

**THE COACH-ATHLETE RELATIONSHIP:
THE IMPACTS OF AN ATHLETE'S RACE/ETHNICITY ON
PREFERRED COACHING STYLES**

An Undergraduate Research Scholars Thesis

by

JACOB KNOSTMAN

Submitted to the Undergraduate Research Scholars program at
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the designation as an

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR

Approved by Research Advisor:

Dr. Phia Salter

May 2019

Major: Psychology

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | 1 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 3 |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| II. METHODS | 9 |
| Participants..... | 9 |
| Procedures and Design..... | 9 |
| Materials | 10 |
| III. RESULTS | 12 |
| Shortened Leadership Scale for Sports (SLSS) | 12 |
| Free Response Questions | 13 |
| IV. CONCLUSION..... | 16 |
| REFERENCES | 20 |

ABSTRACT

The Coach-Athlete Relationship:
The Impacts of an Athlete's Race/Ethnicity on Preferred Coaching Styles

Jacob Knostman
Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University

Research Advisor: Dr. Phia Salter
Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University

The quality of a coach-athlete relationship has been found to predict on field performance, as well as levels of academic self-efficacy, self-regulation, and aggression in athletes (Jowett, 2017; Nicholls et. al., 2017; Worthy, 2018). Previous research has also indicated that learning style preferences are influenced by ethnicity, regardless of socioeconomic status (Banks, 1988). Despite establishing that the quality of an athlete's relationship with their coach can have a profound impact for the athlete both on and off the field, and that there are cultural differences in how people view and learn about the world, little is known about the impacts that an athlete's race/ethnicity may have on the effectiveness of different coaching attributes, styles, and/or techniques. This study aims to provide insight into this gap in knowledge by administering a survey to athletes at Texas A&M that consists of a shortened version of the Leadership Scale for Sport (SLSS; Chelludurai, 1980; Chiu, Rodriguez, & Won, 2016), which asked about an athlete's preferences regarding their coach's approaches to training/instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback. Also included in the survey were short response questions that were formulated to discover any differences that may exist between racial/ethnic groups in coaching preference not covered by the SLSS. Based

on prior research on cultural worldviews (Komarraju & Cokley, 2008), We hypothesized that athletes of color would prefer social support and democratic behavior from their coaches more frequently than white athletes, and white athletes will prefer autocratic behavior from their coaches more. SLSS data supported our hypothesis that athletes of color would prefer social support more often than white athletes, however, no significant differences were found on the leadership dimensions of democratic and autocratic behavior. Potential explanations for this lack of significance are discussed. Additionally, the term Athletic Racial Profiling is proposed to describe instances in which overgeneralizations about particular racial or ethnic groups are applied universally to individual athletes within those groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my research advisor Dr. Phia Salter for her continued support and invaluable guidance throughout this entire process. If she hadn't taken a chance on devoting her time and energy into pursuing my initial research question none of this would have been possible. I would also like to thank graduate students Michael Perez and Jericka Battle for their assistance on nearly every aspect of this project. Every step of the way they were great mentors regarding the research process and what steps I would need to take to accomplish my goals. I cannot stress enough that this thesis would not have been written without the sacrifices that Dr. Salter, Michael, and Jericka made for this project and I owe a great deal of credit to them for this accomplishment.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Jesse Owens, the Black American who contradicted the axioms of white supremacy by winning gold at the 1936 Olympics held in Nazi Germany, was once quoted as saying, “The battles that count aren’t the ones for gold medals. The struggles within yourself – the invisible, inevitable battles inside all of us – that’s where it’s at” (1970). Not many are in a better position to be a firsthand witness and potential ally in these battles that athletes fight within themselves on a daily basis than their coach. But are the struggles that athletes of color grapple with the same as those of their white peers? If not, then it is essential that coaches of athletes from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds be aware of the uniqueness of each athlete’s battle and how it relates to their background. The purpose of this study is, firstly, to determine whether athletes from different racial and ethnic backgrounds will identify different qualities, coaching styles, and attributes as important to their relationship with their coach, and secondly, to look at how race/ethnicity impacts which attributes these athletes are likely to perceive as the most effective.

Research on issues surrounding race and ethnicity in sport psychology has been scarce, with only 19.86% of articles published in the top three sports psychology journals between 1987 and 2000 mentioning race or ethnicity, and a smaller number making those topics the primary focus of the study (Ram, Starek, & Johnson, 2004). There has been a stated need by researchers within psychology that more research is necessary in the context of race in interpersonal relationships (Orbuch & Fine, 2003), and more specifically, researchers within the field of sports psychology have claimed that more research needs to be done on race and ethnicity (Duda & Allison, 1990). Additionally, it has been found that when cultural identities and issues of

diversity are overlooked in research, consequences include the exclusion of minority participants' worldviews and experiences (Fisher et al., 2003; Ryba & Wright, 2005), the perpetuation of stereotyped understandings of their lives (Andersen, 1993; Ryba et al., 2013), and the reinforcing of cultural power and privilege differentials (Blodgett et al., 2014; Butryn, 2002; Ryba & Schinke, 2009). With regards to sport settings, ignoring cultural identities leads to decreased physical activity participation, alienation and distress (Schinke et. al., 2008), and reduced physical performance and/or failure to meet one's performance potential (Schinke, McGannon, Battochio, & Wells, 2013). We found only 1 article focusing on how an athlete's racial/ethnic background effects the coach-athlete relationship, an article by Jowett and Frost (2007) that investigates the effects that Black male English soccer players' racial/ethnic identity have on their relationship with their coaches. They found that "a number of participants viewed the ethnic background as a meaningful and influential factor for the relationships that they had developed", and that "the opportunity to be coached by a black coach would have allowed a higher degree of communication exchange and empathy" (Jowett & Frost, p. 255, 2007). With more diverse athletes entering the athletic arena (Vicente, 2007) and the International Society of Sports Psychology recently encouraging researchers and practitioners to do their work through a culturally reflexive lens (Blodgett et. al., 2015), it is more important than ever for coaches to be able to establish an environment that is optimized to the needs and preferences of their increasingly diverse athletes.

Previous research on interracial relationships has found that successful ones require multicultural sensitivity, which consists of the ability to understand and respect people from diverse cultural backgrounds, and the ability to communicate effectively and work collaboratively (Hunter & Elias, 2000). Given this definition of multicultural sensitivity, it is

reasonable to presuppose that if a coach understands potential coaching style preference differences between athletes from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, then they are more likely to develop a multiculturally sensitive environment for their team, benefiting the coach's relationships with their players. When looking at how interracial relationships are affected by their interracial dynamic, it was discovered that teachers are more likely to ascribe stereotypically negative stereotypes to their black students than their white students (Pigott & Cowen, 2000), and teachers are more likely to have positive interactions when engaging with students of the same race (Feldman, 1985). This is crucial because it has been found that the coach athlete relationship is where interconnected thoughts, feelings, and behaviors develop (Jowett, 2005), and that African-American NCAA athletes who live in high-crime environments that report a high-quality relationship with their coach showed a higher level of academic self-efficacy and self-regulation and a low level of reactive and proactive aggression (Worthy, 2018).

It has been found in previous sports psychology literature that race and ethnicity plays a critical role in the coach-athlete relationship, and one example of this is the finding that, in addition to gender relations and religion, ethnicity underpins coaches' everyday practices (Norman, 2016). One phenomenon that has been extensively studied that is evidence of how an athlete's racial/ethnic background affects the coach-athlete relationship is the concept of "stacking", which is when black players are played at non-central positions and positions not deemed to require a lot of intelligence (Curtis & Loy, 1978; Maguire, 1998). It has also been discovered by Williams & Youseff (1979) that, when looking at American college football, coaches rate black players differently than white players on many physical, psychological, and social characteristics based on stereotypes, and that coaches stereotype positions, then match racial stereotypes with positional ones and assign positions based on their stereotypical beliefs.

Although no study before has investigated to see if there are differences between athletes of different racial/ethnic groups in the coaching techniques and styles that they prefer, Jowett and Frost's (2007) study did find that Black English soccer players viewed their race and ethnicity, as well as the racial and ethnic background of their coach, as important to how their relationship with their coach developed. They believed if they had a coach who was Black then the relationship would have allowed for more open communications. Further investigation is needed to determine if these findings indicate the existence of differential coaching preferences across athletes of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. There is literature outside the realm of sports psychology that suggest that this may be the case. It has been found that one's ethnic background influences cognitive and learning styles, even after accounting for socioeconomic status (Banks, 1988). It has also been found that intrinsic motivation in the classroom for African-American children is fostered in an environment that consists of complex, changing stimuli, whereas White American children's intrinsic motivation is promoted more in an environment that is more quiet and passive (Boykin, 1978; Tuck, 1988). It has also been observed that people of color tend to have more collectivistic attitudes and ways of viewing the world, and that they value harmony within the collective more often than white people (Komarraju & Cokley, 2008). Given that an athlete's motivation is associated with the quality of their respective coach-athlete relationship (Riley & Smith, 2011), more research is necessary to determine if these differential preferences extend to the coach-athlete relationship in order for coaches to be equipped with knowledge that they can then use to maximize their athletes' intrinsic motivation, leading to stronger relationships between coaches and athletes.

It is clear that many aspects of an athlete's life both on and off the field are affected by their racial and ethnic background, as well as their relationship with their coach. This makes it

critical to understand how a coach can best interact with their team as a whole and with the athletes on an individual basis regardless of their race/ethnicity. In order to accomplish this, coaches need to know if different attributes, techniques, and coaching styles are universally effective for athletes from all different racial and ethnic backgrounds, and if not, what qualities are more pertinent for each athlete's background. Our hypothesis is that when participants are asked what attributes and qualities in a coach they respond to best, athletes of color will prefer social support and democratic behaviors (communal/collectivist orientation) more often than white athletes, and white athletes will prefer autocratic coaching behaviors (individualist orientation) more often than athletes of color.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Participants

This study consisted of club sport athletes and students who self-identified as athletes ($n = 72$) at Texas A&M University. Student athletes were recruited via an email to club sport athletes or through the psychology subject pool at Texas A&M. There were 26 participants who identified as male and 46 who identified as female. Twenty-two athletes of color and 50 white athletes responded to the survey. Of the athletes of color who participated, 2 identified as Arab/Arab-American/Middle Eastern, 10 identified as Hispanic-American/Latino, 9 identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander, and 1 identified as Biracial (White/Hispanic). Participants were informed in the email or through the subject pool that their participation was voluntary. They completed the survey online via Qualtrics, a software used to create surveys that can record the responses of participants anonymously.

Procedures and Design

This study used a quasi-experimental design with participants grouped by race/ethnicity (Athletes of color; White athletes). The participants used their personal computing device of choice and opened a link that launched the survey in Qualtrics, a survey software that anonymously records the responses of participants. They were first asked to answer demographic items (e.g. race/ethnicity, sport played, gender, age). Participants then completed the Shortened Leadership Scale for Sport (SLSS; Chiu, Rodriguez, & Won, 2016), followed by 6 open-ended, short response questions on their coaching preferences.

Materials

Shortened Leadership Scale for Sport (SLSS)

The SLSS is a 25-item questionnaire that was designed to measure five dimensions of leadership: training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support and positive feedback (Chiu et al, 2016). The training and instruction dimension consists of 5 items (e.g. ‘see to it that every athlete is working to her/his capacity’) that examines a coach’s behavior in terms of improving the performance of the athletes on his/her team. The democratic behavior dimension is comprised of 5 items (e.g. ‘ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions’) and assesses the coach’s tendency to involve team members in decision-making. The autocratic behavior dimension contains 5 items (e.g. ‘work relatively independent of the athletes’) relating to how the coach stresses his or her authority and independence in decision making. The social support dimension consists of 5 items (e.g. ‘help the athletes with their personal problems’) that assess the coach’s concern for the needs of team members. Finally, the positive feedback dimension includes 5 items (e.g. ‘compliment an athlete for her/his performance in front of others’) that reflect the coach’s tendency to reinforce the athletes’ good performances and contributions. Participants indicated to which degree of time (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, or 100%) they preferred their coach to engage in the behaviors listed in the SLSS. The responses were coded such that a response of ‘0% of the time’ was given the value 1, ‘25% of the time’ was given the value 2, ‘50% of the time’ was given the value 3, ‘75% of the time’ was given the value 4, and ‘100% of the time’ was given the value 5.

Open-ended Coaching Preferences

Following the SLSS there were 6 short response questions intended to uncover the subjective aspect of athletes’ coaching preferences. The 6 questions asked were, “How does a

coach earn your respect?”, “How would YOU coach you?”, “What are things coaches do that make you not want to play for them? What are some coaching qualities, attributes, and/or styles that you dislike playing for?”, “Think about a time a coach did something that made you not want to play for them. Identify some of the qualities or attributes the coach exhibited that contributed to that feeling.”, “Name some qualities the best coach you’ve ever had possessed. Name the defining qualities the best coach you’ve ever had possessed.”, and “Think about a time a coach made you want to play for them. Identify some of the qualities or attributes the coach exhibited that contributed to you wanting to play for them.”

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Shortened Leadership Scale for Sports (SLSS)

Preferences for leadership and coaching styles were measured using the SLSS on 5 dimensions of leadership. The 5 dimensions measured were Training and Instruction, Democratic Behaviors, Autocratic Behaviors, Social Support, and Positive Feedback. Athletes of Color and White Athletes were compared on these 5 dimensions of leadership using an independent-samples t-test.

The results indicated that there was a significant difference in coaching preference between Athletes of Color and White Athletes on the dimension of social support, $t(57.21) = 2.19, p < .05$. Participants who were Athletes of Color ($M = 3.94, SD = 0.67$) reported preferring more social support from their coaches than did participants who were White Athletes ($M = 3.50, SD = 0.98$). No significant difference was found between Athletes of Color and White Athletes on the dimensions of Training and Instruction, (AoC: $M = 4.24, SD = 0.69$; WA: $M = 4.18, SD = 0.81$), $t(70) = 0.30, p > .05$; Democratic Behaviors, (AoC: $M = 3.93, SD = 0.67$; WA: $M = 3.60, SD = 0.84$), $t(70) = 1.63, p > .05$; Autocratic Behaviors, (AoC: $M = 3.94, SD = 0.67$; WA: $M = 3.50, SD = 0.98$), $t(70) = 0.41, p > 0.05$; and Positive Feedback, (AoC: $M = 4.35, SD = 0.63$; WA: $M = 4.12, SD = 0.69$), $t(70) = 1.38, p > .05$. See Table 1.

Table 1.

| INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|
| | F | t | Df | Sig |
| Training Instructions | .920 | .304 | 70 | .762 |
| Democratic Behaviors | .186 | 1.63 | 70 | .108 |
| Autocratic Behaviors | .199 | .414 | 70 | .657 |
| Social Support | 5.018 | 1.899 | 57.21 | .033** |
| Positive Feedback | .939 | 1.382 | 70 | .171 |

Free Response Questions

In addition to the SLSS, participants also responded to 6 free response questions. By including qualitative responses, the goal was to get a more nuanced view of the athletes coaching preferences, and to investigate whether there were any differences that appeared outside of the leadership dimensions measured by the SLSS. Recurring themes in the participants responses were analyzed in light of the major themes of the SLSS.

Responses to the first question, “How does a coach earn your respect?”, indicated that the respect of a large number of both white athletes ($n = 12$; 24%) and athletes of color ($n = 6$; 27%) was earned when coaches showed a mutual respect for their athletes; “A coach earns my respect by showing respect back” (P34, Female, Hispanic-American/Latino). One notable difference between white athletes and athletes of color in their responses to this question was that white athletes ($n = 6$; 12%) indicated that they respected authoritative styles, “By not being a push over, being relatively strict, ACTING like they are the one in charge” (P12, Female, White), whereas athletes of color ($n = 1$; 4.5%) indicated these kinds of preferences much less.

Responses to the second question, “How would YOU coach you?”, indicated that athletes of color ($n = 4$; 18%) would coach themselves in a manner that involved forming a personal relationship/bond with their athlete-self more often than white athletes ($n = 1$; 2%); “Creating a bond with my coach outside of practice... makes it easier to communicate. The sharing of good news becomes ten times more appreciated and being told bad news... is not seen as an insult, but as constructive criticism from a friend” (P26, Female, Hispanic-American/Latino).

The participants responses to the third and fourth questions, “What are things coaches do that make you not want to play for them? What are some coaching qualities, attributes, and/or styles that you dislike playing for?”, and “Think about a time a coach did something that made you not want to play for them. Identify some of the qualities or attributes the coach exhibited that contributed to that feeling.”, indicated that both white athletes ($n = 13$; 26%) and athletes of color ($n = 5$; 22.7%) disliked when a coach would show favoritism; “when they play favorites and don't notice you just because your not as talented as someone else but you work much harder” (P48, Male, White). One white athlete perceived racism as one of the reasons for her mistreatment on a particular team; “She treated me like I was a charity case to only be on the team because she needed a trophy white girl” (P49, Female, White).

Responses to the fifth and sixth questions, “Name some qualities the best coach you’ve ever had possessed. Name the defining qualities the best coach you’ve ever had possessed.”, and “Think about a time a coach made you want to play for them. Identify some of the qualities or attributes the coach exhibited that contributed to you wanting to play for them.”, supported the data gathered in the SLSS in that athletes of color ($n = 7$; 31.8%) expressed their preference for social support from their coaches more often than white athletes ($n = 9$; 18%) did; “Bonded with the team outside of practice and created personal relationships with us. We could trust him and

he provided us with emotional support and guidance” (P26, Female, Hispanic-American/Latino). It was also found that some white athletes ($n = 4$; 8%) expressed a preference for authoritarian behavior, whereas no athletes of color shared these preferences on these questions; “The best coach needs to be able to cuss you out” (P8, Male, White). Athletes of color ($n = 5$; 23%) also indicated that they preferred coaches who coached with compassion and understanding more often than white athletes ($n = 3$; 6%).

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study was to determine if athletes of color have differing coaching preferences from white athletes, and if so, which dimensions of leadership athletes of color identify as preferring more or less of from their coaches than white athletes. We administered the Shortened Leadership Scale for Sports (SLSS; Chiu, Rodriguez, & Won, 2016) and 6 free response questions to 72 participants from Texas A&M University who either were recruited through the introductory psychology participant pool and self-identified as athletes or through their membership on a club sport team at the university. The study consisted of 50 white athletes and 22 athletes of color. We predicted that when participants are evaluated on what attributes and qualities in a coach they respond to best, athletes of color will prefer social support and democratic behaviors more often than white athletes, and that white athletes will prefer autocratic behavior more than athletes of color.

The results partially supported our hypothesis. On the SLSS, athletes of color indicated that they preferred social support significantly more than white athletes. This finding on the SLSS was supported by the qualitative data. A common theme in the athletes of color's responses to the free response questions was their stated preference for behaviors that involve social support from their coaches. Many white athletes also expressed their preference for social support from their coaches on the free response questions, however not as frequently as athletes of color. No significant difference was found between white athletes and athletes of color on the leadership dimensions of democratic or autocratic behaviors on the SLSS.

One limitation of our study was that our sample was not balanced in terms of gender. The study responses consisted of more female participants ($n = 42$; 63.9%) than male participants ($n=30$; 36.1%). Given that research indicates that women have been found to be more dissatisfied in autocratically led groups than their male counterparts (Kushell & Newton, 1986), the large number of women in our study may have accounted for the equally low preference for autocratic behavior, and equally high preference for democratic behaviors between athletes of color and white athletes that was found in the SLSS data. Given that all 4 participants who consistently expressed authoritarian/autocratic preferences in their free response answers were white, and that 3 of those 4 participants were male, subsequent research should focus on obtaining a sample with a more even gender breakdown to examine if differential preferences appear on the leadership dimensions of democratic and autocratic behavior once a more representative sample is used.

Another limitation of this study was that we were not able to recruit elite athletes who are at the top of their field (i.e. varsity-level collegiate athletes, professional athletes). Elite athletes have been found to have superior cognitive abilities (Scharfen & Memmert, 2019) and differing psychological characteristics (Zakrajsek, Raabe, & Blanton, 2019) when compared to non-elite athletes. The differences between elite and non-elite athletes could mean that elite athletes have different coaching preferences than non-elite athletes, and further research should be conducted to see if the differential preferences found between non-elite athletes of color and non-elite white athletes in this study extend to elite athletes of color and elite white athletes.

Another important limitation to acknowledge in this study is the small sample size for Athletes of color. Notably, there were no African-American participants in our study, and all but 3 athletes of color who responded were either Hispanic-American/Latino or Asian-

American/Pacific Islander. Further research should investigate whether the observed coaching preference differences extend to a sample of athletes that is more representative of the general population.

Racial profiling has been defined as an act of injustice that uses race as the foundation for shaping perceptions and behaviors associated with defining who is and which groups are designated as “criminal” (Moore, 2015). Racial profiling exists outside of the arena of law enforcement as well. Consumer Racial Profiling (CRP) has been defined by Gabbidon (2003) as “the discriminatory treatment of racial and ethnic minorities in retail establishments.” It is evident from the literature on “stacking”, which is when black players are played at non-central positions and positions not deemed to require a lot of intelligence (Curtis & Loy, 1978; Maguire, 1998), as well as on the phenomenon of live sports commentators tending to discuss black athletes in terms of their physical abilities and white athletes in terms of their cognitive abilities (Rada, 1996), that racial profiling exists within the field of athletics as well. We propose that the term Athletic Racial Profiling (ARP) be used to describe instances in which overgeneralizations about particular racial or ethnic groups are applied universally to individual athletes within those groups. Although this study’s purpose was not primarily to investigate the phenomenon of ARP, it is important to acknowledge because this study’s results could be misconstrued to promote the use of ARP.

The qualitative and quantitative data gathered in this study indicated that there are more similarities in coaching preferences between athletes of color and white athletes than there are differences. Participants of both categories expressed their dislike for coaches who pick favorites and who are overly harsh and strict, and expressed their preference for coaches who were knowledgeable about their sport and gave them positive feedback when it was earned. Although

social support from their coaches was preferred significantly more by athletes of color than white athletes, it was apparent from the responses to the free response questions that many white athletes value coaches who establish relationships with them that transcend the sporting environment and prefer coaches who form personal relationships with them.

When cultural identities and issues of diversity are overlooked in research, consequences include the exclusion of minority participants' worldviews and experiences (Fisher et al., 2003; Ryba & Wright, 2005), the perpetuation of stereotyped understandings of their lives (Andersen, 1993; Ryba et al., 2013), and the reinforcing of cultural power and privilege differentials (Blodgett et al., 2014; Butryn, 2002; Ryba & Schinke, 2009). Coaches should take the conclusions drawn from this study to assist in creating a multiculturally sensitive environment for their players, and to increase their awareness of the cultural differences that can influence an athlete's cognitions and behaviors. Coaches should not engage in ARP by exposing their athletes of color, or white athletes, to differential treatment solely based upon the results of this study. This is more important than ever as the number of diverse athletes entering the athletic arena continues to grow (Vicente, 2007).

REFERENCES

- Andersen, M. B. (1993). Questionable sensitivity: A comment on Lee and Rotella. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7, 1–3.
- Banks, J. A. (1988). Ethnicity, class, cognitive, and motivational styles: Research and teaching implications. *Journal of Negro Education*, 57(4), 452–466.
- Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., Coholic, D. A., Enosse, L., Peltier, D., & Pheasant, C. (2014). Navigating the insider-outsider hyphen: A qualitative exploration of the acculturation challenges of Aboriginal athletes pursuing sport in Euro-Canadian contexts. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15, 345–355.
- Blodgett, A. T., Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., & Fisher, A. L. (2015). Cultural sport psychology research: conceptions, evolutions, and forecasts. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 8:1, 24-43.
- Boykin, A. W. (1978). Psychological/behavioral verve in academic/task performance: Pre-theoretical considerations. *Journal of Negro Education*, 47(4), 343–354.
- Butryn, T. M. (2002). Critically examining white racial identity and privilege in sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 316–336.
- Curtis, J. E., & Lay, J. W. (1978). Race/Ethnicity and relative centrality of playing positions in team sports. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Review*, 6, 258-313.
- Duda, J. L., & Allison, M. T. (1990). Cross-cultural analysis in exercise and sport psychology: A void in the field. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 12, 114-131.
- Feldman, R. S. (1985). Nonverbal behaviour, race, and the classroom teacher. *Theory-into-practice*, 24, 45-49.
- Fisher, L. A., Butryn, T. M., & Roper, E. A. (2003). Diversifying (and politicizing) sport psychology: A promising perspective. *The Sport Psychologist*, 17, 391–405.

- Gabbidon, S. L. (2003). Racial profiling by store clerks and security personnel in retail establishments: An exploration of "Shopping while Black." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19, 345-364.
- Hunter, L., & Elias, M. J. (2000). Interracial friendships, intercultural sensitivity, and social competence: How are they related? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 551-573.
- Jowett, S. (2005). On repairing and enhancing the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett & M. Jones (Eds.), *The psychology of coaching*, 14-26.
- Komarraju, M., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism-collectivism: A comparison of African Americans and European Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 14(4), 336-343.
- Kushell, E., & Newton, R. (1986). Gender, leadership style, and subordinate satisfaction: An experiment. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 14(3-4), 203-209.
- Maguire, J. A. (1988). Race and position assignment in English soccer: A preliminary analysis of ethnicity and sport in Britain. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 257-269.
- Moore, N. (2015). *The political roots of racial tracking in American criminal justice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norman, L. (2016). The impact of an "equal opportunities" ideological framework on coaches' knowledge and practice. *International Review of the Sociology of Sport*, 51, 975-1004.
- Orbuch, T. L., & Fine, M. A. (2003). The context of race/ethnicity in interpersonal relationships: Crossing the chasm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 147-152.
- Owens, J. (1970). *Blackthink: My Life as Black Man and White Man*. New York, NY: Morrow Publishing.
- Pigott, R. L., & Cowen, E. L. (2000). Teacher race, child race, racial congruence, and teacher ratings of children's adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 38, 177-196.

- Rada, J. (1996). Color blind-sided: Racial bias in network television's coverage of professional football games. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 7(3), 231-240.
- Ram, N., Starek, J., & Johnson, J. (2004). Race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation: Still a void in sport and exercise psychology. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 26, 250-268.
- 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.
- Scharfen, H., & Memmert, D. (2019). Measurement of cognitive functions in experts and elite athletes: A meta-analytic review. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*.
- Schinke, R. J., Hanrahan, S. J., Eys, M. A., Blodgett, A., Peltier, D., Ritchie, S., ... Enosse, L. (2008). The development of cross-cultural relations with a Canadian aboriginal community through sport psychology research. *Quest*, 60, 357-369.
- Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., Battocchio, R. C., & Wells, G. (2013). Acculturation in elite sport: A thematic analysis of immigrant athletes and coaches. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 15, 1676-1686.
- Tuck, K. D. (1988, October). Verve effects: The relationship of task performance to stimulus preference and variability in low-income Black and White children. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. ProQuest Information & Learning.
- Vicente, R. (2007). *1999-00-2005-06 NCAA student-athlete race and ethnicity report*. Retrieved September 13, 2018, from http://www.ncaapublications.com/Uploads/PDF/2005-06_race_ethnicity_reportf05055c6-deb3-45de-ab1c-cbeeb4c19584.pdf.

Worthy, K. (2018). The coach-athlete relationship as a predictor of self-regulation, academic self-efficacy, and aggression among athletes with exposure to community violence. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 79.

Zakrajsek, R. A., Raabe, J., & Blanton, J. E. (2019). Psychological characteristics of elite athletes. In M. H. Anshel, T. A. Petrie, & J. A. Steinfeldt (Eds.), *APA handbook of sport and exercise psychology, volume 1: Sport psychology., Vol. 1.* (pp. 129–148).