Psychology of Sport & Exercise 45 (2019) 101580

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Psychology of Sport & Exercise

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/psychsport

Outside the lines: An exploratory study of high school sport head coaches' critical praxis

Jill Kochanek*, Karl Erickson

Michigan State University, Institute for the Study of Youth Sports (ISYS), 308 West Circle Drive, East Lansing, MI, 48824, United States

A B S T R A C T

Objectives: Though popular views often treat athletics as separate from politics, sport is becoming an increasingly multicultural, socially active context. This reality prompts consideration of what place broader social issues have in youth development through sport. This study serves as an initial exploration of high school sport head coaches' critical praxis.

Design: Qualitative study design, informed by a cultural praxis agenda, consisted of semi-structured interviews with 12 head sport coaches from one, suburban and Midwestern, high school community context.

Method: Reflexive thematic analysis of interviews with coaches involved semantic (surface level) and latent (interpretative) coding (Braun & Clarke, 2019; Braun, Clarke, & Weate, 2016).

Results: Results highlight three key findings. First, coaches use various strategies to navigate social issues that arise in their work with student-athletes. Second, relevant issues are contextually situated and sport culture specific. Third, latent analyses capture and challenge assumptions that coaches made about coach effectiveness and athlete development and offer preliminary evidence to suggest that coaches' critical praxis (i.e., awareness and action) varies along a continuum.

Conclusion: Future research is necessary to more systematically examine how coaches in varied contexts adopt a critical praxis to inform extant coaching approaches that can help coaches engage in a praxis that empowers *all* student-athletes.

1. Introduction

Though popular views often treat athletics as separate from broader social issues (Hartmann, 2016), sport has become an increasingly multicultural context (Blodgett, Schinke, McGannon, & Fisher, 2015; Ryba, Stambulova, & Schinke, 2013). Cultural sport psychology and sociology scholars have commented on the widening exchange of people, beliefs, and information in our globalized world as impacting/impacted by the current sport landscape. Alongside the growing diversity of sport stakeholders (e.g., athletes and coaches) is a rising visibility, and perhaps prevalence, of the use of sport as a platform for social activism (Cooky, 2017). Prominent examples include Colin Kaepernick's protest of police brutality against communities of color; Kevin Love's mental health advocacy; and, sport activism a part of the #MeToo movement challenging sexual harassment against girls/women. Critical sport scholars have made conceptual and empirical contributions regarding these, and other, social issues and related athlete activism (e.g., Cooper, Macaulay, & Rodriguez, 2019; Kaufman & Wolff, 2010; Reel & Crouch, 2019; Schinke, Stambulova, Si, & Moore, 2017). Diversity trends and the surge of athletic activism are not restricted to elite sport but are also present at youth levels. Younger players may not only seek to emulate professional athletes but more readily consume messages that engage social (justice) issues through social media (Cooper et al., 2019). This reality prompts consideration of what place, if any, broader sociocultural issues (and activism) have in youth development through sport. Given coaches' influential role, inquiry into how coaches navigate such matters in their work with athletes is vital (Kochanek & Erickson, 2019).

1.1. Prevalent sport psychology perspectives on social issues and sport coaching

Mainstream sport psychology literature defines coach effectiveness as the consistent exercise of professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledges that contribute to athlete outcomes in a specific coaching context (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). From this perspective, athlete outcomes are not only performance based but include psychosocial outcomes such as competence, confidence, connection, and character. Effective coaching is also context specific. Coaches must respond to contextual characteristics (e.g., performance or participation based) and athletes' individual needs. Prevalent practical approaches (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009; USOC, 2017) recommend that coaches be aware of their athletes' social identities and avoid "using language or techniques that might encourage" (p. 280) players to separate their sport and lived experiences. Such approaches align with current perspectives on positive youth development (PYD) through sport (Fraser-Thomas, Côté,

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: kochane2@msu.edu (J. Kochanek).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101580
Received 4 February 2019; Received in revised form 22 August 2019; Accepted 22 August 2019
Available online 23 August 2019
1469-0292/

& Deakin, 2005; Gould & Carson, 2008). While PYD through sport researchers and practitioners have meaningfully contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of how coaches (and programs) can intentionally optimize positive outcomes among youth athletes (Holt, 2016), current conceptualizations of coaching for PYD promotion adopt an individual-centered, functionalist orientation that risk decontextualizing and universalizing a young person's developmental process and outcomes (Kochanek & Erickson, 2019). Moreover, practical frameworks offer minimal elaboration on how coaches might actually navigate social issues— *beyond* simply acknowledging that they impact athletes. *Critical perspectives*, or non-dominant views that attend to broader sociocultural issues, are thus vital to interrogate status quo beliefs/assumptions in sport coaching for PYD promotion in theory, research, and practice (Coakley, 2016; Kochanek & Erickson, 2019).

1.2. Critical sport perspectives on social issues and sport coaching

Despite the lack of critical sport perspectives in the extant discourse on PYD through sport specifically and sport coaching generally, some scholars have advocated for culturally-sensitive, context-specific sport research and practice (Ryba, Stambulova, Si, & Schinke, 2013; Ryba & Schinke, 2009; Ryba & Wright, 2005, 2010). *Cultural sport psychology* (CSP) regards the broad genre of scholarly and applied efforts to introduce contextualized understandings of marginalized topics and cultural identities in sport (Ryba et al., 2013). Fundamental to the work of CSP researchers and practitioners is *cultural praxis* (Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke, McGannon, Parham, & Lane, 2012), which regards centering, rather than peripherally accounting for, diversity, identity, and power dynamics (Ryba & Schinke, 2009; Ryba & Wright, 2005, 2010). Cultural praxis integrates theory, lived culture, and social action in a professional setting to promote athlete performance/development, participant well-being, and equity and social justice. Recent scholarship (Schinke, Blodgett, Ryba, Kao, & Middleton, 2019; Schinke & McGannon, 2015) has emphasized *intersectionality* as central to the CSP discourse. *Intersectionality* refers to interlocking, compounding oppressions that individuals with multiple socially marginalized identities (e.g., women of color) may experience (See Crenshaw, 1989). Thus, cultural praxis necessitates that those engaged in cultural praxis attend to intersecting identities (e.g., race, gender, (dis)ability) of those in sport who may be uniquely marginalized. Cultural praxis also requires self-reflexive sensibility: critical awareness of how researchers'/practitioners' values, biases, social position, and identity categories impact participants (Blodgett et al., 2015; Ryba et al., 2013). Blodgett et al. (2015) importantly reminds those doing CSP work that praxis involves reciprocal processes of reflection and action for social justice.

Cultural sport psychology (and sport sociology) scholars have employed cultural praxis in an effort to further develop critical sport scholarship. Researchers have interrogated "everyday sport psychology practices" of consultants (e.g., Schinke et al., 2012), and conceptual and empirical efforts have made visible broader social issues and power dynamics relevant to coaching (Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2009; Cushion, 2018; Lyle & Cushion, 2017; Potrac & Jones, 2009; Potrac, Jones, Gilbourne, & Nelson, 2012). For example, Cushion (2018) puts forth that *critical reflection* might help guard against the potentially disempowering effects of dominant coaching practices (i.e., practical reflection). Critical reflection regards introspection about how broader social structures and forces influence coaches' attitudes and actions (Cassidy et al., 2009; Knowles, Gilbourne, Borrie, & Neville, 2001; Knowles Tyler, Gilbourne, & Eubank, 2006). Research, however, evidences critical reflection as absent from sport coaches' recount of their reflective experiences (Knowles, Tyler, Gilbourne, & Eubank, 2006). Despite the burgeoning of CSP-related studies, scant empirical work explores coaches' critical action (and reflection) (Gearity, 2012; Gearity & Metzger, 2017). Thus, this exploratory study aims to address this literature gap and examine how coaches think about and navigate (i.e., praxis) broader social issues in their work with athletes.

2. Theoretical and methodological approach

This exploratory study adopts a cultural praxis conceptual framework. As with other critical perspectives (e.g., critical race theory, critical feminist theories, and critical pedagogy), these frameworks deviate from conventional understandings of "theory" as "precisely stated and logically related propositions" (Treviño , Harris &Wallace, 2008, p. 9), and encompass guiding tenets that can serve as analytical tools to interrogate prevailing worldviews (Kochanek & Erickson, 2019). Cultural praxis operates as a heuristic (Ryba & Wright, 2010; Schinke & McGannon, 2015) that centers undertreated, if not altogether ignored, issues of diversity, identity, intersectionality, and power in sport—and in this case coaching and PYD discourses. Several core components of cultural praxis (See Blodgett et al., 2015; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2019) underpin this critical inquiry: (a) probe hidden culture-blind, ethnocentric assumptions that structure everyday sport practices; (b) problematize power relations that operate to construct "difference" in favor of a universalized, decontextualized status quo (i.e., White, ethnocentric, masculine, and heteronormative); and, (c) address the potentially disempowering effects of such constructions on minoritized people in sport and society alike.

This investigation aims to contribute to the CSP research by applying a critical theoretical approach that centralizes sociocultural issues relative to youth sport coaching. Of particular relevance to this project is Butryn's (2010) exploration of Whiteness in sport psychology and Blodgett et al. (2015)'s subsequent urge for scholars to problematize how their research may center and reinforce (White) hegemonic social structures. Our study takes seriously these calls to action, and focuses a critical gaze of inquiry on a privileged sport space—-relative to socioeconomic class and race—though sensitive to the multiple, intersectional dimensions of identity. Rather than affirm status quo sport perspectives, this exploratory effort is an attempt to unpack how privileged spaces (and social actors) more, or less, perpetuate culture-blind discourses and power dynamics in athletics and their potentially adverse effects for marginalized athletes and social progress.

Along with serving as a heuristic, cultural praxis also informs the process (or "how to") of conducting research (Blodgett et al., 2015; McGannon & Smith, 2015; Smith & McGannon, 2018). Cultural praxis as research aims to promote social justice through two chief processes. First, cultural praxis adopts localized, participatory processes that validate lived experiences of marginalized participants to provide deeper insights into social injustices that constrain their sport experience and life. Second, cultural praxis requires that researchers engage in reflective processes (i.e., reflexive sensibilities) in order to iteratively, proactively attend to the politics of knowledge production.

2.1. Positionality

The primary investigator (PI) acknowledges that her identity as a White, female youth sports coach and scholar of critical perspectives (i.e., researcher-coach-activist) impacts the knowledge production process as she assumes that social issues are relevant to sport coaches' praxis. She holds an anti-positivistic worldview oriented toward interpretivism (i.e., multiple realities exist and meanings are contextual situated and socially constructed). Epistemologically, the PI assumes that diverse lived experiences constitute valid knowledge and truth. She holds that knowledge is most valuable when knowing informs "doing" (i.e., action to promote social justice). Ontologically, she critiques tendencies for normative discourse to leave status quo understandings of coach effectiveness and athlete development uncontested. To guard against marginalizing non-dominant perspectives, she acknowledges the importance of iteratively reflecting on her own positionality (i.e., White, educated, and female) and engaging in a "proactive ethic" (See Blee & Currier, 2011) that validates the voices of individuals/groups whose experiences status quo research and practice often overlooked

(McGannon & Smith, 2015; Schinke et al., 2019). Thus, critical interpretation of coaches' views of broader social issues as more, or less, relevant to their work with student-athletes can challenge mainstream coaching approaches that often treat these matters as separate from sport.

2.2. Purpose and research questions

This study serves as an initial exploration of U.S. high school sport head coaches' *critical praxis*: reflection **and** action (and their reciprocal relationship) that attends to broader social forces and contests status quo social norms (Freire, 1972; hooks, 1994). The notion of critical praxis is drawn from earlier critical pedagogical (and race) scholarship, which underpin CSP research and practice. Applied to sport, critical praxis thus encompasses issues of social and personal identity (and intersectionality), power, and pedagogy that operate in/through athletics. The following research questions guided the study: (a) what, if any, social issues do high school coaches see as relevant in their work with athletes? (b) how do coaches navigate issues that arise? and, (c) how do coaches decide what issues are relevant—or not?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

Study participants were 12 U.S. high school head coaches (8 male, 4 female), which reflected typical gender disparities in U.S. high school coaching (LaVoi, 2014). Head coaches represented various sports of girls' and boys' teams including softball, swimming, football, soccer, lacrosse, shooting, basketball, field hockey, strength and conditioning, and cheerleading. All participants were current head coaches situated within a single high school sport community, located in a Midwestern suburban school district. This exploratory study was bounded because sociocultural norms are contextually situated. Doing so allowed for meaningful interpretation of the interplay between unique features of U.S. high school sport (as popular and competitive) generally and this community (as suburban and Midwestern) specifically, and whether/how coaches address social issues in their work with student-athletes.

It is important to note that the PI did not explicitly ask participants to reveal aspects of their social (e.g., sexual orientation or (dis)ability) or personal identities in order to respect participant autonomy and anonymity. While these identity characteristics are conceptually useful, the PI intentionally created space for participants to freely share details, and other experiences, that they felt comfortable divulging and appraised as relevant to their coaching praxis. All coaches directly, or indirectly, identified as White through discussion of social issues. Most coaches stated that they were educators and/or residents of the community (or surrounding area) with its associated demographic characteristics. Some coaches also shared information about personal relationships and interactions that helped them become more aware of social identities different from their own. For example, one coach spoke about developing a greater sensitivity toward sexual orientation and dis/ability through his relationship with a family member who identified as gay and his primary profession respectively.

3.2. Data collection

After Institutional Review Board approval, the PI selected participants using purposeful sampling through preexisting ties to the Athletic Director (AD) from one Midwestern, suburban high school community. The AD disseminated study information via email to head coaches on his athletic staff. Head coaches who expressed interest in participating in the study contacted the PI, who provided prospective participants with additional study information and a consent form. After the researcher obtained consent, she scheduled an individual, in-person interview with each head coach. Interviews lasted 45–60 min, were audiotaped and then transcribed verbatim, resulting in 96 transcribed pages.

3.3. Methodological rigor

While reliability is an appropriate measure of rigor in quantitative research, this qualitative study merits differently defining what constitutes rigor in line with its interpretivist form (Smith, 2018; Smith & McGannon, 2018). Researchers adopted a relativist approach (i.e., use of open-ended criteria that fit the study context and purpose) to achieve methodological rigor (see Smith & McGannon, 2018). As such, the PI engaged in *reflexivity* throughout the research process. Reflexivity not only regards exposing how the researcher's ontological and epistemological assumptions inform the study, but accounting for how the researcher's relationship to study participants (i.e., power dynamic) affects the construction of knowledge itself (Day, 2012; McGannon & Smith, 2015; Smith & McGannon, 2018). The PI was positioned as an insider-outsider as she is a former student-athlete from the sport community of inquiry. Her close community ties helped her gain entry and shared professional identity as a coach lessened typical power imbalance between researcher and study participant. Embedded in a status quo sport space, coaches also possessed social privilege relative to aspects of their profession and social (White) identities. As such, the PI made reflexive strides to iteratively, actively acknowledge her positionality as an educated, White female who shares many of these social privileges. The critical theoretical frame and interpretivist orientation of this study was not an attempt to speak *for* marginalized individuals/communities but rather shed light on potentially problematic ways of knowing/doing in privileged sport spaces that silence non-dominant perspectives.

The PI further strove to ensure methodological rigor through iterative reflexivity via critical dialogue with a critical friend (Smith & McGannon, 2018). This process serves to generate critical feedback, rather than agreement, as the critical friend asks questions that challenge and make visible the researcher's theoretical knowingness and construction of knowledge (i.e., interpretations of the data). Specifically, the PI conducted a bracketed interview with a critical friend prior to coach interviews to help ensure coherence between the researcher's worldview, theoretical perspective, research questions, and study methods. The bracketed interview also guided the PI to identify her positionality, acknowledge her theoretical interests, and promote transparency. Critical dialogue also took place during interview and data analysis phases to expose assumptions underlying the researcher's interpretative approach and explore alternative explanations relative to the study.

The PI also used strategies to support rigor by attending to the researcher-participant power dynamic (Smith & McGannon, 2018). She conducted them in private, quiet spaces (e.g., coaches' offices) within the high school area, which made interviews more comfortable and convenient for coaches. Given the potentially sensitive nature of interview questions, the PI carried out interviews in person to meaningfully connect with coaches. As a former student-athlete from this community and current high school coach, she appropriately disclosed this information to build rapport with coaches and invite them to share their experiences.

The PI used a semi-structured interview protocol that was informed by previous cultural praxis scholarship and research (Knowles et al., 2006, 2001; McGannon & Smith, 2015; Smith & McGannon, 2018). The interview protocol served to methodically answer primary research questions and make coaches feel empowered to offer their perspective on potentially sensitive topics. The PI asked broad, open-ended questions and used clarification probes when necessary. First, the PI asked coaches to describe the high school community in which they coached along with characteristics of their sport context and athletes. Second, the PI asked questions that guided coaches to speak to *how* they interact and work with athletes and *what* (i.e., personal/social identities,

philosophy, and experiences) informed their coaching. Questions about the social context and coach-athlete interactions situated discussion of potentially higher stakes social issues. Last, the PI engaged in methodological note-taking and reflexive journaling throughout data collection and analysis. Procedures allowed her to make her theoretical interests and interpretative orientation transparent (McGannon & Smith, 2015; Smith & McGannon, 2018), track the refinement of the interview guide, and process impressions of participant interviews.

3.4. Thematic analysis

Scholars have identified various qualitative methodologies (See McGannon & Smith, 2015) in alignment with cultural praxis (and CSP research) and noted others as promising. One additional research methodology in line with such an agenda is Braun and Clarke's (2019) *reflexive thematic analysis* (also see Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun et al., 2016). Reflexive thematic analysis affords the researcher theoretical flexibility to engage with the data at semantic (i.e., surface level) and latent (i.e., interpretative) levels. For this project, latent coding allowed researchers to go beyond study participants' expressed statements in accordance with a cultural praxis framework. That is, the PI was able to go beyond "what coaches said" (i.e., semantic codes) and draw attention to "what coaches did not say" (i.e., latent codes): hidden culture-blind assumptions and power dynamics underpinning coaches' reflection and action on social issues.

The PI engaged in Braun et al.'s (2016) proposed six-step process. She familiarized herself with the data by reading and re-reading transcripts, decontextualizing the data, and identifying each unit of text for its distinct meaning. The PI then generated semantic codes from coaches' explicit response, and language, used related to social issues. For example, based on coach's statements about racial protest before a game (i.e., "let's be respectful … but not let this social issue affect our focus."), the PI constructed a semantic code (i.e., "race/racism as distracting") to reflect the coach's point that race/racism was less relevant to her team. Semantic codes (e.g., "mental health as relevant") also captured when coaches identified certain issues as germane (e.g., "I think it is a huge issue."). The PI carried out a second review of the data to develop latent codes guided by cultural praxis tenets. Latent codes represented culture-blind assumptions underlying coaches more, or less, critical reflection and action. In the above race-related example, the PI used a latent code (i.e., "equates athlete development with social functioning") to captured assumptions underlying this coach's praxis. The PI consolidated codes into semantic (e.g., relevant issues and less relevant) and latent themes (e.g., problematizing athlete development and coach effectiveness). She examined whether themes had enough support from and meaningfully related to the data. Last, she created an integrative thematic map to depict coaches' critical praxis and theorized significant patterns and implications.

4. Results

Study findings have three key components: 1) ecology of coaches' (critical) praxis; 2) semantic themes that emerged from coaches' explicit identification of issues, strategies, less (or not at all) relevant issues, and motives/sources of support for engaging in a critical praxis; and, 3) deeper latent themes that problematize coaches' praxis according to cultural praxis tenets. Specifically, latent interpretation critically probed when coaches fell short of a robust critical praxis and contest status quo assumptions about coach effectiveness and athlete development that underpin their approach.

4.1. Ecology of coaches' critical praxis

The ecology of coaches' (critical) praxis describes environmental features of their coaching context. High school head coaches' (critical) praxis was situated within specific sport subcultures nested within the high school sport setting, community, and society.

High school community. Coaches described the high school community in which they worked as a supportive, though sheltered, and with high pressures to succeed. Coaches called the community "the bubble" in reference to these characteristics. For example, one coach noted that, "I wasn't sure what [the bubble] meant, until I was here for a couple of years. Then I understood that [there is] a strong tradition of academic and athletic excellence, and the community expects it." One coach interpreted, "bubble" meaning, "when we play schools that are urban or the opposite demographic. I have to almost give them a speech because they've never been exposed … stepping on the field, I say, 'your field is state of art; other fields aren't all like that'."

Almost all head coaches described the high school community demographic as homogenous. They explained that most student-athletes were from White, upper-middle socioeconomic class families. One coach analogized, "[Our] demographic: mayonnaise sandwich on white bread. But we have some minority student-athletes … coming through the program." While coaches noted that athletes of other ethnic, racial, or class-based backgrounds were in the minority, they articulated that the community was well-educated and held progressive views.

High school sport context characteristics. Coaches described that their high school sport context was competitive. Coaches held expectations for their program (and student-athletes) to always be in contention for league titles. While coaches explained that winning mattered, they also rejected a win-at-all-costs mentality. One coach stated, "the administration does a good job of putting out expectations in the frame of we're going to be positive and teach things geared toward winning, but not win-at-all-costs". Other coaches shared this philosophy and touted that developing "intangibles" in their athletes, such as "work ethic and selflessness through the work towards winning" as central to their coaching.

Sport subcultural characteristics. Coaches offered rich descriptions that distinguished their sport relative to physical demands and sociocultural norms. The swimming head coach commented that the unique physical demands of swimming not only reinforce student-athletes' discipline and ambition, but impact coach-athlete interactions stating,

> "Most swimmers are so disciplined and organized … they understand what it takes to be a swimmer. So that most of the time they are going to be great students. They are very driven; their expectations are high. Because swimming requires so much discipline. And, the sport is unique because … 80 or 90% of the time, their head is under water. So it is important [that] when they are on the wall we are talking to them."

The rifle coach, in contrast, described how the powerful mechanical device specific to his sport required that he get athletes to understand, "[They're] responsible for that piece of lead until it quits moving. They are quite aware that they are responsible … we tell them to keep their finger off the trigger and never point at anything [they] don't want to destroy." In this way, values of personal responsibility and safety are emphasized in the range.

Coaches also identified sociocultural norms that operate in their sport. The cheerleading coach noted that she "[had] only had all females, never had a male". Even though males could participate, her sport was gendered. Head coaches of boys' teams also spoke about subcultural characteristics. The football coach explained how physicality was tied to notions of toughness recounting, "I had a parent say, 'what are you going to do to make them tougher, I think they are too soft; we don't hit enough'", while the boys' lacrosse coach noted how "lacrosse in particular has a cultural blemish … people assume that 'lax bros' are heavy drinkers, partiers, drug addicts". Alternatively, the rifle coach mentioned commonly held political views in his sport stating, "[Shooting] is an old school conservative sort of sport." Thus, sport-specific sociocultural norms that coaches described ranged from gender to political beliefs.

4.2. Semantic themes based on coaches' explicit responses

Relevant issues. Coaches identified myriad of social issues as relevant to their work with athletes: mental health, socioeconomic status, school violence, sexual orientation, gender biases, underage drinking, race/racism, social media, and sexual violence and social relationships. Issues that coaches commonly emphasized as germane included mental health, sexual violence and social relationships, and underage drinking. Coaches of girls' and boys' teams gave accounts of athletes with mental health struggles, such as anxiety or depression. Two coaches described that some players "had to quit" or "were not survivors of" the program, while another coach indicated that one of his players was able to "blossom". Coaches noted that high pressures to succeed and social media as two factors that contribute to mental health struggles among student-athletes: One coach commented,

> "I see more bullying done in social media than anything else … That impacts their performance because they're coming in here depressed and upset. It comes back to that: they are bullied … That is the biggest need we need as a community, world, and society. It is ok to have a mental—you know— it's ok, but let's get them help. And how?"

Coaches also explained that distress student-athletes experienced was exacerbated because they "[didn't] want to let others see them struggling".

Several coaches recognized sexual violence as an important social issue to address with student-athletes. The football coach explained that "[the team] had an incident where someone had pictures, he was hiding and threatening the girl with them, that he was going to show them". He elaborated, "you are fighting what we see in society today, where that is ok—although they get in trouble. I try to highlight when those things happen. Like LeSean McCoy. We will be talking about that at camp." Coaches also conveyed the importance of talking about sexual violence with female student-athletes. One coach recalled bringing up a local incident in which a "girl that got drunk and football boys took advantage of her."

4.3. Strategies to navigate social issues

Coaches navigated relevant social issues through indirect and direct methods. While the cheerleading coach addressed the topic of body image generally so as not to "address the elephant in the room" but give athletes "some things in the back of their minds when they are not said", the football coach did so with racial discrimination and LGBTQ issues because "[talking] about it specifically makes it even more uncomfortable." Coaches also reported using a variety of strategies to navigate social issues directly, including being proactive, dialoguing with athletes, using administrative support, teaching athletes lessons, and working with athlete leaders. Dialogue regarded conversations *with* athletes where coaches shared power: they gave athletes opportunities to ask questions and express their opinions. Coaches described this two-way exchange as distinct from teaching values/lessons *to* athletes when an issue arose. For example, one coach used dialogue and solicited help from the athletic director to proactively address race/racism before a match against an opponent who intended to protest the National Anthem (played prior to most athletic events in the U.S. at all competitive levels): "So [the AD] shared that knowledge with them. We went on to discuss, you know— 'girls what do you think? Is this the right way to share your opinion? You know, everyone has the right to express themselves? Do we need to be a part of that?'." Alternatively, this coach used a situation involving underage drinking as a teachable moment in which she communicated values *to* athletes rather than engaging them in open-ended questions: "I addressed it as a whole team. I said, 'I got wind that these were some topics of conversation, and from a leadership perspective, you need to think about how do you want to be viewed; how do you want to view yourself and each other?'"

Coaches also mentioned that other, often subtler, behavioral practices helped them handle issues, namely being vulnerable and caring for athletes as individuals. Concrete tactics that coaches used in their daily practice to demonstrate care through coach-athlete interactions included "connect[ing] with every kid every day", communicating that "they can always call me", and reinforcing a caring climate by "explain [ing] to kids that you don't know what everyone else is going through. What you can do is … treat her like a teammate we care about and look after." Coaches articulated that showing athletes care helped them build trust and made open communication easier for athletes when issue came up (e.g., mental health). Coaches indicated that being vulnerable was also important to build trust and convey care. Many coaches described sharing fears and doubts that they had experienced as a player with their student-athletes. To "empathize more than sympathize", coaches opened up to athletes about times they failed to overcome performance-related or social pressures and acknowledged when they made coaching mistakes.

4.4. Motives and experiences/sources that support a critical praxis

To describe *why* they were willing to navigate social issues, coaches cited motives and experiences/sources of support. Coaches were motivated to confront these topics in order to promote positive sport experiences, teach life skills, and meet their athletes' needs. Coaches revealed that even though issues "make you age … at the end of the day you are making a difference", noting that their impact could go beyond, and was secondary to, performance. As the softball coach stated, "you hope they are the best shortstop or secondary but that is secondary". Coaches addressed challenging social issues because they wanted to cultivate passion so that kids would come back "on [the swimming] deck" or "into the weight room". They also wanted to "teach life lessons" and "educate student-athletes on/off the field." One coach insisted that he navigated issues to meet his athletes' needs saying, "I don't think [I] should ever say [a potential issue] is not relevant to them or me because if it's relevant to them, it's relevant to [me]."

Experiences/sources that support a critical praxis. Along with motives, coaches elaborated on experiences, and sources, that supported when/how they engage in a critical praxis. Coaches across sports mentioned other social actors as significant sources of support. While some coaches reached out to outside sources (e.g., law enforcement or educational programs) others expressed the instrumental role that the athletic director had in helping coaches confront a breadth of topics. The girls' field hockey coach admitted, "I'm sure there is a lot that I'm not equipped for, but I'm fortunate to have a great administration, [our AD] does a great job … I can always have a dialogue with him on how I can work through this." Other coaches (e.g., swimming, lacrosse, and cheerleading) similarly praised the AD as a leader whose proactive communication and guidance made them feel more comfortable and capable to handle issues.

Coaches likewise communicated that diverse coaching/educational experiences informed their critical praxis. Professional experiences that coaches drew on included being an inner city teacher, a counselor, and an employee with the Special Olympics. The girls' soccer coach described that, "I was in my little bubble in high school … I went to [college], which was diverse, but having taught [in the inner city] and seeing what they have and don't" gave her perspective. Coaches also mentioned that becoming a parent (mother or father) strengthened their beliefs about the relevance of working through social issues with student-athletes.

4.5. Social issues as less (or not at all) relevant

Coaches also identified certain topics as less, or not at all, relevant to their praxis. Semantic themes regard language (i.e., "personal responsibility" and "social issues as distractions") and logic (i.e., alterative factors) that coaches offered for why they avoided topics.

"Social issues as distraction" language. Several coaches used "social issues as distraction" language to indicated that certain social issues were less significant to their work. For example, the rifle coach clarified his stance on school violence protests: "Yeah, at the high school, a bunch of [students] walked out at 11. I said, 'you represent the shooting fraternity and I don't want to hear about any of you doing that. Because it is stupid'". Through his overt dismissal of student-athletes' activism inside/outside the range as "stupid", this coach indicates that these issues/actions are unnecessary disruptions. Another coach used similar language after dialoguing with her players about whether to kneel during the National Anthem. She urged,

> "Let's be respectful, but remember that we are going to focus on our game and not let this social issue affect our focus. We know this is going to happen, we are prepared for it, we have to be aware of it, and to some degree acknowledge that it is happening, but we don't have to let it lose our focus."

Though more willing to engage student-athletes in a conversation about social protest, this coach advises players to make sure protests do not distract them—or "make them lose focus", language that prioritizes performance over social protest. Other coaches fashioned similar language in response to Kaepernick's protest and school shooting walk-outs. One coach noted, "[the protest] wasn't something that prevented us for getting done what we needed to get done", while another coach voiced the athletic department's position: "Go out and protest … but you need to come back to class. You're fine to go to sports as long as you come in and you're not rowdy, or nothing stupid." Thus, coaches use "sport as distraction" language to signify some social issues as less relevant to their praxis—instead emphasizing sport performance and participation goals.

"Personal responsibility" language. Coaches also conveyed that broader social dynamics and aspects of athletes' social identity as less, or not at all, relevant to their coaching using "personal responsibility" language. One coach stated,

> "A guy was complaining that other teammates were picking on him … When you get out in the real world, no one is going to take your side, you have to do it. You are responsible. Of course, you can't let someone do something nasty to teammates, but don't sit in the corner and cry about."

This coach's use of "personal responsibility" language disregards the potential interplay between aspects of student-athletes' social identities and maladaptive group dynamics (i.e., bullying). Another coach employed similar language about ethnic/racial diversity on his team. He described how players, regardless of ethnic/racial background, had a responsibility to respect team rules:

> "I've had maybe 10–20 African American players—one every year. I've had Chinese kids come over and speak no English … My big thing is inclusion. They are a part of my family, and that doesn't make a difference who they are or what they are. They still have to abide by the same rules and respect the same things we all respect. I think sometimes they get catered to a lot."

That is, the coach negates, rather than negotiates, racial/ethnic differences by placing responsibility on players to abide by pre-established team norms.

Lack of contextual relevance. Coaches frequently stated that they did not address social issues that they viewed lacked contextual relevance. One coach commented, "it's one time I will take their 'bubble' and go with it … The Kaepernick stuff—that's all stuff going on out there—and, because they are in here, that's the one time I used that to my advantage. I never brought it up." When answering whether mental health issues were relevant to his coaching, another coach replied, "mental health not so much, but mental training—yes. I've never had kids with mental health issues. They usually are not survivors of the basketball program." The implication underlying these responses is that racism and mental health are issues coaches *would have* addressed had they been perceived as germane to their player-context dynamic.

Lack of coach expertise or developmental appropriateness. Coaches put forth two additional reasons for why they left potential issues unaddressed: lack of expertise and developmental appropriateness. On topics related to mental health, one coach felt that she "did not have enough training". On issues of sexual violence against women and racial protest, another coach similarly expressed, "I hesitated because I didn't feel equipped". While coaches may have been critically aware of certain issues arising in sport, they stop short of addressing these matters because they do not feel equipped/expert. Related to mental health (namely depression and suicidal ideations), the basketball coach also noted that she evaded the topic because she felt the issues were not developmentally appropriate for student-athletes.

4.6. Latent themes: problematizing coaches' (critical) praxis

Latent analysis offers a deeper, incisive perspective of coaches' praxis—as more or less—critical. Latent themes reflect guiding tenets of a cultural praxis framework that expose hidden assumptions underpinning what coaches "say" (to describe their praxis) and problematize coaches' praxis related to two constructs: coach effectiveness (i.e., what constitutes quality coaching?) and athlete development (i.e., what is positive development?)

Problematizing Coach Effectiveness. Latent interpretation can reveal assumptions that coaches make about coach effectiveness and possible disempowering effects. Analyses make visible how coaches may undertreat the potential value of knowledge of student-athletes' (and their own) social identities but also assume that coaching requires expertise on social issues. For example, the rifle coach overlooked the potential significance (and complexity) of athletes' social identities to his coaching when he recalls: "And no one [protested school violence] … You have kids in band, which everyone thinks is liberal, but playing an instrument—the exact same way every time—it's the same. The translation works well. So, I don't see most of that political stuff is an issue." For this coach, effective coaching regards teaching players to perform "the exact same way every time". Given the "point-and-shoot" nature of his coaching context, he appears to assume that sociopolitical ideologies and movements constitute "stuff" that is separate from his sport, players, and coaching process. Though shooting requires mechanical execution of motor skill, this assumption may be problematic in that his athletes enter the range with unique experiences and social identities (e.g., political ideologies) that can impact their performance, motivation, and development.

The boys' basketball coach similarly dismissed the relevance of his athletes' social identities to his coaching. When describing how he navigates diverse ethic/racial differences to establish team culture, he clarified "They are a part of my family, and that doesn't make a difference who or what they are. They still have to abide by the same rules and respect the same things we all respect." While players may need to understand and follow rules in order to be a part of a team, this coach assumes that effective coaching (for team culture) involves pre-established team norms that mute rather than celebrate difference. He forgoes considering that such a praxis may strip, not celebrate, meaningful aspects of players' identity—which may negative implications for players' sense of social support and well-being.

Some coaches also discounted the impact of intrapersonal knowledge of their own social identity on their coach process. The football coach offers an illustrative example specific to sexual orientation/gender identity: "Some [issues] don't necessarily fit very comfortably, like LGBT things … that doesn't really fit into a nice neat box, but it is more about treating people with respect … That is how I try to address that." Topics about which coaches are less "comfortable" or familiar can seem daunting to approach. While attending to every social issue that arises may be unnecessary and impractical, this coach overlooks how potential biases he may hold based on his own social identity (and

lived experiences) might inform his praxis. The assumption that coach effectiveness may not require this intrapersonal knowledge allows him to foreclosure considering why, given his social identity and sport context, this topic is unsettling and *seems* less important to directly address. It may precisely because of how he identifies as a man and the hyper-masculine football culture that "LGBT things … do not fit" in his approach or space.

When other coaches felt less familiar with, or expert on, social issues they were also less certain about addressing these topics. Coaches acknowledged the limitations of their own their professional role to note that certain circumstances required that they guide athletes to seek professional help or expertise elsewhere (e.g., mental health) (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). On issues of racism and mental health, the girls' soccer coach did "not feel equipped" and "hesitated to address [this topics]", sentiments that the girls' basketball coach shared related to mental health and sexual violence issues. Their approach, however, is fundamentally different from inaction that dismisses social issues (e.g., athletes' social identities and realities) as relevant. Inaction stemming from the assumption that coaches need to have expertise, or feel expertly confident, to approach social issues can have disempowering effects when "coach as expert" logic functions to excuse (even if unknowingly) coaches from attending to issues that matter to athletes' social identities and realities. One coach challenged "coach as expert" logic stating, "I would not feel uncomfortable dealing with anything. That doesn't mean I know the answer, but I'd feel comfortable having a conversation with the kid." Though less expert, and perhaps confident, in his knowledge of social issues, this coach's willingness to "have a conversation" demonstrates a critical understanding of coach effectiveness. In this view, quality coaching does not require expertise, but an active attentiveness to issues that are important to his student-athletes.

Problematizing Athlete Development. Latent interpretation of coaches' praxis can reveal assumptions that coaches make about athlete development. Analyses make visible how some coaches universalize certain values/skills and narrowly equate athlete development with social functioning. For example, the football coach described how he taught student-athletes certain core values and used these to navigate social issues—including, "perseverance, competitiveness, competition, [and] teamwork." He elaborated:

> "We talk about those specifically with our players. We have a champions manual … modeled after [what] Urban Meyer gives out at Ohio State … We are not in the business of building D-1 football players. We're here to build young men to become great fathers, husbands, and community members. Football is the vehicle to teach that."

While learning to cooperate and compete are valuable developmental outcomes, "building young men to become great fathers and husbands" seems to endorse a narrow, universalized conception of masculinity—especially when considered within his sport subcultural context. Left unchecked, assumptions about the "type of man" to which his athletes should aspire may marginalize student-athletes that do not identify with, or "fit", this ideal.

Despite coaching in a sport subculture that may similarly reinforce status quo notions of masculinity, the boys' lacrosse coach showed a more critical praxis. He explained, "[To be] as confidential as possible, we have a young man who may live an alternative lifestyle … I think some of the guys on the team were not real comfortable with it; others were fine with it." To navigate this team dynamic, the coach modeled and promoted social responsibility among student-athletes. This value, he expressed, "bled down" to the boys; and, when this player's grandfather passed away in season, "Members of the position that he played took him out to lunch and had a conversation with him. That was the turning point … he's become more involved with the program; lacrosse has given him a niche where he can fit in, where no one is judging him." More than acknowledging non-dominant conceptions of masculinity, this coach actively embraces alternative constructions through a practice of social responsibility. He places responsibility on himself and his student-athletes to foster inclusion rather than on the player "with an alternative lifestyle" to acquiesce to the dominant masculine ideal. In doing so, he demonstrates a more robust, critical understanding of athlete development.

Latent interpretation of coaches' praxis can also make visible how coaches narrowly equate athlete development with social functioning. This assumption became most apparent when coaches described how they addressed issues of racism/racial protest. The girls' basketball coach detailed: "We put our hands on our hearts. So that has been a tradition … the kids just do it because I tell them. I talk about not swaying or chewing gum and we are all focused on the National Anthem." Viewing sport as a medium for learning citizenship qualities is not in itself problematic; and, showing respect may be a valuable skill for young people to practice. In this moment, however, the coach strictly equates athlete development with status quo social functioning, which may foreclose this coach from considering that for student-athletes of diverse ethnic/racial social identities the flag may not symbolize freedom but systemic oppression. Her assumption may further marginalize athletes of color who are compelled to assimilate to, rather than challenge, these systems (i.e., institutional racism).

To navigate the same issue, the girls' field hockey adopted a different approach— proactively dialoguing about why their opponent planned to protest the National Anthem:

> "We were sort of like, 'that is their choice to kneel, if that is what this team wants to do, that's their choice.' We were going to respect our flag, but [we] invited any of the girls that wanted to talk about this further, or if any of them felt the need to kneel."

Through her efforts to inform student-athletes and ask them questions, this coach does not solely equate athlete development with social functioning. She is (to a greater extent) encouraging critical thought and discussion among her student-athletes. Even so, she falls short of a robust critical praxis that endorses perspective-taking and critical contribution skills as developmental outcomes. While racial protest may seem less relevant to a homogenous, predominately White community, this viewpoint shifts all responsibility to affect social change on marginalized youth. One coach became critically aware of this notion at the end of her interview noting, "I was reading the study information and saw race, and [thought]— what am I going to bring up because these kids literally don't. Maybe that is the issue, that they don't even. It's not an issue because it's not their reality". She then described her intentions to make players aware of their privilege: "I think I have to have a conversation. I haven't thought about it yet, but I do plan to have a conversation."

5. Discussion

The purpose of this exploratory study was to better understand whether, and how, U.S. high school sport coaches think about and navigate broader social issues in their work with athletes. This project builds off CSP scholarship to probe the extent to which coaches contest, or reinforce, culture-blind discourses and power dynamics and their potentially (dis)empowering effects, but also serves as a unique bridge between critical sport and practical coaching literature. Findings can offer practically-relevant insights for coaches to promote PYD through sport. Results are discussed below along with implications and future research directions with a cultural praxis agenda.

Coaches not only identified myriad of social issues as relevant to their praxis but also offered various strategies to address these topics. While critical sport scholars identify that popular beliefs (including those held by coaches) characterize sport as separate from broader political, social issues (Coakley, 2011; Cushion, 2018), head coaches did recognize and attend to several issues in their work with athletes. Coaches also offered potentially promising strategies for effectively navigating such challenging situations—such as dialoguing with

athletes, working with athlete leaders, being vulnerable, and coaching with care. Extant theory and research on coaching (e.g., autonomy-supportive or transformational coaching styles) evidence the efficacy of these practices to promote positive sport experiences and athlete development (Kipp & Weiss, 2013; Turnnidge & Côté, 2016). Research robustly supports links between athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors that grant athletes choice/agency and foster relatedness and adaptive athlete outcomes (Kipp & Weiss, 2015; Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2013). Cultural praxis literature also endorses the efficacy of strategies—namely dialogue—that involve *working with* youth to address sociocultural issues in cultural sensitive ways (Ryba, 2009; Ryba et al., 2013).

Results indicate pertinent issues as context- and subculture-specific, nested within their sport, high school, and community space. Findings corroborate CSP scholarship (See Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2019) and studies on social issues (e.g., gender hierarchy) in varied geographic and sport contexts (e.g., Kavoura, A., Kokkonen, M., Chroni, S., & Ryba, 2017; Kavoura, Ryba, & Chroni, 2015). Social norms operating at proximate and distal system levels informed what issues coaches identified as more, or less, germane. In this largely upper-middle class, White U.S. high school setting many coaches viewed racial protest as less, but emphasized mental health issues as more, relevant given community-specific pressures to succeed. Findings also align with prevalent practical frameworks (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Gould & Carson, 2008) that direct coaches to consider developmental, competitive, and social contextual features in order to effectively work with athletes. Uniquely, the current study provides insight into the interplay between high school coaches' praxis and sport-specific physical demands (e.g., training load) or subcultural characteristics (e.g., gender stereotypes)—in particular how sport-specific characteristics can designate the actual, and perceived, prevalence of certain social issues.

Last, and most innovatively, latent interpretation served as a mechanism to engage in research as cultural praxis and probe potential hidden assumptions that coaches made about coach effectiveness and athlete development. These two constructs reflect the "unchallenged position" of ethnocentric ways of coaching to which cultural praxis critically attends (Ryba et al., 2013). Findings offer novel, practical insight into how dominant ways of coaching are more, or less, (un) contested, in a privileged sport space (Blodgett et al., 2015; Schinke et al., 2019). Specifically, coaches' critical praxis varied along a continuum. Coaches who showed higher levels of awareness and action were more critical in their praxis. The extent to which coaches demonstrated a truly critical praxis that challenged the dominant coaching discourse varied not only by coach (given their positionality), but by content (issue) and context (sport). For example, the boys' lacrosse coach more critically attended to non-dominant conceptions of masculinity relative to the boys' football coach who was less critically aware of such issues. The lacrosse coach's more robust critical praxis likely guided him to acknowledge his own biases and athletes' potentially diverse lived experiences. He described engaging in "socially responsible" action: allowing players to explore and define masculinity in ways that embrace their authentic selves. Such socially responsible coaching aligns with CSP scholars who advocate for coaching as cultural praxis in order to fully support athlete development/well-being and social justice (Blodgett et al., 2015; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2012, 2019).

While some coaches demonstrated a strong critical praxis toward social issues, latent interpretation also exposed when they fell short of critical action—and a truly critical praxis. Recent studies corroborate how coaches may overlook the relevance of certain issues given their individual and social, contextually contained positioning (e.g., Gearity & Metzger, 2017; Halbrook, Watson, & Voelker, 2018; Ryba et al., 2013). For example, though (partially) critically aware of racism/racial protest, the field hockey coach stopped short of robust critical action in her work with athletes. A more critical praxis could have guided her to invite her players to engage in dialogue and perspective taking *with* the opponent to challenge ignorance and racist inaction among (White) athletes—empowering both teams and society alike. Otherwise, less robust critical action not only risks placing responsibility for social change on marginalized student-athletes, but may harmfully mask oppressive norms and (White) ignorance toward institutional racism in "athlete development" rhetoric (Hershberg, Johnson, DeSouza, Hunter, & Zaff, 2015; Kochanek & Erickson, 2019). While directly addressing every social issue that arises may be impractical and unnecessary, latent insights can guide coaches to consider how to integrate stronger levels of critical praxis into their current approach. Changes (even slight) that orient coaches toward critical awareness and action have potential to help coaches foster inclusive climates and meaningful coach-athlete relationships (See Blodgett et al., 2015; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2019) in support of their stated aim: to promote enjoyable, adaptive sport experiences.

5.1. Theoretical and practical implications

Study findings have theoretical and practical implications for coaching. Coaches identified and navigated various social issues, but also felt ill-equipped with knowledge and skills to effectively do so. Prevalent applied frameworks (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009; USOC, 2017) only peripherally account for these sociocultural complexities and thus offer little guidance. In contrast, critical sport scholars highlight the need to view coaching as cultural praxis and center broader social issues and accompanying power dynamics (e.g., Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2009; Cushion, 2018; Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2012), but often do so with less practical direction. Future research needs to use critical perspectives (e.g., Gearity & Metzger, 2017) and/or cultural praxis to develop practically meaningful models that fully account for the social dynamics inextricable to coaching.

Critical considerations from this study have practical implications for coaches to engage in cultural praxis. Results point to when/how a robust critical praxis might guide coaches to contest ethnocentric assumptions about coach effectiveness and athlete development. Study findings offer practical clarity on how coaches can improve their critical awareness and action along intrapersonal, interpersonal, contextual, and (athlete) developmental dimensions. First, latent analyses showed that coaches' social identities/experiences informed what issues they viewed as (ir)relevant. Central to cultural praxis (e.g., Cassidy et al., 2009; Cushion, 2018; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2012), intrapersonal knowledge of how a coach's own identity and biases impact quality coaching. Coaches can strive to hone their reflective sensibilities to check culture-blind assumptions that may undermine their practice.

From an interpersonal perspective, coaches can avoid considering athletes as "universal beings or stereotype them" (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 137) and attend to how athletes' lived experiences and multiple, intersecting identities influence their sport experience (Schinke et al., 2019; Schinke & McGannon, 2015). To harken back to how the boys' football coach's navigated gender identity and boys' basketball coach's addressed race/ethnicity, more than recognize diversity, quality coaching requires that coaches *embrace* difference to honor student-athletes' identities and support their development (Blodgett et al., 2015; Kochanek & Erickson, 2019; Schinke et al., 2019).

Furthermore, coaches can be aware of how social issues are contextually contained: features of their community and sport subculture make certain issues more, or less, pressing. Coaches should attend to visible issues but also critically contemplate matters that are easy to overlook *because* of their context. Last, a more critical praxis can guide coaches to promote critical forms of social contribution (e.g., activism) as an adaptive developmental outcome (Hershberg et al., 2015; Kochanek & Erickson, 2019; Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke et al., 2019). In doing so, coaches not only promote youth empowerment but social justice.

5.2. Future research directions

The bounded scope of this study allowed for rich, meaningful interpretation of the interplay between context-specific characteristics and coaches' (critical) praxis and lends to several future research directions. Subsequent empirical work can shed light on how other high school head sport coaches— in diverse and/or under-resourced contexts and different competitive and developmental levels— navigate sociocultural issues. Additional context-specific studies can further enrich our understanding of how coaches with varied identities/backgrounds embedded in distinct social and cross-cultural settings engage, if at all, in a critical praxis. Future empirical work might assess whether coaches in more diverse, or underserved, communities show a greater sensitivity toward structural inequalities that may disadvantage athletes given aspects social identities (e.g., race and class). A developmental perspective could also provide insight into age-appropriate considerations relevant to coaches *working with* athletes to promote individual development and social progress alike.

The coach-centered focus of this study also serves as valuable point of departure for future research. Additional studies that capture athletes' perspectives regarding how, if at all, coaches effectively demonstrate a critical praxis and what coaching strategies athletes identify as empowering could offer concrete, meaningful information on what coaching as cultural praxis looks like in practice. Examining perspectives of athletic directors is a second fruitful line of inquiry— given how coaches identified their athletic director as an invaluable source of support. As gatekeepers of U.S. high school sport, athletic directors establish program culture. Thus, understanding how these gatekeepers engage in their (critical) praxis and support or thwart that of coaches is essential.

6. Conclusion

Whether, and how, coaches engage in a critical praxis is undertreated in research and practice. Addressing broader social issues is difficult work for coaches to carry out, along with their other roles and responsibilities. To ensure that sport is a positive developmental context for youth, theory and research need to more rigorously examine how coaches might shift toward a more critical praxis that attends to sociocultural (and power) dynamics operating in/through sport. Such efforts can inform practical initiatives to help coaches act in socially responsible ways that empower youth as active agents in their developmental process and of social progress.

Acknowledgement

Research reported in this publication was supported by Michigan State University's The College of Education, Summer Research Development Fellowship.

References

Blee, K., & Currier, A. (2011). Ethics beyond the IRB: An introductory essay. *Qualitative Sociology, 34*, 401–413.

Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., & Fisher, L. A. (2015). Cultural sport psychology research: Conceptions, evolutions and forecasts. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 8*, 24–43.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*, 589–597.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using thematic analysis in sport and exercise research. In B. Smith, & A. C. Sparkes (Eds.). *International handbook on qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 191–218). London: Routledge.

Butryn, T. M. (2010). Interrogating whiteness in sport psychology. In T. V. Ryba, R. J. Schinke, & G. Tenenbaum (Eds.). *The cultural turn in sport psychology* (pp. 127–152). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R., & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as "positive development?". *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 35*, 306–324.

Coakley, J. (2016). Positive youth development through sport: Myths, beliefs, and realities. In N. L. Holt (Ed.). *Positive youth development through sport* (pp. 21–33). (2nded). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cooky, C. (2017). "We cannot stand idly by": A necessary call for a public sociology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 34*, 1–11.

Cooper, J. N., Macaulay, C., & Rodriguez, S. H. (2019). Race and resistance: A typology of African American sport activism. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 54*, 151–181.

Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 4*, 307–327.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). *Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics.* University of Chicago Legal Forum139–167.

Cushion, C. J. (2018). Reflection and reflective practice discourses in coaching: A critical analysis. *Sport, Education and Society, 23*, 82–94.

Day, S. (2012). A reflexive lens: Exploring dilemmas of qualitative methodology through the concept of reflexivity. *Qualitative Sociology Review, 8*, 60–85.

Denison, J., Mills, J. P., & Konoval, T. (2015). Sports' disciplinary legacy and the challenge of 'coaching differently'. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*, 772–783.

Fraser-Thomas, J. L., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue tofoster positive development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 10*, 19–40.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Herder and Herder.

Gearity, B. T., & Metzger, L. H. (2017). Intersectionality, microaggressions, and microaffirmations: Toward a cultural praxis of sport coaching. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 34*, 160–175.

Gearity, B. T. (2012). Review of In R. L. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. T. Ronglan (Vol. Eds.), *(2011). The sociology of sports coaching: 29*, (pp. 122–125). NY: Routledge Sociology of Sport Journal.

Gould, D., & Carson, S. (2008). Life skills development through sport: Current status and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1*, 58–78.

Halbrook, M., Watson, J., & Voelker, D. (2018). High school coaches' experiences with openly lesbian, gay, and bisexual athletes. *Journal of Homosexuality, 66*, 838–856.

Hartmann, D. (2016). *A new era of athlete awareness and advocacy. The Society*. Retrieved from https://thesocietypages.org/editors/2016/07/27/a-new-era-of-athlete-awareness-and-advocacy/.

Hershberg, R. M., Johnson, S. K., DeSouza, L. M., Hunter, C. J., & Zaff, J. (2015). Promoting contribution among youth: Implications for positive youth development research for youth development programs. In E. P. Bowers, G. J. Geldhof, S. K. Johnson, L. J. Hillard, R. M. Hershberg, J. V. Lerner, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.). *Promoting positive youth development: Lessons from the 4-H study* (pp. 211–228). New York, NY: Springer.

Holt, N. L. (2016). *Positive youth development through sport* (Second edition). New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* NY: Routledge.

Kaufman, P., & Wolff, E. A. (2010). Playing and protesting: Sport as a vehicle for social change. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 34*, 154–175.

Kavoura, A., Kokkonen, M., Chroni, S., & Ryba, T. V. (2017). "Some women are born fighters": Discursive constructions of a fighter identity by female Finnish judo athletes. *Sex Roles*. Advanced online publication https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0869-1.

Kavoura, A., Ryba, T. V., & Chroni, S. (2015). Negotiating female judoka identities in Greece:A foucauldian discourse analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 17*, 88–98.

Kipp, L. E., & Weiss, M. R. (2013). Social influences, psychological need satisfaction, and well- being among female adolescent gymnasts. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 2*, 62–75.

Kipp, L. E., & Weiss, M. R. (2015). Social predictors of psychological need satisfaction and well-being among female adolescent gymnasts: A longitudinal analysis. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 4*, 153–169.

Knowles, Z., Gilbourne, D., Borrie, A., & Neville, A. (2001). Developing the reflective sports coach: A study exploring the processes of reflection within a higher education coaching program. *Reflective Practice, 2*, 185–207.

Knowles, Z., Tyler, G., Gilbourne, D., & Eubank, M. (2006). Reflecting on reflection: Exploring the practice of sports coaching graduates. *Reflective Practice, 7*, 163–179.

Kochanek, J., & Erickson, K. (2019). Interrogating positive youth development through sport using critical race theory. *Quest*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2019.1641728.

LaVoi, N. M. (2014). *Minnesota state high school coaches association on report 2013-14*Minneapolis, MN: Tucker Center for Research on Girls & Women in Sport.

Lyle, J., & Cushion, C. (2017). *Sport coaching concepts: A framework for coaching practice.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge Vol. 2nd ed.

McGannon, K. R., & Smith, B. (2015). Centralizing culture in cultural sport psychology research: The potential of narrative inquiry and discursive psychology. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 17*, 79–87.

Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2009). Power, conflict, and cooperation: Toward a micropolitics of coaching. *Quest, 61*, 223–236.

Potrac, P., Jones, R. L., Gilbourne, D., & Nelson, L. (2012). 'Handshakes, BBQs, and bullets': Self-interest, shame and regret in football coaching. *Sports Coaching Review, 1*, 79–92.

Reel, J. J., & Crouch, E. (2019). #MeToo: Uncovering sexual harassment and assault in sport. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology, 13*, 177–179.

Ryba, T. V. (2009). Understanding your role in cultural sport psychology. In R. J. Schinke, & S. J. Hanrahan (Eds.). *Cultural sport psychology* (pp. 35–44). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Ryba, T. V., & Schinke, R. J. (2009). Methodology as a ritualized eurocentrism: Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 7*, 263–274.

Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N., Si, G., & Schinke, R. J. (2013). ISSP position stand: Culturally competent research and practice in sport and exercise psychology. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 123–142.

Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2005). From mental game to cultural praxis: A cultural studies model's implications for the future of sport psychology. *Quest, 57*, 192–219.

Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2010). Sport psychology and the cultural turn: Notes toward cultural praxis. In T. V. Ryba, R. J. Schinke, & G. Tenenbaum (Eds.). *The cultural turn in sport psychology* (pp. 1–28). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Schinke, R. J., Blodgett, A. T., Ryba, T. V., Kao, S. F., & Middleton, T. R. F. (2019). Cultural sport psychology as a pathway to advance in identity and settlement research to practice. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 42*, 58–65.

Schinke, R. J., Stambulova, N., Si, G., & Moore, Z. (2017). International Society of Sport Psychology position stand: Athletes' mental health, performance, and development. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Advanced online publication https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1295557.

Schinke, R. J., & McGannon, K. R. (2015). Cultural sport psychology and intersecting identities: An introduction to the special section. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 17*, 45–47.

Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., Parham, W. D., & Lane, A. M. (2012). Toward cultural praxis and cultural sensitivity: Strategies for self-reflexive sport psychology practice. *Quest, 64*, 34–46.

Smith, B. (2018). Generalizability in qualitative research: Misunderstandings, opportunities and recommendations for the sport and exercise sciences. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 10*, 137–149.

Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 101–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357.

Treviño, J. A., Harris, M. A., & Wallace, D. (2008). What's so critical about critical race theory?Contemporary. *Justice Review, 11*, 7–10.

Turnnidge, J., & Côté, J. (2016). Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 16*, 327–342.

Vella, S. A., Oades, L. G., & Crowe, T. P. (2013). A pilot test for transformational leadership training for sports coaches: Impact on the developmental experiences of adolescent athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 8*, 513–530.

United States Olympic Committee Quality Coaching Framework (USOC) (2017). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.