

# Artifact 3: Question Redesign- Dialogically Informed Questioning

**Name: Matthew**

**Original Question:**

What constitutes “fairness” and “safety” in men’s and women’s sports regarding why transgender athletes are excluded from these categories?

**Redesign #1:** Tell me about a time where you felt the other team had an advantage in sport. How can we understand advantages in sport from a Developmental Systems Model?

**Redesign #2:** Have you ever been not included in a sport because of certain rules? What were the intentions of those rules or circumstances? How much of it is out of your control? Out of society’s control?

**Pushback:**

There are “biological advantages” transgender athletes have over cisgender athletes that make it “dangerous”, “unfair”, and “exclusionary” for women in sports.

**Response:**

About biological advantage:

Has anyone had any experiences with trans athletes? How do we account for the messiness of real life when trying to isolate for standalone variables in “biology”? Why does society rely so much on biology when stirring up trans panic?

About safety:

The rules that sought for the safety of women in sports continuously overlook current issues of women’s safety in sports (e.g., eating disorders, sexual assault, privacy of medical information, etc.). What does the concern for women’s safety in sport reveal about the objective of transpanic? Where do cis-men fit into this picture? How are cis-men affected by this depiction of transpanic?

About fairness and exclusion:

The rules that have aimed to ensure the “fairness” of women in sports has done more to exclude women as a whole than it has to include women. More ciswomen have been accused of being transgender than have transgender women been removed from sport. What does this reveal about the connection between the oppression of cis-women and transwomen. Why aren’t transwomen seen as a threat to cismen in sport? What do we, as students, have at stake (materially and socially) by advocating for or against trans participation in sport?

**Running notes from share out:**

- What was insufficient about the “original”?
  - o The original question asks students to categorize and objectify the issue with transgender participation in sport

- The new question asks students to personalize and embody their understanding of “fairness” and “inclusion” while breaking down what makes constitutes “safety” in sport.
- What were your intentions?
  - The intentions of the original question was to encourage critical thinking from students, but even the most critical of thinkers can fall into their biases if they don’t address them first. The intention of the question redesign was to encourage students to think through their personal experiences in sport in contrast to the institutional and rhetorical arguments of trans panic in sport.
- How well does dialogic framing fit your content area?
  - Dialogic framing is very relevant to the scientific and sociological study of sport.
  - Students come into Critical Sport Studies informed by their own experiences but are still grounded in the biases of institutional thought (i.e., scientific method, sex/gender binaries, sport as a cultural practice vs propaganda tool)
- What is some feedback from others?
  - Be careful about deconstructing womanhood as women are often objectified in academia already.
  - Focus on the intersections and solidarities that can be formed between athletes of all demographics.