

## SOCIAL CAPITAL AND GENDER EQUITY IN SPORTS

Dr. Irene Kamberidou,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Nikolaos Patsantaras<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Contemporary critical theories have distinguished sport as a site through which issues on social capital, or rather a deficit of social capital, must be considered today, along with local cultural practices within their socio-historical specificity. Cooperation between the European Commission (EC) and Sport Governing Bodies (SGBs) cannot be fruitful if SGBs continue their non-inclusive practices of social exclusion in their organizational structures, such as the under-representation of women in competitive sports and in decision-making capacities (the leaky pipeline and the glass ceiling). Indeed the European Commission has been promoting, through multi-dimensional and proactive strategies, gender-inclusive policies, gender mainstreaming, including the promotion of interdisciplinary international research on the gender subject, addressing critical issues concerning gender identity, the under-representation of women and non-mainstream groups. Developments in new technologies of mass communication have created unprecedented global audiences for Mega sports events. The positive social impact of these events, such as the social construction and redefinition of identity based on ethnic, racial and gender equity and equality, the influx of corporate sponsorships as an important source of income for host cities and international organizations, has been overestimated. The politics of sport do not ultimately deliver the social benefits they proclaim. For example, women in European sport comprise a restricted minority: in competitive sports, in SGB's, in research, as role models and as mentors. In order to eventually eliminate the deficit in social capital generated by SGBs, international and inter-cultural interdisciplinary dialogue on sport and social capital in the European Union is absolutely critical. Additionally, the social sciences and the humanities are vital for understanding social change and informing policy-making, as well as providing input on social, economic and political dimensions.

**Keywords:** sport as social capital, sport identity, social cohesion, sport governing bodies (SGBs) and non-inclusive practices, *dark side* of social capital, leaky pipeline, glass ceiling, gender, sport politics, social capital deficit, social exclusion, integrating a gender perspective

### *Irene Kamberidou speaking at Bocconi University in Milano:*

In the first part of our ongoing study presented earlier on "Social Capital Dimensions and Civil Society: inclusive vs. exclusive Social Capital in Sport Governance" (Patsantaras & Kamberidou 2006)—at the 2.00 o'clock session entitled *Social Responsibility: towards a new model in sport governance?*—we examined theories on social capital from the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We discussed the various ambiguous definitions pertaining to social capital, distinctions between bonding social capital and bridging social capital, namely, the inclusive vs. exclusionary social capital in sports such as building elite social capital, which entails gender exclusion, as well as the activities and contributions of volunteer and non profit organizations such as *Peace Games*, to the concept of social capital.

In the framework of our ongoing study, which is not funded by any Greek or international organization, we have so far assessed that the concept of social capital in sports, at least in Greece, is underdeveloped and has a *dark side*, namely it is used according to personal interests or personal political or self-serving agendas.

Consequently, social capital in sport is not a producer of social cohesion. Instead of promoting the promulgated values and ideals of sports, the social capital of sports is used and exploited by individuals who attain positions of power/authority in SGBs, not to promote social capital and sport values, but to attain power, status and financial benefits, specifically the means to use the social capital of sports in a variety of self serving ways (dark side), reinforcing social exclusion, rather than promoting promulgated Olympic values. For instance, no sport federation in Greece has a woman president, with the exception of one, the Water ski federation. However one need point out that this is not an Olympic sport.

In reference to this *dark side* or *deficit of social capital in sports*, although our study is still ongoing, it is quite clear that in the case of sports governance, women in the SGB hierarchies are clearly absent in Greece. The male dominated so-called *bridging* social capital has reinforced egocentric bonding, exclusive identities, homogeneous groups, social divides, discrimination, gender classifications, and capitalization, (Putnam 2000: 22-23), that is to say, the inclusive vs. exclusionary or rather *dark* concept of social capital (Patsantaras & Kamberidou 2006). The *leaky pipeline* and the *glass ceiling* in SGBs as well as in competitive sports continues, not

to mention the negative impact of commercialization pertaining to the gender factor. Undeniably, the relationship between social capital and sport remains underdeveloped.

The glass ceiling effect due to the biological gender (sex) as an analytical category remains actively visible, not only in Greece, but around the world. For instance, the institutional realities of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), where the proportional representation of women is in the proximity of absenteeism or *invisibility*. We need point out here that the IOC's institutional hierarchy, until 1981, was exclusively male. From a total of 93 members in 1993, only 7 were women (7,5%). Today, women in the IOC comprise a *restricted minority*. From a total of the 116 members only 12 are women (10,3%), a violation or rather contempt of the Olympic Charter, according to which: "The IOC strongly encourages, by appropriate means, the promotion of women in sport at all levels and in all structures, particularly in the executive bodies of national and international sports organizations with a view to the strict application of the principle of equality of men and women".<sup>3</sup>

Additionally, despite the comparatively accelerated integration of women in Olympic competitive sports, due to the elimination of formal obstacles and established socio-cultural prohibitions,<sup>4</sup> women athletes are still under-represented in comparison to men in competitive sports. Women are still under-represented in competitive sports in comparison to their male counterparts, and this, not only because of the socio-cultural causes associated with the chronological delay in eliminating barriers to inclusion, but also due to the particularly high levels of commercialization which originally had obstructed women's inclusion and integration into Olympic sports. For example, in the 1996 Olympic Games of Atlanta, in which a total of 10,305 male and female athletes from 197 member-countries of the Olympic movement participated, only 3,496 were women. In Sidney in the year 2000, the percentage of female athletes was 38,2%. In the Athens 2004 Olympic Games, from a total of 11.099 athletes from 202 countries, only 40,7% were women, however this is the largest participation record yet!<sup>5</sup>

This too constitutes a clear contradiction between the social reality of the IOC and its institutional declarations, raising many questions and arguments concerning gender equity and equal opportunity in the framework of the Olympic movement. Furthermore, it raises questions related to recent discussions and policies of the European Commission concerning gender mainstreaming, which includes the promotion of international research on the gender subject, and the elimination of the glass ceiling and leaky pipeline.<sup>6</sup>

### **Institutionalized Social Exclusion: the social gender and sport identity**

In this transitional stage of the postmodernist period, institutionalized social discrimination or gender exclusion— supported and enforced by rules and regulations— is anachronistic, socially problematic, contradictory, deficient and theoretically inconsistent.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, gender dichotomy in competitive sports, as opposed to other social spaces (politics, science, the economy, technology) is enforced in the name of gender equity and gender equality and continues to be an 'unavoidable', conventional, standard and typical practice, enforce by rules and regulations. The biological gender, as an analytical category, is also dynamically present—not only in competitive sports but also in SGBs, in the pyramidal hierarchies of decision-making sport bodies, organizations, federations, clubs, etc.

The under-representation of women in Olympic sports is no longer an issue or a problem of supply or lack of supply— namely the reserve of female athletes in competitive sports and that of women in the sport-governing bodies. It is the problem of the leaky pipeline and the glass ceiling, specifically how we can change attitudes and social stereotypes and keep women in this social space once they are in, thereby eliminating the leaky pipeline, and secondly how to break the glass ceiling and promote women's inclusion, advancement and agency in SGBs. In other words, how their socialization process once in the field of sports or in positions of authority can be promoted, retained and reproduced.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Kamberidou, I. (2004). *Gender and Olympism. Proceedings of the 8th Panhellenic Conference of the Graduates of Physical Ed. and Sport (PEPFA)*, 7-9 May 2004, Athens Greece. [in Greek]

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

## **Mass Media and Mega sports events: highlighting gender *difference* and gendered Olympic cultures**

Extensive discussions in the sport sciences highlighting gender differences, the mass media's emphasis on gender *difference*, a result of the historically so-called, biological difference or anachronistic *biologistic* theories originally interpreted as the inferiority of women to men, among other things, have played an important role in the gender codification of Olympic sports, thereby reproducing gender division. In other words, preserving and safeguarding the institutional and structural gendered classification in Olympic sports, thereby creating conditions for the multi-variant hierarchical evaluations of men's and women's performances. As a result, gender dichotomy-division in Olympic sports— consolidated in the name of gender equity and gender equality encourages and reproduces the under-representation of women in the Olympic institutions, in SGBs, etc.<sup>3</sup>

In the social space of Olympic sports, two social capital cultures or categories have been created—the *male-masculine culture* and the *female-feminine culture*. Unquestionably, the male-masculine culture reigns at the top of the pyramidal hierarchy of this social space in which semantic prototypes, models, role-models, cultural icons and sports idols are established and promoted for *the staging of gender*, namely, the construction of gender identity, among other things. This establishes social distinctions, social discrimination and social inequalities for female athletes, such as the under-representation of women.

Additionally, gender exclusion/discrimination is clearly observed in the mass media<sup>7</sup> as well. When female athletes adopt male body characteristics as a result of intensive training or doping,<sup>8</sup> along with so-called masculine attitudes and verbal expressions, they are labeled and depicted in the media as "mannish", "macho" or "monsters"<sup>9</sup> etc.

Evidently, the same applies to male athletes who adopt the so-called female-feminine characteristics due to the composition of their sport. However, although such

---

<sup>3</sup> Kamberidou, I. (2005). The female athlete, a social idol: a new archetype. *Women & Sport*, (2), 3, pp. 11-22. Publication of the Hellenic Union for the Advancement of Women and Girls in Sport (PEPGAS). [in Greek].

characterizations do not eliminate the biological basis of gender dichotomy (segregation), they do open the road to *gender fluidity* in Olympic sports—a fluidity which may in time eliminate its androcentric character.<sup>4</sup> The gender *difference* assigned to men's and women's Olympic sports have created discriminatory hierarchical evaluations in many social sectors, such as the extensive promotion and coverage in the mass media of men's competitions, as well as male athletes, their sport performances and athletic roles, in contrast to the comparative *invisibility*, limited coverage or *absenteeism* in the media of female athletes and women's sports or competitions—with the exception of the minority of the commercialized female athletes who are portrayed in the mass media as sex-symbols and not for their athletic achievements or sport identity.<sup>10</sup>

A noteworthy example of the under-representation of female athletes and women's competitions is revealed in the study commissioned by the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles (AAF). According to the AAF press release from Los Angeles, dated July 20, 2005: "In the last five years the television coverage of women's sports has declined. In fact, the percentage of stories and airtime devoted to women's sports on local news programs is now as low as it was 15 years ago".

A study commissioned by the AAF, *'Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 – 2004'*, indicates that women's sports received only 6.3% of the air time in 2004 compared to 1999, when 8.7% of the airtime was devoted to women's sports. In 1989 and 1993, women's sports received 5%, and 5.1% of the coverage, respectively. AAF President Anita L. DeFrantz, commenting on the findings, said: "The continued paucity of women's stories occurs against the backdrop of significant growth of girls' and women's sports nationally and internationally, a development that is simply ignored by television sports news. The wilful neglect of women's sports is an abdication of journalistic responsibility and has the effect of diminishing the significance of women's sport and hindering its further growth. This inequity is unfair. It is wrong. It can be changed and it must be changed."<sup>11</sup>

The study<sup>12</sup> included an examination of three two-week segments (a total of six weeks) of televised sports news coverage on each of three local (Los Angeles) network affiliates (KNBC, KCBS, and KABC). The study's major findings reveal: 1)

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 11-22.



Women's sports were underreported in the six weeks of early evening and late-night television sports news on three network affiliates. 2) Men's sports received 91.4% of the airtime, women's sports 6.3%, and gender neutral topics 2.4%. 3) The 1993 study found that there was almost no network affiliate news coverage of women's sports on weekdays. 4) The 2004 study found less frequent trivialization and humorous sexualization of women than previous studies. 5) Coverage of women's sports was less varied than men's (42.4% of all women's sports stories in the sample were on professional tennis). 6) 94.4% of the sports news and highlights anchor people were men. 7) No women anchors appeared on any of the three network affiliate news shows. And no women of color news anchors or ancillary reporters appeared in any of the reports in the sample.<sup>13</sup>

### **Gendered Social Capital: Genetic Personification in Olympic Sports**

Sport Identity has been associated with various socio-cultural meanings since the appearance of Olympic sports in the 19<sup>th</sup> century when women— and not only women—were excluded from most sectors of public life, and not only from the Olympic games. Olympic sports were non-inclusive even to certain *categories* of men. For instance, in regard to *difference* and consequently disrespect for ethnic diversity, Olympic sports, had excluded men from the so-called Third world countries from its institutional positions.<sup>14</sup>

Moreover, the *biological body* in Olympic sports, through which gender identity and subsequently sport identity is defined, is a social reality attached to a network of specific symbols, interpretations and ideologies.<sup>15</sup> Undeniably, there are arguments according to which the human body is not a product of linguistic interpretations and discussions. Certainly this may apply to certain biological parameters, genetic characteristics related to performance—records in specific Olympic sports. Nevertheless, the historical context of the Olympic phenomenon has shown us, through many examples and models, that anachronistic biologicistic knowledge or biological '*facts*' have been accordingly integrated and incorporated into cultural influences, social structures and structural thinking, thereby formulating social views,

attitudes and stereotypes concerning capabilities, capacities or performance in relation to biological gender.

Today, even though women do participate in Olympic activity, Olympic sports are still not perceived nor institutionally structured as gender-neutral or gender-inclusive. Gender classification/dichotomy (segregation), a socio-symbolic class system, is clearly institutionalized as a structural category in Olympic sports, in contrast to other social spaces (eg. economy, technology, medicine). In other words, identity continues to be genetically personified in the Olympic culture. To reiterate, it is supported and enforced by rules and regulations, and as result specialized social expectations and sport identities are constructed and highlighted according to *difference*. That is to say, in relation to the specific value system and the meanings associated with *difference* in the Olympic sports phenomenon, in accordance with various socio-cultural *scales* and not only in accordance men's and women's actual sport performances.

Corporeality, the human body is examined and perceived, as a simple, one-sided and static biological-anatomical unit or entity, instead of a totality of cultural representations and documentations. The gendered structural distinctions, conceive the body as an biological entity, specifically as a means, an instrument or a tool for high performance. The structural emphasis given to the biological difference between, as a central category of the institutional composition in Olympic sports, leads to bipolarity in the competitive-sport expression. This bipolarity has implied, since the beginning, that Olympic sports emphasize genetic characteristics and are genetically personified—namely not interested if the participating gender subject “*has* a female or a male body”, but that “*it is* a female or male body”.<sup>16</sup> As a result, the human body is instrumentalized, transformed into a *tool*, and rationalized in a different way in accordance to biological stereotyping.

In other words, the social capital of sports, regardless of gender— whether a male athlete or a female athlete— is ‘measured’ only and exclusively in its biological dimension, and continues to appear as a physio-organic entity, a material entity, namely a means to an end, an instrument, for attaining high or maximal performance records (victory) at all costs, including the changes and transformations of the body due to the sports training processes, such as the changes incited by intensive training, doping, genetic doping, etc. Neglected have been the consequences and impact of



these changes on established views concerning gender identity, such as the multifaceted and multi-variable transformation process of sport identities.

### **The Social Gender: Identity, a bio-socio-cultural interpretation**

Until the 1970s social scientists studied only class and race as primary factors of social status and identity. Today, in regard to the foundations of identity, gender has been incorporated into race and class. Gender is the axis around which identity is constructed, namely it is the axis around which social life is organized and through which we understand our experiences. However, we continue to act as if gender is related only to women. One must point out that men also have a gender and, as women are subject to social inequalities and exclusions.<sup>17</sup>

Discussions on the gender subject, gender identity and corporeality<sup>18</sup> are no longer based exclusively on the biological gender (sex), but on the social gender which formulates, defines and redefines identity according to historical, bio-socio-cultural interpretations. In the new theoretical framework, gender identity, corporeality, the body and gender' are being rediscovered and are under reconstruction, in other words viewed as *linguistic conceptions*, socio-historical manifestations, transformable meanings and evolving elements of change. Specifically, gender is activated, deactivated or neutralized, according to time and space: socio-political developments, predominant social conditions and circumstances that transform the meaning of biological *difference* in society. The body, corporeality through which gender identity is defined, represented and reflected, is a social reality attached to a network of specific symbols, interpretations and ideologies.

In today's postmodernist reality, gender is being transformed from a static biological perception into a dynamic social category, thereby affecting and changing identity, gender relations and the expectations of the social environment. **In this theoretical framework the biological gender is losing its primacy as an analytical category in most social spaces.**<sup>19</sup> For instance, there is no regulated gender classification or segregation, imposed by rules and regulations, in Information Society, in Science and Technology, in the Economy or in the political arena, namely

gender is *deactivated* or *neutralized* in these social spaces, as an analytical category as opposed to the gender impact factor in **sports** or in the armed forces.

## Sex and Gender

Feminist theories based on *difference* fell under question in the late 1980s and early 1990s, creating an open space for discussions on gender. By the mid 1990s debates and discourse concerning the terms gender vs. sex, identity, corporeality, femininities, masculinities, 'female masculinity' and male femininity' incisively questioned the concept of difference.<sup>20</sup> A change of the example or the Model, was observed during this period.<sup>21</sup> A new theory, a new concept on gender and gender identity was established. For example, the term gender equality replaced equality of the sexes, and the term *sex* is now associated primarily with the biological gender as an analytical category. It defines only the biological differences between men and women: chromosomes, chemistry and anatomy. Conversely, the term *gender* is associated with the *social gender* which formulates and constructs identity: gender identity, ethnic identity, sport identity, etc.

The meaning of gender today refers to the social subject, without taking into account the biological gender (sex) as an element of social categorization, classification or codification. **Both men and women have genders** and are defined as gender subjects— a meaning and a concept that attempts to neutralize or deactivate the focus on difference in favour of *diversity* and **respect for diversity**, equal opportunities, etc. Consequently, the gender subject, whether male or female, in this analytical framework, is defined as a conveyor of *identities*, namely **a conveyor of social functions, positions, professions or disciplines**.<sup>5</sup> This does not however mean that the biological gender (sex) has been eliminated or will no longer exist as a social category. This does not mean that the gender subject has become genderless or has been 'castrated'. It signifies, however, that the biological factor, as an analytical category that leads to discrimination, is less and less interrelated to traditional views, perceptions, attitudes and stereotypes concerning identity, masculinity and femininity.

---

<sup>5</sup> Kamberidou, I. (2005). The female athlete, a social idol: a new archetype. *Women & Sport*, (2), 3, pp. 11-22. Publication of the Hellenic Union for the Advancement of Women and Girls in Sport (PEPGAS). [in Greek]

It offers a form of 'gender-neutrality' or gender-inclusive perspectives and attitudes in all social spheres. Gender is not disappearing in modern social reality, but it is being transformed from a static biological perception into a dynamic and evolving social category, the meaning of which is changing and as a result affecting and changing gender identities, and subsequently the expectations and attitudes of the social environment.

The analysis of gender refers to the meanings, the importance, the ideologies, the socio-political ideas that are attached to difference in a specific culture, society or civilization, according to which—depending on which society or culture— biological difference is either activated, actively present, or it is deactivated or neutralized in accordance to the prevailing social processes and developments.<sup>22</sup>

Gender identity, for example, differs according to *space and time*—namely what it means to be a man or a woman, in a specific society or a particular culture, or during a specific historical period. Gender identity, masculinities and femininities, are bio-socio-cultural interpretations, conceptions and meaning that are manufactured and transformable. Gender identity is constructed, structured, restructured and redefined in relation to time and *topos* (space/socio-cultural environment). Unquestionably, differences between men and women cannot be examined in general, in other words on a grande or global scale. The women of the world do not comprise one collective entity and neither do the men! There are many differences amongst women who live in the same society and culture, as there are amongst men: socio-economic class, race, color, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, physical disabilities, sexual orientation, age, etc.

Biological determinism and differential socialization, the two schools or theories that dominate, share two fundamental hypotheses. They distinguish men and women as different. They emphasize or highlight gender differences, thereby ignoring *commonalities*, *sameness* as well as *multiple identities*. In concentrating on difference and social differentiation, in assuming that the differences between men and women are greater and more decisive factors that are worth studying and analyzing, commonalities and sameness have been ignored.<sup>23</sup> Women and men alike have multiple identities. They are conveyors of multiple roles. They have multiple masculinities and multiple femininities. We belong to many categories and have many

roles-identities beyond our biological sex: parents, spouses, professionals, employees, workers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, athletes, etc.

In conclusion, gender is about how and when focusing of *difference* promotes social exclusion, in other words, when social differentiation becomes disadvantageous or an obstacle to equal opportunities and participation in social life for the individual, for underprivileged social groups, for non-mainstream groups and social spaces. Consequently, gender categorization/classification is a product of social inequalities and exclusions and not the reverse.<sup>24</sup> In other words, concentrating only on difference promotes inequalities and social exclusions, whereas focusing or celebrating diversity advocates not only tolerance but also **trust**, respect, acknowledgment, appreciation or *respect* of the *other*, respect for our social capital.

### Concluding remarks

In the framework of postmodern Olympic social reality sport social capital, sport identity, including perceptions concerning the human body and corporeality are in the stage of *development*, in the process of *being schematized and post-schematized*, namely in the process of transformation, change, namely being reshaped, reconstructed and redefined in accordance to views related to socio-cultural and scientific developments.

Corporeality and sport identity, for both genders, must be examined, not only as a *biological entity* in a medical or sports science framework, but also on a sociological, anthropological, philosophical and psychological basis. In this age of cyborgs, plastic bodies, 'genetic doping', virtual reality technologies, commercialization and increasing state interventions, new agendas are needed. We need to integrate gender, among other things, into the picture: to *rethink* and re-evaluation gender categories, relations and interrelations between sport, the body, *nature*, gender, sexuality, race, class, science, power, subjectivity, domination, opposition as well as *difference* vs. diversity. In view of the new technologies of power new questions need to be raised, especially those related to *resistance strategies* and *opposition politics*.

## Recommendations:

In order to eventually eliminate social exclusion—the leaky pipeline and the glass ceiling— and make effective use of our social capital in sports, Olympic sports, along with participation in SGBs must be made more gender-inclusive. This could be discussed on an interdisciplinary level, including social, economic and political levels. We need theoretical approaches which contribute to the understanding of social capital, beyond discriminatory anachronistic biological theories and outdated conceptions, especially in view of the European Commission's 7<sup>th</sup> framework, namely gender-inclusive policies, gender mainstreaming, the promotion of international research on the gender subject in the social sciences and in the humanities.<sup>25</sup> Specifically, in order to formulate and propose *multi-dimensional and proactive strategies*, required is the establishment of an international, interdisciplinary, inter-cultural network of researchers (sport sciences, sport studies, the social sciences, the humanities, gender studies, etc.) so as to:

1. Addresses critical exclusionary practices pertaining to the concept of social capital, and in particular the gender factor, namely gender identity and the under-representation of women and non-mainstream groups in SGBs.
2. Establish on what levels, and under what pre-conditions can theories or theoretical approaches on social capital be used as an analytical tool for the examination and understanding of the multi-variable, multifaceted and complex transformation processes of gender identity, and consequently sport identity.
3. Promote effective education strategies that transform social stereotypes before they take root, as in the example of the Peace Games holistic academic model ([www.peacegames.org](http://www.peacegames.org)), to be incorporated through pilot projects into the EU public school systems
4. Examine the interrelations between sport performance, the gender subject, the socio-cultural environment and corporeality, including the male/female body aesthetic.

5. Study the social effects and impact of intensive and prolonged specialized training, and not only: the changes and transformations of the body/corporeality due to intensive training, doping, genetic doping, etc, and consequently, the impact of these changes on established social views, attitudes and expectations concerning gender identity and consequently the construction of sport identity.

## References

1. Clarke, Gill: "Difference matters: sexuality and physical education", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 41-56.
2. Duncan M.C. & Messner M. (2000). "Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 – 2004. Report by the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles (AAF)". Published in AAF website: <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>.
3. Elueze, R./Jones, R.L. (1998). "A quest for equality: A gender comparison of the BBC's TV coverage of the 1995 World Athletics Championships". In: *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal (WSPAJ)* 7.H. 1: 45-69.
4. EU-Council Presidency: "Female Potential as Benefit for Research Community", in: *Das Österreichische Magazin Fur Forschung Und Technologie -Austria Innovative*, Vien 2006, 3a: 22-23.
5. European Commission: "Gender Scoreboard 2001. Framework Strategy in Gender Equality, Staff Working Document", in: *European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment and Social Affairs*. Brussels, 2001, [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment\\_social/gender\\_equality/docs/workprgs/coreboard\\_2001.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment_social/gender_equality/docs/workprgs/coreboard_2001.pdf)
6. European Commission: "i2010: A European Information Society for Growth and Employment, COM (2005) 229 final, June 1, 2005", *Directorate-General for Information Society and Media*, Brussels. in: [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/eeurope/i2010/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/index_en.htm)
7. Evans, John & Penney, Dawn: "Talking Gender", in: Penney Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education: contemporary issues and future directions*. London and New York 2002, 13-24.
8. Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 - 2004 is available on the AAF Website at <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>.
9. Hargreaves, Jennifer (2000). *"Heroin of Sport: the politics of difference and identity"*. Routledge, London and New York.



10. Kamberidou, I. (2005). The female athlete, a social idol: a new archetype. *Women & Sport*, (2), 3, pp. 11-22. Publication of the Hellenic Union for the Advancement of Women and Girls in Sport (PEPGAS). [in Greek].
11. Kamberidou, I. (2005). The female athlete, a social idol: a new archetype. *Women & Sport*, (2), 3, pp. 11-22. Publication of the Hellenic Union for the Advancement of Women and Girls in Sport (PEPGAS). [in Greek].
12. Kamberidou, Irene & Patsantaras, Nikolaos (2006). "Towards a Gender-Neutral Inclusive Information Society: Preserving the European Model in the Information Age". Published in website [http://cordis.europa.eu.int/ist/directorate\\_g/seminar20060405.htm](http://cordis.europa.eu.int/ist/directorate_g/seminar20060405.htm): *The CORDIS focus online edition*, March 2006.
13. Kimmel, Michael: *The Gendered Society*. New York 2004.
14. Kirk, David: "Physical Education: a gendered history", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 24-37.
15. Macdonald, Doune: "Extending agendas: physical culture research for the twenty-first century", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 208-219.
16. Olympic Charter, Rule 2, paragraph 5 of the Olympic Charter in force since 18-07-1996, in: [www.athens2004.com](http://www.athens2004.com).
17. Patsantaras, Nikolaos & Kamberidou, Irene: "Gender Equity in Olympic Sports: Absenteeism and 'Invisibility' ", in: 6 *Pandektis International Sports Law Review* 3-4 (2006), 361-375.
18. Patsantaras, Nikolaos et al.: "Sinndimensionen des olympischen Wettkampfs. Eine systemtheoretische Betrachtung", in: 2 *Das Wissenschaftsmagazin der Deutschen Sporthochschule Köln* (2005), 38-46.
19. [www. Athens 2004.com](http://www.athens2004.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> Irene Kamberidou is a Lecturer of Sociology at the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, the Faculty of Sport Science where she teaches *Gender Issues and Sports* and *Principles of Sociology*. She obtained her BA and MA at Emmanuel College and Boston College, respectively, Boston Massachusetts USA, and her PhD from the Sociology Department of the Panteios University of Social and Political Sciences in Athens, Greece. Dr. Kamberidou is also a member of the Gender Expert Action Group (GEAG) of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Information Society and Media. (Email: [ikamper@phed.uoa.gr](mailto:ikamper@phed.uoa.gr))

<sup>2</sup> Nikolaos Patsantaras is a graduate of the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens where he is currently a Lecturer of Sports Sociology in the Faculty of Sport Science. He obtained his PhD in Sport Sociology from the University of Konstanz, Germany. Dr. Patsantaras currently teaches 'Sport Sociology' and 'Olympism: a sociological approach/perspective'. He is also a member of the Gender Expert Action Group of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Information Society and Media. (Email: [npatsant@phed.uoa.gr](mailto:npatsant@phed.uoa.gr)).

<sup>3</sup>Rule 2, paragraph 5 of the Olympic Charter in force since 18-07-1996, in: [www.athens2004.com](http://www.athens2004.com).

<sup>4</sup> This applies to 'western' type societies. It does not represent, for instance Islam, or Middle East societies where women are not only completely excluded from sports, but from most forms of public social activity. For instance in the Seoul Games, in 1988, there were 160 countries and 21 Muslim athletes all male. See: Baier, H. (1999). *"Epikur in den Gärten des Wissens. Der neue Hedonismus in Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft"*. Konstanz: 37. Furthermore, in Atlanta in 1996, 26 national delegations did not have female athletes. In Sidney, 2000, 9 delegations did not have female athletes. (See: [www. Athens 2004.com](http://www.athens2004.com))

<sup>5</sup>[www.athens2004.com](http://www.athens2004.com)

<sup>6</sup>Kamberidou, Irene & Patsantaras, Nikolaos (2006). "Towards a Gender-Neutral Inclusive Information Society: Preserving the European Model in the Information Age". Published in website [http://cordis.europa.eu.int/ist/directorate\\_g/seminar20060405.htm](http://cordis.europa.eu.int/ist/directorate_g/seminar20060405.htm): *The CORDIS focus online edition*, March 2006.

<sup>7</sup>Duncan M.C. & Messner M. (2000). "Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 – 2004. Report by the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles (AAF)". Published in AAF website: <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>. Also see press release dated July 20, 2005 in AAF website: <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup>In reference to the Doping Phenomenon see: Πατσαντάρας Ν. (2006 ). *Ολυμπισμός : Κοινωνιολογική Προσέγγιση* (Olympism: a Sociological Perspective), Chapter II: "Το Φαινόμενο Ντόπινγκ" (The Doping Phenomenon). Πανεπιστημιακές Σημειώσεις. ΤΕΦΑΑ του Εθνικού & Καποδιστριακού Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών: 17-50.

<sup>9</sup>Hargreaves, Jennifer (2000). *"Heroins of Sport: the politics of difference and identity"*. Routledge, London and New York: 2.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.: 2. Also see: Elueze, R./Jones, R.L. (1998). "A quest for equality: A gender comparison of the BBC's TV coverage of the 1995 World Athletics Championships". In: *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal (WSPAJ)* 7.H. 1: 45-69.

<sup>11</sup> Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 - 2004 is available on the AAF Website at <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>. Past studies are also available at: [www.aaf.org](http://www.aaf.org). Free copies may be requested by e-mail, [library@aaf.org](mailto:library@aaf.org), or by calling (323) 730-4646.

<sup>12</sup> Margaret Carlisle Duncan, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Michael A. Messner, Ph.D., University of Southern California, were the co-investigators for the study. Moreover, Duncan and Messner conducted the three previous AAF studies on television and women's sport and have published extensively on the topic. The new study addresses both quantitative and qualitative aspects of women's sports coverage by television sports news and highlights shows.

<sup>13</sup> Gender in Televised Sports: News and Highlights Shows, 1989 - 2004 is available on the AAF Web site at <http://www.aaf.org/9arr/ResearchReports/tv2004.pdf>.

The study included an examination of three two-week segments (a total of six weeks) of televised sports news coverage on each of three local (Los Angeles) network affiliates (KNBC, KCBS, and KABC). The study also looked at ESPN's "SportsCenter" and Fox's "Southern California Sports Report." The study's major findings reveal: 1) Women's sports were underreported in the six weeks of early evening and late-night television sports news on three network affiliates sampled in the study. Men's sports received 91.4% of the airtime, women's sports 6.3%, and gender neutral topics 2.4%. 2) On Los Angeles network affiliates, men's sports reports outnumbered women's sports stories by an 9:1 ratio, Fox's "Southern California Sports Report" male-to-female ratio was 15:1, and ESPN's "SportsCenter" ratio was 20:1. The percentage of time devoted to women's sports was also lower on Fox (3.0%) and on "SportsCenter" (2.1%) compared with the network affiliate news reports (6.3%). 4) All of the "SportsCenter" programs, all of the Fox programs, and 96.2% of the network affiliate sports news shows in the sample began with a men's sports topic as the lead story. 5) Well over half (58%) of the network affiliate news shows included no women's sports stories, and 48% of the Fox and ESPN highlights shows included no women's sports stories. Meanwhile, 100% of the 279 news and highlights broadcasts in the sample included coverage of men's sports. 6) In 2004, the stories on women's sports were somewhat more evenly distributed across the week, but 43% of them appeared on expanded-format Saturday and Sunday shows. The 1993 study found that there was almost no network affiliate news coverage of women's sports on weekdays. 7) The 2004 study found less frequent trivialization and humorous sexualization of women than previous studies. 8) Coverage of women's sports was less varied than men's (42.4% of all women's sports stories in the sample were on professional tennis). 9) 94.4% of the sports news and highlights anchor people were men. No women anchors appeared on any of the three network affiliate news shows. And no women of color news anchors or ancillary reporters appeared in any of the reports in the sample.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>14</sup>Patsantaras, Nikolaos & Kamberidou, Irene: "Gender Equity in Olympic Sports: Absenteeism and 'Invisibility'", in: 6 *Pandektis International Sports Law Review* 3-4 (2006), 361-375, p.364.

<sup>15</sup>Evans, John & Penney, Dawn: "Talking Gender", in: Penney Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education: contemporary issues and future directions*. London and New York 2002, 13-24, p. 16.

<sup>16</sup>Patsantaras, Nikolaos et al.: "Sinndimensionen des olympischen Wettkampfs. Eine systemtheoretische Betrachtung", in: 2 *Das Wissenschaftsmagazin der Deutschen Sporthochschule Köln* (2005), 38-46, p. 40.

<sup>17</sup>Kimmel, Michael: *The Gendered Society*. New York 2004, p. 1, 5.

<sup>18</sup>Macdonald, Doune: "Extending agendas: physical culture research for the twenty-first century", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 208-219, p. 210.

<sup>19</sup>Patsantaras, Nikolaos & Kamberidou Irene: "Gender Equity in Olympic Sports: Absenteeism and 'Invisibility'", in: *Pandektis International Sports Law Review*, vol. 6, issues 3-4 (2006) 361-375, p.364.

When citing: Kamberidou, Irene & Patsantaras, Nikolaos (2006). "Social Capital and Gender Equity in Sports". Presentation at the international conference *Social Capital and Sport Governance in Europe: Trust and the Use of Social Ties*, 4-5/12/2006, organized by the Universitat Commerciale Luigi Bocconi and IPAS- Institute of Public Administration and Health Care Management 'Carlo Masini', in collaboration with the European Commission, Milano Italy.

---

<sup>20</sup> Kimmel: *Gendered Society*, p. 14.

<sup>21</sup> Clarke, Gill: "Difference matters: sexuality and physical education", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 41-56.

<sup>22</sup> Kirk, David: "Physical Education: a gendered history", in: Penney, Dawn (ed.): *Gender and Physical Education, Contemporary Issues and Future Directions*. New York 2002, 24-37.

<sup>23</sup> Kimmel: *Gendered Society*, p.1,2, 5.

<sup>24</sup> Kimmel: *Gendered Society*, p. 15

<sup>25</sup> EU-Council Presidency: "Female Potential as Benefit for Research Community", in: *Das Österreichische Magazin Fur Forschung Und Technologie -Austria Innovative*, Vien 2006, 3a: 22-23. Additionally, in regard to gender mainstreaming also see:

European Commission: "Gender Scoreboard 2001. Framework Strategy in Gender Equality, Staff Working Document", in: *European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment and Social Affairs*. Brussels, 2001, [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment\\_social/gender\\_equality/docs/workprg/scoreboard\\_2001.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment_social/gender_equality/docs/workprg/scoreboard_2001.pdf)

European Commission: "i2010: A European Information Society for Growth and Employment, COM (2005) 229 final, June 1, 2005", *Directorate-General for Information Society and Media*, Brussels. in: [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/eeurope/i2010/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/index_en.htm)