is arguing that "masculinity", characterized as it is in sport by a "do or die" kind of philosophy, is not challenged when women enter sports which adhere to the masculinist model. As with the male standard which Willis refers to, "masculinity", as a standard in a masculinist model of sport, is not challenged. Hargreaves

and Willis are arguing, on the other hand, that it is precisely these standards that should be contended.

Willis (1982: 130) argues that unintentional collusion occurs when a counter-ideological definition cannot be, in itself, a force to challenge the hegemonic view. Although collusion like that expressed in the case of Billie Jean King, and the entering of women into "masculine" sport appears to weaken hegemonic views (and perhaps to a certain extent it does) it continues, at the same time, to give new life to, or perhaps new emphasis on certain aspects of the ideology in question.

Unintentional collusion is again manifested in women's sport by the female athlete who does everything in her power to emphasize her "femininity" (Willis, 1982: 130). Jan Felshin (1974) coined the term "apologetic" referring to the way some female athletes strive to maintain their "femininity" by dressing and acting in gender-appropriate ways, in order to avoid "exposure" of a "non-feminine" image; it is the belief that she must "apologize" for her supposedly "unfeminine" sporting abilities.⁵ Obviously, this sort of collusion does not challenge any of the ideologies surrounding notions of "masculinity", "femininity", and hence the relations of women and men to sport itself. Furthermore, the media plays on this apologetic. Claire Williams et al cite a newspaper report of the seventh place finisher in the women's marathon at the

1984 Olympics, who was described after the race, as having "gold looping earrings, fingers coiled with rings, long burgundy fingernails and joy in her eyes" (Sydney Morning Herald, cited in Williams et al, 1985: 642).

Masculine hegemony is reflected not only in sporting practices but also in sport research. Willis (1982: 119) points to research which focuses on the female body and its ability to achieve in sport. Again, this research is based on the premise of "difference". The "ability to achieve" is judged against a masculinist standard, in that a woman's ability to achieve is measured against a man's ability and a man's standard. He argues that to know

...why it is that women can muster only 90 percent of a man's strength cannot help us to comprehend, explain, or change the massive feeling in our society that a woman has no business flexing her muscles anyway (1982: 119).

The research of self-defined social biologist Ken Dyer (1982, 1989) differs from the research to which Willis refers, but in the end is fraught with the same problems. Among his numerous bar charts and statistical analyses comparing women's and men's sport performances, Dyer (1989: 87) concludes that "women's best performances...may one day equal those of men."⁶ Willis (1982: 119) maintains that research involving comparison and difference tells us nothing about the "social meaning" of women in sport and actually aids masculine hegemonic control of sport. He argues that it would be more pertinent to question why the

presence of women in sport in our society is still, in some cases, an anomaly (Willis, 1982: 119).

The media also focuses on physical differences between women and men and how these differences relate to sport performance. Willis (1982: 122) comments on how attention is drawn in sport to "unarguable physical differences out of context" (Willis, 1982: 122). An example of this was evident in the television coverage of the 1987 Hawaii Ironman (sic) triathlon, where it was stressed that one of the top female competitors was the mother of three children. Willis (1982: 122) states:

Even in the case of a successful athlete you can see at a glance that she is different from men, defined essentially by sex rather than by athletics, and perhaps even a freak for being able to have a baby and be successful in sport.

We rarely, if ever, hear about the children of a male athlete, unless of course they are "successful" athletes themselves. Again, it is obvious that the media plays an important role in the dissemination of dominant ideologies, by choosing what aspects of an athlete's personal life to emphasize.

The same female triathlete mentioned above commented in an interview just how grateful she was for the sacrifices her husband and children have made with respect to her career as a triathlete. Again, the media is selective when commentators and editors decide what is important, what should be preserved and what should be edited in the

production process. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that we rarely, if ever, hear about the sacrifices that a male athlete's wife and children have had to make to advance his career. This woman's comments are another example, in a sense, of unintentional collusion with a dominant ideology. Evidently, she believes that her husband and children have made a sacrifice. While we know that the media is at work, stressing certain values over others, we also know that in terms of gender-appropriate behaviour in our society, it is women who are primarily responsible for nurturance and care of men and children. Consequently, it is hardly surprising that a female athlete would say these things. Not only is it the "appropriate" and "commonsense" thing to say, nurturing her husband and children is the "appropriate" and "commonsense" thing to do. She, among others, has "bought into" the ideology; her comments merely serve to perpetuate it.

Some argue that women face the strongest opposition when they take part in the traditional "masculine" sports (Jennifer Hargreaves, 1986: 116). Often women are ridiculed or questioned about their sexuality and the desired effect of this trivialization is evident:

...if a woman seems to be encroaching too far, and too threateningly, into male sanctuaries, she can be symbolically vapourised and reconstituted as an object, a butt for smutty jokes and complacent elbow nudging (Willis, 1982: 122).

Helen Lenskyj (1984-85; 1986; 1987), M. Ann Hall (1984; 1985), and Jennifer Hargreaves (1986), among others, have

documented the ways in which questioning of female athletes' sexuality serves to reinforce masculine hegemony in sport. Lenskyj (1986: 55) points out that when women enter "masculine" sports, not only is it argued that their "femininity" may be at stake, but it is also maintained that either the sport itself has made the women "unfeminine", or the women themselves are accused of being "unfeminine" at the outset. The ultimate extension of the "unfeminine" argument occurs when homophobic accusations of lesbianism are made toward women athletes. These accusations are pervasive in sport and are elicited by both heterosexual men and women in and out of sport. Charges of lesbianism serve to silence lesbians in sport, keep heterosexual and lesbian women out of sport, and incite the "apologetic" to be played out. Consequently, a no-win situation is set up for the female athlete, lesbian or heterosexual.

Jennifer Hargreaves (1986: 117) claims that, in contrast, women who "exemplify the stereotype of 'femininity'", or who "apologize" for their sporting abilities are treated predominantly as sex symbols in order to "celebrate" the female/male distinction in terms of physical difference. She cites a newspaper journalist who wrote, "pretty Miss Mary Decker who, in this Amazonian world, wears make-up on the track and shaves her legs" (1986: 117). The message is that Decker's performance on the track is "qualified" by the gender-appropriateness of

her appearance; she can be an exceptional athlete and yet remain "feminine".

Lenskyj (1984-85; 1986) points to heterosexual attitudes and practices which have resulted in the construction of notions of "femininity" and "masculinity". These socially constructed definitions of gender have carried over into the sports world in terms of "feminine" and "masculine" sports, which serve to exclude women from many sports. There has been a great deal of research compiled on what is termed the "sport-femininity" conflict (Harris, 1980; Rohrbaugh, 1979). This so-called "conflict" manifests itself when women become involved in sport, since sport is perceived to be "masculine" territory and hence "unfeminine". M. Ann Hall (1985: 35) maintains that this research, that is, sex role and sex identity studies, hinders "political attempts to critique the cultural ideologies which maintain the stereotypes in the first place." In other words, focusing on whether female athletes are "feminine" or become "masculinized" through sport may actually serve to preserve the "femininity" of female athletes. Clearly then, sex role research aids in the maintenance of masculine hegemony in sport by sustaining concepts of "femininity" and "masculinity". More pertinent and useful research would analyze gender relations in and through sport and ask what it is about these that privilege sport as a male prerogative (Hall, 1985).

Lois Bryson (1987) has identified four processes which characterize masculine hegemony in sport. These are: definition, direct control, ignoring, and trivialization.

In terms of definition, Bryson (1987: 351) argues that sport is defined as something in which men or children, mostly boys, participate. While this is in fact the case, Bryson's point is that sport is defined as "appropriate" activity primarily for men and boys, to the exclusion of women and girls.

In terms of direct control, Bryson points out that sport is organized by men, even if the sport is dominated by women. Consequently, she maintains that "with few exceptions men are making critical decisions that form the environment in which women's sport exists" (1987: 352). As a result, women often end up with poor funding, inferior access to grounds, equipment, times for matches and practices, coaching and training facilities (Bryson, 1987).

Direct control is not only manifested in the political realm. John Hargreaves (1986: 152) points to the "male media preserve" as a site where women are restricted to commenting and reporting only on "women's sports".

The fact that it has proved harder for women to break into media sport as professionals than to break into sport itself is a good indication that media sport plays a strong conservative role in the reproduction of inequality between the sexes (John Hargreaves, 1986: 152).

Jim Spence, the former vice president of ABC sports has written:

There is no reason why an audience, whatever its makeup, should be required to tolerate an announcer with a very shallow level of knowledge or feeling for sports. And that, of course, is the main reason we have had 99 percent of our sports dealt to us by men (cited in Halpert, 1988: 37-38).

In discussing the ignoring of women's sport, Bryson (1987: 353) argues that the media is almost solely concerned with men's sport.

While a great deal of effort has been put into explaining why women will never be able to compete with men in sports that require power and speed, very little seems to have been written about the sports in which women are likely to excel, such as the endurance events....⁷

The trivialization of women in sport ranges from women not being "allowed" to coach men, to women athletes being treated as sex objects, as mentioned previously (Bryson, 1987: 356). Again, this is evidenced when references are made to a female athlete's appearance, her marital status and her family situation. Bryson (1987: 356) cites an example in which even female spectators at a boxing match were trivialized in a newspaper report which read: "Festival Hall was filled with 2000 people - mainly men but with a sprinkling of dumb blondes."

Bennett et al (1987) have identified five ways in which masculine hegemony is manifested in and through sport. These are: 1) silence; 2) pseudo-logic; 3) patronizing humour; 4) ritualized activities; and 5) slander (1987: 371).

A powerful source of communication, silence indicates lack of interest, disapproval, or both, which in turn promotes self-doubt and lack of enthusiasm (Bennett et al, 1987). With pseudo-logic, the emphasis is on the superiority of boys and men in sport as a rationale for less funding and support for girls and women in sport:

The real message is that winning against men is impossible, winning against other women is irrelevant, winning the public is unlikely, winning is everything, and therefore we do not even belong in the game (Bennett et al, 1987: 372).

Patronizing humour is manifested when girls'/women's sport is ridiculed in order to demonstrate that girls and women are incompetent in comparison to boys and men (Bennett et al, 1987). Bennett et al (1987: 372) state that to

ritualize an activity reserves it for a specific group, clearly identifying it as appropriate only for that group.

Only when the "other", that is, women, participate in sport does the rite lose its meaning (Bennett et al, 1987). The activity is no longer exclusively a male ritual and is therefore no longer a ritual.⁸

Slander takes the form of derogatory allegations and innuendo, such as calling a woman a "dyke" or suggesting that she would never be attractive to a man by doing what she is doing (Bennett et al, 1987).

The implication that skillful women are not women is one of the strongest devices in the patriarchal bag of tricks for keeping women from movement competence (Bennett et al, 1987: 373).

Bryson (1987: 358-359) concludes that feminists appear to be in a Catch 22 situation with respect to sport:

To compete almost of itself seems to promote dominant male values, because sport is currently defined in these terms. Yet not to compete tends to confirm the stereotype of women lacking in those attributes of skill and power that the stereotype conveys.

In other words, it would appear that women are faced with either having to buy into masculine-defined sport ideologies or having to resist these ideologies by not competing, and thereby inadvertently supporting an ideology of "femininity" which posits women as weak, passive and lacking the abilities that sport requires. Bryson (1987: 359), among others, maintains however, that masculine hegemony in sport is constantly being challenged and argues that, as a result, it is continually having to be constructed and reconstructed. Men in sport are constantly having to protect their dominant position, be it on the field, in the media, or in the decision making arena. Nevertheless, it is evident that while masculine hegemony is constantly being threatened, it is also still very much intact.

It has been suggested that women's sports do not have to be judged in terms of masculine achievement, and could be judged solely by their own merits (Willis, 1982). In other words, the masculinist standard does not have to be taken as the standard to which women must be compared and try to live up to. Approaching women's sport as intrinsically valuable can avoid masculine-defined standards and hence avoid buying

into masculinist sport ideologies. Willis (1982: 134) suggests that women should attempt to offer their own version of "sports reality" which would undercut masculinist standards. The work of some feminists engaging in the process of deconstruction and redefinition of sport will be dealt with in Chapter Four.

1.3 Summary

Masculine hegemony is manifested in and through sport in both blatant and subtle forms. The purpose of this chapter has been to focus on the more insidious ways in which masculinist ideology becomes constructed as "commonsense" understanding and why this is the case. With reference particularly to "difference" between, and comparison of women and men through their sporting practices, masculine hegemony becomes firmly entrenched (but not guaranteed). Furthermore, masculine hegemony in sport is able to maintain its stronghold when individuals engage in seemingly counter-hegemonic practices, as these practices frequently end up reinforcing the ideologies they seek to deconstruct. The following two chapters will include an analysis and critique of the theory and practices of CAAWS in order to demonstrate how the organization unintentionally colluded with dominant masculinist ideologies in their attempts to facilitate social change in sport.

1.4 Endnotes

(1) The term "masculine" hegemony will be used throughout this thesis instead of "male" hegemony. Although I would argue that men, by virtue of their sex, exert hegemonic control, hence the term, "male" hegemony, the basis of this control lies in the fact that, in general, men are representations of social constructs of "masculinity". Furthermore, in concurrence with Jennifer Hargreaves (1986: 115), who argues: "the diversity of gender identities is undoubtably greater than ever before so that there is no simple category of 'masculinity', but a fabrication of many," I would argue that, like hegemony itself, masculinity is socially constructed, and therefore its meaning can acquire different forms in different social and historical contexts.

(2) Any analysis of hegemony requires looking at class, gender, race, and ethnicity. Hargreaves' quote is somewhat problematic as it tends to favour an analysis of class over that of gender, race and ethnicity.

(3) If we take as our starting point the idea that women and men are innately different and that the male body is superior (Willis, 1982: 129), the social meaning attributed to biological difference is that women are fundamentally different (biologically) from men and as a result, are inferior physically (in terms of the body's ability to perform) to men.

(4) The buccal smear test consists of a microscopic analysis of cells scraped from inside the cheek to determine the pattern of sex chromosomes. One doctor has estimated that between 6 and 15 per cent of cases end up recording as false positive (Albert de la Chapelle, in Carlson, 1988: 43). If an abnormality appears, the woman is subjected to further clinical and gynecological exams. If she is disqualified from competition, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) will help her invent an "injury" or some other excuse for withdrawal so that she may "save face" (Carlson, 1988). What is actually occurring is that the socially/politically questionable practice of sex testing is kept hidden. Furthermore, abnormalities in chromosome configurations have not even been proven to give any competitive "advantage". The use of the test also implies that there is some norm in terms of chromosome count and therefore does not recognize individual differences that may occur among women (Carlson, 1988). The IOC justifies sex testing of female athletes by arguing that they are curtailing any physical inequalities and unfair advantages that one woman may have over another. As one endocrinologist who opposes sex testing has pointed out, "If some women get disqualified for being extra strong, then why not also disqualify those with unusual height or more oxygen capacity" (Myron Genel, cited in Carlson, 1988: 44).

(5) Although Felshin described the "apologetic" in 1974, it is still very evident in women's sport today. Florence Griffith Joyner, for instance, Olympic gold medalist and world record holder in the 100 and 200 metre track events, is well known for her lengthy fingernails painted in several shades, her colourful bodysuits (one of which is white lace), and the makeup and jewelry that she wears on and off the track.

(6) While Dyer claims to be an advocate for women and sport and most of his research is geared towards "proving" that women are "catching up" to men in terms of performance, his statement that women's best performances may one day equal those of men reflects: 1) the idea that it is only the best women athletes who may do this, and 2) that these best women will only equal and not surpass the performances of men. This statement neglects those sports in which women are already outperforming men and it assumes that only the best women may be able to equal performances of any man. Because there have always been and will always be some women who are stronger, faster and more skillful than some men, Dyer's statement is problematic.

(7) Bryson's statement was chosen because it reflects a particular bias evident in the media's portrayal of sporting events (or lack thereof). Interestingly, the statement is also problematic. Bryson claims that women are likely to "excel" in endurance events. This particular use of the word, "excel" is relative; Bryson uses it in comparative terms, that is, women are likely to "excel" relative to men's performances in endurance sports. If Bryson was referring to the value or excellence of women's achievements in and of themselves, there would be no need to single out endurance sports as only those in which women may "excel". Any sport in which women participate could be considered as a sport in which women excel. Thus, Bryson's statement exemplifies a particular problem evident when women's sport is viewed relative to men's sport (the masculinist standard) and compared to it; that is, the "standard" is reinforced.

(8) Eric Dunning (1986: 83) discusses the ritualized activities of the Rugby Union in Britain. The ritual begins after the game, in the bar or on the team bus. A song called, "The Zulu Warrior" is sung as a signal for one or more of the players to perform a "striptease", mimicking the actions of female strippers. At the bar, the players drink to excess, often engaging in competitions to see who can become intoxicated the fastest. When they are drunk, the players sing "obscene" songs, and if any girlfriends or wives of the players are present, "Goodnight Ladies" is sung to encourage the women to leave (Dunning, 1986: 83). According to Dunning (1986: 84) the obscene songs have at least two recurring themes; the mocking of women and of homosexuals.

Dunning (1986: 84) points out that rugby became a game in Britain in the 1850's. In the beginning, only men from the upper and middle classes took part in it. He adds that the

majority of suffragettes also came from upper and middle social classes. Dunning (1986: 84) argues that women from these classes were increasingly becoming a "threat" to the men from these classes. Consequently, some of the men developed rugby "as a male preserve where they could bolster their threatened masculinity and, at the same time, mock, vilify and objectify women, the principal source of the threat" (Dunning, 1986: 84).

These particular rugby clubs have a vested interest in keeping women out of their ritualized post-game activities. Undoubtedly, if women were "allowed" to take part in these activities, the ritual would be meaningless since its purpose is to celebrate machismo and denigrate women.

CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORY AND HEGEMONY OF CAAWS

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the historical development of CAAWS, focusing on the athletic and employment backgrounds of the individuals involved in the formation and maintenance of the organization. It will be suggested that because of the relatively homogeneous composition of people associated with CAAWS, the organization has unintentionally cooperated in the reproduction of masculine hegemony in sport. As a result, CAAWS does not, for the most part, achieve its objectives, nor is CAAWS able to uphold many of the claims which are made on behalf of the organization.

2.2 Historical Overview¹

Founded in March, 1981, CAAWS is the only national feminist organization in Canada which advocates on behalf of girls and women in sport and physical activity.

In 1970, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women completed a report indicating that fewer girls than boys participated in sports in Canadian schools (cited in Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1986: 7). As a result of this finding and the subsequent guidelines that were drawn up by the Royal Commission, Fitness and Amateur Sport (F&AS) made the decision to sponsor a national conference on women and

sport. Thus, the first "National Conference on Women and Sport" was held in Toronto in 1974. The purpose of this conference was to "discuss the unique situation of women within Canadian sport with a group of athletes, coaches, educators, administrators and researchers" (Government of Canada, cited in Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1986: 8).

A second national conference, "The Female Athletic Conference", was held at Simon Fraser University (SFU) in 1980. It was funded by both the Institute for Human Performance at SFU and the federal government. The purpose of this conference was to discuss and evaluate issues related to women in sport, that is, the physiological, psychological and socio-cultural (Anne Popma, cited in Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1986: 8).

It was recognized that little action had been taken on recommendations from the 1974 conference. A group of women at the conference (including Sue Vail, then Manager of F&AS Women's Program), discussed the possibility of forming a national organization concerned with women and sport. A workshop, funded by F&AS Women's Program, was subsequently organized by Sue Vail and others and held at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario.

Those who organized and attended the workshop were "women who shared a common interest and concern with women and sport," and because there did not yet exist any national

network of, or structure for women in sport in Canada, the organizers had to rely on "personal contacts or names known to them" (Theberge, 1983: 80). This meant that those who attended the workshop were athletes and former athletes, sport administrators, representatives from universities, F&AS, provincial governments and national feminist organizations such as the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, and the National Association of Women and the Law (Fitness and Amateur Sport, 1986: 8; Theberge, 1983: 80).

Out of the workshop, a "feminist perspective" on sport was established:

...there is inequality in sport based on sex, the sport system is sexist, and an understanding of sex roles and sexism in sport is the starting point for an analysis of sport (Theberge, 1983: 80).

It was determined that the purpose of CAAWS would be:

to advance the position of women by defining, promoting, and supporting a feminist perspective on sport and to improve the status of women in sport (Theberge, 1983: 80).

The decision to call the group the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women **"and"** Sport, instead of **"in"** sport was significant as participants at the workshop agreed that conditions for women in sport will improve only when the conditions for women in general improve. Consequently, it was decided that CAAWS would work alongside the broader feminist movement. The organization would

concurrently work on changing sport itself, particularly the commercialism, violence and emphasis on performance.

Also agreed upon at the workshop was that CAAWS would apply for and accept government funding. Some individuals questioned the critical capacity of CAAWS, particularly with respect to practices of the state, given the fact that the organization would be financially dependent on the state. They concluded however that government dollars were "not only acceptable but necessary" and that "little harm is done by accepting project-specific support" (Theberge, 1983: 81).

CAAWS first formal constitution was devised at the 1984 Annual General Meeting. It stated:

We are a democratic organization: decisions of policy, election of the national executive and board of directors, and amendments to the constitution are made by the membership; any member can be nominated to run for the national executive.

We are a national organization: every province and territory has a representative on the board of directors. The executive is elected by the country as a whole, and we function and serve our members in both official languages.

We are a feminist organization: our purpose, entrenched in the constitution is 'to advance the position of women by defining, promoting and supporting a feminist perspective on sport,' and 'to improve the status of women in sport' (CAAWS, 1984: 2).

In February, 1987, the CAAWS Board of Directors formulated a new set of position statements. The decision to do so came about when the Board got together to develop a long term plan for CAAWS. A researcher was hired in order

to "identify the issues for girls and women in sport and physical activity" (CAAWS, 1987a: 3). A questionnaire was distributed to approximately 50 women involved in sport and fitness leadership across Canada in order to obtain the information. Each person on the Board was also responsible for gathering individuals together to discuss the questionnaire. The questionnaire dealt with 12 issues: resource allocation; participation development; sport infrastructure; leadership development; education; advocacy; program and policy development; high performance competition; promotion; sport stratification and research.² The responses to the questionnaire provided the Board with a list of issues for girls and women in sport and physical activity. These issues were then used in the formation of the new position statements which read as follows:

1. CAAW&S believes that systematic inequities result in unfavourable resource allocation, programming and leadership development for girls and women in sport and physical activity.
2. CAAW&S promotes actions which place and support women in decision-making positions in sport and physical activity.
3. CAAW&S believes that the survival and advancement of women in sport and physical activity is dependent upon feminist empowerment and the feminist community.
4. CAAW&S believes that any representation of girls and women in sport and physical activity should eliminate stereotypes and promote participation as a positive force in their lives.
5. CAAW&S believes that feminist values must be validated and entrenched in the management and delivery of sport and physical activity (CAAWS, 1987a: 3).

Furthermore, the Board decided that it was necessary for CAAWS to establish a "common focus" in order to "bring all

its Directors together" (CAAWS, 1987a: 3), or, as one Board member commented, "...because we were all over the place." After considering the issues identified through the questionnaire research, the common focus was decided:

The development and implementation of policies on girls and women in sport and physical activity at the provincial level (CAAWS, 1987a: 3).

The philosophy or purpose of CAAWS has changed little since its formation in 1981, other than some rearranging of terms. It now reads as follows:

The Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS) defines, promotes and supports a feminist perspective to advance the position of girls and women and to improve the quality of sport and physical activity (CAAWS, 1983a: 7).

2.3 The Board and General Membership of CAAWS

The key participants in the formation and maintenance of CAAWS are, or have been athletes, coaches, sport administrators, and individuals affiliated with universities, governments and national feminist organizations. Two particular groups of individuals were represented at the conferences: 1) those from organized "sport" per se (athletes, former athletes, coaches); and 2) those from state institutions (universities, government [provincial and federal] and national feminist organizations). The latter came from decision making positions with respect to issues in sport (sport administrators in universities and government), while the former constitute the recipients of these decisions. It would be simplistic to assume however, that the "recipients"

were adequately represented. For the most part, those who attended the conferences had at one time been or were already involved in organized sport, meaning that a vast segment of the population was excluded.

Among others, the key actors in organizing the workshop at which CAAWS was formed were Sue Vail, who at that time was the Manager of F&AS Women's Program; Abby Hoffman, a former national team athlete, who came from an administrative position with the Ontario Sport Branch to become Director General of Sport Canada in 1962; and Betty Baxter, former national team athlete and coach of the national women's volleyball team. Like the individuals who attended the two previous conferences, those who attended the workshop came from organized sport and/or government institutions. Thus, the perspective of individuals with an administrative and/or elite athletic background in organized sport, was heard while another (that of the more recreational athlete or the individual who is not physically active) was not. For the most part then, the key individuals involved in the organization of the workshop and the subsequent formation of CAAWS came from an elite athletic background and/or academia and/or an administrative position within organized sport.

The general membership and Board of CAAWS have, over the years, reflected similar sport/employment profiles. For example, of the twelve Board members representing CAAWS in

1988, at least six had been at one time, or were currently employed in sport administration positions at the national or provincial level. Four of the twelve were employed at universities in teaching and/or coaching positions. At least two of the twelve came from an elite athletic background (that is, had represented Canada in international competition).

The situation changed little in 1989. At least four of the twelve had been at one time, or were currently employed in sport administration positions at the national or provincial level. Five of the twelve were employed at universities (one of the five taught at a community college) in teaching and/or coaching positions. At least four of the twelve came from an elite athletic background. All of these Board members are white, able-bodied, university educated, and the majority are in well-paid employment. According to some Board members, the general membership of CAAWS reflects a similar composition of women.

2.4 The Role of Fitness and Amateur Sport

The fact that F&AS had representatives at and funded both conferences and the workshop is significant. Furthermore, F&AS Women's Program became one of two federal government organizations upon which CAAWS depended for funding; the other being Secretary of State Women's Program. It would be difficult to argue that these factors in CAAWS development were not critical. CAAWS was created by a

particular group of people, many of whom were in some form or another connected to the state, while CAAWS itself was to be dependent on the state for its funding. Undoubtedly, the direction that CAAWS would take, from its inception, was being determined by the individuals involved with CAAWS and by the state. One Board member remarked that the creation of CAAWS was not incidental:

CAAWS is a lobby group that had been created for a very specific purpose and that is, there are some key women in sport who have said, 'We have to get this on the agenda and the only way you can do that, the only way you can get action done is by a group outside the government, lobbying the government.' So, CAAWS is a lobby group which has been created by someone inside the state with others somewhat outside of the state, so its that old function of 'push and pull' with the state.

This same Board member also remarked that Abby Hoffman's role in the creation of CAAWS and her subsequent appointment to Director General of Sport Canada was significant in that CAAWS would be in constant consultation with her. The directions that CAAWS would take became dependent upon what Abby Hoffman as Director General thought the organization could get from the state. The Board member commented:

...the CAAWS Board would say, 'Alright, what do we want from the state,' and Abby would say, 'Well, I think we can get this ruling; I think we can get a women's sport program through.' So CAAWS then starts lobbying for women and state programs.

CAAWS, whose role ostensibly was that of advocacy, was seemingly left with no choice but to carry out its activities as if the organization was merely an appendage of the state.

Another Board member commented that the role of F&AS Women's Program in the activities of CAAWS fluctuated over the years depending, among other factors, upon who was on the Board of Directors of CAAWS. For example, at times there were a number of Board members with strong ties to the state in terms of their employment (as sport administrators or researchers, for instance). These Board members would want to have a good relationship with F&AS Women's Program, as their work was also dependent upon F&AS Women's Program funding. Consequently, they would welcome F&AS representatives, for fear of "rocking the boat". This same Board member claimed that at times there were "struggles" with F&AS Women's Program representatives. Abby Hoffman would be asked to intervene on behalf of CAAWS to ensure that individuals from F&AS Women's Program would not attend CAAWS meetings.

From the above analysis of the backgrounds of the individuals responsible for the formation and maintenance of CAAWS, it can be concluded that, over the years, the CAAWS Board has maintained a close affiliation with the state; in terms of the backgrounds of Board members and the decision-making process employed by the Board. Interestingly however, because CAAWS is also dependent upon state funds, any activity in which the organization is engaged remains subject to state approval and consequently, state control.

2.5 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS

At the 1981 workshop, a "feminist perspective" on sport was established by the participants. CAAWS was to be the "voice" for women and sport. They would work with the feminist movement to improve conditions for women, while concurrently working to change sport itself and improve the conditions for women in sport - a huge task even at the best of times. If indeed CAAWS was to be the "voice" for women and girls in sport and physical activity, what was the essence of this voice and what was CAAWS saying?

The philosophy of CAAWS is that, as an organization, they define, promote and support a feminist perspective. Six Board members were asked the question: "CAAWS identifies itself as a feminist organization. What does this mean to you?" I have divided the responses into three categories: 1) structure of the organization; 2) theory of the organization; and 3) practice of the organization.

In terms of structure, CAAWS was described as being an organization "run by women for women" and that it is "less hierarchical" and "less authoritarian." The belief that there is consensus, sharing, nurturance and trust amongst its members was expressed by some of those interviewed. Some Board members also remarked that there is no exploitation of paid staff or volunteers, and paid staff receive "fair wages." One individual stated that the members of CAAWS are working from the "same body of

knowledge", while another stated that a positive aspect of the organization is that it is composed of individuals who bring a variety of perspectives.

Although the organization may indeed work according to "feminist process", it cannot be denied that CAAWS does this within a hierarchical framework, that is, amongst the two state institutions responsible for CAAWS' funding, F&AS Women's Program and Secretary of State Women's Program. Furthermore, the fact that at times, Abby Hoffman or the Director of the Women's Program at F&AS (or one of her cohorts), attends Board meetings of CAAWS, demonstrates the close contact between CAAWS and the state. Undoubtedly, the state plays a role beyond that of funding; F&AS Women's Program occasionally takes an active role in the activities of CAAWS.

In terms of theory, it was stated that CAAWS tries to be as representative and inclusive as possible. One member declared that CAAWS takes a liberal feminist approach as they work for change within the system, while another stated that the organization takes more of a "blended" approach, utilizing liberal (in policy work), radical (in developing alternatives to the present system), and socialist (in dealing with issues of race and class) feminist perspectives. It was also stated that the basic premise of the organization in making change centers on the fact that men have more power than women in society.

Because the organization works predominantly within the system, lobbying the government for social change, CAAWS is primarily a liberal feminist/reformist organization. In reviewing the history and the backgrounds (employment, educational, sport) of the individuals involved in the organization, it is not surprising that although CAAWS may be involved in creating "alternatives", and concerned with issues of race and class, their fight for reforms (which incidently benefit a certain segment of the population, similar to the composition of the membership of CAAWS) has been, and currently is, the primary concern of the organization.

In terms of practice, it was stated that the organization works at the "grassroots", municipal, provincial and federal levels, lobbying and advocating in an attempt to change girls' and women's position in society, particularly in sport. They work to promote girls' and women's participation in sport and physical activity with the belief that girls and women have "equal rights to a certain quality of life." Among other things, they call for equal opportunities, more women coaches, more money, more role models, and more media coverage for girls and women.

Again, the fact that the primary objective of CAAWS boils down to getting as many girls and women as possible involved in sport and physical activity and sport leadership

positions, is indicative of their liberal feminist/reformist roots. As an organization, CAAWS does not question the ethos of the entire institution of sport; the objective is to get as many women and girls integrated into the institution, ostensibly with the hope that once women assume more sport leadership positions, sport itself will undergo change. From a more "radical" perspective however, the idea that integration facilitates change, or that change can occur from within, is questionable.

Furthermore, it is doubtful whether CAAWS has ever worked from the "grassroots" level. While the organization claims to speak on behalf of the "grassroots", this is not the same as direct involvement. In a CAAWS booklet, "Women, Sport and Physical Activity", released in 1988, it was stated that a feminist perspective would use:

women's and girls' herstory, life experiences and psychology as the starting point in designing, scheduling and managing programs for women as participants, leaders or administrators (CAAWS, 1988a: 8).

When asked how, or in what ways CAAWS incorporates girls' and women's herstory, life experiences and psychology, Board members' responses ranged from concern that the statement is somewhat idealistic and that it is actually only a stated intent, to the fact that the organization relies on its members' experiences as well as the research of others in order to incorporate these aspects. Some Board members who were interviewed recognized that at present CAAWS is predominantly made up of white, upper middle class, able-

bodied women, but argued that by relying on research carried out by their own members and others, they could account for a variety of women's experiences. Some also recognized the importance of and the need to expand their membership to include women from various classes, races, backgrounds and experiences. One member remarked:

...as a group, CAAWS hasn't done its own research, but we represent each of our own perspectives and part of the make-up of the Board incorporates different perspectives. So, there are elite athletes, there are community athletes, there are - we're trying to become more diverse to include women of different racial backgrounds, abled as well as disabled, but that hasn't so far been a real part of what CAAWS is doing. But (it is) mostly through research that some of us have done (this) and through our own backgrounds and experiences.

Another member stated:

I think right now, interestingly enough, there seems to be a large number of us, I think, coming more from the competitive sport background than say, fitness, which is a bit unfortunate because exactly the group you're talking about (I had asked about incorporation of experiences of women from lower income brackets) probably are not going to be as concerned with competitive sport as say, fitness and lifestyle, that sort of thing. So, yes I think we could certainly expand our mandate that way. On the other hand, I think you could go in real waves where you could get a group that come in and they were really fitness oriented and you didn't have any trouble with that and then - it's just a mix of people I think. I think CAAWS tries to do that.

While the second Board member quoted above admits to the problem of inadequate representation of classes of women, for example, she ends by stating that at times the organization is filled with a "mix" of people and that to have this is one of the objectives of CAAWS. Similarly, another member commented on the variety of experience that comes from CAAWS members at different moments in time:

So, I guess in the true sense of feminist process, the women who happen to be there at that period of time representing CAAWS have an opportunity to bring their own experience and perspective to their work as well. But it has limitations, there's no doubt.

While limitations may be recognized, two Board members in particular stated that because sport is a luxury and can be afforded (both financially and time-wise) predominantly by middle/upper middle income groups, the "middle class has a responsibility to offer programs" to other classes and to call for more affordable facilities, transportation and child care subsidies:

I think one of the problems with sport and physical activity (is that it) has been something of a luxury for a certain class of women. Women of colour or women from lower income levels just don't have the time to spend on sport and physical activity yet that their lot in life could be vastly improved if they did have access on an equal and fair basis; that their lives may be enhanced by sport and physical activity. So, I think it's important for CAAWS to always have that kind of perspective - that we have in just talking about sport for women - that it has been really a middle class, white activity. And so there have been a lot of inequalities in those areas and we've been working towards eliminating those kinds of inequalities. But there's also making sure that other women have that same kind of access to resources and facilities. And they're probably in a less capable position to find that same kind of equal and fair access. So, it's something towards which CAAWS really has to be working and we've made some attempts, but it's one of those areas that is just in its infancy in terms of our concern.

In recognizing the limitations of the CAAWS membership, these Board members nevertheless believe that, at present, the organization must serve as a voice for women who are not represented in their membership per se, that is, women who are disabled, and/or who are from lower income brackets,

and/or who are not from an organized sport or elite athletic background, and/or who are senior citizens, and/or who are women of colour.

Essentially, the rationale of CAAWS is that sport is a luxury which renders sport problematic, as only certain groups can afford to take part in it, yet the CAAWS Board and general membership reflects this problem. Concurrently, sport is seen as "valuable" in that the CAAWS Board believes that women's and girls' lives could be "vastly improved" if they were given "access on an equal and fair basis." Consequently, as demonstrated in the above statement by the CAAWS Board member, "equal access" to sport for girls and women takes precedence over a critical approach to sport in general.

2.6 Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to outline the historical development of CAAWS, focusing on the key individuals involved in the formation and maintenance of the organization. That these women form a relatively homogeneous group in terms of their sport/employment/class/educational backgrounds is significant as these factors contribute to CAAWS' hegemonic perspective relative to girls/women in sport. CAAWS claims to be the "voice" for all girls and women, yet the interests reflected in that voice are those from a particular segment of the population represented in part by the Board and

general membership of CAAWS, that is, white, able-bodied, educated, employed, athletic women.

CAAWS makes claims which they are unable to uphold because of the organization's hegemonic standpoint. For example, one of the objectives of CAAWS is to change sport itself, and in particular, the commercialism, violence and emphasis on performance. CAAWS does not do this. Their primary objective is to get as many women as possible involved in sport/physical activity. This does not change, nor does it question the masculinist ideological underpinnings of the institution of sport.

CAAWS' hegemonic perspective therefore is representative of a masculine hegemonic perspective in the North American context, and consequently the organization inadvertently assists in the reproduction of masculine hegemony in sport. In the following chapter, I will analyze and critique four activities in and through which CAAWS has unintentionally cooperated with masculinist ideologies in sport.

2.7 Endnotes

(1) Most of the information on the historical development of CAAWS comes from Theberge (1983).

(2) Interestingly, these twelve "issues" were obtained directly from Fitness and Amateur Sport's "Sport Canada Policy on Women in Sport" (1986). In fact, these issues make up the Policy Statements of Sport Canada and F&AS Women's Program, demonstrating the close links between CAAWS and the state.

CHAPTER THREE

CAAWS HEGEMONIC PRAXIS

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter will be to critically analyze four activities in which CAAWS was, or is currently, engaged. These are: 1) the Justine Blainey case; 2) the Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport; 3) the CAAWS Breakthrough Awards; and 4) the CAAWS Newsmagazine. An analysis of CAAWS' involvement in each of these activities will illustrate CAAWS' hegemonic perspective and the ways in which the organization unintentionally contributes to masculine hegemony in sport and to the hegemonic power of the state.

In the first section, CAAWS' involvement in the Justine Blainey case will be explored in terms of how CAAWS, in an attempt to engage in a counter-hegemonic practice, unintentionally aided in the reinforcement of masculinist ideologies in sport and the hegemony of the state. The second section looks at the role of CAAWS in the development of the Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport. Specifically, the problematic aspects of CAAWS' hegemonic position as the "voice" for girls and women in sport and physical activity will be dealt with.

In the third section, the CAAWS Breakthrough Awards are discussed, with a focus on the organization's lack of

connection with the "grassroots". In the fourth and final section of the chapter, two specific issues with respect to the CAAWS Newsmagazine are dealt with. The first is used to exemplify CAAWS lack of connectedness to the "grassroots" and the implications of the organization's hegemonic perspective. The second deals with one of the ways in which the organization has compromised its own agenda and consequently its counter-hegemonic capabilities.

3.2 The Justine Blainey Case

3.2.1 Historical Overview

In 1985, at age 12, Justine Blainey tried out for, and was subsequently offered a position on a boys' hockey team. She was later denied the opportunity to play on the team because of her sex.

According to subsection 19(2) of the Ontario Human Rights Code (OHRC) at the time, the right

to equal treatment with respect to services and facilities is not infringed where membership in an athletic organization or participation in an athletic activity is restricted to persons of the same sex (Ontario Human Rights Code, cited in Kidd, 1983: 69).

Consequently, the Ontario Hockey Association (OHA), in not granting Blainey the right to play on the team was not in violation of the Code, and therefore Blainey had no legal recourse through the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Instead, with the help of LEAF (Women's Legal Education and Action Fund), she took her case to the Divisional Court of the Supreme Court of Ontario on September 25, 1985. Blainey and LEAF argued that subsection 19(2) of the OHRC infringed section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which came into effect on April 17, 1985, precluding discrimination on the basis of sex. The court decided that although subsection 19(2) did infringe the Charter, it was of a reasonable limit and therefore constitutional.

On January 22, 1986, Blainey, with the assistance of LEAF and CAAWS, appealed the Divisional Court's decision at the Ontario Court of Appeal. On April 17, 1986, the Ontario Court of Appeal concluded that subsection 19(2) was unconstitutional and therefore could not be applied in Blainey's case. The Ontario Court of Appeal however could not order the OHA to allow Blainey to play with the boys' team as the OHA is not considered a government body and therefore not subject to the regulations of the Charter. The Ontario Human Rights Commission still could not accept the complaint either.

In May, 1986, at age 13, Justine Blainey tried out for and was offered a position on another boys' hockey team. Due to OHA policy however, she was once again refused permission to play on the team. In anticipation of the eradication of subsection 19(2), Blainey was granted the opportunity to file a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission on June 20, 1986. In December of 1986, Bill 7 was passed in the Ontario legislature eradicating subsection 19(2). On December 3, 1987, the Ontario Human Rights Commission Court of Appeal granted Blainey the right to play on a boys' hockey team.

3.2.2 Review of the Process

In June, 1982, a revised OHRC containing subsection 19(2) came into effect. Essentially, what the revised Code did was take away any legal recourse girls and women might

have through the Ontario Human Rights Commission if denied membership in a sport organization or participation in an athletic activity. The amendment to the OHRC left Blainey with only one option - section 15(1) of the Charter which states that everyone is entitled to equal treatment and equal benefit of the law without discrimination on the basis of sex.

At the time of Blainey's ordeal, the OHA worked on a "restricted integration policy", meaning that boys must play on boys' teams only, and girls are generally required to play on girls' teams unless they are under the age of 12 and "there is no comparable all-female team in the relevant geographic area" (Springate, 1987: 1-2). Despite the "restricted integration policy", 54 girls were given approval by the OHA to play on boys' teams in the 1986-87 hockey season (Springate, 1987: 9). Until Blainey however, no girl or woman over the age of 12 had sought permission to do so. Furthermore, Blainey did not apply through the OHA to play on the boys' team as she knew she would have been refused due to the fact that there were a number of Ontario Women's Hockey Association (OWHA) teams in her area.

After being refused a position on the boys' team for the 1986-87 hockey season, Blainey played on the OWHA's Scarborough Bantam team. While she maintained that there were some players on the team more skillful than herself, Blainey nonetheless sought to play on a boys' team arguing

that the hockey was more competitive than that played in the OWHA and the coaches of the boys' teams pushed their players harder. Blainey also wanted to play hockey in which body checking was allowed. Boys' teams in the Metro Toronto Hockey League (MTHL) allow body checking at age 12, whereas OWHA teams do not permit deliberate body checking except on some of the senior women's teams.

At the Ontario Human Rights Commission Board of Inquiry Hearings, the President and the Development Coordinator of the OWHA testified for that organization against Justine Blainey. The primary reason for their opposition was that they believed the structure of the OWHA would be threatened. They feared that the logical outcome, if Blainey were to succeed in her appeal, would result in boys being allowed to play on girls' teams.

They were also concerned that if a number of girls decided to follow Blainey, OWHA teams would be forced to fold due to lack of participants. Furthermore, they argued that if large numbers of young girls left the OWHA to play on boys' teams, the "feeder system" whereby, as players get older, they move up through the ranks to women's teams, would be destroyed. They feared that when the girls who left for boys' teams reached puberty and were forced to return to OWHA teams, they would find that girls'/women's hockey had become "second-rate" (Springate, 1987: 13). They also remarked that while they believe most girls prefer to

play on all-girl teams, if enough players leave, particularly the more highly skilled, the OWHA's system and credibility would be undermined. Also expressed by the OWHA representatives and others was the concern that if girls were allowed to play on boys' teams, municipal authorities might be inclined to allocate less ice time to OWHA teams. It was decided at the Hearings however, that municipalities

would not be so unreasonable as to attempt to turn back the clock and take ice time away from the organization that is, and will remain, the most important provider of organized hockey for females in Ontario, namely the OWHA (Springate, 1987: 13).

The Coordinator of the Women's Hockey Committee of the Quebec Ice Hockey Federation also argued against Blainey's appeal. Since 1978 in that province, girls have been permitted to play on boys' teams without any interference from the law. She pointed out however, that all-girl hockey teams are almost non-existent and there are not many girls playing on boys' teams. In Quebec, if girls want to play hockey, they must play on teams comprised mainly of boys. She also remarked that because so few girls have chosen this route, integrated hockey is therefore not very attractive, even when no other alternative is available. Essentially, her argument was that because of integration, girls' hockey in Quebec has suffered. More resources are put into encouraging girls to play on boys' teams than on developing girls' and women's hockey in and of itself.

In response to the OWHA's concern that integration would go "both ways" with boys infiltrating girls' teams, it was pointed out that subsection 13(1) of the OHRC which deals with "special programs", designed to assist disadvantaged people and groups, would prohibit this from happening (Springate, 1987: 5). The OWHA would qualify as a "special program" as it assists two disadvantaged groups, girls' and women, insofar as their opportunities to play hockey are concerned. Therefore, the OWHA can offer programs restricted to girls and women without being in violation of the OHRC or the Charter.

It was also determined at the Hearings, that because Ontario has, solidly in place, opportunities for girls to play hockey on all-girl teams, the situation in Quebec would not likely be repeated in Ontario. Furthermore, it was decided that while there could be some unfortunate implications for the OWHA if it was ruled that girls could play on boys' teams, the potential impact was seen to be minimal.

I am satisfied that while there may be some adverse impact on the OWHA if females are allowed to play on male teams, the impact will prove to be relatively modest (Springate, 1987: 23).

The ruling of the Ontario Human Rights Commission Board of Inquiry does not apply to any sport other than hockey (Simpson, 1988: 2). Furthermore, the decision is specific to Blainey's case, meaning that it is still possible for the OHA to deny participation to a girl wishing to play on a

boys' team (Simpson, 1988: 2). She would have to lodge a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission which would then decide whether a violation of the OHRC had actually taken place.

The ruling that the OWHA qualifies as a "special program" under subsection 13(1) of the OHRC does not apply to all girls'/women's sport either (Simpson, 1988: 2). If an organization, team or league wanted to be covered under subsection 13(1), they would have to apply through the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

3.2.3 Hegemony, the State and CAAWS

CAAWS legal support for Blainey began when Blainey appealed the Divisional Court decision at the Ontario Court of Appeal on January 22, 1986. In fact, the Toronto CAAWS group was formed around the issue. Prior to that however, CAAWS was involved in their own integrated vs. separate debates, as well as urging the Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Women's Issues at the time (1985-86), Ian Scott, to take a stand on eradicating subsection 19 (2). Through the CAAWS Newsletter, they also urged their members to support the repeal of subsection 19 (2), and the right for girls to play on boys' teams.

CAAWS' ideal in terms of the integrated/separate issue has been described as a "separate-but-equal" approach in which girls'/women's and boys'/men's sport is separate, that

is, girls/women play on girls'/women's teams, and boys/men play on boys'/men's teams. They are quick to add however, that at present, women's sport is "separate-but-second class", far from the ideal. As an organization, CAAWS argues that integration represents a step toward separate-but-equal. In other words, they argue that integration will give more opportunities to women and girls in sport and will help facilitate attitudinal change with respect to girls'/women's ability to achieve in sport. With attitudinal change, it is hoped that more opportunities in sport will be made available to girls and women and that there will be "equal" access to resources in sport for girls/women and boys/men. If this happens, then girls'/women's sport could become "separate", having the same resources as the boys/men.

Aniko Varpalotai, a CAAWS member, argued that although she favours a separate-but-equal approach, she supports integration for affirmative action purposes, viewing integration as a step towards separate-but-equal (Varpalotai, in Standing Committee on Administration of Justice, 1986).

I view integration as an important developmental step towards the achievement of real structural and social equality of opportunity. Even if legislated integration is met with resistance, each case represents the fact that equality does not yet exist. Thus the symbolic value of the repeal of subsection 19 (2) is at least as important in raising public consciousness and hopefully initiating a change of attitudes as are the practical implications (Varpalotai, cited in Standing Committee on Administration of Justice, 1986: J-20).

Aside from the definitional difficulties intrinsic to employing a concept of "equality", two important viewpoints are put forth in this statement and both are problematic. One is that integration is a step toward "equality of opportunity" and the other is that integration is synonymous with "equality".

If integration is merely a step towards "equality of opportunity", who would be the primary beneficiaries? Ostensibly, the purpose of integration is to make available the opportunity for "highly skilled" female athletes, those who are "good enough", to play on boys' teams. It would follow then that only the "highly skilled" would benefit from an "equal opportunity" system. Furthermore, if integration is synonymous with "equality", where or how does this "equality" manifest itself when girls/women are given the "right" to play on boys'/men's teams?

The notion of integration being synonymous with "equality" or "equality of opportunity" is reminiscent of individuals or groups who attempt to articulate counter ideologies only to find that the dominant ideology has become even more insidious and further entrenched. The basic premise of integration is that girls/women should have the "right" to play on teams composed primarily of boys/men. The dominant ideology in the integration issue posits boys' hockey as more competitive, more challenging, more aggressive, more highly skilled, than girls' hockey, and

these are cited as some of the reasons girls should be allowed to play on boys' teams. In other words, they are seen as desirable characteristics in the world of hockey (and other sports). The dominant ideology holds that boys' hockey is more desirable than girls' hockey, thus it has more intrinsic value as well. Consequently, it is not necessary to compare boys' hockey to girls' hockey -- boys' hockey stands on its own. In order for the dominant ideology to remain intact however, girls' hockey must be compared to boys' hockey. In other words, boys' hockey is the exemplified "male standard" to which Willis (1982) refers; it is the standard to which girls' hockey must be judged, compared and, in the case of integration, reached. The only way that this standard can be reached is for girls to be given the right to join the team. Even then, whether the standard is "reached" or not is a moot point.

The important point is that boys' hockey as the "standard" is not questioned, and neither is the dominant ideology; in fact, both are reinforced. On an ideological level, Blainey and her supporters colluded with the dominant ideology. The conditions in which girls'/women's hockey exists did not improve as a result of the final decision in the Blainey case¹, yet the state and status of boys' hockey did improve, both on a practical level and on an ideological level. On a practical level, the decision granted boys' teams access to male as well as female hockey players.

The following analysis of some of the language that was used by advocates of Blainey and the integration issue will demonstrate how, on an ideological level, individuals and groups unknowingly cooperated with the dominant ideology, thus reinforcing the notion of girls and women as inferior to boys and men.

Ian Scott, Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Women's Issues declared his support for the eradication of subsection 19(2) by stating:

Sports are an *extremely important force* in our society; we want it clearly understood that the government believes that no part of society is off limits to either *competent* women or men (Scott, cited in Ministry of the Attorney General, 1985: 2). (*italics mine*)

Sport is considered a "good" to be enjoyed by the "competent". Scott also stated:

...I find it incongruous that it, of all statutes, would deny women the chance to *prove their merit*. We believe in assuring basic rights to all our citizens, and we believe in promoting *competence*. We intend to remove artificial barriers such as this to allow individuals to achieve their *best* (1985: 2). (*italics mine*)

Both statements imply that the repeal of 19(2) and the Blainey decision will affect only the "competent", those who have the skill level required to play with the boys. The second statement also implies that by having the right to play on a boys'/men's team, girls/women will have the chance to "prove" themselves and achieve their "best".

One way that masculine hegemony is maintained in sport is by comparing women and men. The focus is on difference

with the implication being that women are different and therefore inferior. Comparisons between performance, skill levels and abilities serve to reinforce the masculinist standard as the standard, even when to do so is not intentional. For example, CAAWS sent an Action Bulletin to all of its members urging them to support integration:

(Integration) could contribute to the elimination of the myth about the inferiority of women: we would see more and more women equalling and some going beyond the performance of men (CAAWS, 1988b).

By focusing on how the "performance gap" between women and men is narrowing, it might appear that one can demonstrate that women are not "inferior" to men and that they may even surpass men in terms of performance. Yet, this merely reinforces men's performances as the "standard". Furthermore, this "standard" is something we, as women must strive to equal, or better yet, surpass.

One CAAWS member postulated that by equalizing opportunities for girls and women, more women would be able to compete on an "equal footing" with men, hence narrowing the performance gap almost to oblivion:

At this point in the history of women's sport experience and development, only a small minority of young women past puberty are able to *compete on an equal footing with men*; however, research in this area shows that the *performance gap between the sexes is narrowing rapidly*, and the importance of *equalizing opportunities* for girls to engage in the full range of physical activities from a young age is widely recognized (Lenskyj, 1985: 2). (*italics mine*)

The performance gap is representative of men's performances; the "gap" exists because of comparison. The comparison relies on a certain standard of performance - that of men.

Again, the standard itself is not questioned. In fact, the above statement indicates that one of the reasons for equalizing opportunities in sport for girls/women would be so that they can have more opportunities to reach or surpass that standard. The assumption is that "yes, we are inferior to boys and men now, but just you wait and see."

Other ways in which comparisons were made to the masculinist standard or the dominant ideology, which stresses that boys' hockey is more skillful, more challenging and just downright better than girls' hockey, are demonstrated in the following statements:

The implementation of Title IX legislation in the USA has produced over a decade of sport-related cases, many of which concerned *talented female athletes seeking entry to a male team or male athletic program in order to maximize opportunities for training and competition* (Lenskyj, 1984a: 2). (*italics mine*)

But in the meantime, those of us who have supported the efforts of females to have access to the *best sporting opportunities* for which they *qualify by ability*, even if they are to be found in male-only programs....(Kidd, 1985: 1). (*italics mine*)

Integration does not mean the disappearance of girls-only teams; it means only that those girls with the *skill and desire* will participate with boys on teams (CAAWS, 1988b). (*italics mine*)

While Blainey sits on the sidelines, fed by promises and moral support for doing the right thing the right way, she is losing the chance to *develop her skills* as only she could in the league (sic) matched to her skill (Canadian Human Rights Advocate, cited in CAAWS, 1986: 20). (*italics mine*)

In the 1986-87 hockey season, Blainey played with an OWHA bantam team composed of some players whom Blainey admitted were more skillful than herself. Although the above four

statements were ostensibly made in support of Blainey, they demonstrate collusion with the notion that boys' hockey is more skillful than girls' hockey, even if the facts in this case do not support the arguments. This is an example of a "commonsense" assumption. Blainey did not choose to play on the boys' team because she was missing a certain level of skill by playing on the girls' team,² however "commonsense" reasoning indicates that her desire to play with the boys must have been because of the assumed higher level of skill available there. After all, everyone knows that boys' hockey is more highly skilled than girls' hockey. These statements represent ideology turned into commonsense understanding, and it is this commonsense understanding that blinds individuals and groups into unintentionally colluding with the ideology they seek to abolish.

A final example of the way in which language served to further entrench the dominant ideology can be seen in a statement that deals with what Willis (1982: 122) refers to as the taking of "unarguable physical differences out of context," in order to shift the focus away from the woman's athletic abilities. One way this is done in sport is by the trivialization of women and/or their performances. In this case, the trivializing, however unintentional, took the form of shifting the focus from Blainey's quest as an athlete to her sexuality:

In truth, Blainey is probably fighting for the right of any daughters she might someday have to someday play in the OHA (Canadian Human Rights Advocate, cited in CAAWS, 1986: 20).

Not only is this statement heterosexist in its assumptions, it also serves to reduce Blainey to her reproductive capacities, a practice which is not uncommon in the sportsworld.

3.2.4 Summary

As an organization, CAAWS supported integration as a step in the process toward their ideal of separate-but-equal, thus they also supported Blainey's right to play on a boys' hockey team.³ For example, when testifying at the Ontario Court of Appeal, CAAWS cited a case in the United States in which the courts decided that both separate girls' teams and access to boys' teams are necessary to advance the position of girls and women in sport (Brodsky, 1986).

In summarizing the implications of the Blainey case and the integration issue, the ramifications on a practical and an ideological level may be further ascertained. On a practical level, Blainey's case could be viewed as a "victory" because she was granted the right to do what she wished to do, namely, to play on a boys' hockey team. As one CAAWS member stated,

A sport organization can no longer exclude a girl from play solely because of her gender. Justine's perseverance made that possible and her victory was a victory for all Canadian girls and women (Lenskyj, 1988a: 4).

On an ideological level however, whether her "victory" was truly a "victory for all Canadian girls and women", is

questionable. The decision in Blainey's case did not affect any sport other than hockey, and even then, if a female hockey player wished to play on a boys' team she could still be denied that opportunity.

The repeal of subsection 19(2) opened up the possibility for girls and women to have legal recourse if denied the opportunity to play on a boys'/men's team; it did not automatically grant them access to boys'/men's teams. Evidently, there are some "strings attached" to the meaning of the victory. Thus, the hegemonic power of the state is maintained. A concession was given by the state in the form of an amendment to the OHRC. The opposition (CAAWS and others) interpreted this as a victory, yet neither the state's hegemony nor masculine hegemony in sport was in any way threatened by the Blainey case and the repeal of 19(2). If anything, the ideological power of both were more firmly entrenched. The state continues to have jurisdiction over whether integrated sport is a reality and what form sport itself may take.

Furthermore, the Blainey case was in process as the Ontario legislature was debating whether to delete subsection 19(2). It is interesting to note that while Blainey's right to appear before the Ontario Human Rights Commission Board of Appeal was granted prior to the eradication of subsection 19(2), the final decision in the case was made after Bill 7 had been passed in the

legislature, deleting 19(2). Would the outcome have been the same had Bill 7 not been passed?

In this section, I have attempted to demonstrate how the dominant ideology which privileges boys'/men's hockey was further entrenched by CAAWS and others who supported the integration issue and Blainey. Obviously, this was not intentional collusion, but the effect was one of reinforcing the assumption that boys'/men's hockey: a) is superior to girls'/women's hockey; and b) is the standard to which girls'/women's hockey should be compared, judged, and reached. Thus, masculine hegemony in this case, was reinforced and the hegemony of the state is left intact. The state maintained its power and control throughout the process and continues to do so even though concessions were made.

The CAAWS member quoted earlier remarked that

...the symbolic value of the repeal of subsection 19(2) is at least as important in raising public consciousness and hopefully initiating a change of attitudes as are the practical implications (Varpalotai, cited in Standing Committee on Administration of Justice, 1986: J-20).

Unfortunately, with respect to the symbolic aspect of the Blainey decision and the arguments that were made in support of her case, as well as integration in general, it is unlikely that a "change of attitudes" is imminent. More likely, on an ideological level, and perhaps even on a practical level, those attitudes have been further reinforced.

The following section will deal with the role of CAAWS in the formation of the Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the ways in which CAAWS' hegemonic perspective renders it difficult, if not impossible, for the organization to engage in truly counter-hegemonic practices against the state and masculine hegemony in sport.

3.3 The Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport

3.3.1 Historical Overview

In March, 1987, officials of the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation (MTR) announced their intention to develop a provincial policy on women in sport and physical activity. The impetus for the announcement arose primarily out of the repeal of subsection 19(2) of the OHRC and the Justine Blainey case.¹

MTR representatives realized that their clients could be affected now that "discrimination on the basis of gender was no longer permitted" in sport (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, date unknown: 2). Furthermore, after the release of the federal "Women in Sport Policy" in 1986, and because of criticism the MTR had been facing from "women's advocacy groups," including CAAWS, MTR officials recognized that the time had come for a provincial policy (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, date unknown: 2).

Interestingly, while MTR representatives claimed that discrimination based on gender was no longer permitted, they concurrently "quietly advised all provincial sport associations that it was 'business as usual' until a complaint was lodged against them" (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, date unknown: 2). The repeal of subsection 19(2) meant that a woman or girl now had legal

recourse through the OHRC, however the Blainey case itself applied only to Blainey and not to any other girl, woman, facility or provincial sport association, for that matter (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, date unknown: 3). In anticipation of the Blainey victory and the possible repercussions of this, and the repeal of 19(2), the MTR started work on the policy. The first draft was compiled by and distributed to MTR personnel in June, 1987.

In July, 1987, the MTR held its first set of "client consultations." These consultations took place over a period of two days and focused on "definition of the issues" (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1987a: 2). Those who were invited to attend the meeting included MTR staff, representatives from provincial sports, fitness and recreation organizations, representatives from women's advocacy groups, including CAAWS, key staff representatives from other Ministries and "selected individual experts from the sport community" (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1987a: 2).

In August, 1987, the MTR released a second draft of the policy which was again distributed to the policy committee members in the MTR for their input. By September, 1987, a third draft of the policy had been compiled, this time for public consultation.

In October, 1987, the MTR held another set of client consultations in Toronto, London, Thunder Bay, Sudbury and Ottawa, at which the third draft was reviewed. The purpose of these consultations was to develop "specific and appropriate strategies to address the problems" (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1987a: 2). Those who were invited to attend were MTR recreation operations staff and over 500 regional clients of the MTR, including CAAWS (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1987a: 2).

Five drafts followed the September copy and were completed in January, February, March, April, and July of 1988. The MTR distributed copies of each draft to everyone who attended the consultation meetings. They were asked to submit their comments to the appropriate officials of the MTR, who would then add the revisions to the next copy of the draft.

The July, 1988 draft was the final copy of the policy to be completed. Essentially, the policy addresses some of the social and legal factors leading to lower participation rates and administrative positions held by women in comparison to men, and the ways in which the Ministry will address these "inequities" to increase the number of women involved in sport and physical activity at all levels. In the policy, the Ministry argues that structural, systemic, and attitudinal change must take place. The stated objective of the policy reads:

Women and girls in Ontario will seek and will have a full and equal range of opportunities to be participants, competitors and leaders in physical activity and sport (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1988: 2).

At the time of writing, the policy was awaiting approval by the Ontario legislature.

3.3.2 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS

In February, 1987, the CAAWS Board of Directors decided upon a "common focus" for the organization, that is:

the development and implementation of policies on girls and women in sport and physical activity at the provincial level (CAAWS, 1987a: 3).

The decision to focus on provincial policy development came about in part from research by a CAAWS member which identified the "issues" for girls and women in sport and physical activity (see Chapter Two). Work on provincial policies was also perceived by the Board as a means to bring the Board of Directors "together", that is, there would be a common focus in terms of agenda in CAAWS groups across the country. Prior to this decision however, CAAWS had been urging the provincial government to take action on developing a policy. The decision to "common focus" was a timely one as the provincial government announced its intention to develop the policy in March, 1987.

CAAWS took an active role in the development of the Ontario policy.² In May, 1987, two MTR officials attended a meeting of the Toronto CAAWS group in order to familiarize themselves with CAAWS and to hear its concerns regarding the policy. The Toronto CAAWS group sought assurance from the

MTR that the issues CAAWS thought should be addressed would be addressed, and the group volunteered to speak on behalf of women in Ontario:

This Regional group will assist in communicating the issues to women across the province so that they are able to address them from their perspective at the various Ontario regional meetings organized by the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation for the fall of 1987 (CAAWS, 1987b: 6). (emphasis in text)

CAAWS hegemonic perspective manifests itself in the way in which they claim to be the "voice" for girls and women, yet the organization speaks from the perspective of women in sport leadership positions. Consequently, CAAWS represents the "voice" for women in sport leadership positions who, in turn, represent the "voice" for girls and women in sport and physical activity. The "clients" themselves are not asked what they believe the issues to be; they are spoken on behalf of.

Maude Barlow, the keynote speaker at the 1988 CAAWS Conference, discussed CAAWS role in policy formation, remarking:

You represent the grassroots; you take the hurts and the slights and direct them into the system. You give voice to those with no voice (1988: 8). (italics mine)

In the keynote address at the 1987 CAAWS conference, a CAAWS member, in discussing CAAWS function with respect to policy stated:

If CAAWS does not serve the function of a relevant public in sport and physical activity, who will speak for girls and women in sport? (Bedingfeld, 1988: 19)

As stated in Chapter Two, it is questionable whether CAAWS actually does represent the "grassroots", when the composition of the organization's membership is considered. Furthermore, in keeping with the philosophy of CAAWS to define, promote and support a feminist perspective to advance the position of girls and women, and to improve the quality of physical activity, CAAWS places itself in a position whereby this task depends upon their voice.

The problematic aspect of this "voice" can be demonstrated further by looking at CAAWS' role in the development of the provincial policy. CAAWS views provincial policy as a tool for gaining "equality of opportunity" for girls and women in sport and physical activity.

Perhaps the primary difficulty in taking an "equality of opportunity" approach is the ambiguous meaning of the concept. For example, CAAWS argues that

in order for meaningful change to take place with and for women, the policy and implementation plan must be based on womens' (sic) experience, womens' (sic) history and womens' (sic) needs (Steele et al, 1987: 1).

An "equality of opportunity" approach is actually in contradiction to the above statement. The concept "equality of opportunity" assumes that each individual starts out on the same "footing", so to speak. It is a concept which does not take into account the fact that society consists of women of different classes, races, sexual orientations,

ages, ethnic backgrounds and abilities. Although CAAWS maintains that the policy should take into account the "disadvantaged situation" of "women of all ages, socio-economic and cultural backgrounds" (Steele et al, 1987: 3), thus seeming to account for these variables, it is unrealistic to assume that government policy, based on a notion of "equality of opportunity", could actually do this. Albeit, the policy itself promises to do this, but how one can account for all women is difficult to imagine, when the experiences, history and needs of women differ greatly depending on age, race, class, sexual orientation, ethnicity and whether the woman is able-bodied or not. Ultimately, the reality is that a particular group of people are the primary beneficiaries of an "equality of opportunity" approach: able-bodied, white individuals of mid to upper income levels, who can afford both the time and money required to be involved in organized sport and physical activity in the first place.

CAAWS took a somewhat counter-hegemonic stance in some of its responses to the various drafts of the policy.³ Closer inspection reveals however, that CAAWS achieved this only in theory, while the organization's practices remained within the confines of its own hegemonic standpoint. For example, as stated previously, concern was expressed by CAAWS that the needs of women from all socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, abilities, and ages must be addressed by the policy and that the focus of the policy should not be

elite athlete development, but should be concerned with increasing participation at all levels of the sport/physical activity system. CAAWS representatives also maintained that the policy must reflect the diversity of women's experiences:

No single stratification model adequately addresses the current status of girls and women in fitness and sport. Given the diversity of experience and opportunity, females in Ontario cannot be homogeneously defined as having similar needs, expectations and interests. (CAAWS, 1987c: 1)

On a theoretical level, CAAWS recognized the importance of including the particular and diverse circumstances of "disadvantaged" groups of women in the policy, yet as an organization, CAAWS did not reflect these interests through their membership nor through their practices, for the most part. CAAWS maintains its hegemonic perspective, and in doing so, concurrently and unintentionally cooperates with masculine hegemony in sport.

Undoubtedly, CAAWS desired a policy that would be inclusive and would focus on increasing participation among all women at all levels of sport/physical activity. The point is that while CAAWS recognized the importance of their demands, the organization's own practices often demonstrated a contrary rationale; CAAWS itself primarily serves the needs and interests of a particular population of women, represented in part, by the CAAWS Board and general membership. Consequently, in theory, CAAWS was able to assume a somewhat counter-hegemonic stance, yet in practice, the organization maintained a hegemonic perspective.

When the Board of CAAWS decided to focus on provincial policy development, they were aware that there would be limitations in terms of what could actually be achieved through policy. Furthermore, they maintained this stand throughout the policy development process. However, the language that is employed in the CAAWS literature gives the sense of a greater hope in policy. For example, in referring to the "common focus" and policy development, one CAAWS member remarked:

We now have a focus and an agenda which will direct our energies toward *effectively changing the situation* for girls and women in sport and physical activity (McDonald, 1987: 3). (*italics mine*)

First of all, this statement reflects the hegemonic position of CAAWS in facilitating change; the organization will take part in "effectively changing the situation for girls and women..." Policy or not, this is a grandiose task. Furthermore, it is unlikely that CAAWS could achieve this objective precisely because they claim to be the "voice" for all women, when in reality they speak for only a small segment of the population. CAAWS' assumption of this, and the organization's subsequent work in policy development, are examples of the unintentional way in which the organization actually supports masculine hegemony in sport and the state's power in controlling women's sport. Secondly, although it is plausible that a policy in action is better than no policy at all, the limitations of policy must also be considered.

CAAWS was concerned primarily with the implementation of the policy. The definition of concepts employed in the written document, for example, was seen by CAAWS to be crucial in order for the policy to be implemented properly. In the September, 1987 draft of the policy, it was stated:

The Ministry believes that girls' and womens' (sic) experience, achievements and performance in sport and physical activity should be valued equally with that of boys' and men's (p. 6)

Some members of CAAWS claimed that the meaning of this statement was problematic in that it seemed to suggest that the existing male model of sport is valuable and should be valued and, as a result, girls/women should try to emulate boys/men (Steele et al, 1987). Clearly, this is an example of a counter-hegemonic claim, as this group of women from CAAWS were arguing that, ideologically, a masculinist standard may not be the ideal and that "equality" may not mean being "just like the boys." Interestingly, despite the concern over the statement, it was not removed from the policy, nor altered.

The analysis of the statement exemplifies an apparent contradiction in CAAWS' praxis. Theoretically, the organization is able, at times, to assume a somewhat counter-hegemonic standpoint, however for the most part, in practice, the organization cooperates with and maintains a masculine hegemonic perspective. Consequently, it can be argued that CAAWS compromised its counter-hegemonic analysis by maintaining a hegemonic standpoint in practice; CAAWS supports a policy which will primarily benefit a particular

group of women and which does not question masculine hegemony in sport.

In order to assist individuals "working for change at all levels of the physical activity delivery system" (CAAWS, 1989a: 9), some CAAWS Board members developed a resource handbook for policy development. Essentially, the handbook discusses strategy, the writing of policy, the implementation plan and monitoring of policy from a "woman-centered" perspective. The fact that CAAWS recognized the need for such a guide indicates the organization's wariness of the government system and process and could therefore be considered a somewhat counter-hegemonic activity. Unfortunately, the final draft of the guide was never completed and therefore not distributed due to staff and Board changes following a withdrawal of funding monies by Secretary of State Women's Program.

In the policy handbook, CAAWS claims that the barriers to "gender equality"⁴ are institutional and attitudinal. CAAWS envisions policy as one method of removing these barriers:

Institutional barriers to women's equality can be removed. Policy development and implementation can address such tangible aspects of women's oppression. Attitudinal barriers may also be addressed in policy when referring to images, leaders, education, etc., however it is difficult to legislate how one thinks. This aspect of change takes time (CAAWS, 1988c: 4).

Evidently, CAAWS believes that to work within the system is one method of creating change. Whether change on the scale

that CAAWS would have desired is possible through government policy is questionable.

3.3.3 Hegemony and the Role of the State

CAAWS was generally pleased with the way in which their comments and criticisms were received by the MTR. In fact, in addition to representatives from the MTR personally attending a Toronto CAAWS meeting, an extra meeting for CAAWS representatives only, was added to the agenda at the July consultation meetings. Furthermore, throughout the policy process CAAWS was, and still is, in communication with the MTR.

There is no doubt that CAAWS had an impact on the policy, but was there a cost involved? In response to the question, "How successful do you think CAAWS was in incorporating its feminist philosophy into provincial policy?", one CAAWS Board member replied:

I think that in the Ontario case there's been some limited success. I don't think that the Ontario policy would have gone as far as it went without the influence of CAAWS.

When asked to elaborate on her second statement, she replied that throughout the development of the policy, CAAWS took the "more radical end of a critiquing stance", and that because CAAWS is perceived in the sport community to be a "radical" voice, their responses to the policy were expected. She also maintained that because CAAWS took this stance,

...it allowed for other groups to go further in their own critique and their own analysis and it felt safe for them to do that because we were even further than them.

Another Board member commented on how CAAWS was viewed in the sport community to be a "radical" organization, but added that this was not remarkable as any organization which deals specifically with women and sport issues would be viewed as "radical".

Another Board member stated:

...the fact that CAAWS actually made an impact (on the policy) says something. Several years ago, CAAWS wouldn't have been heard or invited or listened to. So, I think our image is changing somewhat. I mean, back then, we really did appear to be a very radical organization and somewhat irrelevant to government concerns. They didn't think we were at all representative. But I guess, I'm not exactly sure what made a change. Maybe it was our persistence. Maybe it was the fact that they read some of the things that we actually wrote and produced and they were more impressed by the material than by the individuals they had been in contact with.

When asked to elaborate on how CAAWS image has changed, this same CAAWS member replied:

...I think that we've learned a lot. We've got different ways of doing it now....we know that certain strategies won't work and so we have to, I guess, be a bit more soft and refined about how we approach these people and make contacts with them that are less intimidating.

In the interview, this individual did not give the impression that she thought CAAWS compromised itself in any way over the years and particularly in their work on policy. She claimed that there are women in CAAWS now who are perhaps even more radical than they were previously, but

that they have learned to be more strategic and clearer as to what their own agenda is.

While she remarked on how CAAWS was surprisingly well received by Ministry personnel, this Board member also pointed out that CAAWS had altered their approach, becoming "more soft and refined" and "less intimidating". Furthermore, when asked the question, "How successful do you think CAAWS was in incorporating its feminist philosophy into provincial policy?", she replied that she was not sure how "feminist" the policy actually was.

Whether CAAWS compromised itself remains questionable. What is also questionable is whether the "more soft and refined"⁵ approach is a strategic tactic or merely compromising one's stand on an issue. Furthermore, in employing such concepts as "equality" and "equality of opportunity", is CAAWS compromising itself to the language of those in power, thus in turn compromising their own agenda?; who really benefits from an "equality of opportunity" approach?

Previously, I discussed the way in which CAAWS assumed a somewhat counter-hegemonic standpoint when referring to how, on an ideological level, the policy should not condone the idea that a masculinist model of sport is that which girls/women desire. On an ideological level, the statement referred to, as well as many others made throughout the

policy, are problematic also because the arguments put forth rely on comparison between girls/women and boys/men. The last section of the statement to which CAAWS objected claimed that girls'/women's experience, achievements and performance "should be valued equally with that of boys' and men's." (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1987b: 6). Evidently, boys'/men's sport is granted a certain value and the objective is to have girls'/women's sport "equally" valued, no more and no less. As the CAAWS critique of the statement suggests, boys'/men's sport represents the standard, and the goal is to get girls'/women's sport to that standard.

Comparison is used in the policy to uncover the "inequalities" in sport in terms of participation rates and administration positions held. The following excerpts from statements made in the policy will demonstrate the way in which this comparison was manifested: "...fewer females than males are involved in physical activity programs...;" "...more males compete in more events...;" "...less than 30% of the sport managers in Ontario are female" (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, 1988: 1). Again, there is a standard to which the statistics for women are compared and that standard is represented by the statistics for men. This is hardly surprising; the objective of the policy is for girls/women in Ontario to "have full and equal range of opportunities..." (Ontario Ministry of Tourism and

Recreation, 1988: 2). From an ideological standpoint the question to be asked is: "Equal to whom?"

Any notion of "equality" relies on comparison to a certain level or standard. In this case, that standard is boys'/men's sport. Ideologically, the concept of "policy" itself can be considered problematic as in order to justify its own existence, the fact that there is "inequality" in sport must be taken into account and demonstrated. Consequently, the policy must rely on comparison which results in the reinforcement of the masculinist standard.

Through the interviews, it was clear that CAAWS was generally pleased with the final policy, although as stated previously, concern was expressed over the implementation plan. As one member remarked, it is how the policy is actually implemented that will be the "proof of the pudding". Another member stated that the implementation plan was fairly broad, whereas CAAWS wanted it to be more specific. She expressed concern that important questions have not yet been addressed by the MTR such as: Who is responsible for the policy's implementation?; Who actually supported the policy within the Ministry?; What is the scope of the policy and its implementation?; What government dollars are attached to the implementation?; and, How much power is attached to the policy itself and its implementation?⁶

These questions and concerns are relevant, as a policy is obviously meaningless if it is not implemented. Interestingly, at the time of writing, the policy and its implementation still await passing in the Ontario legislature. The delay has been due to a number of factors. Since the repeal of 19(2) and the Blainey victory, there are legal implications that will undoubtedly affect the policy, and these are being reviewed with a "fine tooth comb" (Varpalotai and Shantz, 1989: 14). As one CAAWS member remarked

...the Justine Blainey case has certainly given legal precedence and legal strength to all of this, so its not just a policy by itself. It's got legal connotations.

Furthermore, an MTR official involved in the development of the policy, stated that one of the difficulties the Attorney General's office was having with the policy involved definitional problems of some of the concepts, such as, "how integrated is integrated?"

Another stated reason for the delay was that the idea for the policy to be government-wide instead of just affecting clients of the MTR, was being debated. If the policy did become a government-wide policy, then its effects would obviously be more far-reaching.

In an article in the Toronto Globe and Mail, a former CAAWS member discussed the possibility that the delay of the policy is actually due to its potential implications for Toronto's bid to house the 1996 Olympics (Robinson, 1990:

C-11)). Although the MTR denies that Toronto's bid is the cause of the delay, undoubtedly if the policy had been passed, Toronto would not be able to house the Olympics. After all, the Olympics do not provide "equal opportunities" for women and men to compete.

Interestingly, the creation of the policy was constantly under the supervision and control of the MTR. That the initial policy was drafted by the policy committee of the MTR and distributed amongst Ministry personnel only, demonstrates the initial control the MTR had over the policy which incidently they were able to maintain throughout. Although individuals and organizations were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the various drafts, ultimately it was the MTR who had the final say of what went into the policy and what did not.

Consequently, it is the state which has the final say, in terms of when and if the policy is passed and how it will be implemented, thus it is the state that ultimately has hegemonic power. This hegemonic power is particularly blatant if the delay is due, fully or in part, to Toronto's inability to house the Olympics if the policy is passed; it demonstrates the way in which what appear to be "gains" made in sport and physical activity by and for women actually end up reaffirming the dominance of the state.

A hegemonic group maintains its power even though concessions are made to subordinate groups. In this case, the concession is the development of the provincial policy. While the policy appears to be a positive move on the part of government in addressing women's concerns, it is the state that ultimately has direct control over the policy. Consequently, the dominance of the state is not threatened and its hegemony remains intact; perhaps it is even slightly more entrenched.

3.3.4 Summary

The purpose of this section has been to demonstrate how CAAWS, through their involvement in the development of the Ontario Policy, unintentionally contributed to masculine hegemony in sport and the hegemony of the state and yet at times, was able to articulate somewhat counter-hegemonic analyses of the policy. The organization's ability to engage in counter-hegemonic practices however, is deconstructed by their hegemonic standpoint.

Undoubtedly, there exist difficulties in assuming a counter-hegemonic approach while working directly within the system, in this case, provincial policy development. In other words, it is questionable how counter-hegemonic an organization can be when they must work for change within the confines of established hegemonic structures and systems. The hegemonic power of the state is exemplified by

the fact that it remains in control of the passing and subsequent implementation of the policy.

Ideologically, to seek equality in sport for women is problematic, not only because notions of "equality" engender comparison and the subsequent reforms primarily benefit a certain segment of the population, but also because sport itself is intrinsically problematic. In other words, with respect to counter-hegemonic practices, perhaps challenges to the institution of sport and to state policies with alternative strategies for change might be preferable to seeking "equality".

In the following section, the CAAWS Breakthrough Awards are discussed. These awards symbolize the hegemonic elitism of the organization and further illustrate the organization's lack of contact with the "grassroots".

3.4 The Breakthrough Awards

3.4.1 Introduction

CAAWS initiated the celebration of the Breakthrough Awards in 1986. These awards are funded by Fitness and Amateur Sport (F&AS) Women's Program. They

identify, recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of an individual or group who through their actions have challenged the perceptions of the traditional limits attributed to women and girls in sport and physical activity, and in doing so have empowered the women and girls to more fully participate in sport and physical activity (CAAWS, 1990a).

Until 1988, there were three categories for award presentation: 1) Individual/Participant; 2) Media; and, 3) Organization. In 1989, a fourth category was added, the "Herstorical". CAAWS claims that this award differs from other sports awards in that it is not necessarily an award for outstanding performance by an elite athlete, but that its aim is

to honour excellence and leadership by a Canadian woman involved in sport or fitness or recreational pursuits (CAAWS, 1987d: 8).

Recipients of the award are nominated by CAAWS members who are requested to choose individuals for each of the four categories. The final selection is made by a group of CAAWS members.

3.4.2 The Winners

The following is a list of the Breakthrough Award winners since 1986:

1986

Individual/Participant - Sharon Wood (first North American woman to climb Mount Everest).

Media - Chatelaine Magazine (which "line for line, provides the most extensive coverage of women's sports, fitness and recreational activities in Canada" (CAAWS, 1987d: 8)).

Organization - Lloyd's Bank (which contributed \$100,000 to Sharon Wood's climb).

1987

Individual/Participant - Justine Blainey (hockey player, who was granted the "right" to play on a boys' hockey team).

Media - Sally Armstrong (Associate Editor of Canadian Living Magazine for her work in presenting "alternative and empowering" images of women in physical activity (CAAWS, 1989b)).

Organization - none awarded

1988

Individual/Participant - Betty Baxter (feminist activist; supporter of opportunities and alternatives for girls and women in sport and physical activity; founding member of CAAWS).

Media - Broadside - A Feminist Review (has helped to raise awareness of girls' and women's struggles and achievements in sport and physical activity).

Organization - City of Ottawa, Women in Sport (a program with a mandate to provide sport opportunities for girls and women who have not previously been involved in organized sport).

1989

Individual/Participant - Andrea Borys (Associate Dean of Education, University of Alberta - for her efforts in ensuring gender equality).

Media - Catherine Ford (Associate Editor, The Calgary Herald - for her efforts in increasing the quality and quantity of coverage of women's sports).

Organization - Women's Representative Committee of the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) - (for their work in improving the status of women in the CIAU at all levels).

Herstorical - Helen Gurney (since the 1940's, she has struggled for full participation of girls and women in sport and physical activity; for her creation of an archive on women's interuniversity athletics at the University of Toronto; for her research on girls and women's sport; for her work in creating the CWIAA, Sport Ontario and the Women's Program of Fitness and Amateur Sport; representative for all women high school coaches).

1990

Individual/Participant - Vicki Keith (long distance swimmer - has set 17 new world records for women and men).

Media - Linda Walker (sportscaster with STV in Saskatoon - has helped to increase awareness and appreciation of university women's and men's basketball and volleyball).

Organization - The Rick Hansen Centre (in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies at the University of Alberta - training centre for physically disabled athletes - has assessed and trained 225 women with disabilities).

Herstorical - Helen Lenskyj (founding member of CAAWS; a well known Canadian feminist sport researcher).

Undoubtedly, the five recipients of the individual/participant category of the Breakthrough Award have "challenged the perceptions of the traditional limits attributed to women and girls in sport and physical activity" through their athletic accomplishments or advocacy work. The winners in the other categories have also made valuable contributions to girls'/women's sport and physical activity. Interestingly though, two of the recipients were founding members of CAAWS, and four winners received the award for work they are doing or have done concerning university athletics, including the television sportscaster.

3.4.3 Hegemony and the Role of CAAWS

Ostensibly, CAAWS role, in part, is to represent the "grassroots". The "grassroots" have not yet been present in the celebration of the Breakthrough Awards, yet CAAWS claims that they could be:

(T)he winner could be a competitive athlete who garnered acclaim on the Canadian, Olympic or world scene for her unusual or remarkable or record-setting achievement. The winner could be a coach, a teacher at any level from high school to Olympics who inspires Canadian females to challenge themselves physically and mentally, or a sports administrator, a women's rights activist, a health leader and a housewife (CAAWS, 1987e: 8).

Perhaps unintentionally on the part of CAAWS, the above statement nonetheless denotes a hierarchical structure; on the top is the elite "Olympic", "record-setting" athlete and on the bottom is the "housewife". A "housewife" has not yet been among the Breakthrough Award recipients.

Of the athletes who have won the award, all would be considered, in terms of performance, to be at an elite level. The organizations which have won, excluding Lloyd's Bank, have helped to increase participation and/or improve the status of girls/women in sport and physical activity. The media winners have helped to increase the quantity and quality of the exposure of girls/women in sport and physical activity. The winners in the herstorical category have, through research and various other activities, helped to increase awareness of the situation of girls/women in sport and physical activity.

It is evident that the work of these individuals and organizations has benefitted many girls and women, however the participants themselves are, once again, not the focus. Instead, the award recipients or "leaders" in the sport/physical activity scene are the focus, the subjects, while the participants or the beneficiaries of the work of these individuals or organizations are relegated to object status; the objects of the work of the subjects. One CAAWS member stated that the purpose of the Breakthrough Award is "to honour *excellence and leadership* by Canadian women" (Lenskyj, 1988a: 4). (*italics mine*) Undoubtedly, this is exactly what the award has so far accomplished.

The fact that a corporation, Lloyd's Bank, won a Breakthrough Award, is significant. At the time, CAAWS, as an organization, did not question the practice.¹ In fact, CAAWS considered the role of corporations important in advancing the position of women in sport:

Recognition of and financial support for their endeavours by the media and the corporate sector are equally important factors in making sure breakthroughs continue in the future (CAAWS, 1987d: 8).

In an article written for Broadside magazine and in a letter to the CAAWS Newsmagazine, a CAAWS member objected to the award going to a corporation:

(H)ow can a feminist organization reconcile its feminist principles, and, one would hope, its socialist leanings, with the gesture of granting an award to a corporation. Any North American corporation, by definition, is almost certain to be an accomplice in the exploitation of women, working class people, and racial and ethnic minorities (Lenskyj, 1988b: 2).

Furthermore, she maintained that while Chatelaine may indeed have provided the most extensive coverage, line for line, for women's sport and fitness activities, feminist magazines such as Broadside and Kinesis which "cover many of the political issues related to women's sport" should also be considered as potential recipients of the award (Lenskyj, 1988a: 4; 1988b: 2). Interestingly, since Lenskyj's objection, a corporation has not won the award, and in 1988, Broadside magazine was the recipient of the media award.

As previously stated, nominations for award recipients are made by CAAWS members, yet it is a selected group of CAAWS members who make the final decision. In 1988 for example, the CAAWS office received only ten nominations. Evidently, the final decision remains in the hands of the selected individuals from CAAWS. The few nominations received suggests that the general CAAWS membership does not have a significant impact on the decision. What is problematic is the fact that over the years, CAAWS has not received a large number of nominations from its membership, yet the "illusion" is given to the general membership that they are the decision-makers in terms of who wins the awards.

3.4.4 Summary

The purpose of the above discussion has been to demonstrate an aspect of the hegemonic position of CAAWS relative to their "clients" - girls and women in sport and

physical activity. While the Breakthrough Awards do bring much deserved recognition to women who have made significant contributions to girls'/women's involvement in sport and physical activity, they nonetheless honour a particular population of women. In fact, thus far, all of the recipients have been white, able-bodied women.² Interestingly, the backgrounds (socioeconomic, class, education, athletic) of the award recipients, for the most part, are similar to the backgrounds of the Board and general membership of CAAWS. Furthermore, not only is there an exclusive population of award recipients evident, the access to the Awards Banquet itself is exclusive. At the 1990 Breakthrough Awards celebration, for example, tickets cost \$30.00 per person to attend (CAAWS, 1990b).

CAAWS' hegemonic position is demonstrated not only by the way in which recipients of the awards are chosen, but also in who is chosen. That CAAWS is not representative of the groups of girls/women they claim to speak on behalf of, is evident in the group of women they choose to receive their Breakthrough Awards.

CAAWS supports its own hegemonic perspective, thus rendering it difficult, if not impossible, for the organization to engage in practices which run counter to masculine hegemony in sport. The Breakthrough Awards, for the most part, celebrate "elitism", a practice which is prevalent in masculinist sport. Instead of celebrating the

majority of girls and women who are not from the high performance sport system, sport leadership positions, or in media, CAAWS continues the masculinist practice of honouring only the "best"; the "leaders" in the field.

In the following section, two separate events involving the CAAWS Newsmagazine are discussed. The first illustrates the organization's lack of connection to the "grassroots" while the second highlights one way in which CAAWS compromised its own agenda. Both exemplify how the organization has unintentionally cooperated with masculine hegemony and the hegemony of the state.

3.5 The CAAWS Newsmagazine

3.5.1 Introduction

Funded by Fitness and Amateur Sport (F&AS) Women's Program, the CAAWS newsmagazine is the only publication in Canada which focuses on women in sport and physical activity. It began as a quarterly publication in 1982, until 1985, when it was reduced to three times per year. In 1988-89, the newsmagazine was produced bi-yearly.

The purpose of the CAAWS newsmagazine is primarily for communication within the organization and to those outside of it:

(It) is the organization's central tool for internal and external communication. It provides in depth discussion around issues of concern to women involved in sport and physical activity. In addition, regular columns provide updates for what is happening across the country and what developments are occurring in the priority projects identified by CAAWS (CAAWS, 1989c).

CAAWS members and non-members are invited to submit works for publication in the newsmagazine.

The newsmagazine was first entitled the "CAAWS Newsletter", until the Summer, 1987 issue, when it became known as "The Starting Line: Women and Sport". The name was changed slightly for the following issue, Winter, 1987, when it became known as "The Starting Line: Women and Sport - Physical Activity". At the 1988 Annual General Meeting, it was announced that CAAWS would be creating yet another title and look for the newsmagazine:

CAAWS is working hard at developing its image in the public's eye as a well-organized; positive; progressive association (CAAWS, 1988d).

As a result, the Spring, 1989 issue was entitled, "Action - The Newsmagazine of Women in Sport and Physical Activity", and the newsmagazine continues to be referred to as such. One Board member interviewed stated that CAAWS was attempting to move away from an emphasis solely on competitive sport ("The Starting Line") in terms of the content of the newsmagazine toward a physical activity/fitness orientation (Action).

3.5.2 Coaches, Lesbians and CAAWS

Two specific events involving the newsmagazine will be discussed in this section. The first will illustrate how CAAWS is out of contact with the "grassroots". The second will demonstrate one way in which CAAWS has compromised itself in order to uphold its "image in the public's eye", hence limiting the organization's potential for engaging in practices which run counter to the hegemony of the state and masculine hegemony in sport.

3.5.3 The Coach

The Fall, 1985 CAAWS Newsletter carried an article entitled, "Field hockey prospects clouded by coaching issue", written by Lynne Tyler, a CAAWS member and member of the production staff of the Newsletter. Essentially, the article deals with the process employed in firing the coach of the National women's field hockey team in June of 1985. Tyler (1985: 16) points out how coaches live in an

"unpredictable environment" with unclear hiring and firing procedures set by the federal and provincial sport governing bodies.

She proceeds to discuss the potential reasons for the coach's dismissal. She states that the Canadian team went into the 1984 Olympics ranked second in the world, but tied for third place. In speaking with the Canadian Women's Field Hockey Association (CWFHA) president, Tyler learned that while the president denied that Canada's placing in the Olympics had anything to do with the coach being fired, the vice-president of the CWFHA stated that she was unsure whether the team's placing did not affect the decision to fire the coach.

Tyler adds that after the Olympics, the coach had the responsibility of deciding which players were to remain on the team, and which players would be asked to leave. Tyler is critical of the fact that as the coach was deciding which players would be on the team, the CWFHA had the athletes fill out a questionnaire evaluating the coach's performance. Tyler cites the coach's objection to the procedure:

(Y)ou don't put a questionnaire in front of an athlete who has just been dropped from the national team and expect a rational response (Marina van der Merwe, cited in Tyler, 1985: 16).

Tyler (1985: 16-17) agreed:

(T)he performance appraisal process was, at the very least, inadequate. The reliance on the questionnaire to athletes, especially at a time when they were under great emotional stress, seems an excessively narrow base.

Tyler discusses how, after pressure from Sport Canada, and some individuals on the CWFHA Executive, the evaluation procedure of the coach was expanded to include views of the national team technical staff (medical staff, regional coaches). More positive assessments of the coach were put forth by these respondents.

Nevertheless, the Canadian Team Development Committee still recommended that she be fired. Sport Canada intervened again and suggested that its guidelines for performance appraisal be employed. Furthermore, they suggested that she remain the coach of the team until October, 1985, at which time a decision would be made. The Board of the CWFHA rejected Sport Canada's suggestion and fired the coach. Although she reapplied for the position and was chosen by the selection committee as the only qualified candidate, the Board refused to hire her.

Tyler (1985: 18) claims that the athletes' questionnaire responses "referred primarily to lack of communication with the coach, and insufficient tactical growth and development." She maintains however, that the unfair method of evaluating the coach overrides these concerns, and argues that

(a) training program can always be improved, but it is difficult to achieve progress without a clear and workable process for evaluating coaching performance.

Tyler (1985: 19) concludes the article by stating that the process employed in performance appraisals of coaches is problematic in other national sport governing bodies as well, leaving coaches "vulnerable to vague and conflicting expectations, or worse, the whim of the Board."

A letter written by Phyllis Ellis, a member of Canada's Olympic field hockey team, appeared in the following issue of the CAAWS Newsletter (Spring, 1986). She claimed that Tyler and CAAWS had neglected the athletes in the field hockey dispute:

When I read this article I felt very sad. Not because of the content or quotations...but because of the *neglect for the female athletes involved* on (sic) the 'field hockey dispute'. I want to know that CAAWS believes in the advancement of all women in sport, *not just women they choose to support* (Ellis, 1986: 4). (italics mine)

Ellis (1986: 4) stated that CAAWS should have spoken with the athletes involved in order to understand their position:

The most important thing I want to tell you is that there are women in sport that need your understanding and support. Simply acknowledging our credibility by asking our opinions might have helped you understand us. We are part of you. Don't detach us by misunderstanding....Please don't make us feel that the feminist perspective is something we must earn and please don't narrow your focus such that you only support the cause of one woman at the expense of so many others.

Tyler (1986) responded to the letter as it appeared in the CAAWS Newsletter, explaining that she attempted to provide several views on the situation and that she had tried to contact the athletes themselves but was unable to reach anyone. Furthermore, she maintained that the purpose of the

article was to critique the process in evaluating and firing a coach and not to take sides.

In speaking with one of the athletes on the team, I learned of some of the difficulties the players had with the coach. This particular individual stated that the coach left the selection of the Olympic team until just four weeks before the 1984 Olympics, and even then,

decisions and selections, we used to say, mattered more on the colour of your eyes than it did on playing ability.

She maintained that players were discouraged from questioning the coach's methods:

I was always one of the athletes that would question. When the coach said, 'Jump', a lot of athletes would say, 'How high?'; some of us would say, 'Why?'

To this, the coach would respond, "You never ask 'Why'."

This particular player was cut from the team which played in the 1984 Olympics. Following the Olympics, eight of the eighteen athletes on the Olympic team were cut and subsequently had their carding rescinded.¹

The athletes who were dismissed from the team decided to challenge the decision and urged the Board of Directors of the CWFHA to fire the coach. The athlete interviewed claimed that 13 or 14 of the 18 members of the Olympic squad called for the firing of the coach. The Board agreed with the athletes and subsequently fired the coach. In October of 1985 however, Sport Canada intervened, threatening to

withdraw funding to the CWFHA if the coach was fired. According to the athlete interviewed, the CWFHA Board was given an ultimatum by Sport Canada: listen to the athletes, fire the coach and their funding would be withdrawn, or keep the coach, get rid of the athletes and the funding would be maintained.

In concurrence with Phyllis Ellis, who wrote the letter to CAAWS, the former team member interviewed argued that if CAAWS had communicated with the athletes involved, the article would have been better balanced. Furthermore, she insisted that CAAWS might have been able to assist the athletes in some way:

That was the first time that athletes were trying to take control, and organizing in a collective way as a union....We were the first group...to really try to challenge the nature of high performance sport in the country.

She maintains that CAAWS' lack of communication with the athletes is part of a larger problem in CAAWS, that is, their lack of connectedness to the "grassroots" in general. Furthermore, she added that when a group of athletes attempts to "challenge the fundamental basis under which sport is being governed by its management/worker relationship", CAAWS cannot address the issue other than to maintain a management perspective because of their liberal feminist roots. She also commented on CAAWS' lack of social/historical analysis; that is, in the work that CAAWS does, there is no attempt at addressing the social/historical conditions leading

to the development of why a group of athletes are saying, 'No, we aren't going to sign this contract; we are going to fight this coach. We are going to fight until we have control over our working conditions'.

Subsequent to the Newsletter article, the athletes chose not to have CAAWS involved in their organizing.

Tyler's article does appear to be somewhat biased toward the coach. Tyler claims that she attempted unsuccessfully to reach the athletes involved, yet without their direct input, this bias is nevertheless even more evident. The comments of the athlete interviewed indicate CAAWS' lack of contact with the "grassroots",² including contact with elite athletes such as these, who tend to be more visible than non-elite athletes. This lack of connection is made particularly apparent by the fact that on the cover of the CAAWS Newsletter in which the article by Tyler appears, is a photograph of two women playing field hockey. One of the women is Phyllis Ellis, who wrote the subsequent letter, and who was one of the key athletes involved in organizing against the coach. Had CAAWS been aware of this, it is doubtful whether this photograph would have been chosen for the cover.

Tyler stated that her purpose in writing the article was to critique the process used in evaluating and firing a coach. In so doing, with the coach as the focus, she assumed a "management" perspective on the issue, and, as the athlete interviewed remarked, because CAAWS is grounded in liberal feminism, it would follow that the perspective of

"management" (coach) as opposed to "worker" (athlete) is the position that CAAWS would assume. Furthermore, as has been argued throughout this thesis, because CAAWS relies on leaders and administrators in the sport/physical activity world to define the work that CAAWS does, it is hardly surprising that the position of the coach as "leader" is the focus of CAAWS; her dilemma is the point of reference for the organization. She is "subject"; the athletes are "other". CAAWS' work may benefit the coach in the long run, but at what expense to the athletes involved?

3.5.4 The "Lesbian Issue"

In 1988, the CAAWS Board decided that an issue of the newsmagazine would deal specifically with lesbianism in sport, including articles dealing with sexuality in general. The idea sparked quite a controversy among Board members, particularly around the "image" of CAAWS. In fact, the Board decided to delay the lesbian issue of the newsmagazine as CAAWS was about to embark on a membership drive.

Furthermore, the Board deemed it inappropriate to entitle this particular issue of the newsmagazine, the "lesbian" issue. Instead, they designated it the "sexuality" issue, and, as one Board member stated, there was disagreement among Board members:

...it did eventually turn into the 'sexuality' issue because everybody said...I can still remember them saying, 'Well, you didn't want to have something sitting on your desk that would be like this, with 'The Lesbian Issue' on it. Of course, some of us said, 'Why not?' Or others would say, you know the CAAWS

newsmagazine is sent out like this, right (with the recipient's address on the back cover), 'Oh, well you'd have to put it in a wrapper then, because some women wouldn't want that landing on their desk'.

In 1989, Secretary of State Women's Program cut CAAWS' funding (and other women's organizations) by 15 %. At that time, CAAWS was informed by Secretary of State that they were not as representative of women/girls as they claimed to be, and that in order to continue to receive Secretary of State funding, their membership must be expanded to include women of colour, disabled women, older women and women from various socioeconomic backgrounds. Consequently, the Board of CAAWS oriented itself toward increasing the organization's membership.

The CAAWS newsmagazine is one of the organization's major communication devices. As one CAAWS member stated, the newsmagazine, is "the most visible part of what CAAWS does....(I)t is where we have our most public visibility." The CAAWS Board, therefore, concluded that the newsmagazine could be used as one method of increasing membership.

When some members of the Board motioned that an issue of the newsmagazine be devoted to lesbianism/sexuality, other Board members rejected the idea, claiming that the sensitive nature of the topic of sexuality would conflict with the organization's attempt to increase membership. As one member remarked:

(T)o launch into something like sexuality and sport is probably a *very touchy subject* and the idea is to

establish a *good rapport* with all our readers....and then once they're *comfortable* with our orientation, our feminist orientation, in the way that we talk about ourselves, in the work that we do, and the women that we want to help in terms of our advocacy roles - that once people are comfortable with that, then we can go on to this; this really crucial issue of sexuality and participation in sport.

According to this member of CAAWS, the issue of sexuality and sport is "crucial", however it is also a "touchy" subject and one with which readers may not feel "comfortable". Consequently, in order to establish a "good rapport" and to increase the number of people interested in CAAWS, the idea of launching into sexuality and sport issues must be contentious at best. Another CAAWS member claimed that

we have to be *sensitive* to the kinds of concerns our potential membership has and I don't think we want to *scare anybody away*. I think they're important issues but I think we do have to be careful that we don't go *overboard* on certain issues at the expense of *everyday kinds of issues* that *concern a lot more women* who aren't as deep into feminism and all of the surrounding issues.

This member believes that because of the "sensitive" nature of sexuality, CAAWS would be going "overboard" if it were to deal with such an issue during a membership drive. Instead, she maintains that "everyday kinds of issues that concern a lot more women" override the issue of sexuality. Apart from the fact that sexuality is an "everyday" kind of issue and concerns all women, it is interesting to note that the "Feminist Leadership Perspective" issue of the newsmagazine replaced publication of the sexuality issue. It is unlikely that "leadership" issues are more "everyday" issues and "concern a lot more women" than sexuality issues.

The question that arises from this discussion is whether CAAWS compromised itself in any way by postponing the sexuality issue given the statements by CAAWS members cited above. One member agreed that CAAWS has compromised itself in order to gain members but adds that this

is a part of the *maturing process* of CAAWS; that we are more concerned about our *image* and how we come across and the kinds of people we attract to join CAAWS. So, we've had to make some compromises along the way and that goes part and parcel with having to get government funding, and you know, and being a liberal feminist organization.

This member is astutely aware of the fact that to be a liberal feminist organization and to accept government funding means that one must make compromises. Interestingly, concern about CAAWS "image" is seen as part of the "maturing process" of the organization, and one cannot help but wonder if there is any connection between the postponement of the sexuality issue and the "kinds of people" CAAWS would like to attract as members.

While it is evident that some members believe that CAAWS did compromise itself, that compromise was considered acceptable. The concern over increasing membership superceded the motion to release the sexuality issue during the membership drive. This is not to say that there were no conflicts among Board members. Some believed the issues of sexuality/lesbianism to be crucial in discussing women and sport, while others did not want to dedicate an entire issue of the newsmagazine to either sexuality or lesbianism. In fact, one member, referring to an earlier newsmagazine

article entitled, "In Support of Choice" (Lenskyj, 1988c), which dealt with reproductive choice and freedom of sexual expression (lesbianism), assumed that sexuality had already been dealt with, so why do it again?...

Another Board member, who was in support of dealing with the issue, stated:

...the word 'lesbian' always comes to people's mind(s), either spoken or thought, when you're talking about women and sport. And therefore, we felt that we needed to be in the fore, be really up-front and talk about the issues for straight and lesbian women in sport, around this whole notion that women and sport equals lesbian.

Despite the protests of some Board members, the fact remains that CAAWS did make a compromise to the extent that the sexuality issue was delayed.³ Was there a cost to CAAWS in making this compromise? Perhaps the greatest cost is that compromise is "part and parcel" of receiving government funding, so as long as CAAWS receives government funding, compromises must be made. The fact that the newsmagazine is CAAWS primary forum for communication and "public visibility", is overshadowed by the fact that the organization is dependent upon government funding in order to produce the magazine.

The hegemony of one group over another relies on the subordinate group to make compromises and consequently "consent" to its subordinate status. CAAWS' "consent" to being dominated or controlled is demonstrated through their

compromise. The concession made by the state is that CAAWS continues to receive funding in order to first of all, remain in existence, and second, to produce the newsmagazine and carry out its other activities. The state's hegemony remains intact, as the activities of CAAWS, for the most part, remain under the auspices of the state. The power and domination of the state remains unthreatened by a group which must compromise itself in order to exist.

3.5.5 Summary

The purpose of this section has been to demonstrate, through reference to the CAAWS newsmagazine, in the first case, the organization's lack of connectedness to the "grassroots", and in the second, an instance in and through which CAAWS compromised its own agenda in favour of attending to the organization's "image". Neither facilitates the formation of counter-hegemonic theories or practices.

Undoubtedly, the hegemonic power of the state, by virtue of its control over CAAWS funding, limits the "radical" potential of the organization. Furthermore, the fact that the organization is comprised almost solely of a particular population of women also restricts CAAWS activities. While disagreement among the Board in terms of making decisions is evident, the more "conservative" or compromised position is nevertheless the stance that is assumed. This is interesting particularly because

compromise locks directly into the hegemonic practices of the state and masculine hegemony.

The Board of CAAWS makes certain compromises that they believe are required in order to maintain the organization's "image". Aware that the state oversees their activities, the Board believes that these compromises must be made in order for CAAWS to remain in operation. Interestingly, CAAWS' funding from Secretary of State Women's Program was entirely withdrawn anyway. Although F&AS Women's Program provides the funds to CAAWS for the newsmagazine (hence it is still published), the content of the most recent issue, and the fact that it was not the sexuality issue, indicates that compromises are still being made.

In the following chapter, feminist deconstruction and redefinition of masculinist ideologies in sport is discussed.

3.6 Endnotes (Chapter Three)

3.6.1 The Justine Blainey Case

(1) As stated previously, it was admitted at the Hearings that there could be "some adverse impact" on the OWHA as a result of the decision (Springate, 1987: 23).

(2) Blainey stated that there were some players on the women's Scarborough Bantam team who were more skillful than herself. She sought to play on the boys' team arguing that the hockey was more competitive than that played in the OWHA, the coaches for the boys' teams pushed their players harder and body checking at her age was allowed on the boys' teams and not allowed on the girls' teams.

(3) In an extensive report compiled for CAAWS and Sport Canada by a CAAWS member, some of the limitations of the integration approach were recognized. These were: 1) that pre-pubescent girls and the "top" athletes would primarily benefit from integration; 2) that girls' and women's sport could be jeopardized if the top players join boys' teams; 3) that girls/women would not necessarily want to be part of a "male model" of team sport, characterized by elitism, violence, commercialism and a win at all costs attitude (Lenskyj, 1984b). Nevertheless, as an organization, CAAWS urged its members to support integration.

3.6.2 The Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport

(1) The MTR had, in fact, made the decision to develop a policy prior to the passing of Bill 7 and the Blainey outcome, in anticipation of the results of the two issues. The public announcement was made in March, 1987, subsequent to the OHRC amendment and the Blainey decision.

(2) CAAWS is also involved in provincial policy development in British Columbia, Quebec and Nova Scotia. Because it is beyond the scope of this thesis to do otherwise, I will deal only with the events that took place in Ontario.

(3) The term "somewhat" is used as it is questionable whether a group attempting to create change while working within the confines of existing hegemonic structures can engage in truly counter-hegemonic practices.

(4) CAAWS defines "gender equality" as "women's equality of opportunity and access in a system where men are already advantaged" (CAAWS, 1988c: 3).

(5) The statement, "more soft and refined" exemplifies the "feminization" of language in order to have a "voice" in government. In light of the earlier discussion of the "apologetic" as a form of compromise and unintentional collusion employed by many women in sport, perhaps in terms of language, this statement also represents a form of compromise/collusion.

(6) These issues had not been addressed at the time of the interview.

3.6.3 The Breakthrough Awards

(1) Interestingly, in later years, when CAAWS was requested by Secretary of State Women's Program to approach corporations for funding, some CAAWS Board members criticized the suggestion. Evidently, the organization did not remain static on this issue (or others) indicating the potential for various "subject positions" to unfold in the organization, and therefore, the potential for counter-hegemonic practices to take form at some point in time.

(2) Although the Rick Hansen Centre benefits physically disabled women, it was the Centre itself that received the award and not one of the participants at the Centre.

3.6.4 The CAAWS Newsmagazine

(1) To be "carded" as an athlete means to receive funding from the federal government in order to further one's athletic pursuits. The higher one is ranked in terms of international performance, the more money she/he will receive, and one must be ranked in order to receive the funding.

(2) Although national team athletes are not the "grassroots", the field hockey team nevertheless represents a group of individuals subordinate to a coach and the CWFHA. In concurrence with the former team member interviewed, I am arguing that the field hockey issue can be viewed in terms of a management/worker relationship. Because of their liberal feminist roots and their hegemonic standpoint, CAAWS supports management in this case. The athletes are ignored.

(3) Subsequent to the Spring, 1990 newsmagazine, CAAWS went through a number of changes due to the complete funding cut by Secretary of State Women's Program. The Winter, 1991 issue, which was recently released, is not the sexuality issue. Of the seven feature articles in this issue of the newsmagazine, three deal with women and the Olympics: "Sex Equality in the Olympics - A Report to the Toronto Olympic Task Force"; "Female Medalists - Olympic Games"; "Olympic Education: Studying Women for a Change". One dealt with the

Gay Games (the "Olympics" for lesbians and gays, albeit the ethos differs from that of the traditional Olympics): "Celebration '90 Meant Pride, Visibility and Participation for Thousands". Another focused on women in leadership roles: "Leadership: Enriching the Experience". Finally, one article reports on the 1990 Breakthrough Awards Celebration and another discusses medical advice given to women in sport over the past century. Whether the issues such as the ones dealt with in the Winter 1991 newsmagazine will actually aid CAAWS "image", or their attractiveness to a larger population in terms of their membership drive, is questionable.

CHAPTER FOUR

ALTERNATIVES

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present alternative methods of facilitating social change from the "grassroots" level without the financial support of the state. Some specific "feminist" counter-hegemonic alternatives to traditional forms of masculinist sport will be discussed.

4.2 Feminist Redefinition/Transformation of Sport

In Chapter One, it was stated that the entrance of women into traditionally masculine sport is nothing more than unintentional collusion, in that women merely conform to the masculine ethos of sport without challenging it in any way. Liberal feminist/reformist approaches to sport have been extensively criticized for this very problem. These critiques are summed up neatly by Jennifer Hargreaves (1986: 117) when she states that the liberal feminist/reformist approach is "in essence, a struggle by women and by men on their behalf to get more of what men have always had." As in the case of Justine Blainey and the Ontario Provincial Policy for Women in Physical Activity and Sport, legal reforms also benefit a particular group of women (Hall, 1986); usually they are white, able-bodied, elite athletic women in the mid to upper income range.

Unlike the goals of the liberal feminist/reformist approach (equality of access and equality of opportunity), the "radical" approach is characterized by attempts to redefine sport from a feminist perspective. Not surprisingly, the goals of reformist "equality" and radical "redefinition" conflict (Theberge, 1981). For this reason, feminist redefinitions of sport are taking place, for the most part, outside of the "system". In other words, the "radical" approach is similar to a feminist separatist approach, in which sport is defined and controlled by and for women without dependence (financial or otherwise) upon the state.

Perhaps the most obvious critique of this approach is that "separate is almost always unequal" (Theberge, 1981: 348). While the liberal feminist/reformist concept of "equality" is not the goal of the radical approach, it is nevertheless apparent that an activity which takes place outside the system does not necessarily alter the system itself. Consequently, a critic of this approach might question, "What is the point, if change is not being effected where it needs most to be effected?" The answer might be because feminist redefinition of sport serves not only to highlight the contradictions intrinsic to masculine-defined sport but also because women have the opportunity to experience the value of woman-centered sport (Bryson, 1987).

Some argue that because our world, including sport, is male and masculine-defined, our alternatives then must also be defined from a male/masculine perspective, since our understanding of sport comes from this perspective (Theberge, 1981). On the contrary, the notion of separatism itself, that is, relative autonomy from the institution of masculinist sport, is a concept created by women within the social structure. Undoubtedly, ideology is a powerful force, however it is nevertheless possible for individuals to hold at least "partially" independent beliefs within society, as stated in Chapter One.

What is feminist sport? Feminist sport has no clear-cut definition, nor does it have a specific format for deployment. Redefinition is viewed as a process, "not a *product* turned out by inventive minds but rather an ongoing *process of invention*" (Birrell and Richter, 1987: 397) (emphases in text).

The starting point for feminist redefinition of sport is women's experience in masculinist sport. The feminist consciousness of the women involved helps to inform and define these experiences (Birrell and Richter, 1987). Women are "subjects" in the process of redefinition and through drawing on their experiences, they challenge prevalent notions of sport, while concurrently working towards its transformation "into a practice which has relevance within their lives" (Birrell and Richter, 1987: 396).

Patriarchy in general, and masculinist sport in particular posits woman as "object" and man as "subject". This is accomplished in some blatant and not so blatant ways. Sport, because it is still primarily viewed as "fun and games" and therefore unproblematic, is an ideal site for the insidious ways in which women are granted "object" status.

Masculine hegemony in sport has served to deny most girls and women the opportunity to become what Bennett et al (1987: 370) refer to as "skilful performers". By skillful performer, they are not referring to elite athletes, but

one who exhibits movement literacy, one who has a well developed vocabulary of movement skills and can choose among them freely, and use them joyfully to experience one's self as a unified human being (p. 370).

Bennett et al (1987) argue that by denying girls and women the opportunity to develop these skills, patriarchy gains control of girls'/women's bodies. Girls/women are separated from their bodies, and consequently feel that they do not possess "self-control". Masculine hegemony, in this respect, serves to deny women their bodies, hence there is a giving over of one's self to others. Woman is constructed as "object" and man is constructed as "subject"; owner and controller of himself and others (Bennett et al, 1987: 370).

As a result. according to Bennett et al (1987), Birrell and Richter (1987) and others, woman as "subject" and women's experiences are the starting point in the feminist

redefinition/transformation of sport. Interestingly, one of the most pervasive and disturbing themes in this thesis has been the way in which, relative to CAAWS, sport administrators/leaders are considered "subject", while participants/non-participants in sport and physical activity are considered "object". The relegation of particular individuals to "subject" or "object" positions constitutes one problematic aspect of CAAWS hegemonic perspective. As Bennett et al (1987: 376) state:

As a mere beginning, we need to pay less attention to what is happening in women's athletics and more to the experiences available to the ninety-nine percent of women and girls who have not had the opportunity or choice to experience themselves as whole and integrated beings through their moving selves.

Birrell and Richter (1987) argue that feminist redefinition/transformation of sport involves deconstruction and reconstruction. Specifically, they discuss the process of deconstruction in six areas of masculinist sport. These are: 1) The overemphasis on winning instead of on the enjoyment of the game; 2) The hierarchical structure of sport including the power relationship between player and coach; 3) The strife for elitism based on skill; 4) Exclusivity based on gender, age, race, class, sexual orientation, and size; 5) The alienation of players from each other in the name of competition; and 6) The endangerment of the individual in order to win (p. 401).

In their research, Birrell and Richter (1987) deal with the some of the ways in which feminist softball teams are

"reconstructing" the game vis a vis the above six dimensions. I have chosen to focus on the experiences of the Pink Turf Soccer League in Toronto, Ontario, as an example of a group attempting to construct a feminist sport. I will be using the same six dimensions for analysis.

4.3 The Pink Turf Soccer League

The Pink Turf Soccer League began in 1985 when four women, who had never played soccer before, decided to organize soccer games in downtown Toronto. As of the 1990 season, the league consisted of four teams with twenty-two members per team, however the numbers of participants in the league has fluctuated over the years. At one point, for example, there were eight teams in the league.

For the first year, games would take place on Sunday mornings with 12-20 women in attendance. The league started to take shape the following year. At the beginning of the season, players were requested to fill out forms stating, among other things, their previous experience and whether they had ever coached. Coaches were selected from those who stated that they had had previous coaching experience. Teams were set up so as to place the more experienced players with the less experienced. The league was not sanctioned by the Ontario Soccer Association (OSA), therefore they could not have OSA referees at their games. Fortunately, a male friend of one of the players volunteered

to referee and subsequently a few of his friends volunteered as well.

The Pink Turf Soccer League defines itself as "feminist lesbian-positive". "Lesbian-positive" reflects the fact that approximately 98% of the women are lesbians. Any woman can play; the only stipulation is that she accepts "lesbian behaviour". As one league member stated, "It's the one situation where everything gets reversed." "Feminist" means that the league is run collectively. The collective is made up of two representatives and the coach from each team. It was stated however, that the league was run in a collective manner only in theory, while in reality, most of the women wanted decisions to be made for them. Having come from traditional masculinist sport backgrounds, many of the women in the league desired the "hierarchical" approach to decision-making. While these same women had little trouble voicing their complaints, it was virtually impossible to persuade them to participate in collective meetings. The league member interviewed remarked:

I think that the key point is that women who are in sport are products of the system...if they're products of the system, chances are, there're not going to be a whole lot of feminists within that group.

Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of the women are lesbians, only a few are feminists. Nevertheless, these few women did make a difference in how the league operated.¹

4.4 Feminist Challenges to Six Masculinist Assumptions in Sport

1) The overemphasis on winning instead of on the enjoyment of the game.

The challenge to this aspect of masculinist sport is characterized by concern primarily over the process of play instead of the outcome. Birrell and Richter (1987: 402) cite one woman's experience in softball:

I want the satisfaction of playing the game well and the beauty of the well-executed double play, and strike-outs and spectacular catches. I want the pleasure and satisfaction of playing well, and when the importance of winning gets in the way of having a good time playing the game, that's where the line is drawn for me.

Contrary to popular belief, competition can and does exist within feminist sport, albeit with less emphasis on outcome. Debates around competition occurred at virtually every collective meeting of the Pink Turf League. Two distinct "camps" were formed around the issue: 1) the hierarchically-run teams; and 2) the collectively-run teams. The debates centered predominantly around whether or not to have playoffs. Those who were in the first camp were considered by the latter to be non-feminist, and those in the latter were described by the former as "grassroots feminist radical crazy".

When the women in the league were polled, the majority chose in favour of having playoffs, despite the fact that there had been a push for an alternative. Along with the playoffs, they also opted for a banquet at the end of the

season to commemorate the winning team. As the league member interviewed stated:

...the gals...from the traditional system really got into it and really liked it and the gals that had never played sport before were like, 'Well, see, this is fun,' because they have never been able to play sports before. They never got any...prizes or anything like that, so it was kind of like going back to high school and doing the thing that you never could do before...being acceptable at something that you thought you were a klutz at.

The collective respected the players' wish to have playoffs, until only the winning teams started showing up at the banquets. Without consulting the players the following year, the "collective" decided that there would be no playoffs. Consequently, the players were furious and could not see the point of playing if not to win anything. After countless debates, the collective and the players agreed on playoffs in round-robin tournament style, with no recognized winners. Every team would participate in the playoffs with each team playing the same number of games. The round-robin format worked for approximately two years, until the 1990 season when the league went back to regular playoffs.

While competition proved to be a concept of serious contention within the Pink Turf League, it was struggled with nevertheless, to the point where there was some opportunity for an anti-masculinist notion of competition to emerge.

2) The hierarchical structure of sport including the relationship between player and coach.

Within feminist transformations of sport, a collective format is employed instead of the traditional hierarchy. In terms of the player/coach relationship, this would include discussion between players and coach as to how the team should be run. For example, in Birrell and Richter's (1987) research, some teams employed a system whereby the position of coach was rotated among players.

In the Pink Turf League, structure differed from team to team. Furthermore, because the league considered itself feminist, it was decided that the players on each team should decide for themselves how their team would function. Consequently, some coaches gave all the power to the players and some held on to the traditional approach whereby the coach has all decision-making power, contrary to any type of collective approach to coaching. There were some teams however, which placed the coach in a more mediative role.

A rule was instituted in the league whereby each player on a team must have the same amount of playing time per game. Instead of telling players when to go on and come off the field, one coach had the players decide amongst themselves how they would stick to the rule as best they could. According to the coach, the system worked well for the most part, and when it did not, she would mediate. In terms of deconstructing the traditional player/coach power

imbalance, the coach as mediator appears to be a viable alternative.

3) The strife for elitism based on skill.

Instead of emphasizing skill development in order to obtain victory, feminist sport would likely focus on developing skill, in a supportive environment, so that each player has the opportunity to develop skill for its own sake. Obviously, skill levels of players affect the competitive capabilities of teams and, in feminist sport, this is often dealt with in imaginative ways. For example, Birrell and Richter (1987: 403) cite the experience of two unevenly matched women's softball teams. To make the game more interesting and exciting for both teams, the players on the more highly skilled team did not play their usual positions and tried new ones instead, while the lesser skilled team played their usual positions. The more highly skilled team recognized that if they lost the game, they would lose their position in the league standings. Even when the lesser skilled team pulled ahead and eventually won the game, the more highly skilled team accepted the defeat.

In the Pink Turf League, the conflict over competition related directly to skill development. As stated previously, Pink Turf did not deny any woman access to the league based on skill level or playing ability. This mandate worked well for the first year, however in subsequent years, as more women gained more experience,

their own level of tolerance for lesser skilled players decreased. The coaches were then given the responsibility of dealing with this issue and to work with the lesser skilled players. Unfortunately, as the league member interviewed stated, the major flaw in the league was that, for the most part, the coaches themselves did not have proper training and were therefore incapable of teaching skills. When the collective attempted to set up workshops for the coaches, they were met with enough resistance to halt the idea. One positive aspect to this dilemma however, is that within a few years of the league's inception, some of the players who had learned the skills involved in coaching and the game itself, particularly from the better coaches in the league, went on to become coaches.

Another interesting problem arose as players got to know each other and their abilities. Some tried to "stack" their teams with the more highly skilled players. The collective insisted however, that equal numbers of experienced and inexperienced players were to make up each team. Consequently, some of the more competitive players brought new players into the league, who stated on their applications that they were inexperienced, only for the collective to find out that the women had lied. In order to deal with this, the collective decided that they would advertise the league as "developmental" as opposed to "competitive" or "recreational". This meant that emphasis would be placed on skill development instead of brute

competition. Furthermore, the responsibility of following the rule of equal playing time for every player was left up to each team. If a team insisted on "stacking" its players and allowing only the very best players to play, there was nothing the collective could do about it.

Fortunately, for the most part, the "developmental" idea worked well, and as a result most of the more competitive players chose to play with the Metro Toronto Soccer League during the week, and on weekends they would play with the Pink Turf League.

4) Exclusivity based on gender, age, race, class, sexual orientation and size.

A feminist sport would, in all likelihood, have as one of its goals to be as inclusive as possible, not denying anyone access because of age, race, class, sexual orientation, size, or skill level. In most feminist leagues, and in the Pink Turf League, the membership is exclusive to women.

The Pink Turf League did not turn any woman away, yet the league consisted primarily of white working class lesbians. An interesting incident occurred when two heterosexual women from the Metro Toronto Soccer League (MTSL) were referred to Pink Turf as it is the only women's soccer league in downtown Toronto (McKay, 1987). The two women subsequently reported to the MTSL that they had been attacked in the showers by some members of Pink Turf. The

Pink Turf League was curious about this accusation as they do not even have showers, and subsequently reported this to the MTSL. Needless to say, the two women did not play with the Pink Turf League.

5) The alienation of players from each other in the name of competition.

In feminist redefinition of sport, the opponent is not cast as the enemy. There can be mutual enjoyment of the game with individuals cheering all plays, not just those of the players on their team and not just the most spectacular plays. For example, Birrell and Richter (1987:407) cite one softball player's experience:

She hit the ball, oh so far away out into center field, and she was fast so by the time people were thinking of catching it, or the ball was even coming down, she was by second base. And the woman caught it. And rather than trudge off the field and feel disappointed, this woman ran out into center field - she rounded first base and headed for center field - and hugged the woman that caught it. And it wasn't this touchy, feely thing - it was just you caught that ball and I hit it *so* hard and you caught it and that's really good. (emphasis in text)

Since the emphasis was more on skill development among the women who considered themselves feminists in the Pink Turf League, there was no need to reduce the opposing team to enemies, and as stated previously, process was valued over the outcome of the game. Interestingly, the teams that consistently won in the league were the feminist collectively-run teams. There was some resentment among the non-feminist hierarchical teams because of their own desire to win. Unfortunately, they did not envision the

possibility that the reason these teams won was because of their view on the game and the way they operated as a team.

6) The endangerment of the individual in order to win.

Since the outcome is devalued in most, if not all feminist sport, risking injury in order to win is not necessary. In fact, in the feminist softball teams that Birrell and Richter (1987) studied, the women actively discouraged each other from taking risks. This is a positive step considering the life-threatening activities athletes in masculinist sport are required to partake of in order to compete, particularly at the elite level; steroid usage, taking of pain killers in order to continue to train and compete, sometimes too rigorous training programs², and competing in sports which are intrinsically life-threatening such as downhill skiing, track cycling, boxing, ski jumping and speed skating, to name a few.

The Pink Turf League actively discouraged its players from taking risks, however the extent to which individual teams or players (particularly from the more competitive teams) did this is not known.

From the above discussion, it is questionable how "feminist" the Pink Turf League actually is, considering the controversy around stacking teams, competition, and so on. The presence of controversy also indicates the extent to which masculinist ideologies are entrenched in sport.

The fact that the few feminists in the league were able to make some impact upon how the league operated however, demonstrates that deconstruction of masculinist practices and reconstruction of feminist alternatives is possible.

Feminist redefinition/transformation of sport may not radically change masculinist sport in general, however it is hoped that it will have direct impact upon its participants. Feminist redefinition/transformation of sport can be considered counter-hegemonic to the extent that its participants carry an alternative ethos of sport into other areas of their lives. The reality of feminist sport can become commonsense reality because it encompasses the experienced reality of the women who take part in it. This experienced reality may be the starting point for facilitating social change in sport and otherwise, while avoiding any sort of collusion.

A feminist approach to sport can also be considered counter-hegemonic to the extent that it problematizes dominant masculinist ideological beliefs. Feminist versions of sports reality exist alongside the dominant masculinist model, while challenging it in some profound ways. Both the Pink Turf League and the softball teams discussed herein are creating alternatives by redefining existing masculinist assumptions. Of further interest might be individuals or teams attempting to re-create sport, without relying on redefinition only.

"Grassroots" organizing can avoid the pitfalls of state control. Pink Turf, for example, had at one time wanted to be sanctioned by the OSA. The league debated over the merits of sanctioning. They would have access to OSA referees and would have a greater number of women's teams to play against (those which were affiliated with the OSA). Furthermore, sanctioning would provide the opportunity for coaches and referees to become "certified" through their experience with Pink Turf. Without sanctioning, the women's coaching and refereeing experience would not be recognized by the OSA. Some members of Pink Turf argued that the negative aspects of sanctioning were the impending lack of self-sufficiency for the league and the monetary cost of sanctioning.

Nevertheless, the league chose to become sanctioned, however due to the fact that most of the women were not feminists and held firmly to the hierarchical approach to getting things done, the work of applying for sanctioning was left up to a few individuals. These women became quite frustrated and "burnt out" in the process, so it was decided that they would forego the application. Fortunately, some lesbian soccer teams in the Boston, Massachusetts area expressed an interest in playing with Pink Turf, hence the women would have the opportunity to play "outside" teams, without the need for sanctioning. By resisting the "need" for sanctioning, the Pink Turf League avoided the hegemonic

control of the OSA, albeit with some cost involved, that is, the women's experiences (playing and coaching) would not be "recognized" nor considered legitimate by the OSA. Of course, if sanctioned, and playing under the control of the OSA, the Pink Turf League could hardly be considered counter-hegemonic.

Theberge (1987) cites Christine Grant's investigation into the experiences of the International Women's Field Hockey Association (IWFHA) under the hegemonic control of the state. The IWFHA was formed in 1927. Until the early 1970's, the primary goals of the Association were to make the game safe and to promote friendly competition (Grant, in Theberge, 1987). While highly competitive international competitions were held regularly, they were characterized by cooperation and fair play (Grant, in Theberge, 1987). Furthermore, tournaments were structured in such a way as to promote friendly competition without a winning team as the end result.

In the 1960's, government support in the form of funding became available. Because finances were constantly a source of uncertainty within the IWFHA, state funding was accepted. This funding however, was conditional upon success in international competition. By 1971, the structure of tournaments was altered to the extent that the outcome would produce a winning team and the competition

among teams thus became more intense and less "friendly" (Grant, in Theberge, 1987).

Dependence upon the hegemonic control of the state was not the only reason for the change in the ideology of the IWFHA. The movement toward "equality" in sport in the 1960's, whereby "equality" meant access to what men value in sport, also meant that there was a push for success in international competition (Grant, in Theberge, 1987: 392).

From the experiences of the IWFHA, it becomes clear that when self-sufficient, women's sport or feminist sport can take on a different meaning and hold a different experience for the individuals involved, than when an organization, league or association is reliant upon the state for its existence.

(W)hen women were in control of the sport and able to resist the pressures of conforming to the male model, they chose an alternative that was radically different from men's sport (Grant, cited in Theberge: 392).

4.5 Summary

There is no clear cut definition of feminist sport and therefore the forms that it can take may vary from group to group. In this chapter, I used the Pink Turf Soccer League to illustrate one group's challenges to six masculinist assumptions in sport as outlined by Birrell and Richter (1987). The feminist deconstruction/reconstruction of sport discussed here takes place at the "grassroots" level and does not rely on state funding, nor for the most part, on

any "outside" funding body. Because feminists engaged in these practices take as their starting point "grassroots" level organizing, they may draw from personal³ experiences in order to envision alternatives.

Feminists working towards redefining/transforming sport are not only creating alternatives, but are also exposing the contradictions intrinsic to masculinist sport. This is a counter-hegemonic practice as it points out the contradictions without colluding in them, and it is further counter-hegemonic to the extent that it encompasses the creation of alternatives relatively independent of dominant masculinist ideologies.

4.6 Endnotes

(1) On the other hand, the feminist softball leagues discussed in this thesis were comprised of feminists. Being a minority, the feminists in the Pink Turf League evidently had a more difficult time in their attempts at redefining the sport. Not only did they have to struggle with the concept of masculinist sport, but also with women who did not even desire to embark on the challenge.

(2) see Angela Issajenko's, Running Risks (1990), for a detailed account of her training and drug regimen as an internationally ranked athlete.

(3) That is, "personal" as it informs the political.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis, I have demonstrated, through an analysis and critique of some of the major activities of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS), the ways in which the organization has unknowingly cooperated with and reinforced masculine hegemony in sport and the hegemony of the state. In Chapter One, I described how hegemonic masculinist ideology is constructed in and through sport, and the ways in which masculine hegemonic power is disguised and maintained through "commonsense" assumptions. I also dealt with how seemingly counter-hegemonic practices end up, at times, reinforcing dominant masculinist ideologies.

Chapter Two provided an historical overview of CAAWS, focusing on the development of the organization's hegemonic perspective. In Chapter Three, four activities of CAAWS were analyzed and critiqued in order to illustrate how the organization unknowingly cooperated with masculinist ideologies in sport and the hegemonic power of the state. Finally, in Chapter Four, I investigated some of the ways in which feminists are struggling to create counter-hegemonic alternatives to the way in which sport is currently defined in masculinist terms.

As an organization, CAAWS claims to work from the "grassroots" level, speaking on behalf of girls and women,

yet the actual "subjects" in the organization's work are sport administrators and not the participants (the "grassroots"). In reality, CAAWS speaks on behalf of girls and women, through women in sport leadership positions. Furthermore, the general membership and Board of CAAWS reflect a particular segment of the population. These factors combined contribute to the hegemonic perspective of CAAWS and have influenced the "practices" of CAAWS to the extent that the organization's work primarily benefits, or is relevant to, the same segment of the population represented by the CAAWS Board and membership.

In the CAAWS booklet, "Women, Sport and Physical Activity" (1988a: 9), it is stated:

Each year, CAAWS moves a step or two closer to the reality the organization is trying to create for women and girls in sport.

"Women and girls" are not the "subjects" in the creation of this "reality". Because of the homogeneity of the Board and membership of CAAWS, the organization and sport leaders/administrators outside of it, become the spokespeople, the "subjects" in the process of defining the problems and creating the changes.

CAAWS' hegemonic perspective affects not only the practices of the organization, but also the way in which CAAWS views sport in general. Sport is primarily viewed by CAAWS as an activity in which girls/women must be given "equal" access and "equal" opportunities. The liberal

feminist/reformist roots of CAAWS do not facilitate the development of alternatives to the institution of sport *per se*; the objective is to get as many women as possible involved, from the participatory level to the administrative level.

Consequently, as an organization, CAAWS argues for integration at all levels of the sport system:

It is by integrating ourselves in the system at all levels that we will be able to transform the aspects of the sports system which we consider negative. It is certainly more difficult to change a system from the outside than from the inside (CAAWS, 1988b).

Although it is difficult to change sport from outside the system (as in feminist redefinitions of sport), it is doubtful that change would more easily be brought about when working within the system.

Through an analysis of the Pink Turf League, the struggles faced by feminists in their attempts to deconstruct and redefine some masculinist ideologies in sport became apparent. Despite these difficulties, feminist redefinition of sport remains counter-hegemonic as it posits sport as problematic from the outset and because it is a process of redefining masculinist assumptions in and through sport.

Undoubtedly, the CAAWS Board and membership is and has been committed to making change in sport. As stated in the introduction to this thesis, the purpose of critically

analyzing CAAWS was not to negate the organization nor its membership, but to contribute to the construction of a truly counter-hegemonic understanding of sport.

One of the limitations of this thesis is the fact that the history and practices of CAAWS were not contextualized as to the social/historical moment in which they took place. Had this been taken into consideration, I may have been able to give a more detailed analysis of the functioning and maintenance of the organization's hegemonic perspective and recognized further the difficulties involved in assuming or even negotiating a truly counter-hegemonic stance in a particular social and historical context.

A more indepth analysis and comparison of the work of feminists involved in deconstructing and redefining masculinist sport would be useful in realizing the process (including the difficulties) involved in engaging in truly counter-hegemonic practices.

In conclusion, my hope is that this thesis will be useful in both deconstructing masculinist hegemonic practices and constructing alternatives. I have pointed out that the hegemonic power of one group over another is never complete nor is it guaranteed. It is with this knowledge that feminists can begin the process of deconstructing masculine hegemony in sport.

REFERENCES

- Barlow, Maude
1988 Keynote Address: Annual National Conference for
 Women in Sport and Physical Activity
- Bedingfield, E. Wendy
1988 "Keynote Address, CAAWS Annual Conference, 1987 -
 Legislating for Social Change." The Starting Line
 6 (3): 17-19
- Bennett, Roberta S., K. Gail Whitaker, Nina Jo Woolley Smith
and Anne Sablove
1987 "Changing the Rules of the Game: Reflections
 Toward a Feminist Analysis of Sport." Women's
 Studies International Forum 10 (4): 369-379
- Birrell, Susan and Diana M. Richter
1987 "Is a Diamond Forever? Feminist Transformations
 of Sport." Women's Studies International Forum 10
 (4): 395-409
- Brodsky, Gwen
1986 "Justine Blainey and the Ontario Hockey
 Association: an Overview." CAAWS Newsletter 5
 (2): 17
- Bryson, Lois
1987 "Sport and the Maintenance of Masculine Hegemony."
 Women's Studies International Forum 10 (4): 349-
 360
- Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport
(CAAWS)
1984 Newsletter 3 (3)
- CAAWS
1986 Newsletter 5 (2)
- CAAWS
1987a The Starting Line 6 (2)
- CAAWS
1987b Minutes - Ontario (Toronto) Regional Meeting (May
 5)
- CAAWS
1987c Response to Discussion Paper prepared for Meeting
 July 9
- CAAWS
1987d "Breakthrough Award." Newsletter 5 (3): 8-9
- CAAWS
1988a Booklet - "Women, Sport and Physical Activity"

- CAAWS
1988b Action Bulletin (February)
- CAAWS
1988c Common Focus Policy Handbook - Draft Working Document (October)
- CAAWS
1988d Minutes - Annual General Meeting
- CAAWS
1989a ACTION 7 (2)
- CAAWS
1989b Brochure - "Breakthrough Celebration"
- CAAWS
1989c Attachment #1 to Memo from Susan Antoft to Editorial Collective (November 9)
- CAAWS
1990a Action Bulletin (November)
- CAAWS
1990b Brochure - "Breakthrough Awards Celebration"
- CAAWS
1991 ACTION 9 (1)
- Carlson, Alison
1988 "Chromosome Count." Ms. (October): 40-44
- Dunning, Eric
1986 "Sport as a Male Preserve: Notes on the Social Sources of Masculine Identity and its Transformation." Theory Culture and Society 3 (1): 79-90
- Dyer, Ken F.
1982 Challenging the Men: The Social Biology of Female Sporting Achievement. Queensland: University of Queensland Press
- Dyer, Ken F. (ed.)
1989 Sportswomen Towards 2000: A Celebration. South Australia: Hyde Park Press
- Ellis, Phyllis
1986 Letter - CAAWS Newsletter 4 (3)
- Felshin, Jan
1974 "The Social View." Pp. 179-279 in E. Gerber, J. Felshin, P. Berlin and W. Wyrick (eds.), The American Woman in Sport. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company

- Femia, Joseph V.
1981 Gramsci's Political Thought. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Fitness and Amateur Sport (Government of Canada)
1986 Sport Canada Policy on Women in Sport
- Gramsci, Antonio
1971 Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Hall, M. Ann
1984 "Towards a Feminist Analysis of Gender Inequality in Sport." Pp. 82-103 in N. Theberge and P. Donnelly (eds.), Sport and the Sociological Imagination. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press
- Hall, M. Ann
1985 "Knowledge and Gender: Epistemological Questions in the Social Analysis of Sport." Sociology of Sport Journal 2: 25-42
- Hall, M. Ann
1986 "How Should We Theorize Gender in the Context of Sport?" Unpublished paper presented at the "Sport, Sex and Gender Conference," Norway
- Halpert, Felicia E.
1988 "You Call This Adorable? An Open Letter to the Producer of NBC Sports." Ms. (October): 36-39
- Hargreaves, Jennifer
1982 "Theorising Sport: An Introduction." Pp. 1-29 in J. Hargreaves (ed.), Sport, Culture and Ideology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Hargreaves, Jennifer
1986 "Where's the Virtue? Where's the Grace? A Discussion of the Social Production of Gender Relations in and Through Sport." Theory Culture and Society 3 (1): 109-121
- Hargreaves, John
1982a "Sport and Hegemony: Some Theoretical Problems." Pp. 103-135 in H. Cantelon and R. Gruneau (eds.), Sport, Culture and the Modern State. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Hargreaves, John
1982b "Sport, Culture and Ideology." Pp. 30-61 in J. Hargreaves (ed.), Sport, Culture and Ideology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

- Hargreaves, John
1986 Sport, Power and Culture. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Harris, Dorothy V.
1980 "Femininity and Athleticism: Conflict or Consonance?" Pp. 222-239 in Sabo and Runfola, Jock: Sports and Male Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Issajenko, Angela, Martin O'Malley and Karen O'Reilly
1990 Running Risks. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada
- Kidd, Bruce
1983 "Ontario Legalizes Discrimination." Canadian Woman Studies 4 (3): 69-71
- Kidd, Bruce
1985 Memo to all Faculty of University of Toronto (September 25)
- Lenskyj, Helen
1983 "The Role of Physical Education in the Socialization of Girls in Ontario, 1890-1930." Unpublished PhD. Dissertation
- Lenskyj, Helen
1984a "Human Rights and Sports Policies Affecting Girls and Women"
- Lenskyj, Helen
1984b "A Discussion Paper: Female Participation in Sport"
- Lenskyj, Helen
1984-85 "Sport, Femininity and Sexuality." Resources for Feminist Research 13: 66-68
- Lenskyj, Helen
1985 "Brief to Special Committee on Equality Rights" (June 28)
- Lenskyj, Helen
1986 Out of Bounds: Women, Sport and Sexuality. Toronto: The Women's Press
- Lenskyj, Helen
1987 "Female Sexuality and Women's Sport." Women's Studies International Forum 10 (4): 381-386
- Lenskyj, Helen
1988a "CAAWS: Rewarding Excellence?" Broadside 9 (7): 4
- Lenskyj, Helen
1988b Letter in The Starting Line 7 (1): 2

- Lenskyj, Helen
1988c "In Support of Choice." The Starting Line 7 (1):
6-8
- McDonald, Kathy
1987 "Report to the CAAWS AGM." Annual General
Meeting: 3-4
- McKay, Lorraine
1987 "Pink Turf Soccer League." CAAWS Newsletter 5
(3): 24
- Ministry of the Attorney General - Ontario Women's
Directorate
1985 News Release - "Attorney General Moves to End Sex
Discrimination in Sport." (July 25)
- O'Brien, Mary
1984 "Hegemony and Superstructure: A Feminist Critique
of Neo-Marxism." Pp. 85-100 in J. Vickers (ed.),
Taking Sex Into Account. Ottawa: Carleton
University Press, Inc.
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
date unknown "Justine Blainey and the Ontario Ministry of
Tourism and Recreation"
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
1987a Progress Report to MTR Senior Management Committee
(December 9)
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
1987b "A Provincial Policy for Women in Sport and
Physical Activity." Draft for Public Consultation
(September)
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
1988 "A Provincial Policy for Women in Physical
Activity and Sport" (July)
- Robinson, Laura
1990 "Olympic bid behind inaction on sport equality,
group says." The Globe and Mail (August 17): C-
11
- Rohrbaugh, Joanna Bunker
1979 "Femininity on the Line." Psychology Today
(August): 30-42
- Scott, Ian
1985 "Statement by the Honourable Ian Scott - Attorney
General and Minister Responsible for Women's
Issues." Toronto (July 25)

- Simpson, Maureen L.
1988 Memo to J.A. Halstead (January 18)
- Smith, Dorothy
1987 The Everyday World as Problematic. Boston:
Northeastern University Press
- Springate, Ian C.
1987 Ontario Human Rights Commission Board of Inquiry
Hearings
- Standing Committee on Administration of Justice
1986 Minutes from the Standing Committee on
Administration of Justice, Equality Rights Statute
Law Amendment Act (February 6)
- Steele, Danette and CAAWS Policy Committee
1987 "The Canadian Association for the Advancement of
Women and Sport response to the Draft Provincial
Policy for Women in Sport and Physical Activity as
prepared by the Ministry of Tourism and
Recreation." (October)
- Theberge, Nancy
1981 "A Critique of Critiques: Radical and Feminist
Writings on Sport." Social Forces 60 (2): 341-
353
- Theberge, Nancy
1983 "Feminism and Sport: Linking the Two Through a
New Organization" Canadian Woman Studies 4 (3):
79-81
- Theberge, Nancy
1987 "Sport and Women's Empowerment." Women's Studies
International Forum 10 (4): 387-393
- Tyler, Lynne
1985 "Field Hockey Team Prospects Clouded by Coaching
Issue." CAAWS Newsletter 4 (2): 16-19
- Tyler, Lynne
1986 Reply to Ellis. CAAWS Newsletter 4 (3): 4
- Varpalotai, Aniko and Brenda Shantz
1989 "Central Region Report." ACTION 8 (1): 14
- Williams, Claire Louise, Geoffrey Lawrence and David Rowe
1985 "Women and Sport: A Lost Ideal." Women's Studies
International Forum 8 (6): 639-645
- Willis, Paul
1982 "Women in Sport in Ideology." Pp. 117-135 in J.
Hargreaves (ed.), Sport, Culture and Ideology.
London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions Submitted to Former and Current CAAWS Board Members

1. CAAWS identifies itself as a feminist organization - What does this mean to you?
2. In the recently released CAAWS brochure, "Women, Sport and Physical Activity," it is stated on page 8 that "women's and girls' herstory, life experiences and psychology" are used as the "starting point in designing, scheduling and managing programs for women as participants, leaders or administrators." How, or in what ways does CAAWS incorporate girls' and women's herstory, life experiences and psychology when submitting recommendations for provincial policy, for example?
3. How successful do you think CAAWS will be in incorporating its feminist philosophy into provincial policy? How about in the implementation plan?
4. Do you consider Fitness and Amateur Sport's Women's Program to be feminist in its orientation? Why or why not?
5. How do you see CAAWS to be perceived by: a) Ministry personnel; b) Provincial Sport Organizations; c) Secretary of State Women's Program; d) Fitness and Amateur Sport Women's Program? Do they perceive you to be feminist and if so, is this in a positive or negative light?

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions Submitted to Member of the Pink Turf Soccer League

1. Is the league still in existence? If so, what is the membership total approximately? If not, what happened?
2. How did the four women who started the league in 1985 get women interested in joining the league (since neither the four women, nor most of those who subsequently joined the league had played soccer before)?
3. How would you define a "feminist lesbian-positive soccer league"?
4. In the literature, feminist transformation of sport as a process is discussed. How has this process manifested itself in the Pink Turf League, that is, what changes have occurred along the way in terms of the lesbian feminist orientation of the league?
5. How does the league deal with the concept of competition? In much of the literature, competition and the attempts which have been made to re-define it are discussed. Has there been any "redefinition" of competition in the league?
6. Is the league still not sanctioned by the O.S.A.? If it is not, is this because of the lack of self-sufficiency the league would face if sanctioned, or is there another reason? If it is now sanctioned, how has this affected the league?
7. What process of decision-making is employed in the league?
8. Feminist transformation of sport is not easy. What are some of the difficulties the league has encountered in this respect?