AN EXPLORATION OF THE LESBIAN LABEL AMONG HEALTH AND KINESIOLOGY

DEPARTMENT ACADEMICIANS

A Dissertation

by

MELANIE L. SARTORE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2007

Major Subject: Kinesiology

AN EXPLORATION OF THE LESBIAN LABEL AMONG HEALTH AND KINESIOLOGY

DEPARTMENT ACADEMICIANS

A Dissertation

by

MELANIE L. SARTORE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,   George B. Cunningham
Committee Members,   Michael Sagas
                                   Jane Sell
                                   John N. Singer
Head of Department,   Robert Armstrong

August 2007

Major Subject: Kinesiology

ABSTRACT

An Exploration of the Lesbian Label Among Health and Kinesiology Department

Academicians. (August 2007)

Melanie L. Sartore, B.S., Western Illinois University;

M.S., Indiana University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. George B. Cunningham

The majority of research investigations into the meaning and implications of the

lesbian label within the sport context have primarily focused on coaches, athletes, and

physical education teachers. Generally overlooked, however, has been the area of

college and university health and kinesiology academia (i.e., sport-related curricula).

The purpose of this study was to extend this line of inquiry to this setting within the

context of sport. By doing so, investigating the lesbian label, as well as seeking to

identify its presence, impact, and potential consequences as they relate to health and

kinesiology department members, may contribute to the understanding of why a lesbian

stigma persists within the multifaceted context of sport. Further, an additional purpose

of this inquiry was to identify whether the use of identity management strategies, and

their potential negative consequences, were used in relation to the lesbian label.

The lesbian label was investigated through the voices of health and kinesiology

department academicians.   Through their words it was communicated that not only was

the lesbian label and an associated stigma present within their respective departments,

but the meaning of lesbianism within sport-related curricula was somewhat reminiscent

of the meaning in other sport contexts. Thus, to some extent, the lesbian stigma can be extrapolated from sport to sport-related curricula. While complex, the meaning of lesbianism was intertwined with gender norms, religious beliefs, politics, personal beliefs, interpersonal relationships, societal assumptions, perceptions of powerlessness, and a necessity for self-protection. This was predominantly the case related to a female faculty members' possession of certain physical characteristics, her physical presentation and attire, relationship status, and proximity to departmental physical activity courses that are regarded as more masculine (e.g., weight training, racquetball, basketball, etc.), in particular. Finally, whether merely acknowledged as being present or advocating for change with regard to perceptions of inequality and injustice, cognitive and emotional resources were allocated to this issue in a variety of ways. Implications of this exploration and its findings are presented and further inquiry encouraged.

DEDICATION

To my family and to myself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While there is undoubtedly a lifetime's worth of people who have influenced and encouraged me in many ways, I must limit myself to recognizing those in the present and most recent past.

First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. George B. Cunningham. Without Dr. Cunningham, I would not be where I am both figuratively and literally. I am uncertain as to what he saw in me at Indiana University, but am thankful for his acumen, foresight, and persistence. As one of the most distinguished researchers in the field, his teachings, wisdom, and guidance have and will continue to inspire me as a person and scholar.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Michael Sagas, Dr. John N. Singer, and Dr. Jane Sell, for their time, insights, and patience. Dr. Sagas has long been an inspiration, as he is one of the most driven men I have ever met. Despite his numerous, and oftentimes concurrent endeavors, he always found the time to provide feedback on this project, as well as others. Likewise, Dr. Sell, with whom I credit for fueling my passion for the sociological aspects of all things, provided thought-provoking insights and feedback that were integral to this project's success. Finally, the divergent perspectives of Dr. Singer aided in my ability to work outside of my quantitative comfort zone. It was a pleasure to work with him as I extended my methodological wardrobe.

I am forever ingratiated to my friend and mentor, Dr. Catherine Quatman. Dr. Quatman not only encouraged me to challenge my paradigmatic thought processes, but she also unobtrusively guided my way through these uncharted waters. Her enviable

passion, intelligence, and scholarly prowess have influenced me a great deal. This project would not have occurred, nor succeeded, without her aid.

A special thank you is extended to Dr. Tim Ryan. Tim and I began the program at the same time, shared (numerous) offices, took many of the same classes, and experienced many of the same struggles. He put up with my neuroticism on a daily basis without once expressing judgment; I sincerely thank him.

I would like to extend my appreciation to my participants, without whom, this project would never have come to fruition. Not only did they graciously volunteer their time, but they were willing to discuss this sensitive topic and reveal personal information. It is my hope that along with my gratitude, they also recognize their vital roles in opening this long-overdue dialogue.

I would never have entered the field of sport management had it not been for the President's Challenge Physical Activity and Fitness Awards Program. In fact, I would not have survived my Master's education without PC. I will forever be grateful to Jeff McClaine and Dr. Mike Willett.

The lifelong support and encouragement Michael and Patricia Sartore has been my driving force. As exemplars in every aspect of their lives, I can only hope they recognize the significance of their presence in my life.

To my soul mate, Melissa Sartore, I extend the biggest thank you of all. Our relationship, and codependence, was, is, and will always be paramount to my survival.

Lastly, I would like to praise the people who have the courage to be who they are. We can all learn from those who are true to themselves.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Structural hierarchies, power and status differences, and social inequities exist at all levels of society-at-large, organizations, and group settings (Tropp & Brown, 2004; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; Wright & Tropp, 2002). Thus, encountering and working with dissimilar others are inevitable occurrences. Consequently, understanding the impact of diversity is paramount to all settings. At the organizational level, the differences that exist among employees may be visible (i.e., surface-level characteristics) and/or invisible (i.e., deep-level characteristics), both of which have the potential to negatively influence interpersonal, organizational, and workgroup outcomes (Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998; Tsui & Gutek, 1999). Specifically, differences may reflect social category membership as well as some level of societal status (Barnum, 2003).

The social categorization framework puts forth that such differences prompt the formation of in-groups and out-groups, thus increasing the potential for inter-group bias, prejudice and discrimination (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Such practices have been found to negatively affect job performance, job satisfaction, workplace attitudes, career success, and the like (Button, 2001; Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, 1990; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Reskin, 2000). Likewise, and according to status characteristics theory, surface and deep-level characteristics may operate as diffuse or specific status characteristics, the likes of which

_____

This dissertation follows the style of the *Sociology of Sport Journal*.

send messages of competence, power, and prestige to group settings (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977).

While some of the aforementioned surface- and deep-level characteristics are protected under federal legislation and organizational policies, and are subject to great societal pressures for equality (e.g. age, sex, religion), other characteristics have yet to receive the same levels of attention and protection. For instance, in response to societal pressure, discrimination on the basis of one's sexual orientation has been addressed at the organizational level with the discretionary implementation of organizational practices and policies of acceptance and tolerance (Button, 2001); however, there exist no federal mandates to do so and thus no level of federal protection for gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) employees (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Cahill, 2005). Consequently, discrimination on the basis of one's sexual orientation persists, as does the adoption of identity management strategies by GLB individuals who have yet to disclose their sexual orientation for fear of the negative consequences that they may face should they be "outed" (Button, 2004; Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005).

Whereas general attitudes toward homosexuality have improved over the past three decades (e.g., Avery et al., 2007; Yang, 1997), the stigma associated with being, or perceived as being, GLB is representative of one of the most powerful and pervasive labels in society. Based on historical beliefs of immorality and perversion, GLB persons are ascribed negative stereotypes, much like other minority groups, subsequently resulting in prejudice and discrimination (Cahill, 2005; Herek, 1991, 2000; Link & Phelan, 2001). That is, as a result of the homosexual stigma (i.e., undesirable and

devalued different-ness; see Goffman, 1963), those identified as GLBs may experience

prejudice and discrimination ranging from overt violence to subtle social exclusion

across numerous contexts (Anderson, 2002; Cahill, 2005, Herek, 2000).

Within the organizational context, GLB persons may experience what Greenhaus

et al. (1990) refer to as *access discrimination* (i.e., the exclusion of members of a

particular group from entering an organization; see Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio,

2002) and *treatment discrimination* (i.e., the denial of legitimately earned organizational

resources, rewards, and opportunities as a result of particular category membership; see

Meyer, 2003), the latter of which has been found to result in negative work attitudes and

outcomes (Pinel & Paulin, 2005; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Further, the fear of

suffering discrimination often forces GLB persons to negotiate between their sexual

identity and other identities in an effort to hide their sexual orientation from others

(Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005; Griffin, 1991; Krane & Barber, 2005). To the extent

that managing the GLB identity in an unsupportive work environment becomes

psychological taxing, one's work performance, work attitudes, and personal well-being

may ultimately be compromised (Lewis, Derlega, Clarke, & Kuang, 2006; Meyer, 2003;

Smith & Ingram, 2004).

The sport context (e.g., athletic teams and departments, physical education

programs, kinesiology departments, professional sport organizations, etc.), often

identified as being rich in patriarchal traditions of heterosexual masculinity and male

hegemony (see Griffin, 1998; Harry, 1995; Messner, 1988), may represent the

quintessential heterosexist environment (i.e., heterosexuality as the norm; see Herek

1992). As such, the GLB label is perhaps its most powerful and pervasive within this

environment, where the prototypical employee mirrors what society views as "normal"

by taking the form of a White, Protestant, able-bodied, heterosexual male (Fink, Pastore

& Reimer, 2001; Fiske, 1998; Hegarty & Pratto, 2001). To the extent that this prototype

is synonymous with the proposed heterosexist culture of sport and has subsequently

become deeply engrained into the administrative practices of sport organizations, it has

also likely become an unconscious habit for the attributes to be instinctively linked to

one another, to sport organizations, and to sport as a whole (Reskin, 2000). As such, this

prototype represents the stereotypical, as well as the typical, sport organization employee

and signifies those with majority status. Thus, individuals deviating from this prototype

by any or all of its characteristics may face difficult working conditions and potentially

experience discrimination and prejudice as a result of their differences (Fink et al.).

Research supports this contention by demonstrating that discrimination occurs when

employees possess prototypically incongruent characteristics (e.g., sex and race; see

Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Knoppers, Bedker-Meyer, Ewing, & Forrest, 1991; Lovett

& Lowry, 1988, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991).

　　　While the presence of surface-level (dis)similarity serves as the basis for the

initial categorization of the self and others (see Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al.,

1987), these characteristics are also used to make inferences toward the presence of

deep-level (dis)similarity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992; Tsui &

Gutek, 1999). Further, in an effort to eliminate cognitive demand, these deep-level

inferences are influenced by domain-relevant stereotypes (Fiske, 1998; Opario & Fiske,

2001). Additionally, many surface-level characteristics serve as diffuse status

characteristics that influence group dynamics by reproducing societal status and

corresponding hierarchies to workgroup settings (Berger et al., 1972; Berger, et al.,

1977). Consider the following example. In relation to the prototypical sport

organization employee, when a White male enters an organization as a new employee,

assumptions of deep-level characteristics will likely be stereotype-congruent and thus

consistent with the Protestant, able-bodied, and heterosexual prototype, whether or not

he actually embodies these characteristics. Likewise, his socially constructed majority

status and associated stereotypes communicate societal and contextual power, prestige,

and expectations of competence to others (Ridgeway, 2001; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin,

1999; Rowley, Kurtz-Costes, Mistry, & Feagans, 2007; Simon, Aufderheide, and

Kampmeier, 2004; Wagner & Berger, 1997). As a result of such generalizations, and to

the extent that the White male neither contests nor contradicts said conclusions, he will

likely reap all of the benefits associated with his majority status (e.g., Knoppers, Bedker-

Meyer, Ewing & Forrest, 1990, 1991; Sack, Singh, & Theil, 2005).

The aforementioned example provides an illustration of who possesses majority

status within the sport context. As such, deviating from the employee prototype, as

presented by Fink and colleagues (2001), procures a minority or marked status. This is

consistent with Fiske (1998), who argues that a "marked status suggests that people will

be categorized according to the ways in which they differ from the default" (p. 366).

Therefore, when a White woman enters the sport domain as a new employee, the

salience of her sex dissimilarity to the "default" White male (i.e., prototype) likely

evokes stereotypical information for which her coworkers may rely as the basis for their initial categorizations and subsequent deep-level inferences. In accordance with the sport employee prototype, her coworkers may speculate as to her religious beliefs, physical abilities, and sexual orientation, the latter of which may carry the greatest impact in the sport context (Griffin, 1998). To the extent that the woman does not overtly exude heterosexuality and femininity—in turn, contradicting traditional gender stereotypes—her coworkers may interpret her sexual orientation as ambiguous, rely on dominant sport stereotypes revolving around hegemonic masculinity and male dominance (Griffin, 1998; Harry, 1995, Krane, 2001; Krane & Barber, 2005; Messner, 1988), as a result, and subsequently label her a lesbian, whether true or not.

Consistent with the notion that the social construction of gender serves as a social control mechanism (see Fiske, 1998), the lesbian label is suggested to do the same within the sport context. As stated by Griffin (1998), the fear of being labeled a lesbian in sport "ensures that women do not gain control over their sport experience or develop their physical competence beyond what is acceptable in a sexist culture" (p. 49). In an effort to avoid the lesbian label and all that it encompasses, females within sport often take great caution in their self-presentation, interactions, and behaviors (Griffin, 1991, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2005). The threat associated with being labeled a lesbian may serve as the impetus for the adoption of identity and impression management strategies whereby the ascription of negative stereotypes can be avoided. These strategies are adopted despite their potential psychological and organizational costs, and revolve around norms of silence and fear, as well as the necessity for protection (Krane &

Barber, 2005; Lewis et al., 2006; Powers, 1996; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Smith &

Ingram, 2004).

The pervasiveness of the lesbian label and stigma suggests that women in all

positions and at all levels of sport may be at susceptible to its repercussions. Indeed, the

lesbian label has been investigated as it pertains to coaches, athletes, and junior high and

high school physical educators (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Griffin, 1991, 1998; Krane &

Barber, 2005; Lenskyj, 1991; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). Specifically, in response to the

threat of confirming associated stereotypes, this line of research has primarily focused on

the identity management strategies adopted in an effort to thwart the lesbian label and

associated stigma. For instance, it has been documented that both lesbian physical

educators and lesbian coaches adhere to the prevailing norm of silence and subsequently

adopt identity management strategies in an effort to hide from or evade suspicion of

lesbianism (Griffin, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2005; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). Also

within sport, Blinde and Taub (1992) found that heterosexual female collegiate athletes

managed their athlete identity in relation to the lesbian stigma. Specifically, in contrast

to lesbians in sport, many of these heterosexual student athletes were silent about their

athlete identity when off the court or field so as to avoid any associations with and

speculation toward lesbianism. Instead, these student athletes focused on social and

sexual identities by emphasizing things such as partying and (heterosexual) dating,

respectively.

Extrapolating from the above findings, I argue that females in sport, regardless of

sexual orientation, adopt some form of identity management strategies as a result of the

lesbian label and associated stigma. While this line of research has focused a great deal on athletes, coaches, and physical educators, there is a dearth of inquiry into the presence and understanding of the lesbian stigma within related academic fields within higher education. Specifically, and to the extent that a great deal of time and energy is devoted to managing one's identities in response to this stigma, the time and energy accorded to teaching, research, student advisement, student mentoring, and the like, may be compromised. Further, as research has demonstrated that the psychologically taxing nature of such identity negotiations may manifest as negative physical and mental symptoms and outcomes, it is also necessary to investigate the lesbian stigma in relation to health and kinesiology department academician's overall well-being as well as job performance (Lewis et al., 2006; Meyer, 2003; Smith & Ingram, 2004). As such, the purpose of this study is to extend the understanding and implications of the lesbian label within the sport domain through the voices and experiences of health and kinesiology department faculty members. Specifically, the following research questions are posed:

1. To what extent are lesbianism and the lesbian label present within health and kinesiology department academia?

2. If present, what are the experiences of lesbian and heterosexual female health and kinesiology department faculty members in the presence of the lesbian label?

3. How do lesbian health and kinesiology department faculty members manage their identities in relation to an identified lesbian label? What are the outcomes of these strategies?

4. How do heterosexual female health and kinesiology department faculty members manage their identities in relation to an identified lesbian label? What are the outcomes of these strategies?

5. Is a lesbian label identifiable amongst heterosexual male health and kinesiology department faculty? If so, to what extent and what is it's perceived impact?

Current Study

As previously mentioned, investigations into the meaning and implications of the lesbian label within the sport context have primarily focused on coaches, athletes, and physical education teachers. Generally overlooked, however, has been the area of college and university health and kinesiology academia (i.e., sport-related curricula). In light of this, the significance of the current study lies in extending this line of inquiry to another population within the context of sport. By doing so, investigating the lesbian label, as well as seeking to identify it's presence, impact and, and potential consequences as they relate to health and kinesiology department members, may contribute to the understanding of why a lesbian stigma persists within the multifaceted context of sport. Further, this line of inquiry may call additional attention to the existence of identity management strategies used in relation to the lesbian label and the potential negative consequences of such behaviors. I also hope that by examining the lesbian label in two contrasting locations I will identify contextual differences that may or may not foster acceptance and tolerance for sexual minorities. Lastly, my investigation of this topic is

undertaken with the aspiration of promoting open dialogue that illuminates the importance of this topic promotes an impetus for change.

In pursuit of this research agenda, this dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter II contains the literature review, including topics such as the history of sexuality and sexual orientation, sexual orientation in American society, homophobia, sexual prejudice, and homosexual stigma and stereotype threat. After addressing such issues in society in general, sexual orientation within the sport context is reviewed. The review of sexual orientation as it pertains to sport lays the foundation for the methods of the current study as presented in Chapter III. Within this chapter, participants, procedures, and analyses are detailed. Chapter IV focuses on the results obtained and related implications, and Chapter V presents overall conclusions, potential limitations, and additional research avenues.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to investigate the meaning of the lesbian label within health and kinesiology departments as well as extend the understanding and implications of the lesbian label within the sport domain through the voices and experiences of health and kinesiology department faculty members. Operating primarily from the social categorization framework, this chapter explicates the processes whereby persons identify as and with various social groups as well as the potential negative outcomes associated with such classifications. This chapter also investigates the interaction processes that occur from an expectation states perspective. Lastly, as the social identity perspective is applicable to the comprehension of the experiences of marginalized groups, the use of the social categorization framework as applied to sexual minorities within society at large, organization settings, and of particular relevance to the current study, the sport context is particularly germane (Krane & Barber, 2005).

This chapter presents the importance of social discourse as it relates to the basic tenets of the social categorization framework, status characteristics, and the maintenance of social ideology. Further, the history and social construction of societal homosexuality, the emergence of gay, lesbian, and bisexual stereotypes and their potentially deleterious effects, and lastly, the long-standing relationship between the patriarchal norms of sport, the presence of women in sport, and the lesbian label are presented.

Theoretical Framework

Foucault (1978, 1984) referred to discourses as systems of thoughts and practices that construct people and their worlds. Consistent with this definition and with discourse theory as a whole (see Schwandt, 2001), the discourses (i.e., the social construction of meanings) of society, organizations, and sport have historically embraced the common and powerful ideology of masculine hegemony, consequently conveying messages of gendered power and status. Indeed, despite documented increases in diversity within all three realms (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2006; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998) societal, organizational, and sport, patriarchal traditions remain quite prevalent today. The presence of gendered power and status at the societal and broadly defined organizational level (e.g., Jost & Kay, 2005; Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin, 1999) has permeated sport organizations to the degree that gendered discourse has been suggested to be a determinant of male and female employment roles (Shaw & Hoeber, 2003).

Contextual discourses are continually translated and reinforced through specific language (Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Associated with assumptions and taken-for-granted meanings, discourses are difficult to challenge and highly resistant to change, as they are often deeply engrained and representative of power and control (Foucault, 1984). Accordingly, Foucault (1984) identified discursive power as determinant of social meanings, interactions, inter-group relations, and identity formation. Contextual discourses (i.e., meanings) may influence not only the social categories of which one identifies for the self, but also the social categories of which one differentiates the self

from others. To the extent that status is communicated through category membership and status characteristics are indicative of the perceived abilities, behavioral expectations, and the level of influence or power one holds in group settings, category membership(s), the contextual saliency of associated status characteristics, and the legitimization of such differences, may additively and overwhelmingly disadvantage certain individuals. Such reasoning is consistent with both the social categorization framework (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987) and status characteristics theory (Berger et al., 1972, Berger et al., 1977). While distinct in their origins and specific operating mechanisms (e.g., Oldmeadow, 2007; Oldmeadow, Platow, Foddy, & Anderson, 2003), it is the recognition that people must operate and interact across numerous settings (i.e., society, workgroups, dyads, etc.) while possessing social statuses, category memberships, and corresponding beliefs of competence regarding both (see Barnum, 2003) that underscores both theory's relative importance to the study of gender and sexual orientation within the sport context. The specific intricacies of both theoretical paradigms, as well as the commonalities between the two, are detailed below.

Social Categorization Framework

The fundamental premise of the social categorization framework is that individuals classify themselves and others into various social categories. Comprised of two main theories, self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987) and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), the basis for such classifications may be surface-level characteristics (i.e., race, sex, age, etc), deep-level characteristics (i.e., religion, sexual-orientation, values, beliefs, etc.), and/or other group memberships (i.e., functional

background, education, etc.).   While both self-categorization theory and social identity

theory are distinct in their suppositions, neither is mutually exclusive in the process of

categorizing the self and others. As such, the fundamental tenets of each theory as well

as the relationship between the two are presented below.

  Social Identity Theory. Social identity theory (SIT) posits that in an effort to

make sense of the social world and one's own place in it, people classify themselves and

others into various social categories (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Immediate classifications

are automatic, unconscious, and based on highly salient, and often contextually relevant

characteristics, such as age, race, gender, religion, organizational membership, and the

like (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Further,

the basis for which one identifies with a particular social category is influenced by the

need to enhance one's self-esteem. Thus, to the extent that identifying with a particular

social category fosters self-esteem, other members of this social group comprise one's

in-group, and are subsequently evaluated more positively than members outside of this

group. Accordingly, members of other social categories, comprised of dissimilar

individuals, constitute one's out-group and are likely to be evaluated less positively and

perhaps even negatively (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brewer, 1999; Gaertner & Dividio,

2000; Riordan, 2000). This differential evaluation of in-group and out-group members

is a direct by-product of one's group membership and is termed intergroup bias and is

likely to influence the interactions with members of certain social categories (Tsui &

Gutek, 1999).

Self-Categorization Theory. Self-categorization theory is an extension of social identity theory that focuses not on the behavior of groups but rather on the ability of individuals to act as an aggregate at all (Turner et al, 1987). In recognition of Tajfel's social identity concept, this theory states that when categorizing the self as a member of a specific social category or group, the self begins to stray from the "I" and adopts the prototypical cognitions and behaviors associated with group membership. Simply put, this theory addresses the important link between one's self concept and group membership (Turner et al, 1987). According to self-categorization theory, two components, existing on a continuum, comprise the self-concept: personal identity and social identity (Turner et al., 1987; Turner & Oakes, 1989). A third component, human identity, or the self as a human being, is also recognized; however, it can be thought of as the umbrella in which personal identity and social identity is subsumed (Turner et al., 1987).

Personal identity (i.e., self as an individual) is the component of self-categorization theory that differentiates it from social identity theory, while social identity (i.e., self as a social category) intertwines the two theories. On one end of the continuum, an individual's personal identity is comprised of those self-categorizations made on the basis of intrapersonal similarities and interpersonal differences in an attempt to establish individual uniqueness. When applied to social interaction, one's personal identity is the level of uniqueness felt within a given context (Brewer, 1991; Oakes, 1987; Turner et al., 1987). On the other end of the continuum is an individual's social identity. Social identity is based on the comparison of oneself with regard to the

level of similarity (i.e., in-group status) and dissimilarity (i.e., out-group status) of

certain social categories or groups (Brewer, 1991; Turner et al., 1987; Turner & Oakes,

1989). Again, when applied to social interaction, this component results in some degree

of depersonalization and subsequent representation of the self as a member of a social

category. Thus the individual transforms from an "I" and begins to identify as "we",

subsequently adopting the group's prototypical behaviors, values, and norms (Hogg &

Terry, 2000; Brewer, 1991). These social categories may include gender, age, race,

ethnicity, religious affiliation, sexual orientation and the like.

Taken together, the social categorization framework (Tajfel & Turner, 1979;

Turner et al., 1987) puts forth that the categorization process ultimately results in the

transferring the classification of one's self from the "I" to the "we" and making

subsequent distinctions between various "us" and "them" groups. By doing so, one

makes sense of and simplifies his or her own social world. Thus, with this process

comes the formation of in-groups and out-groups; membership of which likely results in

intergroup bias and an "us" versus "them" dynamic (i.e., more favorable attitudes toward

in-group members, see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman, & Tyler,

1990). Further, the in-group/out-group dichotomy and subsequent biases serves to

fulfill one's need for establishing and maintaining a positive self-identity (Rubin &

Hewstone, 1998) and reducing uncertainty through the adoption of cognitive and

behavioral prototypicality to both the self and others (Hogg & Mullin, 1999; Turner et

al., 1987). Accordingly, and perhaps as a function of intergroup bias, the categorization

process is a necessary antecedent for stereotyping in-group and out-group members

(Tsui & Gutek, 1999), such that positive stereotypes are affixed to in-group members and less positive (or negative) stereotypes are attributed to out-group members. To the extent that out-group status is associated with negative stereotypes, prejudice and discriminatory actions may result (Major, Gramzow, McCoy, Levin, Schmader, & Sidanius, 2002; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).

Allport (1954) suggested that in-group formation does not necessarily imply negativity or hostility toward out-group members. Indeed, Brewer (1999) supports this contention by suggesting that discrimination between in-group and out-group members is perhaps a result of favoritism toward individuals within one's in-group and merely a lack of the same favoritism toward individuals comprising one's out-group. Recently, Brown, Bradley and Lang's (2006) experiment in which physiological and affective responses to photographs of in-group and out-group members were assessed demonstrated that neither White nor African American participants responded overly negative to pictures of respective out-group members (i.e., members of the opposite race). However, both Whites and African Americans did respond with exaggerated favorability to pictures of corresponding in-group members (i.e., members of the same race). Similarly, Devine (1989) demonstrated that even when explicit bias was not present, favorability and bias toward in-group members existed at an implicit level. From this standpoint, in-group formation may be the unconscious process of establishing and maintaining positive in-group relationships and not the deliberate or overt process of derogating out-group members (Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999; Gaertner & Dividio, 2000).

In sum, the social categorization framework postulates that categorization is undertaken to both alleviate uncertainty and enhance one's self-esteem, thus allowing an individual to make sense of one's own world through the formation of in-groups and out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1978; Turner et al., 1987). Consequently, and to the extent that contextually salient category membership influences the subsequent behaviors and interactions that result from the formation of these groups, the categorical differences existent between people and groups are fundamentally relevant to nearly any setting. Likewise, the status or statuses associated with different category memberships are also of great importance. Specifically, the expectations affixed to one's own status(es), the statuses of others, and subsequent status generalizations, likely dictate group and social processes, as those possessing higher status are also expected to possess higher levels of competence, and in turn, more influence. Such is the supposition put forth by status characteristics theory (Berger et al., 1972; Berger et al., 1977).

Status Characteristics Theory

Whereas category memberships allow social group members to draw conclusions regarding the relative status and power held by members of one's own and other's social categories, such conclusions do not necessarily convey performance expectations (Barnum, 2003). Relatedly, however, status characteristics, must be differentially evaluated and bear performance expectations. As such, while category memberships are based upon perceptions of (dis)similarities as they relate to one's own social world, status characteristics communicate messages of ability and influence in group contexts (Barnum, 2003). Indeed, it is the latter that serves as the focus of status characteristics

theory. At the heart of status characteristics theory is the belief that, within group and

task settings, certain observable characteristics are accorded higher social value (i.e.,

status) than others. As a result, status hierarchies are formed and expectations of

competencies, abilities, and behaviors established (Berger et al., 1972; Berger et al.,

1977; Webster & Driskell, 1978). Analogous to the traditional social stereotypes affixed

to broadly defined majority and minority group members throughout one's lifetime (e.g.,

Aronson, 2004; Rowley et al., 2007), the generalization of one's status to other settings

reproduces social and cultural disparities and influences the manner to which people

interact. Within groups, processes and interactions are influenced such that one's high

social status (e.g., White male) is inductively generalized to other settings, thus

conveying expectations of superior competence and influence to group and task-oriented

settings. Such an assumption is made regardless of relevance of the status characteristic

to the group or task (Berger et al., 1972, Berger et al., 1977). Oldmeadow (2007) noted

that it is during this process that beliefs of competence function in such a manner that

"high status in one domain often generalizes to advantages and influences in other,

unrelated domains" (p. 274).

A status characteristic is any attribute that is differentially evaluated at the

societal level and linked to specific or general expectations of competence (Berger et al.,

1977; Oldmeadow, et al., 2003). The theory itself differentiates two types of status

characteristics: (a) specific, or those characteristics connoting aptitude at a specific skill

or task (e.g., mathematical aptitude), and (b) diffuse characteristics, or those attributes

eliciting generally positive or negative expectations that are transferable to nearly any

task and/or context (e.g., sex and race; see Berger et al., 1977; Webster & Driskell, 1973). When faced with task completion, any status characteristic not overtly detached from the task may be used to infer a level of competence in task completion, thus allowing for the relative ease of generalization from expansive social categories (i.e., diffuse status characteristics) to group and task settings (Oldmeadow et al., 2003). Diffuse and specific status characteristics are not, however, mutually exclusive and in fact, generalization is a function of both. The type and number of contextually salient status characteristics and their task relevance (i.e., paths of relevance; see Berger et al., 1977) additively contribute to competency expectations of others.

The coupling of the social categorization framework with status characteristics theory suggests that when faced with uncertainty in a task setting, group members may call upon category membership to infer relevant competence and abilities of fellow in-group members. Thus, category membership may couple with salient status(es) to exacerbate generalizations of competence, in turn, accentuating the level of influence that a high status, in-group member may have over other group members. Simply put, the combination of perceived ability with similarity allows for those with higher status and in-group membership to exercise an inordinate amount of influence over others (see Barnum, 2003). The use of such influence to maintain social hierarchies and legitimize the power and status differences within these hierarchies, such as they are, is the fundamental premise of social dominance theory.

Social Dominance Theory

Sidanius and colleagues' (Sidanius, Pratto, & Mitchell, 1994; Sidanius, Levin, Federico, & Pratto, 2001; Sidanius, Pratto, van Laar, & Levin, 2004) work with social dominance theory (SDT) presents a different picture as to why and how in-groups and out-groups are formed. Still aligned with social identity theory (see Sidanius et al., 1994; 2004), SDT hypothesizes that inter-group hierarchies, formed through the actions of individuals, groups and institutions, are promoted through social ideologies and the desire to oppress societal out-groups. Thus, in-groups and out-groups formed at the interpersonal level are influenced by a general societal consensus that serves to legitimize the power and status inequalities existent between social groups (Sidanius et al., 1994; 2001; 2004). Accordingly, the *social dominance orientation (SDO)* or "the active desire to defeat, oppress, humiliate, subjugate, and dominate other groups" (Sidanius et al., 1994, p. 163), of in-group members drives them to establish their status as superior to other pertinent groups through the use of negative stereotypes, overt discriminatory actions, and even violent force.

Research has demonstrated a positive relationship between societal status and SDO (Pratto et al., 2000; Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, & Federico, 1998). A function of societal power (i.e., "the ability to impose one's will on others, despite resistance", p. 865; Sidanius et al., 2004), possessing a high SDO is more prevalent in members of high status, socially privileged groups than in subordinate group members. As power is often a prerequisite of discrimination (e.g., Sachdev & Bourhis, 1991), it is important to note that in accordance with social hierarchy, men and Whites have been found to possess

higher SDO's than their less-privileged counterparts (Pratto et al., 2000; Levin et al., 1998). Further, strong social category identification accentuates one's high SDO, resulting in greater discrimination toward out-group members, thus illuminating the importance of context, one's conceptualization of that context, and corresponding identity salience (Levin, 2004; Sidanius et al., 1994). It should be noted, however, that SDO has also been linked to relatively stable characteristics such as personality as, when controlling for extraneous variables (e.g., socialization and situation), high SDO has been found to hold across numerous contexts (Sidanius et al., 2004). Thus, SDO is not entirely context dependent.

The theory of social dominance emphasizes the consensual nature of societal hierarchies. Research has demonstrated that high status or dominant group members as well as low status or subordinate group members (e.g., women, ethnic and racial minorities, etc.) uphold these structures (Sidanius et al., 2004). Thus, perhaps the most notable findings from social dominance research are those regarding low status group members. For instance, members of low status groups may possess high SDO despite also possessing low levels of in-group favoritism, thus representing a consensual hierarchy structure (Sidanius et al., 2001, 2004). Specifically, when low status group members perceive the current structure as stable and impenetrable, they endorse social hierarchies by failing to exhibit in-group bias and at times demonstrating favoritism toward the ideals of their high-status out-group counterparts (Federico, 1998). Along these same lines, individuals of both dominant and subordinate groups endorse dominant ideology when situationally dictated to do so (Pratto, Tatar, & Conway-Lanz, 1997).

These findings hold important implications for both in-group and out-group members within contexts deeply imbedded in perceptually immutable patriarchal norms and practices.

Whether intergroup bias is intentional or not, research suggests that being viewed as an out-group member carries with it numerous consequences. This is particularly true to the extent that out-group membership is associated with stereotyping, prejudice, and discriminatory actions (Major et al., 2002; Jost & Kay, 2005; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). On an interpersonal level, out-group members are regarded as having lower social value than their in-group counterparts (Sidanius et al., 1994), thus reducing them to a minority status of sorts and potentially resulting in social exclusion, the ascription of negative stereotypes, and stigmatization (e.g., Hopkins & Rae, 2001) . Further, stigmatization based on one's out-group status can result in "minority stress" (p. 38, Meyer, 1995), the effects of which can lead to adverse health and psychological outcomes (Lewis, Derlega, Clarke, & Kuang, 2006; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Meyer, 1995, 2003).   Within the organizational setting, out-group members experience fewer positive work outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction and career success) and suffer from higher instances of differential treatment their in-group counterparts (e.g., given less autonomy, provided less challenging work tasks, and allocated fewer rewards; see Button, 2001; Greenhaus et al.,1990; Ilgen and Youtz, 1986; Roberson & Block, 2001; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004).

Surface-Level Diversity, Deep-Level Diversity, and Status Characteristics

In any discussion of diversity and in adopting any theoretical framework to investigate diversity and diversity-related issues, it is imperative that a clear distinction be made between surface-level diversity and deep-level diversity. Harrison et al. (1998) defined surface-level diversity within the team setting as differences in overt demographic characteristics. These demographic characteristics are highly visible and exhibited through physical features (e.g., age, gender and race/ethnicity). Further and as mentioned above, they are most often representative of diffuse status characteristics (Berger et al., 1972; Berger et al., 1977; Webster & Driskell, 1978). Deep-level diversity refers to differences in attitudes, values, beliefs and personality (Harrison et al., 1998). According to social categorization framework, initial categorizations and the formation of in-groups and out-groups are likely to be based on perceptions of similarity or dissimilarity of these highly salient characteristics (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987). Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly (1992) suggested that initial perceptions of similarity or dissimilarity based on surface-level characteristics are used to make inferences with regard to the level of shared attitudes, beliefs and personality characteristics (see also Chattopadhyay, 1999). Harrison et al. (1998) further suggested that over time and through the acquisition of information about an individual through frequent and content rich social interactions, deep-level characteristics become more important when making the similarity and dissimilarity distinction and thus may negate initial surface-level categorizations. Empirically, Harrison and colleagues supported this contention by demonstrating that over time deep-level attitudinal similarity became more important in

terms of group functioning than surface-level similarity. Specifically, the presence of similar attitudes among team members was suggested to be linked to higher team cohesiveness.

While some of the aforementioned surface- and deep-level characteristics are protected under federal legislation and organizational policies, and are subject to great societal pressures for equality (e.g., age, sex, religion), other characteristics lack protection. For instance, while the rights of gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) persons have received increasing amounts of attention, instigated by the Stonewall riots of 1969 and the subsequent GLB civil rights movement, discrimination based on one's sexual orientation continues to lack explicit federal protection (Cahill, 2005). Further, and despite some notable foreign and state-level advances and the establishment of legal precedent (e.g., *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*) with regard to same-sex marriage in the United States (for review, see Berkley & Watt, 2006), it appears as though Veri's (1999) argument that, "homophobia and heterosexism can be considered the last acceptable forms of social discrimination in this country" (p. 355) is still very much relevant. Thus, at a societal level, individuals differing from heterosexuality may perhaps be perpetual out-group members. As such, sexual orientation has been addressed to some degree at the organizational level with the implementation of organizational practices and policies of acceptance and tolerance (Button, 2001) despite the absence of federal protection for GLB employees (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Cahill, 2005). Despite such advances, however, discrimination on the basis of one's sexual orientation persists, at both the macro and micro levels, as does the adoption of identity management strategies by GLB individuals

who have yet to disclose their sexual orientation for fear of the negative consequences that they may face should they be "outed" (Button, 2004; Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005).

<center>Sexuality and Sexual Orientation</center>

Same-sex coitus behavior can be traced back to the Neanderthals (Dode, 2004). However, the first examples of such carnal relations occurring within "civilized" populations exist among the ancient Egyptians and Greeks (Dode, 2004; Karras, 2000). During these times, it was not uncommon for men to satisfy their sexual desires with females and subservient males, both of whom were considered property. Men of high stature and of great power were most often documented as having young male apprentices with whom a sexual relationship was common, as well as having specific, long-term male companions and lovers. The acts performed in these relationships were neither defined in terms of an individual or collective identity (i.e., homosexuality), nor were they viewed with quite the distain that they are today. Thus, there was no social discourse for such behaviors, consistent with the social constructionist framework (see Foucault, 1978), Greek homosexuality did not exist as the concept of homosexuality itself, did not exist (Halperin, 1990; Thorp, 1992). Rather, same-sex encounters, while debatably viewed as socially acceptable, were viewed in terms of individual sodomitic acts independent of one's sexual identity. Thus, similar to male-female intercourse, same-sex sexual acts were representative of societal dominance and power, as penetration was to be performed by the strong, active partner and received by the weaker, more passive of the two (Dode, 2004; Karras, 2000; Nye, 2004).

Roman history also provides early documented accounts of accepted same-sex love and relationships; however, at the beginning of the first century, Roman law sought to reestablish the prominence of heterosexuality by making same-sex sexual acts forbidden (Dode, 2004; Karras, 2000). This movement corresponded with the introduction of numerous religious ideals (e.g., Christianity and Jewish codes) and led to the persecution and punishment of those partaking in same-sex carnal acts throughout much of Europe. Whereas previously sanctioned by social status and power, sexual acts were now regulated by religious doctrine. As such, marriage was encouraged in an effort to thwart same-sex behavior as well as emphasize fornication as an act that was to only take place between a man and a woman for the purpose of procreation. Simply put, as religious values became synonymous with societal values, so too did same-sex sexual relations become synonymous with immorality and unnaturalness. These European ideals carried over to the colonization of North America, as a scarce population coupled with the overabundance of workable land highlighted the need for human reproduction. Thus, within the New World, early European settlers established a "norm of reproduction" (p. 33; Freedman, 1995) by outlawing sexual acts taking place outside the confines of marriage (e.g., adultery) and non-procreative sexual acts (e.g., buggery), many of which were punishable by death (Dode, 2004). While there was some concession in the severity of punishments for these non-procreative acts during the 17th century, generally these heterosexist ideals (i.e., persecution of behaviors, identities, etc., and challenging heterosexual norms; see Herek, 1995) remained dominant until the late 18th century.

During the 18th century scientists began to investigate the biological differences between men and women (Dode, 2004; Nye, 2004). Convergent with domestic roles, women's weaker muscles, wider hips, narrower shoulders and emotional variability were attributed to her reproductive function, thus categorizing her as a demure, submissive being. In a complementary fashion, the strong musculature, wide shoulders, and assertiveness of men reinforced their heightened social standing and associated power. These are consistent with the traditional gender stereotypes still prescribed today (see Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Fiske, 1998). Further, the corresponding nature of the physiological differences exhibited reinforced the notion that only men and women should be brought together in the physical sense. Together, the evidence of differences served to strengthen social norms and augment the purpose of sexual arousal and sexual behavior – heterosexual procreation, the latter of which would become the standard to which all other sexual "perversions" or "abnormal acts" were compared (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1949; Nye, 2004).

Within the United States, the 19th century brought about a societal shift whereby the meaning of sex transformed from the norm of reproduction of the early settlers to include the need for romance and passion (Freedman, 1995; Miller, 2006). A function of economic development, this newfound emphasis allowed for the inclusion of emotion and non-procreative sexual intimacy to take place between married couples as well as provided an opportunity for intimate, and sometimes physical, relationships to form outside of marriage. Specifically, it was during this time that working-class men and some women sought solace within strong, romantic same-sex friendships often sexual in

nature (Freedman, 1995; Griffin, 1998; Miller, 2006). Middle and upper class men and women also formed strong same-sex bonds within their distinct realms. Consistent with Victorian ideals, men and women of the upper echelons of society led separate, gendered lives and came together rarely. Marriage, for this stratum, was often little more than a legal transaction whereby an occasional rendezvous occurred for the purpose of procreation. Thus, the female identity was closely tied to heterosexual roles allowing for the formation of unquestioned same-sex relationships. Middle class women, for instance, often formed intimate same-sex relationships the likes of which mirrored heterosexual love affairs but evaded suspicions of impropriety.

While same-sex attraction and fornication had existed within society from the time of the Neanderthals up through the Victorian ages and beyond, such acts had yet to be medically termed. In 1869, however, German doctor Karl Maria Kertbeny coined the term "homosexuality" to refer to a specific type of person with same-sex sexual proclivities. A derivation of the Greek word for same, "homo", and the Latin word for sex, "sexualis", it was quickly embraced by the medical community. Shortly after, Richard von Krafft-Ebing published "Psychopathia Sexualis" which contained the words "lesbian" and "female inverts". Whereas Kertbeny argued that same-sex desires were inherent and that man was entitled to do with his body what he wished, Krafft-Ebing referred to these desires in conjunction with disease and mental illness. Thus, the words "lesbian" and "female invert" were defined in terms of the presumed genetic weaknesses, tainted family pedigree, and illnesses believed to cause the same-sex attractions of women (Miller, 2006). With these classifications, previously regarded

isolated instances of forbidden same-sex carnal acts became representative of a specific type of person with a distinct sexual role and identity (i.e., the homosexual; see McIntosh, 1968). Foucault, as translated by Halperin (1998), writes of this 19th century persona, "The sodomite was a temporary aberration; the homosexual is now a species" (p. 95). Further, the species to which Foucault referred was compared to the "heterosexual" norm and regarded as socially perverse, deviant, and pathological by European doctors.

One notable exception to the predominant belief of homosexuality as pathological was Sigmund Freud's supposition that homosexuality was a fixation resulting from life experiences (Freud, 1986). Despite the work of Freud, however, most American doctors and psychiatrists adopted the perspective of homosexuality as a mental illness, prompting both the medical community and society as a whole to question the virtue of intimate same-sex relationships. Despite these potential impediments, social control was not completely attained, as the formation of strong same-sex relationships continued, however, did so in a more subtle manner than before. This was particularly true for women who publicly hid their same-sex sexual proclivities by publicly embracing Victorian tradition, while inconspicuously seeking out more accepting societal microcosms with which to express their same-sex tendencies (Freedman, 1995; Griffin, 1998).

The dichotomization of sexuality and the traditional gender roles for which it was based were challenged during the 20th century (Freedman, 1995; Miller, 2006). During the First World War, for instance, many women were temporarily (a caveat that allowed

for such occurrences to take place) forced to work outside of the home to not only

support their families but also in support of the war effort overseas. Further, women

sought companionship with one another during such trying times. Both of these trends

continued following the First World War as more and more women began to work

outside of the home, attend college, establish strong same sex relationships, take control

over their reproductive and sexual selves with the use of birth control, and ultimately

seek out fair and equitable treatment in relation to their male counterparts. As evidenced

by the Women's Suffrage movement as a whole and accomplishments such as the

passage of the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution, women were

beginning to disaffiliate the conventional female mold of earlier centuries. While

progressive, breaking this mold challenged social order, gender ideology, and male

hegemony; the result of which led to hostility and distain toward nonconformist females.

Further, as these females sought entrance into domains reserved only for White men,

their femininity was called into question, as was their sexuality. Simply put, by stepping

outside of patriarchal heterosexist norms, women deviant in one aspect of their

traditional gender identity (e.g., subservience) were too deemed deviant in other aspects

(e.g., sexuality) of the same identity.

Whereas the post-World War I era saw great increases in women's rights, World

War II and the post-World War II era reestablished traditional gender ideals. Just as in

World War I, the Second World War demanded that women leave the home to

temporarily fill jobs left open by men at war. Some females even volunteered for

military duty, an occurrence that perhaps further demonized women lacking in

traditionally defined femininity (Berube & D'Emilio, 1984). Unlike the First World

War, however, the option for women to continue to inhabit such positions after the war

was vastly diminished. During the war, women took on duties that blurred gender lines

and challenged masculine hegemony. Thus, amidst the backdrop of post-war

McCarthyism, such behaviors were viewed as threatening national security and

traditional American ideals (Berube & D'Emilio, 1984; Miller, 2006). Homosexuality,

still classified as a mental disorder, and other forms of sexual deviance were at best

intolerable and subsequently criminalized in an effort to reinstitute the dichotomous

gender and sexuality divides (Berube & D'Emilio, 1984; Freedman, 1995; Goodman,

1998; Herek, 2006).

Around this same time, Alfred Kinsey's research on the sexual behavior became

publicized. Kinsey and colleagues' (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey,

Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953) research refuted previous assumptions of a

homosexual-heterosexual dichotomy. Their work regarded sexual orientation as a

complex construct existing on a continuum. While anchored by heterosexual and

homosexual exclusivity, respectively, this continuum acknowledges the variability of

sexuality by including alternative orientations such as bisexuality. Following Kinsey's

lead, many researchers have delved further into the understanding of one's sexual

orientation and examined beyond the physical act alone. From this line of inquiry,

sexual orientation has been found to be comprised of much more than just a sexual

behavior to involve fantasies, attractions, desires, identities, behaviors, and self-image,

the likes of which may conflict with one another as well as act in conjunction with or

independently of one another (Herek, 2000b). Beyond being multifaceted, research also suggests that one's sexual orientation is highly malleable and often contextually bound (Lubensky, Holland, Wiethoff, & Crosby, 2004). Further, and from a life course theory perspective, the orientation to which one subscribes may be influenced by the amalgamation of the biological, historical, environmental, and socio-cultural forces exerted during one's lifetime (Hammack, 2005).

Despite scientific evidence revealing the highly complex nature of sexuality and thus refuting the heterosexuality/homosexuality dichotomy as well as the concept of heteronormality, homosexuality remained a stigmatized societal status during the 20th century, due in large part to the listing of homosexuality as a mental disorder by the American Psychiatric Association (Griffin, 1998, Herek, 1995; Herek, 2000a). While removed from the list in 1973, the damage incurred from its long history as a pathological illness may contribute to why the stigma surrounding homosexuality is still evident today (e.g., Herek, 2000a, Lewis et al., 2006). This is particularly true to the extent that heterosexuality has become the norm of which all other sexual orientations are evaluated; a phenomenon termed "compulsory heterosexuality" by Rich (1980). Since its official declassification as a pathological disorder, however, general attitudes toward homosexuality and GLB individuals have shown improvement, as has support for some level of legal acknowledgment of same-sex partnerships (Avery et al., 2007; Herek, 2006; Yang, 1997). Despite such trends, however, negative stereotypes toward GLBs have transcended time and remain evident today.

Homosexual and Lesbian Status and Stereotypes

Ashmore and Del Boca (1981) define a stereotype as "as set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people" (p. 16). In general, social psychologists view negative stereotypes as determinants of negative attitudes and evaluations (i.e., prejudice) toward specific groups and group members (Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996; Fiske, 1998). Indeed, the very nature of stereotypes suggests that simply being aware of them serves to bias the interactions with and behaviors toward members of stereotyped groups (Devine, 1989). This is particularly true to the extent that stereotypes and subsequent behavioral expectations are based on one's status, status characteristics, and contextual surroundings. (Berger et al., 1977; Major & O'Brien, 2005). Gender, for instance, is a diffuse status characteristic that represents the general differences in beliefs and expectations toward men and women, influences perceived orders of prestige, and ultimately dictates the societal and interpersonal perceptions and behaviors of the sexes (Berger et al., 1997; Wagner & Berger, 1997). Thus, according to the burden of proof assumption, unless otherwise demonstrated, broad cultural meanings of gender (i.e., stereotypes) become salient and are perceived as situationally and/or task relevant. Further, as the basis to which these stereotypes exist reflects the higher societal status often accorded to males, behavioral differences in such situations may be somewhat attributed to such cultural gender-typing (Wagner & Berger, 1997).

To the extent that gender and sexual orientation are decidedly coupled diffuse status characteristics, expectations based upon knowledge and/or assumptions of one's sexual orientation may also exist and subsequently influence perceptions of and

behaviors toward sexual minorities (Johnson, 1995; Renfrow, 2006). Indeed, against the

backdrop of the broad social construction of gender roles and homosexuality (Marmor,

1998; Schope & Eliason, 2004), the devalued status of homosexual communicates

numerous expectations and beliefs. For instance, the often undifferentiated relationship

between homosexuality and pedophilia (Plummer, 2006), and gay male stereotypes that

revolve around beliefs of sexual obsession, promiscuousness, femininity, flamboyance,

and perversion (Bernstein, 2004; Simon, 1998) present capacious barriers to which gay

males, in numerous contexts, must overcome.

 The stereotyping process is highly efficient and functional in that when presented

with a target person or persons, cognitive resources are conserved through the activation

of automatic, contextually-relevant categorizations and stereotypes (Devine, 1989; Fiske,

1998; Rush, 1998). Once activated, recall of additional information is likely to be

stereotype-congruent further reinforcing initial categorizations and prejudices while also

maximizing between group differences and minimizing within group differences. For

example, the presentation of an African American to a White may elicit automatic

activation of the negative stereotypes consistent with *tribal stigma* or stigma related to

racial and ethnic origin (see Goffman, 1963), thus prompting activation of additional

stereotype-congruent information for the purposes of inter-group differentiation (Devine,

1989; Fiske, 1998).

 As with most, if not all, surface- and deep-level characteristics, stereotyping is

contextually and culturally dependent (Eagly & Diekman, 2005; Fiske, 1998; Major &

O'Brien, 2005; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Further, prevailing cultural stereotypes are

evident at very young ages and thus influence personal interactions and general attitudes throughout one's lifespan (Aronson, 2004; Rowley et al., 2007). For instance, stereotypes and attitudes toward older persons in America are different than those prescribed to older persons in other countries as dictated by culture (e.g., Kite, Stockdale, Whitley, & Johnson, 2005). Likewise, attitudes toward overweight individuals are more favorable in the Latino culture than in American society (e.g., Crandall & Martinez, 1996). Also likely to differ are those stereotypes held toward non-visible characteristics. Whitely and Kite (1995) revealed that cultural context was a determinant of the stereotypes and attitudes men and women held toward homosexuals. Taken together, it is quite clear that the societal meanings and attitudes attached to specific characteristics vary across cultures. Further, as these stereotypes are suggested to manifest at extremely young ages, so too are the negative expectations and prejudices associated with stereotypical beliefs (Aronson, 2004).

While stereotypes predict prejudice, prejudice is a better predictor of discrimination than are stereotypes (Dovidio et al., 1996). To the extent that the stereotype is highly incongruent with norms and ideology and negative in content, prejudice and discrimination may follow accordingly (Eagly & Diekman, 2005; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Such is the case with regard to gay and lesbian stereotypes, as they have been found to be highly influential in the formation of homophobia and sexual prejudice (Bernstein, 2004; Herek, 2000a). Formed on the basis of traditional gender norms, gay and lesbian stereotypes reflect the general dislike associated with ideological gender non-conformity (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Fiske, 1998; Laumann & Mahay,

2002). Specifically, when a man does not act as a man should (e.g., aggressive) or when a women does not act as a women should (e.g., submissive), they have stepped beyond acceptable gender boundaries, become gender deviants, and threatened social norms. As a result, the ascription of negative stereotypes, homophobia, sexual prejudice, and anti-gay behaviors may occur (Kite & Whitely, 1998; Griffin, 1998; Herek, 2000a; Laumann & Mahay, 2002).

According to Marmor (1998), there are four basic assumptions used in the social construction of homosexuality. These assumptions of homosexuality include (a) sinfulness and immorality, (b) unnaturalness, (c) conscious choice of sexual orientation, and (d) contagiousness. Despite unsubstantiated bases for their respective origins and scientific evidence to the contrary, the pervasiveness of these assumptions is evident in the malevolent stereotypes ascribed to GLB individuals. As such, gay male stereotypes revolve around beliefs of sexual obsession, promiscuousness, femininity, flamboyance, and perversion (Bernstein, 2004; Simon, 1998). Equally unfavorable, lesbian stereotypes embody beliefs of sexual seduction, unwanted predatory advances, masculinity, aggressiveness, and harmfulness toward children (Eliason, Donelan, & Randall, 1992). Indeed, both sets of stereotypes create capacious barriers for which sexual minorities must hurdle in their strife for equal status and their pursuance of "normal" lives. These barriers include societal homophobia and sexual prejudice (Weinberg, 1972; Herek, 1995; 2000a).

Homophobia and Sexual Prejudice

In the previous section, the distinction was made between homophobia and sexual prejudice. The term "homophobia" was first coined by psychologist George Weinberg (1972), who defined the term as "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals – and in the case of homosexuals, self-loathing" (p.4). As Herek (2000a) notes, this definition implies "irrational fear" at the individual level, overlooks societal-level prejudices, and focuses primarily on homosexuality rather than sexual orientation as a whole. Similarly, Herek also notes the term "heterosexism" or a societal ideology in which behaviors, identities, relationships, and communities that counter heterosexual norms are impugned and stigmatized (Herek, 1995) as an unsatisfactory descriptor as it conveys broad societal-level heterosexual ideals and does not account for individual attitudes. Thus, Herek advanced a new term, "sexual prejudice" or "all negative attitudes based on sexual orientation" (p. 19), as a more appropriate, all inclusive term for which to use when referring to negative attitudes toward GLB persons.

Sexual prejudice, whether manifested overtly or subtly, is predicated on four primary motivations, each of which may operate in conjunction with another or others (Herek, 2000a). The first motivation of which Herek refers is experience. Specifically, to the extent that unpleasant experiences and interactions with one or a few GLB individuals have occurred at some time, generalizations of unpleasantness are extended to all GLB persons, resulting in sexual prejudice. Secondly, sexual prejudice may manifest from a general fear of homosexuality as it relates to one's own sexual identity and the maintenance of heterosexist social structures (Lubensky et al., 2004), the latter

of which is strongly grounded in historical precedent (Miller, 2006) and evidenced by the denial of rights afforded to same-sex domestic partnerships (Herek, 2006). Thirdly, sexual prejudice may arise from group norms. Individuals entering a context which dictates consensually accepted hostility and distain toward homosexuals may conform to such ideals in an effort to establish in-group membership. Indeed, such motivations are evident within heterosexist work environments (Griffin & Hebl, 2002; Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo, 1999). Lastly, Herek (2000a) notes that sexual prejudice may originate from perceived value incongruence. Most notably, individuals possessing value systems rich in traditional religious mores and/or conservative principles view GLB individuals as conflicting with their beliefs and thus, exhibit sexual prejudice (Lubensky et al., 2004). Taken together, these motivations not only explain the manifestation of sexual prejudice, but they also reflect the pervasiveness of the overarching stigma toward GLB persons. Indeed, it in is response to this stigma and its potential outcomes that many GLBs do not disclose their predilections outside of accepting environments. Both of these topics are discussed in greater detail in the following section.

<center>Stigma and Stereotype Threat</center>

According to Crocker, Major, and Steele, (1998) "the stereotypes that drive impressions, judgments, and behaviors toward stigmatized individuals are mental representations that make order of one's social world" (p. 543). Thus, stigmatization is a socially constructed process dictated by specific situations, social identity meanings within such situations, and ultimately societal normalcy (Goffman, 1963; Rush, 1998; Steele, Spencer, & Aronson, 2002; Towler & Schneider, 2005). Further, and with regard

to those suffering stigmatization, social stereotypes serve to communicate the level of

devaluation associated with specific social identities (Crocker et al., 1998; Davies,

Spencer, & Steele, 2005). Consistent with Link and Phelan (2001), who conceptualize

stigma as comprised of labeling, stereotyping, separation, status loss, discrimination, and

ultimately power, the stigmatization process is not only socially constructed but also

fundamentally relevant to the enhancement of the in-group/out-group distinction (Tajfel

& Turner, 1979) and the maintenance of social hierarchies (Sidanius et al., 2001). This

is particularly true to the extent that once affixed; a label serves to link both the

favorable and unfavorable characteristics (i.e., stereotypes) to category membership and

subsequently construct an "us" – "them" dichotomy (Link & Phelan, 2001). Based on

these notions of normalcy, power, and inter-group relations (see Crocker et al., 1998;

Goffman, 1963; Jones et al., 1984), Towler and Schneider (2005) sought to investigate

how individuals classify and distinguish between stigmatized groups. Their study

revealed that persons sort stigmatized groups into seven primary dimensions (e.g.,

physical ability, social deviants, sexual identity, and physical appearance)

distinguishable by levels of social desirability, controllability, and general feelings of

pity. Further substantiating their findings, the structures of these dimensions held across

numerous contexts.

Members of stigmatized groups are placed as such based on labels, affixed

negative stereotypes, assumptions, and attributions ascribed to certain surface-level (i.e.,

visible) characteristics such as one's age (Rupp, Vodanovich, & Cred, 2006), physical

ability (McLaughlin, Bell, & Stinger, 2004), body weight (Puhl & Brownwell, 2003),

and race (Bird & Bogart, 2001), as well as marked deep-level characteristics (i.e., invisible) such as sexual orientation (Lewis, Derlega, Clarke, & Kuang, 2006), religious beliefs (Wilson, 1996), and chronic illness (Jacoby, Snape, and Baker, 2005), just to name a few. Members of these and other stigmatized groups are labeled as socially deviant and discriminated against, across numerous contexts, based on stereotypical and culturally-dominant beliefs, despite the fact that certain stigmatized groups are protected under federal law (e.g., disability; see Scheid, 2005).

Research has identified the occurrence of stigmatization within the academic setting (Pinel, Warner, & Chua, 2005), the workplace (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Pinel & Paulin, 2005), the health care industry (Drury & Lewis, 2002), and the service industry (King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, 2006), just to name a few. Further, within these settings the prejudice and discrimination experienced by members of stigmatized groups may range from blatantly overt to markedly subtle (Conley, Devine, Rabow, & Evett, 2002; Crocker et al., 1989; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Krane & Barber, 2005). Herek's (Herek, 1999; Herek, Gillis, Cogan, & Glunt, 1997) research on sexual prejudice, for instance, has consistently revealed the prevalence of violent anti-gay hate crimes toward GLB persons. Equally damaging, subtle discrimination may also occur as a result of sexual prejudice as evidenced by Hebl, Foster, Mannix, and Dovidio's (2002) investigation of GLB job applicants. These researchers revealed that while blatant discrimination was not observed at the time of inquiring about a job position, subtle discrimination occurred as GLB applicants were dealt with in a more standoffish manner than their heterosexual applicant counterparts.

While the degree to which the effects of stigmatization are realized and experienced likely vary by individual differences (see Clair et al., 2005; Crocker et al., 1998), a copious amount of research suggests that the consequences of stigma can be detrimental to one's overall health and well-being (Allport, 1954; Brooks, 1981; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Meyer, 1995; Smith & Ingram, 2004) as well as influential within one's work and personal life (Conley et al., 2002; Crocker & Major, 1989; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Further, and to the extent that members of stigmatized groups are aware of their marked status (i.e., possess some degree of stigma consciousness; see Pinel, 1999), research suggests that such persons hold expectations of prejudice and discrimination as well as adopt identity management strategies and coping mechanisms in an effort to avoid the effects of being stigmatized (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Crocker et al., 1998; Major, Spencer, Schmader, Wolfe, & Crocker, 1998; Pinel, 1999; Pinel & Paulin, 2005).

Stigma consciousness is the response to a particular identity and its domain-relevant stereotypes being made salient (Pinel, 1999). More specifically, it is the degree to which persons focus on their stereotyped status within given contexts. Within the American culture, numerous societal stereotypes exist. For instance, African Americans are likely aware of negative stereotypes regarding their intellectual inferiority and aggressive dispositions (Crocker et al., 1998). Likewise, the prevailing stereotypes revolving around women's excessive emotionality, poor math skills, and leadership abilities are not likely to escape the consciousness of females (Crocker et al., 1998; Davies et al., 2005). As such, the history of these stereotypes and resulting

discrimination suggests that both African Americans and females likely possess high levels of stigma consciousness in certain situations (Pinel, 1999). Thus, stigma consciousness also encompasses some degree of what Steele and colleagues (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999; Steele & Aronson, 1995; Steele et al., 2002) term *stereotype threat*, or the risk of confirming the negative stereotypes of one's social group to the self through behavior. Accordingly, the higher the consciousness the more likely stereotype threat is to occur and result in both acute and chronic behavior modifications whereby an individual will seek to disconfirm stereotypes and maintain self-esteem (see Conley et al., 2002; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Steele et al., 2002). The presence of stereotype threat within specific social groups has been empirically demonstrated with regard to identity salience (i.e., stigma consciousness), relevant stereotypes, and intellectual task performance (Spencer et al., 1999; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005) and career aspirations (Davies et al., 2005), respectively. Contextual factors have also been found to exacerbate the effects of stereotype threat as they may heighten identity salience (Inzlict & Ben-Zeev, 2000; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005) and strengthen stereotype meanings (Steele et al., 2002).

Stereotype Threat, Minority Stress, and Outcomes of GLB Persons

While the "invisible" nature of one's sexual orientation may allow GLB persons to escape physical violence and verbal assaults (i.e., sexual orientation victimization or SOV; see D'Augelli, 1998), the stress of stigmatization and the fear of confirming situationally relevant negative stereotypes can be both psychological and physically taxing for some GLB persons (Brooks, 1981; DiPlacido, 1998; Dworkin & Yi, 2003;

Meyer, 2003; Lewis et al., 2006). Indeed, such stress and its effects are evident at the

societal and interpersonal levels, as well as in specific workplace settings (Conley et al.,

2002; Meyer, 1995; Lewis et al., 2006; Smith & Ingram, 2004; Ragins & Cornwell,

2001). Termed "minority stress," first by Brooks (1981) with regard to lesbians and

later applied to gay males by Meyer (1995), the concept captures the adverse effects of

stigma, prejudice, and discrimination associated with sexual minority (i.e., out-group)

status. Specifically, Meyer (1995) defines minority stress with regard to GLBs as the

"totality of the minority person's experience in the dominant culture" (p. 39). Thus,

minority stress represents the consensual (i.e., socially-dictated) chronic stressors that

minorities must face in addition to everyday life events and daily struggles (DiPlacido,

1998; Meyer, 2003). Sexual prejudice (Herek, 2000a), the possibility of sexual

prejudice, the coping mechanisms employed in the face of sexual prejudice, the

vigilance one maintains to avoid sexual prejudice (see Allport, 1954), and the strategies

employed ensure avoidance, collectively represent the numerous additional stressors

GLB individuals experience in their everyday lives.

Research has consistently demonstrated that GLB identity can lead to stress

resulting in negative health outcomes (Meyer, 2003). Meyer (1995), for instance,

reported that as targets of societal discrimination, gay males in his study experienced

negative mental health outcomes. Indeed, Meyer's (2003) recent meta-analysis revealed

that GLB persons were 2.3 times more likely to suffer from a mental disorder than their

heterosexual counterparts. Behaviorally, minority stress may also result in substance

abuse, suicidal tendencies, and depression for GLB persons (DiPlacido, 1998; Meyer,

1995, 2003; Waldo, 1999). Likewise, minority stress may also be felt in relation to the lack of policy regarding the rights of GLB individuals and partnerships. As noted by Herek (2006), the well-being of sexual minorities may suffer as a result of being denied the psychological, financial, legal, medical, familial, and job-related benefits associated with marriage. Thus, the denial of federal and state marital rights (i.e., varied types of security) to sexual minorities not only perpetuates the stigma of homosexuality by deeming same-sex partnerships as unsuitable for legal recognition, but it may also cause additional stressors for GLBs and thus, an increased risk for psychological and/or physical illnesses (Herek, 2006). Further and consistent with the concept of stigma as a component of minority stress, an elevated stigma consciousness exacerbates the adverse effects experienced by sexual minorities due to maintained vigilance and expectations of prejudice and discrimination (Allport, 1954; Crocker et al., 1998; Jones et al., 1984; Meyer, 1995, 2003; Pinel, 1999). Perhaps more importantly, minority stress may also entail some degree of internalized homophobia or the internalization of negative attitudes toward homosexuals within the self (Smith & Ingram, 2004; Meyer, 2003). Internalized homophobia is particularly problematic in that it may result in some degree of diminished self-regard, self-loathing, and additional adverse health outcomes (Williamson, 2000).

Minority stress and all that it may encompass (i.e., stigma and stereotype threat) can also threaten one's performance. Research has demonstrated that when made aware of stereotypical beliefs toward a social category for which a person is a member, additional effort toward disproving such beliefs takes precedent over the task at hand.

Thus, the presence of stereotypes produces anxiety and a hyper-vigilant state whereby energy and attention are focused on the stereotype, trust in one's ability, feelings of belongingness, and the relationships with relevant others (Aronson, 2004). As such, additional resources are allocated to these processes, compromising performance. Indeed, performance decrements have been demonstrated with regard to stereotypical notions of the math ability of women and African Americans (Spencer et al., 1999; Steele & Aronson, 1995) and athletic performance of White males (Yodyk & Prentice, 2005), as well as stereotypes concerning women and organizational leadership positions (Davies et al., 2005). Similarly, Waldo's (1999) identification of heterosexist work environments as sources of minority stress found that sexual minorities within such domains experienced negative job-related outcomes.

While the prejudices and discriminatory behaviors that result from heterosexists work environment may serve to maintain ideological cultural stereotypes through the behaviors, or lack thereof, of GLB persons, the maintenance of heterosexist norms may also result for the sexual majority of heterosexuals. Rudman and Fairchild's (2004) "backlash effect" or the "social and economic sanctions for counter-stereotypical behavior" (p. 157) provides experimental support for this contention. In experimental settings, these authors demonstrated that atypical group members (i.e., non-conformers or gender deviants) behaving in a counter-stereotypical manner received less help (i.e., sabotage), high ratings of incompetence, and low ratings of likeability than did their typical group member counterparts. Further, these responses to atypical peers behaving counter-stereotypically served to impede the success of these individuals, preserve

stereotypical beliefs and the maintenance of the status quo as well as resulted in increased self-esteem on the part of the perceiver. Consistent with van Knippenberg, De Dreu, and Homan's (2004) conceptualization of perceived identity threat, whereby one's distinctiveness is challenged, as moderating the relationship between categorization and intergroup bias, Rudman and Fairchild's (2004) findings suggest that when gender typicality (i.e., ideology) is threatened or challenged, prejudices and discrimination may ensue.

<div align="center">Disclosure and Identity Management Strategies</div>

Because one's sexual orientation is a deep-level characteristic and not easily identifiable, the actual number of GLB individuals in the workforce is not ascertainable. In 1991 Gonsiorek and Weinrich estimated that anywhere from 4% to 17% of the workforce was comprised of gay and lesbian employees, a percentage that is comparable to, if not higher than, other minority groups (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Of this number, Croteau's (1996) review revealed that 25% to 66% employees reported some instance of workplace discrimination. While these numbers certainly provide a better picture of GLB employees and their experiences, it is possible that figures are not truly representative of the current state as estimates have likely changed over the past ten to fifteen years. Further, as the workplace is commonly not a place where GLB individuals fully disclose their sexual orientation, any estimate has the potential to be underestimated (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

Research suggests that workplace discrimination experienced by GLBs is ubiquitous at best (Beaty & Kirby, 2006; Croteau, 1996; Hebl et al., 2002; Meyer, 2003;

Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). This is particularly true within unsupportive, heterosexist

work environments where diversity is neither valued nor protected and stigmatization is

quite high (Clair et al., 2005; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo,

1999). Thus, consistent with the strategies identified by Crocker et al. (1998) of which

stigmatized persons may adopt when interacting with non-stigmatized others (i.e.,

overcompensation, reservation, and withdrawal), within the work context GLB

employees may adopt identity management and/or disclosure strategies in an effort to

avoid stigmatization and attain or maintain in-group status (Button, 2004; Clair et al.,

2005; Griffin, 1991). These identity management behaviors require a great deal of

cognitive and emotional effort and as such are important internal stressors for GLB

individuals, primarily to the extent that such efforts result in an unauthenticated self

(Clair et al., 2005; DiPlacido, 1998; Leary, 1999). Thus, a conflicted self may also lead

to negative outcomes elsewhere, including the organizational setting (Button, 2004; Day

& Schoenrade, 1997). Further, the additional attention paid to such activities may

detract from one's job duties and ultimately compromise performance (Meyer, 2003).

Tajfel and Turner (1979) postulate six strategic responses employed in an effort

to remedy social category devaluations. Within the workplace setting, however,

research has traditionally identified two primary identity management strategies used by

gays and lesbians; passing and revealing (Clair et al., 2005; for exceptions, see Button,

2004). Leary (1999) defines passing as "a cultural performance whereby one member of

a defined social group masquerades as another in order to enjoy the privileges afforded

to the dominant group" (p. 85). Indeed, this is consistent with Button's (2004) notion of

counterfeiting and reflects the adoption of a false heterosexual identity. According to

Clair et al. (2005), tactics used to pass include fabricating (i.e., deliberate misleading),

concealment (i.e., withholding information), and discretion (i.e., avoidance of the topic).

Button (2004) refers to these latter two concepts as a separate identity management

strategy which is employed by GLB employees so as to appear as asexual. Further,

Button also suggests that these tactics, or as he presents them, strategies, may be used in

conjunction with each other. For example, one may deliberately mislead some

coworkers into believing them as heterosexuals while completely avoiding the topic with

others.

The antithesis of passing, revealing, refers to some level of openness toward and

disclosure of one's invisible identity (Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005). "Coming out" is

the term most commonly applied to revealing one's gay, lesbian, or bisexual identity

(Clair et al., 2005, p. 82). Tactics used to reveal one's sexual orientation exist on an

openness continuum ranging from signaling (i.e., providing subtle hints and clues) to

differentiating (i.e., highlighting differences), the latter of which is proactively done to

challenge stigma and present differences as equal in status. In between these two

extremes is normalizing (i.e., minimize differences through assimilation), a tactic which

Button (2004) refers to as integration. Indeed, research suggests that those GLB

employees who reveal their sexual orientation experience their work environment in

much the same way as do heterosexuals (Day & Schoenrade, 1997; Griffith & Hebl,

2002). Despite this, however, many GLB employees continue to employ passing

strategies for fear of the potential negative consequences of revealing.

Factors both external and internal to the GLB individual influence his or her identity management and disclosure strategies within the organizational setting (Clair et al., 2005; Griffith & Hebl, 2002). Extrinsic factors include organizational climate, the implementation of policies and procedures protecting those with minority status, industry and professional norms, and legal protection. Indeed, supportive work environments which value diversity and actively protect sexual minorities are more conducive for revealing (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). As there is currently no federal protection for GLB persons, this latter point of protection is of particular importance (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Berkley & Watt, 2006; Cahill, 2005). Likewise, industries and professions not associated with a prototypical employee are more inclined to alleviate GLB employees from the burden of feeling as though they must "fit in", thus allowing them to reveal their sexual orientation to coworkers. The sport industry is perhaps the best example of this as heterosexist norms prevail (see Griffin, 1998; Harry, 1995; Messner, 1988) and the typical employee is a "White, Protestant, heterosexual male" and those deviating from this norm suffer differential work experiences, discrimination, and prejudice (Fink & Pastore, 1999; Fink et al., 2001; Krane & Barber, 2005). Thus, within this context, it is not likely that GLB employees will reveal their sexual orientation for fear of stigmatization, sexual prejudice, and discriminatory practices.

Internally, the decision to pass or reveal is influenced by individual differences and personal motives (Clair et al., 2005). Specifically, one's predilection to taking risks, self-awareness and self-monitoring behaviors, stage of adult development, level of self-esteem, possession of additional, visible stigmatized statuses may factor into the identity

management strategies of GLB persons (Cahill et al., 2005). As the potential risk (i.e., stigmatization) of revealing any sexual orientation deviating from heterosexuality is well documented (e.g., Herek, 1995, 2000a), GLB individuals with low risk-taking tendencies are less likely to reveal. Also less likely to reveal are those GLB persons who closely monitor how they are perceived by others. These high self-monitors regulate their behavior to conform to what is socially acceptable. Thus, to the extent that being gay, lesbian, or bisexual is not accepted, the GLB person will not reveal. Low self-monitors, conversely, are not concerned with social acceptability and therefore may reveal their sexual orientation so as to avoid the stressors associated passing as heterosexual and maintaining the unauthenticated self (Clair et al., 2005; Leary, 1999). The decision to reveal or pass is also influenced by one's developmental state embracing one's identity may be associated with maturity and self-esteem acquired through one's lifespan. Finally, to the extent that a GLB individual also possesses a visible stigmatizing social identity (i.e., female, African American, etc.), he or she may already suffer from some level of prejudice and subsequently continue passing for fear of incurring additional negativity (Clair et al., 2005).

As previously noted, the social construction of the homosexual label and associated stereotypes, as interpreted today, bear origin from a not-so-distant past, and some would argue ever-present, patriarchal society in which traditional gender roles were embraced (Freedman, 1995; Foucault, 1978; Halperin, 1998; Miller, 2006). Thus, males were reared to exude masculinity, aggressiveness, and competence while females were groomed to embody femininity by being compliant, nurturing, and submissive.

Any crossing of these characteristics was viewed as unacceptable and suspect. Further,

it was during this same time that romantic relationships were to be heterosexual only and

sexual intercourse was to only take place between a man and a woman for the purposes

of procreation. As such, heterosexuality was the established norm and the basis to which

other sexual orientations were to be evaluated (Rich, 1980). Thus, homosexuality was

the antithesis of this norm and viewed as an unacceptable crossing of sexual boundaries

and threatening to heterosexist ideology. As a result, GLB persons were labeled

unnatural, sick, immoral and thus acceptable targets for condemnation and ridicule.

Further, the social construction of the GLB label became demonized, devalued, and

subject to stereotypical beliefs of depravity and perversion. As such, lesbians remained

vigilant toward and silent about their sexual orientation in public, thus adhering to the

feminine ideal, but sought refuge within environments containing other GLB persons.

One such environment was that of sport.

<div align="center">Sport and Stereotypes</div>

Despite numerous advances in the inclusion of women within the sport context

(e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2006), sport is often identified as being rich in patriarchal

traditions of heterosexual masculinity and male hegemony (see Griffin, 1998; Harry,

1995; Messner, 1988; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Ironically, however, it is this very same

environment in which some women have historically viewed sport as a safe haven.

Despite previous concerns of the damaging effects of sport to women's reproductive

health and overall character, Griffin noted that in the mid-1900's "sport provided a place

where lesbians and other women who did not fit the feminine and heterosexual ideal

could find other women who shared their experience and interests" (p. 39). Thus, sport quickly became associated with such women and deterred many heterosexual women from taking part in for fear of lesbianism and acquired mannishness. However, with the passage of Title IX, the fitness boom, and the establishment of the female-controlled Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), all occurring during the 1970's, both homosexual and heterosexual women flocked to sport and challenged sport's male domination (Griffin, 1998). Indeed, this influx of women into sport during the 1970's and 1980's served as the impetus for men to reestablish control (Griffin, 1998).

Perhaps the quintessential heterosexist environment (i.e., heterosexuality as the norm; see Herek 1992), sport has long been utilized to socialize and reinforce traditional gender roles for men of all ages (Griffin, 1998; Harry, 1995). As such, challenging patriarchal ideals by crossing gender boundaries has elicited negative attitudes toward perpetrators (Anderson, 2002, Griffin, 1998). Indeed, the mere presence of females in the sport realm contrasts sport's masculine ideal and highlights the perceived mismatch between the socio-cultural gender stereotypes accorded to females and the sport context-at-large. Almost certainly, females not conforming to the high standards of femininity deemed necessary for women to acceptably participate in the sport realm are not only perpetrators, but are also subject to a great deal of scrutiny and stigmatization (Griffin, 1998; Kolnes, 1995; Krane & Barber, 2003; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Such is the case in sport organizations where gendered discourse and compulsory heterosexuality (see Rich, 1980) prevail. As such, GLB persons present in sport and sport organizations often

employ identity management strategies to avoid such consequences (Krane & Barber, 2005). As stated by Krane (2001) "…they perform femininity to protect themselves from prejudice and discrimination" (p. 120).

The prototypical employee within sport mirrors what society views as "normal" by taking the form of a White, Protestant, able-bodied, heterosexual male (Fink et al., 2001; Fiske, 1998; Hegarty & Pratto, 2001; Kinsey et al., 1949). Individuals diverging from this template are often considered outsiders or of minority status (i.e., out-group members) and subsequently suffer differential experiences than do their majority (i.e., in-group) counterparts (Fink & Pastore, 1999; Fink et al., 2001; Krane & Barber, 2003). Cunningham and colleague's (Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2003; Cunningham & Sagas, 2004) research supports this contention as African American and female coaches (i.e., out-group members) in their studies were generally less committed to and more likely to leave the profession than were their White male counterparts. Further, those differing from this prototype in a less visible manner (i.e., religion, illness, and/or sexual orientation) may also be susceptible to the negative consequences of their out-group status and as such, present themselves in accordance with the norm, remain silent about their true identities, and/or adopt false identities. Indeed, this is the case with lesbian coaches, teachers, and athletes in sport as many remain silent about their sexual proclivities (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Griffin, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2003, 2005; Woods & Harbeck, 1991).

Whereas male heterosexuality is assumed and rarely questioned in sport (see Griffin, 1998), the opposite is true for females. Simply put, unlike a female in sport,

whether a male acts as a nurturer or asserter, he is assumed to be a heterosexual. Likewise, when a female acts in accordance with traditional stereotypes (i.e., overtly heterosexual and within the acceptable bounds of femininity) her sexuality may not be questioned either (Kolnes, 1995; Krane, 2001). Likewise, presenting one's physical appearance consistent with mainstream culture's feminine ideals also transmits heterosexual messages and thus thwarts doubt about one's sexuality (Krane, 2001; Ruppenicker, 2002; Zipkin, 1999). To the extent that a woman's appearance and behaviors exude stereotypical femininity, her status and power are circumvented by sexualizing her rather than demonizing her (Knight & Giuliano, 2003; Krane, 1997). Further, while a nurturing demeanor is often viewed as feminine, being too caring and warm, particularly in a tactual manner, may elicit suspicion within the sport domain. Equally suspicious is a strong and competent female, as such attributes within sport's masculine territory may result in a "bitch" and/or "butch" label. Indeed, the latter questions her femininity as well as simultaneously calls her sexuality into question, potentially resulting in the ascription of a lesbian label (Griffin, 1998; Krane, 2001; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003).

The aforementioned predicament is reflective of Gherardi and Poggio's (2001) statement that "women who enter traditionally male organizations find themselves in a double-bind situation in which they are required to both assume male patterns of behavior and to preserve their distinctively feminine characteristics" (p. 257). Consistent with the backlash effect (see Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004), women in this "double-bind situation" suffer social repercussions when

presenting themselves counter to feminine ideals. Extrapolating from this, females in

sport and sport organizations not only endure a traditionally masculine domain and

societal backlash, but they must also contend with a third difficult situation; the

historical gender-based stereotype that many women involved in sport, certain sports and

job positions more so than others (e.g., Fallon, 2004; McKinney & McAndrew, 2000;

Krane, 1997), are lesbians (Griffin, 1998). Sport and sport organizations, more so than

other arenas (i.e., organizations in general), may represent a triple-bind situation

containing multiple facets of patriarchy and masculine hegemony revolving around not

only femininity and feminine characteristics, but also sexual orientation. Simply put,

whereas in organizations in general agentic women may be regarded as unfriendly and

perhaps even bitchy (e.g., Rudman & Glick, 2001), agentic women in the sport context

may also elicit the additional label of lesbians and subsequently ascribed the associated

negative stereotypes (Fallon, 2004; Krane, 2001; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). When faced

with this situation, then, it is reasonable to understand why females in sport engage in

numerous identity management techniques in an effort to thwart, acknowledge, or

challenge the lesbian label and stigma (Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005; Griffin, 1991).

Lesbians, for instance, may come out of the closet and identify as such or adopt identity

management strategies to hide or detract attention from their sexual orientation, both of

which may carry negative repercussions (Button, 2004; Griffith & Hebl, 2002). As

numerous authors have demonstrated, the likelihood of the latter occurring is far greater

than the former as the prevailing norm for lesbians in sport is that of silence (Griffin,

1998; Krane & Barber, 2005). On the other hand, straight women, and perhaps closeted

lesbians as well, may feel pressure to evade the lesbian stigma and "prove" their

heterosexuality (Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005). This is consistent with Crocker et al's

(1998) overcompensation strategy.

Griffin (1998) identifies three primary criteria for promoting the female,

heterosexual image in sport: visibility of relationships, appearance and demeanor, and

attitudes and actions about lesbians in sport. Further, she suggests that both

heterosexuals and closeted homosexuals conform to sport's feminine ideal by adhering

to these criteria. For instance, both straight women and closeted lesbian will attempt to

"prove" their heterosexuality by flaunting heterosexual romantic relationships and their

counter-identities as wives and mothers. Indeed, the media has aided in the promotion

and necessity of such depictions (e.g., Knight & Giuliano, 2003). Likewise, Griffin

suggests that female athletes and coaches represent themselves in accordance with

traditional norms of femininity through dress, demeanor, and appearance. Specifically,

she cites instances of coaches and athletes wearing high heels, dresses, and make-up (on

and off the court/field), as well as the conscious choice of growing long hair. This latter

practice is done to evade the stereotype that all lesbians have short hair (Krane, 1997;

Zipkin, 1999). Griffin's final criterion is that of remaining silent about the

discrimination evident toward lesbians in sport. According to Griffin, "the assumption

that if you speak out against discrimination against lesbians, you must be one…." (p.

74), acts as a primary deterrent of voicing one's objections.

Implicit in the promotion of the female, heterosexual image in sport is the

overwhelming norm of silence of and about women with different sexual identities.

Research suggests that in an effort to evade lesbian stereotypes present in the sport realm, both lesbians and heterosexual women neither consciously acknowledge nor challenge such beliefs by adhering to the norm of silence (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Griffin, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2003, 2005; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). For instance, Krane and Barber's (2005) investigation of 13 lesbian coaches, only one of which was openly out within her athletic department, revealed that the majority of these coaches responded to their heterosexist work environments by adopting protection mechanisms so as to evade potential prejudices and discriminatory outcomes. Specifically, most coaches remained silent about their sexual orientation and often monitored their behaviors so as to not connote any hint of lesbianism. One coach reported that she never made physical contact beyond a high five with her athletes. Another reported not entering the locker room when her athletes were changing clothes. Most coaches also felt as though they were neither true to their athletes nor themselves. Thus, to the extent that these coaches valued both their coach identity and their lesbian identity, conflict and stress arose as they also had to constantly negotiate between heterosexual norms consistent with the coaching identity, and their lesbian identity in response to social norms, heterosexist attitudes, potential stigmatization, and the possible organizational consequences of identifying as a lesbian.

Heterosexual women within the sport domain are also susceptible to the lesbian stigma and thus may adopt identity management strategies so as to avoid the lesbian label as well. Many of the heterosexual student athletes interviewed by Blinde and Taub (1992) were silent about their athlete identity when off the court or field, instead

focusing on social and sexual identities by emphasizing things such as partying and dating. Simply put, these athletes (over)emphasized or made salient their feminine characteristics and shunned their athlete identity for fear of the being labeled a lesbian (Blinde & Taub, 1992). Fallon's (2004) investigation of the gender conflicts felt by female rugby players revealed that in response to beliefs of lesbianism and inadequate femininity, many of the players, homosexual and heterosexual, manipulated their appearance by wearing make-up, dresses, and skirts in an attempt to reaffirm their femininity and heterosexuality. However, these same players felt pressure to avoid an overly feminine self-presentation so as to be accepted within the masculine domain of rugby. This continual process of managing perceptions of masculinity and femininity was found to be a source of immense distress for the players. Taken together, regardless of actual sexual orientation, it is likely that in an effort to circumvent negative stereotypes of one potentially harmful label (i.e., lesbian) women in sport may have to accentuate characteristics perceived as congruent with another potentially harmful label (i.e., female). Thus, in terms of homosexuality, women in sport and sport organizations are damned if they are and damned if they aren't.

Purpose

Extrapolating from the above findings, I argue that females in sport, regardless of sexual orientation, might adopt identity management strategies as a result of the lesbian stigma. While this line of research has focused a great deal on athletes, coaches, and physical education, there is a dearth of inquiry into the presence and understanding of the lesbian stigma within health and kinesiology department academia. Specifically, and

to the extent that a great deal of time and energy is devoted to managing one's identities in response to this stigma, the time and energy accorded to teaching, research, student advisement, student mentoring, and the like may be compromised. Further, as research has demonstrated that the psychologically taxing nature of such identity negotiations may manifest as negative physical and mental symptoms and outcomes it is also necessary to investigate the lesbian stigma in relation to college and university health and kinesiology department academician's overall well-being as well as job performance (Lewis et al., 2006; Meyer, 2003; Smith & Ingram, 2004).

The purpose of this study was to extend the understanding and implications of the lesbian label within the sport domain through the voices and experiences of health and kinesiology department faculty members. Through their voices, lesbianism, the lesbian label, associated stereotypes, and the fear of confirming said stereotypes was investigated in relation to homosexual and heterosexual women's psychological well-being, professional development, departmental relationships, identity management, and self-presentation. The goals of this were met through semi-structured interviews, as this format provided the most functional and practical outlet for participants to best communicate their experiences. Thus, qualitative methodology was utilized to investigate the following research questions:

1. To what extent are lesbianism and the lesbian label present within health and kinesiology department academia?

2. If present, what are the experiences of lesbian and heterosexual female health and kinesiology department faculty members in the presence of the lesbian label?

3. How do lesbian health and kinesiology department faculty members manage their identities in relation to an identified lesbian label? What are the outcomes of these strategies?

4. How do heterosexual female health and kinesiology department faculty members manage their identities in relation to an identified lesbian label? What are the outcomes of these strategies?

5. Is a lesbian label identifiable amongst heterosexual male health and kinesiology department faculty? If so, to what extent and what is it's perceived impact?

CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter explicates the methods employed to address the purpose of this inquiry. In an effort to contextualize the use of qualitative methodology, a brief summary of its utility toward the investigation of sexual identity and sexual orientation is presented. Likewise, a description of the lenses through which I operated is also provided. The rationale for the health and kinesiology setting is explained as well as the manner to which I gained access to health and kinesiology departments. Finally, I have detailed my data collection process, data analysis and interpretation procedures, and the measures taken to ensure the most ethical and methodologically-sound investigation.

Qualitative Methodology

While some researchers suggest qualitative methods violate the necessity for objectivity in scientific research and thus, lack the rigor associated with quantitative research, others (e.g., Gamson, 2003; Lincoln & Cannella, 2004) believe that the most important criticisms surrounding qualitative research methods revolve around political power. Lincoln and Cannella note that qualitative inquiry has been labeled an "academic evil" (p. 179), highlighting its corresponding rise in popularity and implementation with the societal and academic paradigm shifts of the 20th century. Specifically, the emergence of multiculturalism brought with it an accompanying need to better understand consequent societal and cultural issues. Unfortunately, it was also during this time that multiculturalism became synonymous with perceived threats to

Western civilization and the "purity of American thought and language" (Lincoln & Cannella, 2004, p. 180). As such, qualitative research was viewed as embodying these same threats.

While deviating from the norm of conventional positivist research (i.e., quantitative methods) may illuminate aspects of problems not previously identified as well as explicate potential avenues for change, it may also call attention to the potential shortcomings of our society (Lincoln & Cannella, 2004). This is particularly true to the extent that qualitative research has long been associated with giving a voice to specific minority populations. As such, through qualitative inquiry, minorities have been given power and provided an outlet of which societal hierarchies may view as a threat. Indeed, giving a voice to minority populations represents the practicality of qualitative research as well as a potential source for the deconstruction of social patriarchy. Such is the purpose of researchers operating through the lens of critical social science (Frisby, 2005; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005).

According to Frisby (2005), "the paradigms we operate from as researchers, whether it is positivism, pragmatism, interpretivism, critical social science, post modernism, or a combination of these paradigms, shape the questions we ask, the methods we use, and the degree to which our findings will have an impact on society" (p. 2). Simply put, researchers, their research, and their interpretations can not be separated from their epistemologies, ontologies, and methodologies. Interpretation from a critical social science perspective acknowledges the lack of neutrality and objectivity in language. Critical researchers recognize that as a result of socially constructed

language, "a set of tacit rules that regulate what can and cannot be said, who can speak with the blessings of authority, and who must listen, whose social constructions are valid and whose are erroneous and unimportant" (i.e., discursive practices; see Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 310) social hierarchies of dominance are established. Accordingly, critical theory and social constructionism will guide the current study.

Critical Theory

Critical social theory is concerned with "the issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion and other social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 307). Accordingly, societal structures (i.e., privilege and oppression) are dictated by individuals and institutions with power. Power, in turn, has been based on history, ideology, and contextual discourse. As such, power and power dynamics have been socially constructed.

Social Constructionism

Social constructionists operate from the standpoint that our epistemologies do not exist within an impervious bubble. Rather, against the backdrop of historical precedent, cultural meanings and practices, shared understandings, language, and so on, "reality" is constructed (Schwandt, 2003). Thus, truth and knowledge are subjectively co-created and byproducts of human consciousness (Guba & Lincoln, 2005)

The Current Study

The topic of sexual orientation can be observed through both a critical and constructionist lens. Specifically, the labels of homosexual, lesbian, and bisexual are

suggested to have been socially constructed with the purpose of maintaining masculine

hegemony and patriarchy. Further, as quantitative inquiry has typically reinforced this

purpose and reduced sexuality to strictly behavior and nothing else, qualitative

methodology is perhaps a better way to better understand the cognitions, symbols,

language, and emotions influencing sexuality. This is discussed in greater detail below.

The gay and lesbian movement of the 1960's and 1970's and the declassification

of homosexuality as a disease in 1973 brought with them new curiosities regarding

sexual orientation. Historically, inquiries into sexual orientation embraced positivistic

ideals and were guided by medical and scientific methods (Gamson, 2003), thus

strengthening beliefs of homosexuality as abnormal and/or a disease. While not all

quantitative research sought to nor resulted in further pathologizing same-sex practices

prior to and during this time (see Kinsey, et al., 1948; Kinsey et al., 1949; 1953; Masters

& Johnson, 1966), the seemingly antagonistic relationship between science and sexuality

ultimately resulted in an "adversarial" (Gamson, 2003, p. 544) relationship between the

positivistic researcher and sexual orientation inquiry. Perhaps indicative of this

relationship, a number of researchers have abandoned the strictly positivist approach to

the inquiry of sexuality and incorporated qualitative methodologies, and ultimately

providing a deeper understanding of sexual orientation within society (e.g., Foucault,

1978; Laumann & Mahay, 2002).

The methodological issues regarding the study of sexual orientation mirror its

debated etiology (Halwani, 1998; Marmor, 1998; Stein, 1998). Essentialists view

homosexuality as an essential feature identifiable in humans at any time and in any

culture and therefore operate primarily from a positivistic lens. Social constructionists, however, view homosexuality as both time-bound and culturally-determined, thus operating from the constructionist lens. Specifically, social constructionists maintain that homosexuality, as defined today, did not exist within Europe and North American until the nineteenth century (Halwani, 1998). Epistemologically, whereas essentialists emphasize logic, reason, and pragmatism, social constructionists address the importance of shared societal understandings, language, and practice (Schwant, 2001). Marmor (1998) identifies three perspectives for which to view the importance of the etiology of homosexuality: scientific, ethical and socio-politico-religious. While supposed value-free scientific inquiry and idealistic ethical considerations suggest little need for determining the causality of homosexuality, strong sociological, political, and religious beliefs and motives drive the formation of sexual prejudices (Herek, 2000a). Thus, the importance of etiology lies in the social construction of the homosexual; it's corresponding sociological discourse, and subsequent consequences surrounding the homosexual identity; not the causation of one's sexual predilections (Foucault, 1978; McIntosh, 1968). The purpose of this study is to investigate such with in the sport academia setting.

The Setting

The setting for this study was college and university health and kinesiology department academia. In an effort to capture divergent perspectives, two universities were chosen on the basis of their contrasting environments. Specifically, one setting is well-known for its strong, and often gendered, traditions and conservative atmosphere

whereas the other is known for its free-thinking environment and propensity toward liberal ideals. Substantiating these differences were both the characterizations of participants as well as documented Republican and Democratic Party alliances, respectively.

The prime impetus for choosing higher education was the current dearth of literature examining the setting of sport-related curricula in relation to the lesbian label and associated stigma so prevalent in the sport realm. Another motivation for this selection is that of my own experiences, interests, and values. As the qualitative researcher is the investigative instrument, my beliefs and values embody those of critical theory and social constructionism, thus enabling me to discover meanings and reflect interpretations consistent with these paradigms.

Gaining Access

Access was gained partially through the use of an intermediary and partially through email solicitations. As Glesne (1999) suggests, use of an intermediary whom the participants "know and respect" (p. 45) will allow for participants to acquire additional information about the researcher through informal communications. When the intermediary was not utilized, access was gained by extending the opportunity to male and female academicians to make their voices heard through an email solicitation. Upon making initial contact by explicating the purposes of the study, those willing to participate were interviewed face-to-face and their words audio recorded.

Participant Selection

      Non-probability sampling was employed for this study. Aspects of convenience and purposive sampling were utilized. Email solicitations were sent to health and kinesiology department faculty members at two universities. The email contained a detailed description of the purpose of the study as well as an assurance that should they choose to participate, all information would remain confidential. Those willing to take part responded to the email, after which face-to-face interview appointments were scheduled.

      In sum, eight heterosexual female health and kinesiology department faculty members, two lesbian health and kinesiology department faculty members, and three male (assumingly heterosexual, unless otherwise stated by them) health and kinesiology department faculty members took part in the process of investigating the research questions. Participant characteristics, such as demographic information, age, and marital status, are presented in Appendix A.

Question Development

      Consistent with Patton (1990), questions embodied aspects of experiences, behaviors, opinions/values, feelings, and knowledge consistent with the purpose of the study. Further, these aspects involved the past, present, and future of individual participants. Asking open-ended questions consistent with these aspects allowed me to obtain quotations used for data analysis (Patton, 1990). Additionally, demographic and background information was collected. A list of interview questions can be found in Appendix B.

Data Collection and Analysis

Glesne (2006) described three dominant techniques utilized in qualitative inquiry: participant observation, interviewing, and data collection/analysis. Ideally, the qualitative researcher employs some combination of multiple investigative techniques, multiple sources, and/or multiple theoretical paradigms in an effort to procure content-rich data and meaningful interpretations. As Schwant (2001) notes, triangulation is the tool for "checking the integrity of the inferences one draws" (p. 257) by using multiple vantage points. Beyond triangulation, however, the three-dimensional approach of crystallization was used in this study. As noted by Janesick (2000), crystallization is a multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary approach that provides a "deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, and understanding of the topic" (p. 392). Thus, the image of a crystal, its varied shapes and angles, continual growth and metamorphosis, and multidimensionality will replace the planar image of a triangle, and subsequently utilized in conjunction with data analysis. Interview data, observations, field notes, and self-reflection were employed in conjunction to establish trustworthiness and integrity.

A series of semi-structured, open-ended interview questions were asked to participants from two contrasting university health and kinesiology departments. Further, employing maximum variation sampling methods (see Patton, 1990), participants varied with regard to age, ethnicity, race, and sex (see Appendix A). As Patton notes, common patterns emerging across heterogeneous samples are essential in "capturing the core experiences and central, shared aspects or impacts of a program" (p. 172). Thus, diverse participants strengthen any possible extrapolations made.

To better acquaint myself with the data, interviews were transcribed verbatim and inductively analyzed by myself alone. A pseudonym was assigned to each participant in order to maintain confidentiality. While data was analyzed throughout the entire research process, interview transcripts were analyzed both individually and collectively. I first read through each interview in it's entirety before next combing through paragraphs, sentences and words for the emergence of themes and sub-themes. Consistent with the premise of inductive analyses, the individual experiences of each faculty member were uniquely explored and analyzed before subsequently integrating them for a broader, yet contextualized, understanding (Patton, 1990).

Coding

Schwandt (2001) identifies coding as "a procedure that disaggregates the data, breaks it down into manageable segments, and identifies or names those segments" (p. 26). As this process is a subjective one, it is necessary to constantly compare and contrast data segments and subsequently categorize them (Schwandt). Specifically, I adhered to developing a "grounded, a posteriori, inductive, context-sensitive" (p. 26) coding scheme whereby working with the raw data transcripts allowed for inferences and code (i.e., category) generation. Further and in an effort to refine category formation, constant comparisons were made between the data segments and the codes as I examined the data.

"Validity"/Credibility

Glesne (2006) notes that the scientific rules of validity, reliability, generalizability, and the like, are applied differently, if at all, by postpositivists when

compared to logical empiricists. Instead, the qualitative researcher's validity concerns

revolve around one's established rapport, reflexivity, and trustworthiness. Rapport

refers to the vague nature of researcher-participant field relationships. It is predicated

upon establishing credibility through the self-presentation of the researcher (i.e.,

appearance, speech, and behavior) in accordance with what is deemed acceptable by

participants. Further, this process involves attaining knowledge and awareness of a

setting's structures and the social interactions within those structures. Reflexivity

concerns the researcher's equal interest in the process and the data collected (Glesne,

2006). It also refers to the process of critical self-reflection performed by the researcher

in an effort to monitor one's own biases, preferences, and so on. Simply put, it is the

critical inspection of the instrument (i.e., the self) during the qualitative research process

(Schwant, 2001). Lastly, the trustworthiness criterion addresses the quality of the

research process and findings in relation to the intended audience. Lincoln and Guba

(1985) identify four criteria for establishing trustworthiness as it relates to conventional

(i.e., quantitative) research. These include (a) credibility, akin to internal validity, (b)

transferability, akin to external validity, (c) dependability, akin to reliability, and (d)

confirmability, akin to objectivity.

A number of procedures have been implemented within qualitative research to

establish trustworthiness and credibility (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Schwant, 2001). Of

these tools, the following were used in the current study:

Peer Review/Peer Debriefing. Schwant (2001) identify one purpose of peer

debriefing as "sharing one's evolving attempts at describing and analyzing qualitative

data to achieve some kind of consensual validation" (p. 189). Accordingly, the current study will seek impartial feedback from colleagues not directly involved in the current research project. While not only aiding in validation, these colleagues will also provide an outside perspective from to review original interpretations.

Reflective Journal. As the qualitative researcher serves as the instrument for inquiry, it is important to reveal and monitor his or her own subjectivity and related biases. As the researcher possesses preconceived opinions and is attached to the field of inquiry, it is of great importance to document these opinions both prior to each interview as well as upon completion. This allows for a constant monitoring of subjectivity and thus, researcher bias. Consistent with this procedure, I documented my thoughts and feelings prior to and after each conducted interview.

Memoing. Used in conjunction with constant comparison analysis and coding, my thoughts about the ongoing emergence of thematic meanings and patterns were documented during analysis. My analysis of these memos was integrated into the overall thematic scheme and final interpretation of the data. Traditionally a component of ground theory methodology, I employed memoing to document my thought processes about the emerging and interrelated codes both counter and consistent with my theoretical framework (Schwandt, 2001).

Negative Case Analysis. While the patterned lives of human beings reveal a great deal about human behavior, so too do the often overlooked contradictory behaviors and outliers. In epistemological terms, just as we think we know something, disconfirming information and interpretations emerge. Thus, negative case analysis is

the conscious search for such cases of disconfirming evidence in an effort to refine interpretations (Glesne, 2006). In accordance with my research questions, my negative case analysis sought to identify female and male health and kinesiology department faculty members not affected by or not cognizant of the lesbian label.

Pilot Testing and Question Analysis

As Glesne (2006) addresses, the purpose of pilot testing is not to acquire data per se, but to better understand the research process, interview questions, observation techniques, and the self. It is an opportunity to test language, question depth and substance, interview length, learn about the research setting. This latter point is of particular importance when choosing pilot testing participants as they should resemble the target sample as closely as possible. Likewise, question analysis was performed by a group of prominent researchers within the sport management and sociology fields. Questions were assessed for clarity, appropriateness, content, and congruency with the purpose of the current study. Both of these processes allowed for refining the current methodology.

Implications

The purpose of this study was to extend the understanding and implications of the lesbian label and associated stigma within the sport domain through the voices and experiences of health and kinesiology department faculty members. Thus, the knowledge gained through this inquiry will not only allow for the voices of an overlooked population to be heard, but also extend the knowledge of the lesbian label, as

it pertains to a relatively unexamined area; college and university-level health and kinesiology academia and sport-related curricula.

Personal Statement

The topic of this study emerged through my own experiences as a female athlete, a sport science and sport management student, and a sport fan and consumer. As a coach's daughter, I have always had a passion for sport and physical activity; so much so that my life's path has been paved with some semblance of sport at almost every turn. During junior high and high school, I competed as a track and cross country athlete and briefly competed at the intercollegiate level as well. Looking back, I believe that it is because of this that I felt I was never viewed as fully exuding femininity. Instead, my identity, as I perceived to be viewed by others, was of that of an athlete, and little else. Indeed, I have never been particularly interested in make-up, high heels, dresses, or any other social construction of femininity.

My affinity and passion for sport led me to pursue it as a career. While also competing as an athlete, my undergraduate career was spent as a physical education major, taking a particular interest in the strength and conditioning field. As I immersed myself into my curriculum, I began to receive derogatory comments from my male track and cross country teammates. I did not have a boyfriend at the time nor did I take an interest in any of them, and as such, the pervasive stereotypes associated with lesbianism in sport and physical education became easily applicable to me. Once involved in a serious heterosexual relationship, however, the comments stopped.

As my final requirement for my undergraduate degree, I completed an internship with the Chicago Bulls' strength and conditioning program. As one of the only females present in the building each day, my duties were somewhat different than the other two male interns. Whereas I was asked to get coffee and make the protein shakes regularly, they were not. Further, when private clients came in for afternoon training sessions, my role was to work primarily with the younger children and females. Thus, there was a clear delineation of the appropriate behaviors of a female in this environment. Unbeknownst to me, this experience would be one of my better within the strength and conditioning world.

After completing my internship I pursued a dual master's degree at in Applied Sport Science and Sport Management at a large Midwestern university. While earning my degree, I also worked in the university's athletic department as an assistant to the head strength and conditioning coach. She was one of the few female head strength coaches in the country, and I very much looked forward to working with her; at first, anyway. Trina, as I'll refer to her, however, was not one to emulate. As I observed Trina, I began to realize that her tenure in a male-dominated profession had led her to overtly flirt with her male athletes, openly discuss heterosexual relationships with female athletes willing to do so, and show observable contempt toward those who were not. Against the backdrop of the lesbian stigma, Trina had adopted these behaviors as a way of surviving as a female in the strength and conditioning field.

Trina's physical appearance also signaled stereotypical heterosexuality. She had long hair, a dark tan, and often wore make-up. While it would not have been conducive

to wear a dress in the weight room, Trina did occasionally wear somewhat revealing clothes. I, on the other hand, had a very short hair cut, wore sweats to work almost everyday, and only rarely wore make-up. After working in the weight room for only a few weeks and in relation to Trina's behavior and appearance, however, I became very self-conscious about my physical appearance and started to try to appear more feminine. Also, as I was again asked to work with female athletes more so than male athletes, I refrained from unnecessary touching for fear of speculation toward my intentions. While the former did nothing to effect my work performance, the latter did. By limiting the touching of athletes I did them a great disservice by not providing them with the best instruction possible. As hindsight is 20/20, I did not view it this way at the time. Instead, I was more concerned with presenting myself as a female and not as a strength and conditioning coach.

My experiences as an athlete, a physical education major, within the weight room, and the like, have not only shaped who I am but also my research interests. As I have experienced the lesbian stigma across multiple contexts so too have I admittedly acted to counter the associated negative stereotypes. As a female who is passionate about sport and who has chosen sport as a career I am interested in the experiences of other females who have perhaps experienced the same. Further, and to the extent that these persons view their behavior as detrimental to their performance, distressful, and ultimately compromising the well-being of the self and others, I am enthusiastic about investigating such happenings within sport-related academia.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

"I would say from my experiences…the area of athletics, physical education, there are some perceptions that there's [sic] probably a higher percentage of lesbians in that, in that field than in other fields. And maybe in some cases the presumption is that some people are lesbians that maybe aren't."

Edwin, Physical Activity Instructor

"Yeah, I think there are assumptions made. I think a woman being in kinesiology is an assumption in itself, like the P.E. teacher. Just like in dance, if the man dances he's gay and if the woman dances, she's straight. So, there are those assumptions in dance. I think there are assumptions in kinesiology with P.E. teachers and if she's a woman P.E. teacher, she's gay."

Emily, Professor of Dance

"….there is an assumption that, that you know, you're fit, you have short hair, you're a P.E. teacher…hmmmm, you must be a lesbian."

Elise, Professor of Sport Management

Overview

Taken in its entirety, this inquiry allowed for an exploration of the lesbians label

through the words of the health and kinesiology department academicians. This chapter

discusses an overarching theme exhumed from their words reflecting that, whether in

reference to an actual person or persons or a representative allegory, the presence of

lesbianism and an associated lesbian stigma was acknowledged. Indeed, the constant

presence of and familiarity with the lesbian stigma was communicated by male and

female health and kinesiology academicians alike. Amidst such omnipresence,

participants articulated the intertwining of gender and sex roles with assumptions of

lesbianism. Correspondingly, the lesbian was also identified in accordance with

stereotypes of sport and masculinity. Such sentiments were shared while often acknowledging the presence of lesbians within their respective departments that both reflected and refuted such prototypicality.

Also communicated by faculty members were issues of openness and self-expression of lesbianism within both the department and society-at-large. Departmentally, openness ranged from silence and hiding to overt expressions of same-sex relationships, the result of which lead to the formation of a subculture of sorts. Those heterosexual faculty members, most often females, holding close interpersonal friendships with lesbian colleagues were not only aware of the hardships and inequities experienced by their lesbian peers, but also acknowledged the importance of advocating open dialogue and acceptance at both the micro and macro levels. Lastly, the existence of religious beliefs, political doctrine, and a questionable entangling of the two were recognized by all as arduous impediments for equality. While difficult to separate the factors surrounding sexual orientation, an effort to do so has been made in the following sections for clarity sake. Thus, predominant aspects of the interviews have been discussed in detail below.

Sex Roles and Gender Norms

Sport and Physical Activity. Guiding each faculty member to his or her current position in health and kinesiology academia was a love for sport and physical activity. Whether playing backyard football, competing in high school and college athletics, exercising to address body issues, or being dragged to dance class by friends, sport and physical activity have been a constant presence in each academician's life. In fact,

notable role models and mentors included famous athletes, former coaches, junior high and high school physical education teachers, and athletically successful family members and friends. Correspondingly, each faculty member's love for sport and physical activity transcended time and was transformed into the common desire of disseminating knowledge related to his or her passion to students. Nancy articulated this desire in terms of a broadly defined departmental archetype,

> "….someone who is both professional and personally committed to physical activity as the glue that is kind of is our common theme and who might either be engaged in how best to teach it or coach it or researches about it in some way shape or form…either from the social science aspect or the natural science aspect. Again the archetype that I can think of ten exceptions to immediately, but is someone who is more likely than average to be interested in competitive sport, attending competitive events, maybe participating him or herself in, recreation leagues or whatever."

The components of this archetype were communicated and reinforced again and again by those interviewed.

Just as sport and physical activity has served as a guide for accomplishing the common goal of educating students; it too has helped mold these academicians into the people that they are today.   From a developmental standpoint it is reasonable to surmise that the additive experiences had within society-at-large, the realm of sport and physical activity, and throughout one's lifetime contribute to how one defines him or herself in the present (Hammack, 2005; Hostetler & Herdt, 1998; Labouvie-Vief, Orwoll, & Manion, 1995; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006). Accordingly, and despite the fervor for sport and physical activity possessed by all, the sport and physical activity experiences of male and female interviewees were reportedly differed. Namely, beyond indicating that sport was just something to do and readily available, males discussed playing sport

with relatively no mention of why they chose the sports that they chose. Rather, their

participation, primarily in traditionally masculine sports (e.g., football, basketball, and

baseball), was just a part of growing up. Females, on the other hand, often referred to

gender characteristics and norms when discussing their activity choices. Gender norms

were present through the evolution of their sport and physical activity experiences, thus

contributing to the formation of their sport and gender identities. As evidenced by their

own words below, the shaping of identities among both male and female academicians

appeared to reflect their indoctrination into sport's masculine, heterosexist domain (e.g.,

Anderson, 2002; Griffin, 1998; Messner, 1988; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003).

A developmental and societal norm (Kiovula, 2001; Riemer & Visio, 2003;

Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006), Erin spoke to feeling an atmosphere of gender-related

sport appropriateness that emerged with adolescence. In her words,

> "…it was really, it was really strongly felt in terms of Erin's a tomboy and she plays football at recess with the boys……all of a sudden, especially by 7th grade there was this very strong feeling that it was not ok anymore to go out and play football at recess. Not that we had recess, but, but boys did play football. They played two below down on the football field during lunch and no one, I mean, it was a weird feeling because it was kind of like an unwritten rule that it was not ok for girls to do that."

Erin went on to express a desire to continue to want to play with the boys but identified

the power that the perceptions of others had on holding her back from doing so,

> "It bothered me that it bothered other people…..exactly, how come I can't play anymore and yet it would have felt very weird to play. I think I would have felt very weird from both sides 'cuz maybe it's kind of a gender awareness, there's some sort of line of gender awareness where up until that point it's ok to be more androgynous, you know, and then at some point there's some line that says, no wait, girls do this at lunch and guys do this at lunch."

Elise described her childhood and adolescent sport experiences with relation to gender

and skill. Specifically, she spoke of playing with the boys because she was able to keep

up with them and prove herself "worthy." She acknowledged an awareness of gender

but did not identify it as having consciously influenced her behaviors or activity choices.

In her words,

> "As long as you can contribute, I didn't relate to them as much as, you know, girl/guy as some of the other girls did……I don't think they related to me that same way because I could play with them. If you can't play with them than you need to be put in another category."

Laura also referred to gender awareness, although in a slightly different manner and

occurring at a later stage in life. As a member of both her college volleyball and

basketball teams, Laura experienced internal and external conflict when going from the

"girlie" environment of volleyball to the characteristically more masculine basketball

team. She discussed both team and gender dynamics as follows,

> "Actually, in college I struggled a little bit because the volleyball and the basketball teams did not like each other and I was on both teams…..in volleyball, it was very, girlie, girlie, girlie and in basketball it was probably just about the opposite."

Laura went on to describe her experiences with these two teams in terms of contextually

modifying her behaviors. In her words,

> "I think that the basketball team was a lot more accepting no matter what you were because they had gotten a lot of discrimination and so they were accepting no matter what. But I can definitely say that I probably did change a little bit, you know, I was probably more relaxed in basketball but yet, I felt like I fit in in volleyball too."

Interestingly and despite still feeling a pressure to modify her behaviors to fit into both

environments, Laura recognized that the historical prejudices and assumptions made

toward women playing basketball allowed for a more relaxed and accepting environment. Perhaps a function of her educational background or her numerous friendships with gay males and lesbians (both points discussed in greater detail below), her discommodious experiences in sport coupled with her awareness of the prejudices toward females in more masculine sports further illuminates the presence of the stereotypes and associated adversity surrounding females, sport, and sexual orientation.

As evidenced through the words of Laura, Erin, and Elise, sport's patriarchal, heterosexist traditions were communicated to them through their participatory experiences. Consistent with the gendered nature of sport (e.g., Koivula, 2001; Riemer & Visio, 2003; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006) as well as the development of one's gender identity throughout their lifetime (Hammack, 2005; Hostetler & Herdt, 1998; Labouvie-Vief et al., 1995), such messages appeared to have influenced Laura, Erin and Elise's behaviors, interactions, and activity choices within the sport domain. Correspondingly, the self-definitions of femininity and masculinity for these women materialized as a reflection of their continued competitive sport participation and prolonged exposure to and socialization within sport's environment of male hegemony.

Consistent with Lantz and Schroeder's (1999) finding that the role of athlete was positively related to masculinity and negatively related to femininity, the respective gender identities of Laura, Erin, and Elise may have formed in conjunction with their identification as athletes. These women all participated in sport during their childhood, throughout school, and continued on to compete at the intercollegiate level. Erin, at one time, was also a coach at the intercollegiate level. Further, the sports in which these

women participated and coached during their lifetime (i.e., basketball and volleyball) and their socially constructed levels of gender appropriateness may have also contributed to their current gender identities (Hammack, 2005; Koivula, 2001). Thus, perhaps a reflection of their many years spent in the competitive sporting environment, Laura, Erin and Elise defined their current levels of femininity and masculinity differently than did the females who lacked the same prolonged exposure. For example, Elise, a former collegiate athlete and the self-described "first born son in her family", stated,

> "….I feel more masculine than, than I assume that other women must feel. Who knows if that's true."

Anchoring this statement and highlighting the social construction of gender, she went on to define femininity as,

> "I guess I still have a lot of the feminine means wimpy, weak, you know those traditional kinds of words that are not very flattering…..very emotional, my mother…"

> Other female faculty members, those who did not compete at the intercollegiate level or work within intercollegiate athletics, defined themselves as being slightly more feminine than did their former college athlete counterparts. Holly, for instance, a former figure skater, described herself as never having had a particular fondness for competitive sport, subsequently identifying herself as very feminine. Relating femininity to her current job position, she stated,

> "I never thought that I would see myself in a job where you know, my makeup would come off during the day and that I couldn't dress up everyday. My mom always laughs and says, I can't believe that you're a P.E. teacher, I would have never…."

Likewise, Elizabeth, who was very athletic as a young child but only sporadically

engaged in organized sport as she got older, defined herself as very feminine and

embraced the traditional gender female gender roles of cooking and cleaning. Despite

this, she viewed femininity on a continuum of sorts. As described by her,

> "I was trying to think, you know, what very first thing pops into my mind when I think femininity and strangely enough, like, pink and high heels and girly stuff comes into my mind and then I start thinking well, femininity you think about Rosie the Riveter and go with a whole different aspect, you know, that I totally believe in women who if they want to stay home they should stay home and if they want to work and have kids, great….that's totally, you can certainly do both and umm, equal forces, all of that. So, I mean it has such a broad spectrum to it."

Concluding that,

> "I think femininity is whatever you feel is appropriate for you as a woman, you know, whatever you want to do, whatever makes you feel good and strong."

Indeed, all of the women interviewed referred to a femininity-masculinity continuum

and subsequently placed themselves somewhere on it. Sport, competitive sport

particularly, and one's experiences within it, appeared to influence where these women

were located on such a continuum. Further, and as evidenced by the current job

positions of Holly and Elizabeth, their self-defined high levels of femininity, coupled

with their passion for sport and physical activity, conceivably lead them to their current

job positions as instructors of the "more feminine" physical activity classes of aerobics,

pilates, and yoga.

Of the males interviewed, none considered themselves to be feminine. In fact,

most failed to acknowledge femininity at all and defined themselves as masculine only.

While Carl discussed feminine qualities, he did so with regard to others perceptions of

him. Specifically, he felt that others perceived him as possessing feminine qualities

because of his occasionally-worn formal attire and affinity toward shopping but he did

not consider himself to be feminine. In his words,

> "Well, I feel, I think that some people feel that I have some feminine qualities
> because a lot of people give me a hard time because I like to dress up a lot for our
> job, you know, physically in [our field] everybody's kind of dressed down with
> the wind pants and shorts and t-shirts. There are some days that I dress down
> because I have exercise labs but on lecture days I personally like to wear either a
> suit or just dress a little nicer and a couple of people you know give me a hard
> time about it and they're like, that's why I took this job so I don't have to dress
> like that. But for me sometimes, you know, especially when I first came here but
> sometimes at the beginning dressing up kind of gives you a little bit more
> confidence and kind of make me feel better."

Carl also discussed his like of shopping in accordance with other's views,

> "…..another thing, I like to shop. You know and some guys they're like, I only
> go to the mall if I have to or to get one specific thing but I can go to the mall like
> all day and look at all the clearance racks and all the red tags not even think twice
> about it."

Interestingly, male faculty members failed to recognize any amount of femininity within

their self-descriptions. Thus, much like the self-definitions of female academicians, the

self-defined masculinity and femininity of males was perhaps also a function of their

sport experiences and continued presence within the sport domain (Hammack, 2005;

Hostetler & Herdt, 1998; Koivula, 2001; Labouvie-Vief, Orwoll et al.,1995; Messner,

1992; Riemer & Visio, 2003; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006).

Femininity and Masculinity. As mentioned above, the dichotomization of

femininity and masculinity was impossible according to the female interviewees;

particularly with regard to their self-definitions. Male faculty members, on the other

hand, did not recognize their own feminine qualities and considered themselves as only

masculine. Although often referring to femininity consistent with traditional gender

norms (e.g., passivity and weakness; see Anleu, 2006) and using terms such as, dainty,

delicate, pink, frill, and referring to dresses, high heels, and their 50's and 60's-era

mothers, the self-described femininity and masculinity of female faculty members rarely

mirrored such notions. With the exception of Elizabeth, a "lesbian in practice" only,

who asserted that she possessed few, if any masculine characteristics, all other females,

both heterosexual and lesbian, described themselves as possessing both masculine and

feminine characteristics. Amy discussed her previous studies when referring to her own

self-definition,

> "I have a feminine side but I also have, I guess, a very distinct masculine side. I
> did study psychology and anima and animus and those two energies working
> within the psyche and I believe that there is, you know, there are people out there
> that are more one than the other. I would consider myself more masculine than I
> am feminine."

Broadly speaking, Alice also referred to male and female energies when conceptualizing

her own experiences,

> "I know strong women and I know feminine women and I know not feminine
> women and some of the women are strong, I think for me the world occurs like
> this….there is female energy and male energy and I know a lot of women with
> male energy."

Others contextualized their possessed levels of femininity and masculinity by

differentiating between their professional and personal lives. Erin, for example,

described a necessity to present herself as more masculine and authoritative in the

classroom setting while taking a more feminine, nurturing role at home.

> "…I do feel that I probably present more masculine in the, in the workplace,
> especially in front of students, and more feminine, nurturing types of qualities
> behind the scenes."

Likewise, Yvonne noted the presence of gender dynamics when instructing her strength training classes articulating a need to assert her dominance in the traditionally-viewed masculine weight room environment,

> "I teach a lot of strength training, and there's a large number of guys that take that class and I know a lot of them look at me in the first couple of weeks and go, you don't know what you're talking about, you're a female, I'm a man, I played sports, I know how to do it. So I generally try to nip that in the bud. I mean, I try to do it diplomatically. But, umm, guys seem to challenge my authority in the weight room a lot."

Classroom gender dynamics, as related to course context and content, were not only an issue for female instructors, but in one documented instance, for a male instructor as well. A departmental irregularity in that historically only female instructors had taught all female health and physical activity classes, Carl recalled a previous semester in which he had unknowingly been assigned to teach a class of only women. Of his experience he not only described his initial unease but also recalled an interaction with a student who questioned his sexual orientation. As supposed by him, his presence as a male instructor for an all female class elicited assumptions of homosexuality. Indeed, instructing an all female class may have exacerbated the assumption that male teachers are homosexuals, whether factual or not (King, 2004). In his words,

> "I didn't know it was an all female class until the first day when I happen to get my roll sheet because on my schedule that I had it didn't indicate female only…..when I got my schedule I was like, wait a minute, there's 36 women. Sure enough, I walked in the classroom and they were like looking at me and I was like, I'm just as nervous as you guys are. But one of the students at the end of the first day she came up and asked me if I was gay, I was like, no. I kind of laughed; it just kind of caught me off guard. I'm assuming that she thought I was gay because you have this guy teaching an all female class."

Gender dynamics were thus present amongst both male and female professors and students. Further, such dynamics appeared to be upheld through the actions of departmental administrators, contributing to the gendering of specific activity classes. Regarding teaching assignments Holly purported,

> "I feel like my boss kind of says yeah, well, the guys will teach the sport activity classes and more of the women will get into the fitness."

Despite this sentiment, Holly herself could not be relinquished from some degree of culpability in perpetuating the presence of gender norms in physical activity, as she expressed gratitude toward her boss for neither asking nor pressuring her to teach the sport activity classes. To some extent, then, and perhaps a function of the salient gender stereotypes and the gendered nature of sport and physical activity, the status quo was maintained by both parties (Jost & Kay, 2005; Koivula, 2001; McKinney & McAndrew, 2000; Schmalz & Kerstetter, 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). A fundamental tenet of social dominance theory, the consensual nature of this status hierarchy operates to legitimize in-group and out-group member placement, their power differences, and contextual norms (Sidanius et al., 2004). In addition to maintaining the current structure of physical activity course instruction, the salience of such gendered beliefs was also related to conceptualizations of lesbians and lesbianism within health and kinesiology departments. A function of the entwinement of gender norms, sport, sex, and sexual orientation (e.g., Griffin, 1998; Krane, 2001; Knight & Giuliano, 2003), a set of common assumptions and stereotypical characteristics comprised this conceptualization and are discussed in greater detail below.

Assumptions and Stereotypical Characteristics

Most colorfully termed a "short hair" or "bull dyke", assumptions of lesbianism and the stereotypical physical characteristics of lesbians, as they related to sex roles and gender norms, were articulated by all. Further, these assumptions and stereotypes characterized the lesbian stigma within the sport and kinesiology domain. Yvonne discussed a perceived automaticity of the assumption of lesbianism within the health and kinesiology field as a whole,

> "I would say they automatically….if we're in health and kines(iology) that they automatically stereotype us as…homosexual. And many people are surprised to find out that you're not. I know that when I was applying for grad school here and I had to meet with some of the professors, umm…when I met with Dr. Ellerby (pseudonym), his grad student took me to lunch and apparently he felt really comfortable because he was like, wow, we were expecting some big 'ol bull dyke lesbian."

Also discussing lesbians within kinesiology, Carl stated,

> "I don't know if you can say assumptions, but it just seems that in kinesiology for some reason there seems to be more you know, homosexual females than in any other, and I'm not saying that's not true, I know there's homosexual people everywhere, you know, but for some reason, I don't know why, I think it's interesting, I don't know why but in kinesiology there seems to be a large percentage, more so than anywhere else."

Specific components of the lesbian label included a short-haired, physically "thick" (i.e., slightly overweight or very muscular) or masculine-looking, middle-aged, single women whose interests revolved around sport and physical education. Indeed, this definition embodies many of the characteristics identified in Nancy's departmental archetype. Despite this resemblance, however, within the broad, multidisciplinary curricula spectrum of health and kinesiology departments, the lesbian stigma and the assumed or identified presence of lesbians was suspected to be greater within the

As Zipkin (1999) notes, short hair has long been recognized as a "lesbian flag" (p. 97) within society such that the length of a woman's hair communicates messages of sexual preference within both lesbian and heterosexual communities. Contradicting the established heterosexist beauty ideal, females, lesbian or not, possessing short hair may cross acceptable socially constructed boundaries and threaten traditional feminine appearance ideals (Anleu, 2006). Likewise, and to the extent that females are already viewed as perpetrators within the sport domain, challenging the relationship between beauty and femininity in sport (see Kiovula, 2001) women wearing their hair short may elicit exponential speculation and prejudice (e.g., Griffin, 1998; Kolnes, 1995; Krane & Barber, 2003; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Erin articulated her familiarity with the "short hair" as she recalled her days of coaching. She spoke of her experiences with other female coaches who intentionally grew their hair out to avoid the "short hair" label and corresponding assumptions. Edwin also referred to short hair as one of the characteristics used when making assumptions toward women in kinesiology,

> "I think there's [sic] a lot of those perceptions that go on. Just the way that if women are athletic looking and if their hair's cut short and they're not married and they're maybe middle-aged than they're thought of as a lesbian without really getting know, you know, what their background is like when they were younger or people asking questions…they just assume a lot of stuff."

Reverberated by Laura, she discussed context, assumptions, and the potential for rumor,

> "Umm, well physical education, kinesiology, any college sport arena, officiating, women in officiating, umm…I definitely think that if they're not married, there's immediately a question that they're gay. Especially if they're past the college age. If they're 27, 28, still not married, it's gonna be questioned; and that's how I would define it. I mean, I think it's just without a doubt you know. Someone may not question it to your face, but…"

Beyond hairstyle, the above statements elude to assumptions regarding age and relationship status of females in health and kinesiology. Specifically, single, middle-aged women are likely suspect; a sentiment shared by both male and female academicians. Females identified as "always" wearing athletic clothes or sporting attire were also susceptible to assumptions of lesbianism. Despite being recognized as necessary for the requirements of their jobs (i.e., teaching 10-11 activity classes each semester), athletic clothing was consistently included in these faculty member's conceptualization of the stereotypical lesbian. Likewise, females possessing higher amounts of musculature or those who were somewhat stocky evoked suspicion. Amy spoke of a former teacher accordingly,

> "I guess if I had to kind of picture someone I guess who stereotypically would be a lesbian, I mean, I have no idea if she was or not, but that would be like, I would see her and go, well, people probably think she's a lesbian based on the fact that she's got short hair, she's in kinesiology, she's always wearing sportswear, she's you know….and she has kind of that more masculine demeanor of…. I don't really know how to place it other than I guess masculine."

Indeed, Nicholas spoke to both female appearance and physicality regarding speculative assumptions of lesbianism,

> "Oh I think sometimes, I mean, you can have some women that take on the sort of manly look and short hair and stuff like that and you know, you might think that she's a lesbian and whether she is not, I don't know."

Taken together, the characteristics identified as eliciting assumptions of lesbianism are those attributes that counter socially constructed gender norms and beauty ideals, thus prompting negativity (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Zipkin, 1999). While conscious of these attributes, there was little indication that the content and persistence of these stereotypes were controllable.

Acquiescence. Assumptions of lesbianism and the corresponding stereotypes were discussed in such a manner as to indicate shared feelings of powerlessness, unavoidability and concession amongst many of the females interviewed. Thus, rather than attempt to "prove" their heterosexuality, many women were docile to the presumption of lesbianism. Perhaps a function of the contradiction of gender roles, Yvonne orated,

> "I mean, there are gender roles that are established and with regard to teaching, you know, the female is the teacher because she's the nurturer and things like that and it's contradictory within sport and kinesiology."

Indeed, as teaching has traditionally been considered as women's work (e.g., King, 2004), the occupational gender or sex-role stereotypes (White, 2006) that correspond to the nurturing educational domain with the sport's male hegemony, respectively, may create a particularly antagonistic context for females to thrive.

Yvonne also discussed how a heterosexual colleague had repeatedly encountered assumptions of lesbianism despite her being heterosexual, married, and a mother of two sons. According to Yvonne, her colleague's short hair and athletic appearance made it all but impossible for her, and other females possessing the same characteristics, to evade the assumption of lesbianism within the health and kinesiology field. As recalled by her,

> "She's like, how do I get around it? I don't know, we're just, we're slammed because we're in this field."

Elise's emphatic, "Oh yeah, plenty", when asked if her sexual orientation had ever been questioned also indicated that assumptions of lesbianism were the status quo for females in sport-related fields. Disturbingly implicit in these sentiments was an ostensible lack

of power toward advocating social change. Indeed, such perceptions are consistent with acquiescence, conformity to the status quo, and endorsing the dominant ideology when situationally dictated to do so (Pratto et al., 1997; Sidanius et al., 2004; Wright, 2001).

The words of the above heterosexual women communicated their awareness of the societal repercussions of the lesbian label and thus, possessed some degree of stigma consciousness (Pinel, 1999). A result of this consciousness, they were also perplexed as to how to evade such insinuations. Interestingly, and counter to the suppositions put forth by stereotype threat researchers (e.g., Conley et al., 2002; Crocker & Major, 1989; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Steele et al., 2002) and the literature addressing the identity management strategies of females within sport (Griffin, 1991; 1998; Krane & Barber, 2003), rather than actively engaging in behaviors that would overtly exhibit their heterosexuality or vigilantly monitor their behaviors to the degree that there would be little cause to suspect lesbianism, these women had resigned themselves to the possibility of being labeled lesbians within the health and kinesiology field. Likewise, Yvonne and her colleague had all but accepted the backlash and associated prejudices that may result from being a woman in the health and kinesiology field (i.e., a trespasser in the male-dominated realm of sport; e.g., Fink et al., 2001; Griffin, 1998; Kolnes, 1995; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003), as they failed to conform to traditional gender ideals (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004).

Relationships and Openness

Colleagues and Students. Among heterosexual faculty members, Erin spoke of swapping funny stories about her husband and children with other married coworkers.

Yvonne shared humorous stories about her husband and children with her students on a

regular basis. Edwin spoke of frequent get-togethers between him, his wife and

children, and the family of one other male colleague. Taken together, these married

heterosexual faculty members voiced having strong interpersonal relationships with their

colleagues, both within and outside of the office setting, and with their students.

Counter to this, unmarried, heterosexual faculty members were slightly more hesitant to

share such information, particularly with students. Carl, for instance, acknowledged that

while he discussed many different things with his students and colleagues, his personal

life was not one of them. Likewise, lesbian faculty members were very selective in their

interpersonal relationships and sharing of personal information. Indeed, some degree of

compartmentalizing took place amongst lesbian and non-married heterosexual faculty

members (e.g., Krane & Barber, 2005)

In support of the proximal relationship between the physical education curricula,

physical activity courses, and assumptions of lesbianism, Elise voiced that students too

held such beliefs, as they reportedly chose which classes to take and not to take based

upon this biased, stereotypical information. Addressing students and these stereotypes,

Elise stated,

> "….the most feminine looking and acting as well, dressing, all those kinds of things, is a lesbian women. The students all think that the others are."

Indeed, based on these assumptions, students often chose not to take the classes taught

by the women who presented themselves as less feminine. When asked how she came

about this information, Elise stated that she "heard it all of the time." She also found it

quite humorous and ironic that by basing their class selection on the proverbial physical

education teacher stereotype; the students were in actuality choosing to enroll in the class that was indeed taught by a lesbian.

Despite the irony that can exist when decisions are made based on stereotypical information and regardless of the physical characteristics possessed, some lesbians were unwilling to share personal information with their students. Elizabeth, for instance, acknowledged that she, on occasion, had referred to her female partner as her husband in an effort to avoid revealing details of her personal life. Elizabeth justified her decision to avoid her personal life in the classroom setting, and thus "pass" as a heterosexual (e.g., Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005; Leary, 1999) to her students as follows,

> "I think that given this university sometimes it is important that our students see us as neutral or as heterosexual in the manner that if they think that we are lesbians or that somebody's gay that they might not take you as seriously or take your information as true."

Yvonne's statement of how openly gay teachers within the field of health and kinesiology are perceived in terms of legitimacy and ideology further substantiated Elizabeth's rationale. In her words,

> "I'd say in the experiences that I've had, until they, they pretty much have to prove themselves to be a good teacher. Because I think they automatically, or I've seen them be treated as less than an ideal teacher because of them being lesbian."

While perhaps less pronounced than in the intercollegiate environment, silence and protection were established norms within health and kinesiology departments, as the level of "outness" among lesbians ranged from counterfeiting or passing to revealing and integrating (Button, 2004; Clair et al., 2005). Of the lesbians, some were identified as open about their sexual orientation and integrated their sexual identity into the work

setting. However, despite being quite engaged with the department as a whole, other

openly lesbian faculty members were somewhat withdrawn. Some lesbians were

identified as being selectively open and limited in their discussions of their personal

lives. Lastly, it was speculated that there were some women on the faculty who were

lesbians, but completely closeted.

Griffith and Hebl (2002) noted that the most conducive work environment in

which GLB employees can reveal their sexual identity to others is that which consists of

a supportive infrastructure that values diversity and actively protects sexual minorities.

Indeed, in Button's (2001) examination of organization and sexual minorities, he noted

that, "statements of non-discrimination represent the only tangible indication that the

presence of sexual minority members will be tolerated" (p. 17). However, organizations

possessing non-discrimination or diversity statements that have been non-voluntarily

imposed, fraught with litigious debate, and half-heartedly enforced by administration,

are not viewed as legitimate protectors of sexual minority persons and their rights.

Further, when housed in an industry that has an established precedent of intolerance,

sexual minorities may receive layers of unsupportive messages in the workplace setting

(Clair et al., 2005).

Within one department, a lack of a supportive environment was communicated in

relation to the level openness and expression of lesbian colleagues. Holly believed that

the prejudices present at the administrative level in the department functioned to relegate

this latter group to the closet. In her words,

> "….but they're not, they're not publicly open about it for fear of, I think, the
> higher administration within the department. Not just the division, but at one

point, that's what I heard it was because of just the overall department and higher up administration."

Laura also noted the influence of departmental administration in the openness of her lesbian colleagues,

"…I know there's some definite people that are higher up in our department that have said they disapprove of this and it's wrong, you're going to hell, I mean, that's not a nice safe environment."

Although some research suggests that open GLB employees experience their work environment in much the same way as do heterosexuals (Day & Schoenrade, 1997; Griffith & Hebl, 2002). Elizabeth spoke to the contrary. Rather, she discussed her experience with slowly being seen differently as her same-sex partnership became known amongst her colleagues as follows,

"I think for a while most people didn't know for a year or two and then they started finding out and I think that, even though it might be just so completely subtle, I think that people look at you a little differently."

A conscious effort was made on the part of all academicians to speak to their students using generalities. For example, when discussing health-related topics such as sexually transmitted infections or rape, words such as "partner", "spouse", and "significant other" were used to avoid heterosexualizing the discussion. Similarly, many faculty members expected their students to speak in a respectful manner and thus, called their vernacular and conversational etiquette into question when necessary. Specifically, Alice has established the precedent that her students must "contextualize their conversations" for the sake of helping others better understand classroom dialogue. Likewise, she discussed her efforts to continually challenge the socially constructed meanings of words within her classes. Similarly, upon hearing her students say phrases

such as "that's so gay"; Amy spoke to proactively correcting the discourse of her

students as follows,

> "I think it's nice because we don't get held responsible for what we say and what
> it is we mean by that….It's just become so ingrained in our society that people
> don't think about what it really means and what it implies."

The collegial atmosphere of these health and kinesiology departments differed a

great deal. Within one department, discussions pertaining to the sexual orientation of

fellow faculty members rarely, if ever, took place. It was repeatedly communicated that

the issue, "had never come up." Within the other department, the issue had indeed come

up and conversations did take place, but only among certain individuals. Characterized

by Amy as a "don't ask, don't tell" type of atmosphere, and a function of tenure,

friendships, and outspoken advocacy, many faculty members reported not having ever

heard comments made about lesbian colleagues, but were confident that such comments

were made outside of their presence.   Indeed, Amy's claims were verified as Yvonne

discussed her conversations with others in terms of curiosity. In her words,

> "We actually sat down with the staff listing once and went, yes, no, yes, no,
> really…are you sure?"

Thus, much like that of gossip on intercollegiate athletic teams and consistent with

gossip as a form of lesbian stigmatization (see Krane, 1997), covert discussions,

speculation of lesbianism, and rumors did occur. Faced with these practices, lesbians

may have felt a necessity to hide their sexual proclivities and thus, adopt identity

management strategies (e.g., Clair et al., 2005; Crocker et al., 1998).

Social.   Two primary themes emerged regarding the social relations of faculty

members. Firstly, and consistent with the social categorization framework (Tajfel &

Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987) and the natural heightening of favorability toward in-

groups members (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Perdue

et al., 1990), if faculty members socialized with each other at all, it was often with those

possessing similar surface-level and deep-level characteristics. Thus, shared social

category membership often resulted in the formation of interpersonal friendships and

close social relationships with other in-group members. Further, while the multiplicity

of these shared category memberships strengthened such bonds (see Roccas & Brewer,

2002; Brewer & Pierce, 2005) in some instances, it failed to do so in others.

Among faculty members, heterosexual married couples with children often

socialized with other heterosexual couples in the department that also had children,

suggesting that possessing similarities in age, marital status, sexual orientation, and

parental status combined to establish a strong in-group affinity. Likewise, the single

faculty members often socialized with other single faculty members. Additionally, and

interestingly, the single and married younger faculty members without children were

likely to socialize with lesbian colleagues and their partners, both with and without

children. When probed about her social relationships within the department and the

social dynamics of the department in general, Elizabeth stated,

> "Yeah, in the slightest of ways they might look at you a little differently from
> being, you know, a heterosexual couple that they can hang out with versus two
> women."

Further adding who she frequently socialized with outside of the work setting,

> "Umm, I wouldn't say so much the couples. There's a few of them, yeah, it's
> always the younger people. Once they start having kids, they usually don't do
> any hanging out at all but the younger people do."

Perhaps a function of the perceived violation of gender roles made salient by traditional family values (Herek, 1988; 2000a) or the violation of the ideological family dynamic in general (McLeod, & Crawford, 1998), lesbian couples and their families did not develop social relationships with heterosexual couples possessing children. Thus, it is possible that despite the commonalities of "marriage", partnership, and having children that existed among both heterosexual and homosexual couples, these similarities may have been negated by the saliency of different sexual orientations and the disjoining gender expectations associated with same-sex couples in the familial context (Herek, 2006; Johnson, 1995; McLeod & Crawford, 1998).

The second thematic development was one of inconsistency regarding who attended departmental social gatherings. Specifically, there was a discrepancy as to whether lesbian faculty members attended departmental functions and if they did, whether or not they were accompanied by their partners. Perhaps indicative of their enlightened community, within one department where two members of an openly lesbian couple were faculty members, attendance and partner attendance was perceived to be a non-issue, as they regularly attended departmental functions together. Thus, it was a common occurrence and accepted amongst the department as a whole.

Members of another health and kinesiology department, however, experienced things vastly different. While most heterosexuals, male and females, on the faculty stated that lesbians and their partners did attend departmental gatherings, such statements appeared to be based upon generalizations made from one specific lesbian and her partner. Confusingly, while many extrapolated from this couple to identify an

atmosphere of social inclusion, others referred to the same couple to refute such occurrences. Likewise, another lesbian in the department discussed how she had never gone to a departmental social gathering, but was considering attending one in the near future. Perhaps the most contradictory of all, the behaviors of a presumed lesbian couple, both departmental faculty members, regarding departmental gatherings was also discussed. Specifically, the covert nature of their relationship was depicted through recalling their separate arrivals to and departures from social events.

Taken together, inconsistency relating to perceptions of social inclusion existed both between and within departments. The department possessing the most tumultuous account of events was subsumed under a college that, amidst impassioned contention, included sexual orientation in their diversity statement. As a result, all of said department's faculty members were aware of the issue of sexual orientation. Conversely, those faculty members within the more contented department had little recollection of what was and was not included in their college's diversity statement (in actuality, their college does indeed also include sexual orientation within their diversity statement), indeed substantiating it's presence as a "non-issue." Thus, the heightened salience of sexual orientation, in general and as prompted by the language of this investigation (see Bush & Geer, 2001), amongst the discombobulated department's faculty may have accounted for their divergent perspectives. Likewise, and against the backdrop of the sexual orientation issue, many of the faculty may have conveyed an all-inclusive perspective in accordance with departmental policy. Further examination of these conflicting perspectives may be warranted.

Context, Conflict, and Contact

"The best way to understand the nature of prejudice is to take both the structure of the social environment and the psychological structure of the individual into account" (Eagly & Diekman, 2005, p. 23). Thus, attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex relationships and lesbian colleagues were cultural, contextual, and individual. Consistent with the motivations for sexual prejudice (Herek, 2000a), the intertwining of these settings and their respective discourses elicited internal and external conflicts between and within faculty members. For instance, external conflict arose when religious and political objections were made toward including of sexual discrimination as a celebrated difference. Internally, conflict was felt when the relationships between heterosexual and lesbian colleagues served to break down societal stereotypes, subsequently leading to the formation of friendships formed between persons who, according to their belief systems, should not be friends. Internal conflict was also presumed to exist within those lesbians within the department who remained closeted as both heterosexual and lesbian faculty members empathized with their situations.

Holly spoke of one her heterosexual colleague's internal struggle of caring for some of her lesbian colleagues as friends, but having been taught to believe that their behavior and lifestyle is sinful. Amy also discussed this dilemma as it pertained to students and a lesbian professor. Specifically she referred to the observed confusion of students upon learning that their instructor was a lesbian. As stated by her,

> "I find that they are extremely conservative and umm, shocked when they find out that she is a lesbian and they're like, well I don't understand, I've been taught my whole life that this is not good and these people are bad and, but I like you and you're a lesbian. I don't understand how that works. So, they kind of have

to question what it is that they've been taught their whole life and I think that sometimes that can be very difficult for them."

The influence of familiarity and contact with GLB persons was described both in relation to the academician's own experiences as well as the observed experiences of others. Consistent with the decategorization process whereby distinctions are made among persons possessing a common out-group category membership by deconstructing stereotypes and category boundaries through interaction and self-reflection, the internal struggles to which Holly and Amy refer were actually their colleagues being viewed as individuals rather than as lesbians (Brewer & Gaertner, 2004; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Similarly, it was also recognized that those with GLB family members, friends, former teammates, and so on, spoke less negatively toward sexual minorities. Edwin discussed the negativity toward lesbians in the department in a similar same vein,

> "Well, I think some of it is, is the background and umm, they probably haven't been exposed to a lot of uhh…they may have been raised in a pretty sheltered environment and just assume a lot….that if a person looks a certain way that they have a certain sexual orientation."

Further, while relegated to the confines of our interview setting, those faculty members with the closest friendships with gays and lesbians were less privy to negative comments made toward sexual minorities, as they would not tolerate such comments. For instance, Laura, who quickly identified herself as having many close gay friends, personified this relationship. In her words,

> "I think that I have been pegged a friend of gay people in the department, so I don't think that I would hear you know a lot of those comments."

Moreover, others asserted the same perception. Laura, for instance, stated that she was 100% certain that negative comments were made outside of her presence. Emily, a

lesbian, conveyed a similar sentiment sharing that she felt an "energy" that made her

suspect that negative comments were made toward lesbians. Thus, negative comments

were likely strategically and covertly made.

Acknowledging her outspokenness beyond the interview locale, Nancy shared

similar beliefs. As a result of her adamant support for equitable treatment toward sexual

minorities at both the college and departmental levels, Nancy recalled the conflicts she

experienced with her colleagues. In her words,

> "It was an issue about whether or not our college should include sexual
> orientation in a statement of non-discrimination…and a certain group of
> individuals in our department had transmitted a letter, privately, to the committee
> in charge of the statement detailing in a lot of detail why they felt that sexual
> orientation should not be part of that non-discrimination statement….. it was out
> and it created a real firestorm because the letter was very frank in it's assessment
> of both religious moral and legal reasons to why homosexuality was not to be
> condoned or even passively acknowledged as part of a non-discrimination
> statement."

Nancy also discussed her resolve to see the issue through when opposition arose from

her colleagues in terms of her empathetic feelings, her morals, and her own close

relationships with GLB persons.

> "….but the hurtful thing was that a number of faculty that I had high respect for
> were signers on this letter. It was just very, very discouraging….. It was a very
> hurtful issue for them and it made me very angry and very sad. I have a lot of
> friends, I have a brother who is gay, it, it's unjust, it's unfair and it makes me
> very angry."

Much like Laura, and as a result of her outspokenness, Nancy surmised,

> "…I have to say that it would probably be surprising if anybody let slip at least
> negative comments around me because, at least the folks that have been here at
> least 5 years now I was pretty outspoken and very upset with a certain lack of
> acceptance of gay and lesbian colleagues. So it's unlikely that people would let
> slip negative comments around me."

Religion and Politics. The intertwining of religion and politics with issues of sexual orientation thematically emerged among academicians. Roger expressed hope for progress in the societal understanding of individual differences in terms of generational and administrative shifts. Further, he noted that making marriage legal for only opposite sex couples (i.e., the 1996 passage of the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), similar state by state acts, and the 2004 proposed constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage; see Herek, 2006), as "the most ridiculous thing in the world". Likewise, Elizabeth discussed her frustration with this issue as related to the lack separation between church and state. Amy also voiced her discontent with the current state of politics and the actions of the current administration, while interjecting the role of religion and conservative politics in sexual prejudice. In her words,

> "I think that that's where it all comes from. Just that, just that basic breakdown of people saying, well, the bible says that this is wrong and you know, our nation has kind of been on a conservative swing for a while…"

Religious beliefs and political orientation can powerfully influence the attitudes we hold toward ourselves and others (e.g., Duckitt, 2006; Donahue & Neilsen, 2005). To the extent that religion, politics, and the intertwining of the two, operate through the lens of "moral values" and tradition, and "pelvic orthodoxy" (i.e., the blaming of feminists and sexual minorities for the deconstruction of the traditional family; see Maguire, 2000), these influences are perhaps most relevant to issues surrounding sexual minorities (Herek, 2006; Morrow & Tyson, 2006; Olson, Cadge, & Harrison, 2006; Price, Nir, & Capella, 2005; Vaggione, 2005). Indeed, Laura's words substantiated this sentiment,

"Well, I think that most people that have a problem with someone being lesbian
or gay is because of religious beliefs."

As Dworkin and Yi (2003) state, "Homosexuality and transgenderism are
considered un-Christian, un-Islamic, against Judaism, a plague, a white man's issue, un-
American, un-African, and part of bourgeois decadence to name a few justifications" (p.
271). Indeed, the positive relationships between religiosity, right-wing authoritarianism,
social dominance orientation (i.e., issues of power and status; see Sidanius et al., 1994;
2001; 2004), and both explicit and implicit forms of sexual prejudice have been
repeatedly documented (Duckitt, 2006; Herek, 2000a; Olson et al., 2006; Price et al.,
2005; Rowatt et al., 2006). Further, and as noted by Morrow and Tyson (2006),
religious beliefs are inseparable from the public debate and social movements regarding
GLB individuals and groups. Best expressed by them, "Try to think of one argument
that exists against extending the full rights and benefits assumed by heterosexual people
to GLB(T) people that is not rooted in a religiously based belief. Nearly impossible"
(Morrow & Tyson, p. 384). Consistent with the conceptualization that religious doctrine
shapes the moral codes in which people operate, negative attitudes and intolerance
toward homosexuals will emerge (Dworkin & Yi, 2003; Morrow & Tyson, 2006).

Personal Beliefs. Consistent with Marmor's (1998) assumptions of
homosexuality, some academicians opined that homosexuality was a lifestyle choice,
while others questioned this belief calling attention to the societal and interpersonal
hardships accompanied with being homosexual. Regardless of origin for this historically
divisive issue, the common belief that the personal relationships, whether heterosexual,
homosexual, or bi-sexual, of their colleagues were their business and no one else's

manifested among academicians. Resultantly, lesbianism emerged as a "non-issue".

Indeed, this latter sentiment was echoed by numerous faculty members, ardently by

some. For instance, Carl repeatedly expressed that lesbianism "did not bother him at all"

in his discussions of lesbian colleagues. Similarly, and perhaps used as an impression

management technique (see Overstreet & Yule, 2001), others used comparable

disclaimers such as.

Despite its "non-issue" status, the sexual orientation of colleagues within their

respective health and kinesiology was something of which nearly every academician was

aware. Elise, for example, went so far as to say that, "everyone on the faculty knows

who is and who isn't." Whether "everyone" did indeed know or not, varying degrees of

friendships and relationships existed between heterosexual and lesbian faculty members.

Elise not only referred to the lesbian couple on her faculty as her closest friends, but they

socialized a great deal and, in fact, they also shared the same residential neighborhood.

Carl discussed his experiences with "people with homosexuality" in terms of

choice. Specifically, he stated that he was happy for those who were happy with their

choice of having a same-sex personal relationship. When probed further about his belief

of the origin of homosexuality he discussed his experiences in terms of experimentations

with sexuality,

> "I know of an instance where there is a person who started out heterosexual and
> went like homosexual, heterosexual, and now they're homosexual again so; I
> think that person may be kind of experimenting. For some I believe it's choosing
> and for others I don't feel that it's choosing, I think it's within the individual but
> I do know of one person who you know, has dated guys before and kind of gone
> back and forth."

Indeed, Carl's words highlight the complex nature of sexual orientation (e.g., Kinsey et al., 1948; Kinsey et al., 1953; Lubensky et al., 2004) as well as substantiate his rationale for, more often than not, speaking about homosexuality as a lifestyle choice.

Refuting the position of homosexuality as a choice and thus offering the view of sexual orientation as an innate and immutable characteristic (Epstein, 2006), Laura discussed the hardships she has witnessed some of her gay and lesbian friends and acquaintances encounter. In her words,

> "If you could choose, why would you choose for people to make fun of you and have to hide? And you know, if they ever do find somebody that they fall in love with, they can't even get married, they can't bring that person home for Christmas, you know, they can't, they can't, they're always lying. Their whole life is a lie."

Similarly, Amy discussed the biological nature of sexual orientation when recalling a television program she viewed that discussed a support group promising the ability to change homosexuals to heterosexuals. She further discussed the nature versus nurture debate regarding the origin of homosexuality. She stated,

> "….the majority of the people that I've talked to have known they were gay pretty much from whenever they were little, umm, and I'm not really sure that you can breed those things into your kids."

Carl, Laura, and Amy, as well as others, spoke to the two ends of, what researchers postulate, is a sexuality continuum of which one's placement may be dictated by the summation of genetic, environmental, historical, and socio-cultural factors (Epstein, 2006; Hammack, 2005; Lubensky et al., 2004). Perhaps a function of a human need to clearly delineate category membership for the sake of coherence (i.e., social categorization; see Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987), the nature versus

nurture, or in scientific terms, the essentialist versus constructivist (see Halwani, 1998),

debate amongst researchers and laypersons alike will likely persist. However, the

emergent literature suggests that beyond being futile, divisive, and ultimately impeding

progress toward understanding the etiology of sexual orientation, those arguing on each

side of this debate would be better served to combine perspectives to address the multi-

dimensionality of male and female sexual orientation across time, cultures, and contexts

(Epstein, 2006; Halwani, 1998; Hammack, 2005; Hostetler & Herdt, 1998). Regardless

of this suggestion, however, the influence of personal beliefs on attitudes and behaviors

toward and policy regarding sexual minorities persists (Duckitt, 2006; Herek, 2000a;

Morrow & Tyson, 2006).

Policy and Advocacy

The origin and nature of sexual orientation, as well as affiliated socially

constructed gender norms, have become increasingly present issues in the struggle for

federal and organizational-level protection of sexual minorities (Berkley & Watt, 2006;

Cahill, 2005; Morrow & Tyson, 2006).   Further, and to the extent that the institution of

marriage is defined in terms of biologically complementary terms, the purposes of

procreation, and the according gender roles and norms, GLB persons in same-sex

relationships are denied the same marital, spousal, and familial benefits and rights as

their heterosexual married counterparts at all levels. As discussed by the faculty

members interviewed, these issues did not go unnoticed.

Of the faculty members, all divulged marital and familial status as well as their

sexual orientation. All of the men were heterosexual and most were married with

111

children. Many of the women also identified as heterosexual and married, some with children. Two of the heterosexual women were single, one recently divorced. Two other women also considered themselves married, although not legally recognized as such, as they were married to other women. Interestingly, while one of these women identified as a lesbian, the other did not. Further, both spoke of their marriages and families similarly to those involved in heterosexual relationships. However, despite a commonality of marriage among many faculty members, the differences surrounding same-sex couple spousal rights, or more accurately, the lack thereof, were acknowledged. Indeed, consistent with the notions of minority stress, the negative psychological and physical effects of the ever-present devaluation of lesbianism (i.e., stigma; see Link & Phelan, 2001), emerged in relation to this issue.

Emily, self-described as being married to a woman, was a mother to her and her partner's young daughter, but found that many of her and her partner's coworkers were confused by their family situation. Of her colleagues, she stated,

> "I really confuse people that I have a child." "Because they don't, I guess they don't feel that lesbians can have kids….I don't know. People that don't know, that really confuses them. Like, Nigel (one of the building maintenance men), he's like you weren't pregnant and I'm like nope."

Of her partner's coworkers, she stated,

> "My partner was pregnant. So for her it was easier because she was in a high school. You know, it was….I guess for her it confused people because they were like, I thought you weren't married and you didn't have a husband. She's like, I am married but I just don't have a husband."

Beyond confusion, other issues and concerns also emerged regarding same-sex

relationships and their families. Namely, issues of policy, availability of resources, and

differential treatment materialized.

While many organizations have chosen to implement policies that support equal

treatment of their GLB employees for a variety of different reasons (Lubensky et al.,

2004), the presence of such policies within these departments was illusive, at best.

Emily discussed her situation in terms of the difficulties she experienced in attaining

spousal and familial rights within her department. Specifically, upon taking her job, she

did not find departmental support in finding employment for her partner; a service that

she asserts take place rigorously for heterosexual married couples. As stated by her,

> "I did not find the help that other people find with their spouses. There was an
> attempt, but I don't feel like it was a true attempt."

Likewise, her realization that in the eyes of the law, her daughter is not

biologically her daughter, brought forth intense concerns regarding her parental status

and legally not possessing the same societal and occupational rights as other mothers

(Palmer, 2003). Currently, the political and legal communities view and treat

individuals in same-sex partnerships as single persons (Riggle, Rostosky, & Prather,

2006). Fortunately, Emily's department worked with her, recognized her daughter as her

own, and granted her many of the parental rights accorded to heterosexual faculty

members with children. Such consideration, however, did not negate the issue in her

eyes nor in the eyes of others. Amy, one of Emily's close friends and colleagues,

discussed the situation in terms of a "double standard",

"I do think that, I just, don't believe in the double standard that we have currently as far …..the fact that gay couples, they can't be married and they're not supposed to have kids, and you know, if they do have kids, do they really, do they get the same kind of benefits as the people who are, you know, traditional man-woman couple?" "….other people in the department here have found out that there's this policy that if you're a primary caregiver of a child that you're supposed to get some kind of reprieve and if you're the secondary caregiver of a child, it's less of a reprieve like within the first years of the child's birth."

As her frustration mounted, Amy went on to say, quite emphatically,

"She's still the one that's up at one o'clock in the morning, three o'clock in the morning, four o'clock in the morning…you know, having to drive her around the block, I mean you know, she's still the parent regardless of the fact that she wasn't the one that actually had the child."

Laura, the aforementioned "pegged friend of gay people in the department", also voiced

concern regarding the lack of rights afforded to same-sex couples. Referring to a lesbian

couple who were former members of the department, she stated,

"….the whole benefits thing, I mean these people have been together 30 something years. You know, if something happened to one of them, it's not protected. And even in a will situation, you know, it could actually be taken away."

She also spoke to a multitude of additional familial struggles she had observed of same-

sex couples,

"Well, how do you handle it with your kids? I mean, so you've got to tell your kids and it's a great situation because they're honest with their kids but they know that their kids are going to get made fun of. They have two mommies or they have two daddies, and they're not normal like other kids and people question whether their kids will be gay because they're gay." "Yeah, so, but they struggle with, you know, like I said about their rights, their insurance, taking vacations and just people staring at them or introducing themselves to somebody that you haven't met when you have your significant other and your two kids."

Indeed, the issues surrounding same-sex partnerships and same-sex couples as parents

were not lost on those interviewed. Much like the trends of society in general, many

faculty members expressed the necessity for legal recognition of same-sex marriage, as the opportunity to benefit financially, psychologically, and physically from the institution of marriage should not be legally mandated (Herek, 2006). While noteworthy, these sentiments rarely translated into outspoken advocacy for equality.

As noted by Griffin (1998), speaking out against the disparaging treatment of sexual minorities elicits suspicion of lesbianism toward advocates. Thus, for fear of being labeled lesbian, women of all sexual identities often remain silent. As Krane and Barber (2005) note, however, advocating social change within the heterosexist sport context need not be compromising to one's sexual identity or take the form of a mass effort. Simply put, while difficult, change can occur through the actions of a lone person and by creating respectful and inclusive environments (Krane & Barber, 2005; Wright, 2001). Thus, by challenging social discourse and encouraging the contextualization of conversations within their classrooms, many of the faculty members interviewed were advocating change.

As mentioned above, many interviewees discussed their distain for the prejudices observed against their lesbian colleagues, friends, and acquaintances while in the interview setting. Indeed, the emotion was often palpable, as evidenced by Laura's words,

> "I mean, these people are people. They're people, they have feelings, you know….I could get on a soap box about it."

While the behaviors of many of these faculty members subtly abetted the progress of social justice, others were more blatant in their supportive actions. Nancy, aware of the powerful influence and emerging presence of majority member support for

minority member rights (Cahill, 2005); spoke of her aforementioned involvement in her

college's non-discrimination statement issue as follows,

> "But, I'm also safe, you see. I was, well tenured, I wasn't a full professor then,
> but I had tenure. I was married with two kids and you know, I could speak out
> without ever anyone questioning….oh, you're just saying that because you're a
> lesbian too. Well, obviously not (laughs), I had other motivations. But if the
> heterosexuals among the crowd can't speak out….it's, it's, it's….an essential
> approach."

Indeed, recognizing that speaking out against prejudice and discrimination toward

lesbians often elicits assumptions of lesbianism, her words reflect the importance of

majority group advocacy in establishing social justice for minority group members.

Whether personally or professionally motivated by compassion, empathy, guilt,

spirituality, individual self-interest, a sense of morality, or the belief in equality in basic

human rights, the role of dominant group members in promoting equality for all has been

established as paramount (e.g., Ellis, 2004; Goodman, 2000; Karacanta & Fitness, 2006).

Summary

Through the words of health and kinesiology faculty members it was

communicated that the meaning of lesbianism in the context of sport-related curricula is

somewhat reminiscent of the meaning in other sport settings (Blinde & Taub, 1992;

Griffin, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2003, 2005; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). Thus, to some

extent, the lesbian stigma can be extrapolated from sport to sport-related curricula.

While complex, the meaning of lesbianism was intertwined with gender norms, religious

beliefs, politics, personal beliefs, interpersonal relationships, societal assumptions,

perceptions of powerlessness, and a necessity for self-protection. This was

predominantly the case related to a female faculty members' possession of certain

physical characteristics, her physical presentation and attire, relationship status, and proximity to departmental physical activity courses; activities regarded as more masculine (e.g., weight training, racquetball, basketball, etc.), in particular. Finally, whether merely acknowledged as being present or advocating for change with regard to perceptions of inequality and injustice, cognitive and emotional resources were allocated to this issue in a variety of ways.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

As stated by Patton (1990), "the inductive search for patterns is guided by the evaluation questions identified at the beginning of the study and focuses on how the findings are intended to be used by intended users." Consistent with this statement and reflecting the purpose of exploring the meaning of lesbianism and the lesbian label through the voices of health and kinesiology department faculty members (i.e., intended users), a series of research questions guided this inquiry. Addressing these questions, it was found that the lesbian label does exist within health and kinesiology departments among both male and female academicians. Correspondingly, this label was viewed according to sport stereotypes and assumptions of masculinity, thus communicating a prototype. The lesbian label also carried with it a stigmatized status that was managed through silence and acquiescence, where lesbians tended to espouse the former and heterosexual females, the latter. Finally, the outcomes associated with such strategies were evidenced by guarded interpersonal, collegial, social, and student-teacher relationships.

While a great deal of research has focused on the lesbian stigma as it pertains to athletes, coaches, and physical education, the dearth of inquiry into the presence and understanding of the lesbian stigma, as related to sport-related curricula in the higher education setting, provided the impetus for this investigation. Indeed, such an undertaking was particularly germane to the degree that in the face of a lesbian stigma, a

great deal of time and energy is devoted to managing one's identities in response to this stigma, thus compromising the attention paid to one's teaching, research, student advisement, and student mentoring duties. Further, as research has demonstrated that the psychologically taxing nature of such identity negotiations may manifest as negative physical and mental symptoms and outcomes it is also necessary to investigate the lesbian stigma in relation to college and university health and kinesiology department academician's overall well-being as well as job performance (Lewis et al., 2006; Meyer, 2003; Smith & Ingram, 2004).

Sport and its contiguous contexts emanate palpable patriarchal traditions, heterosexual masculinity, and male hegemony (see Griffin, 1998; Harry, 1995; Messner, 1988; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). As communicated through the voices of health and kinesiology department faculty members, sport-related academia is no exception. While perhaps less pronounced than other sport settings (i.e., intercollegiate athletics), issues of gender, sexual orientation, power, and status were evident. Thus, just as within other sport settings and sport organizations, gendered discourse and compulsory heterosexuality subsisted (Rich, 1980; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Further, it was against the backdrop of such ideological beliefs that academician's self-conceptions, behaviors, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes were influenced.

Research suggests that in an effort to evade lesbian stereotypes present in the sport realm, both lesbians and heterosexual women neither consciously acknowledge nor challenge such beliefs by adhering to the norm of silence (Blinde & Taub, 1992; Griffin, 1998; Krane & Barber, 2003, 2005; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). To some extent, this

norm persisted within sport-related academia, particularly amongst females instructing

physical activity classes, as a subculture of "known" lesbians was identified. Even

openly lesbian women lead somewhat compartmentalized and sequestered lives.

Perhaps a function of an identified lesbian stigma, an allocation of cognitive and

affective resources emerged. Despite these demanding the use of such resources

however, the stigma was rarely challenged. From a pessimistic viewpoint, it could be

suggested that these resources are wasted if action does not ensue. From an optimistic

viewpoint, however, it could also be suggested that these responses are the impetus for

change. As indicated by participants, varying degrees, a function of context, of action

and change were occurring.

<div align="center">Implications</div>

According to Kincheloe and McLaren (2005), "Critical research can be

understood best in the context of the empowerment of individuals. Inquiry that aspires

to the name 'critical' must be connected to an attempt to confront the injustice of a

particular society or public sphere within the society." (p. 305). Indeed, this exploration

of the lesbian label fulfilled these "requirements" of critical inquiry. Generating an open

dialogue with participants not only allowed them to freely discuss their experiences and

express their views, but it also called attention to the subtle and blatant prejudices

existent within each member's respective department. In turn, many participants

expressed their emotional involvement with the issue. While some participants were

more expressive than others, the overall willingness to discuss the lesbian label, its

related stigma, and individual experiences communicates the need for continued discussion.

As I view it, the most substantial implication of this project was my position. While acknowledged that faculty members may not have been entirely forthcoming due to a variety of issues, my placement as a heterosexual, female, health and kinesiology student and researcher allowed me to possess both insider and outsider status. Recognizing the words of human rights attorney Juan Pablo Ordonez who stated, "The defense of human rights of homosexuals by homosexuals alone is impossible – or at best, places them in imminent peril of their lives. The struggle must be taken up by outsiders, gay or straight people, who are not themselves victim of this hostile society" (Amnesty International, 2001), I straddle this divide as a proponent of eliminating the negative consequences of its existence by opening cross-category dialogue.

Continuing the Exploration

As noted by Wright and Tropp (2002), "the decision to take collective action over inaction rests on the disadvantaged group member's ability to imagine a situation in which the relative positions of the two groups are different" (p. 220). Indeed, the foundation of collective action is comprised of perceptions of injustice (i.e., cognitive awareness) and strong emotional responses (i.e., affect) to these perceptions. While the former is an essential component of collective action, it is the latter that is the impetus for forward movement (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984; Wright & Tropp, 2002). Simply put, it is not enough to merely recognize and acknowledge inequity and injustice, but feelings of anger, dissatisfaction, legitimacy, entitlement, and a perceived ability to disrupt social

order must coincide if collective action is to occur (Major, 1994; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Wright & Tropp, 2002). Indeed, many of these emotions were communicated through the words of department academicians.

Nancy's perception of injustice coupled with her anger toward the disparaging treatment of sexual minorities, prompted her to advocate change and act with others to challenge the status quo and act on behalf of sexual minorities. Consistent with Wright and Tropp's aforementioned conceptualization Nancy and others collectively acted, in a non-normatively manner, based upon perceptions of illegitimacy and controllability. Conceivably, they acted because they felt they could aid in correcting a perceived injustice. Others, as evidenced through their words, perceived things differently and acted in a normative manner or not at all. Many voiced illegitimacy with regard to their perceived differential treatment of both heterosexual women and lesbians, but expressed that they felt the situation was beyond their control. Whether feelings of acceptance or anger emerged, in this situation, inaction and acquiescence prevailed (Wright & Tropp, 2002). Likewise, inaction occurred when justice was perceived. Interestingly, of those spoken to, these three levels of (in)action were representative of (a) self-described, "out" lesbians and/or heterosexual women with close relationships and numerous experiences with homosexuals, (b) "heterosexual" women, and (c) men, respectively. While lacking pristine clarity in such demarcation, these preliminary representations warrant further investigation.

Change can not be made when socially disadvantaged groups are forced to accept their standing by the actions of socially advantaged (Wright & Tropp, 2002). Thus,

advocacy and action on the part of both majority supporters and minority group members must ensue. Within his body of work, Herek (e.g., Herek, 1991; 1998; 2000a; 2000b) has noted that to understand and change the public opinions of and attitudes toward sexual minorities, it is imperative to examine both the positive and negative attitudes that form within our predominantly heterosexist society. Consistent this rationale, there were many positive experiences reported in this investigation, particularly amongst those faculty members who had sexual minority family members and/or held close friendships with gays and lesbians. Thus, shifting focus to the numerous positive experiences with and attitudes toward sexual minorities expressed by participants may further illuminate the manifestation of acceptance and tolerance among out-group members. To the extent that these advocating majority group members and minority group members of all kinds work together, clichés such as, "United we stand, divided we fall", "Majority rule(s)", and "There is safety in numbers" become perhaps their most applicable within the sport setting where disparaging treatment exists toward nearly every minority status (Fink & Pastore, 1999; Fink et al., 2001).

REFERENCES

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2006). Women *in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study-twenty nine year update-1997-2004.* Unpublished manuscript, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Anderson, E. (2002). Openly gay athletes: Contesting hegemonic masculinity in a homophobic environment. *Gender & Society,* **16**, 860-877.

Anleu, S. R. (2006). Gendered bodies: Between conformity and autonomy. In K. Davis, M. Evans, & J. Lorber (Eds.). *Handbook of gender and women's studies.* (pp. 357-375). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Aronson (2004). The threat of stereotype. *Education Leadership,* **62**, 14-19.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review,* **14,** 20-39.

Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1979). Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory: Toward a cognitive-social psychological conceptualization. *Sex Roles,* **5,** 219-248.

Avery, A., Chase, J., Johansson, L., Litvak, S., Montero, D., Wydra, M. (2007). America's changing attitudes toward homosexuality, civil unions, and same-gender marriage: 1977-2004. *Social Work,* **52,** 71-79.

Barnum, C. C. (2003). The effects of group membership and status organizing processes in collective task settings: A step toward theoretical integration

(Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* **64** (4-A), 1429-1533. (UMI No. 3087608).

Beatty, J. E., & Kirby, S. L. Beyond the legal environment: How stigma influences invisible identity groups in the workplace. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* **18,** 29-44.

Berger, J., Cohen, B. P., & Zelditch, M. (1972). Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review,* **37,** 241-255.

Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, Jr., M. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interactions: An expectation states approach.* New York: Elsevier Science.

Berkley, R. A., & Watt, A. H. (2006). Impact of same-sex harassment and gender-role stereotypes on Title VII protection for gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* **18,** 3-19.

Bernstein, M. (2004). Paths to homophobia. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC,* **1,** 41-55.

Berube, A., & D'Emilio, J. (1984). The military and lesbians during the McCarthy years. *Signs,* **9,** 759-775.

Bird, S. T., & Bogart, L. M. (2001). Perceived race-based and socioeconomic status (SES)-based discrimination in interactions with health care providers. *Ethnicity & Disease,* **11,** 554-63.

Blinde, E. M., & Taub, D. E. (1992). Women athletes as falsely accused deviants: Managing the lesbian stigma. *Sociological Quarterly,* **33,** 521-533.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **17,** 475-482.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: In-group love or out-group hate? *Journal of Social Issues,* **55,** 429-444.

Brewer, M. B., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Toward reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.). *Self and social identity. Perspectives on Social Psychology.* (pp. 298-318). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005). Social identity complexity and outgroup tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **31,** 428-437.

Brooks, V. R. (1981). *Minority stress and lesbian women.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Brown, L. M., Bradley, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (2006). Affective reactions to pictures of in-group and out-group members. *Biological Psychology,* **71,** 303-311.

Bush, S. I., & Geer, J. H. (2001). Implicit and explicit memory of neutral, negative emotional, and sexual information. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* **30,** 615-631.

Button, S. B. (2001). Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **86,** 17-28.

Button, S. B. (2004). Identity management strategies utilized by lesbian and gay employees. *Group & Organizational Management,* **29,** 470-494.

Cahill, S. (2005). *The glass nearly half full: 47% of the U.S. population lives in jurisdiction with sexual orientation nondiscrimination law.* Retrieved July 30, 2006, from http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/GlassHalfFull.pdf

Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond direct and asymmetrical effects: The influence of demographic dissimilarity on organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 42,* 273-287.

Clair, J. A., Beatty, J. E., & MacLean, T. L. (2005). Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 30,* 78-95.

Conley, T. D., Devine, P. G., Rabow, J., & Evett, S. R. (2002). Gay men and lesbians' experiences in and expectations for interactions with heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 44,* 83-109.

Crandall, C. S., & Martinez, R. (1996). Culture, ideology, and anti-fat attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 1165-1176.

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96,* 608-630.

Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology.* (pp. 504-553). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Croteau, J. M. (1996). Research on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: An integrative review of methodology and findings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48,* 195-209.

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2004). Group diversity, occupational commitment and occupational turnover intentions among NCAA Division IA football coaching staffs. *Journal of Sport Management,* **18,** 236-254.

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2005). Access discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* **29,** 148-163.

Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F. A. (2003). Coaching self-efficacy, desire to head coach, and occupational turnover intent: Gender differences between NCAA assistant coaches of women's teams. *International Journal of Sport Psychology,* **34,** 125-137.

Davies, P. G., Spencer, S. J., & Steele, C. M. (2005). Clearing the air: Identity safety moderates the effects of stereotype threat on women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **88,** 276-287.

Day, N. E., & Schoenrade, P. (1997). Staying in the closet versus coming out: Relationships between communication about sexual orientation and work attitudes. *Personnel Psychology,* **50,** 147-163.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **56,** 5-18.

DiPlacido, J. (1998). Minority stress among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals: A consequence of heterosexism, homophobia, and stigmatization. In G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues: Vol. 4. Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.* (pp. 138-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dode, L. (2004). *A history of homosexuality.* Victoria, BC, Canada: Arete Publishing.

Donahue, M. J., & Nielsen, M. E. (2005). Religion, attitudes, and social behavior. In R. F. Pauloutzian, & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality.* (pp. 274-291). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 276-319). New York: Guilford.

Drury, C. A. A., Lewis, M. (2002). Exploring the association between body weight, stigma of obesity, and health care avoidance. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners,* **14,** 554-561.

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on out-group attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to out-groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **32,** 684-696.

Dworkin, S. H., & Yi, H. (2003). LGBT identity, violence, and social justice: The psychological is political. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling,* **25,** 269-279.

Eagly, A. H., & Diekman, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 19-35). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **15,** 543-558.

Eliason, M., Donelan, C., & Randall, C. (1992). Lesbian stereotypes. *Health Care for Women International,* **13,** 131-144.

Epstein, R. (2006). Do gays have a choice? *Scientific American Mind, 17*, 50-57.

Fallon, M. A. (2004). An exploration of gender role expectations and conflict among female rugby players (Doctoral dissertation, University of Albany, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* **65** (7-B), 668-828. (UMI No. 3138646).

Federico, C. M. (1998). The interactive effect of social dominance orientation, group status, and perceived stability on favoritism for high-status groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations,* **2,** 119-143.

Fink, J. S., & Pastore, D. L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest,* **51,** 310-327.

Fink, J. S., Pastore, D. L., & Riemer, H. A. (2001). Do differences make a difference? Managing diversity in Division IA intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management,* **15,** 10-50.

Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol. 2.* (pp. 357-411). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1. An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought.* (pp. 51-76). London: Penguin.

Freedman, E. (1995). The historical construction of homosexuality in the U. S. *Socialist Review,* **25,** 31-46.

Freud, S. (1986). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. In P. Buckley (Eds.), *Essential papers on object relations. Essential papers in psychoanalysis* (pp. 5-39). New York: New York University Press.

Frisby, W. (2005). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Critical sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management,* **19,** 1-12.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The Common In-group Identity Model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Gamson, J. (2003). Sexualities, queer theory, and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research.* (540-568). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gherardi, S. & Poggio, B. (2001). Creating and recreating gender order in organizations. *Journal of World Business,* **36,** 245-259.

Gill, D. L., Morrow, R. G., Collins, K. E., Lucey, A. B., & Schultz, A. M. (2006). Attitudes and sexual prejudice in sport and physical activity. *Journal of Sport Management,* **20,** 554-564.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goodman, D. J. (2000). Motivating people from privileged groups to promote social justice. *Teachers College Record,* **102,** 1061-1085.

Goodman, P. (1998). 'Patriotic femininity': Women's morals and men's morale during the Second World War. *Gender & History,* **10,** 278-293.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal,* **33,** 64-86.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal,* **33,** 64-86.

Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: "Coming out" at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **87,** 1191-1199.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halperin, D. M. (1998). Forgetting Foucault: Acts, identities, and the history of sexuality. *Representations,* **63,** 93-120.

Halwani, R. (1998). Essentialism, social constructionism, and the history of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality,* **35,** 25-51.

Hammack, P. L. (2005). The life-course development of human sexual orientation: An integrative paradigm. *Human Development,* **48,** 267-290.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., & Bell, M. P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal,* **41,** 96-107.

Harry, J. (1995). Sports ideology, attitudes toward women, and anti-homosexual, and anti-homosexual attitudes. *Sex Roles,* **32,** 109-116.

Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* **28,** 815-825.

Hegarty, P. & Pratto, F. (2001). The effects of social category norms and stereotypes on explanations for intergroup differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **80,** 723-735.

Herek, G. M. (1998). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research,* **25,** 451-477.

Herek, G. M. (1991). Stigma, prejudice, and violence against lesbians and gay men. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research for public policy* (pp. 60-80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. M. (1992). The social context of hate crimes: Notes on cultural heterosexism. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men* (pp. 89-104). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. (1995). Psychological heterosexism in the United States. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. J. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay and bisexual Identities over the lifespan.* (pp. 321-346). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Herek, G. M. (1999). Psychological sequelae of hate-crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 67,* 945-951.

Herek, G. M. (2000a). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9,* 19-22.

Herek, G. M. (2000b). Homosexuality. In *The encyclopedia of psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 149-153). New York: Oxford University Press.

Herek, G. M. (2006). Legal recognition of same-sex relationships in the United States: A social science perspective. *American Psychologist, 61,* 607-621.

Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., Cogan, J. C., & Glunt, E. K. (1997). Hate crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults: Prevalence, psychological correlates, and methodological issues. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12,* 195-215.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 575-604.*

Hogg, M. A., & Mullin, B.-A. 1999. Joining groups to reduce uncertainty: Subjective uncertainty reduction and group identification. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition.* (pp. 249-279). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review,* **25,** 121-140.

Hopkins, N., & Rae, C. (2001). Intergroup differentiation: Stereotyping as a function of status hierarchy. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* **141,** 323-333.

Hostetler, A. J., & Herdt, G. H. (1998). Culture, sexual lifeways, and developmental subjectivities: Rethinking sexual taxonomies. *Social Research,* **65,** 249-290.

Hums, M. A., Moorman, A. M., & Wolff, E. A. (2003). The inclusion of the Paralympics in the Olympic and Amateur Sports Act - legal and policy implications for integration of athletes with disabilities into the United States Olympic Committee and national governing bodies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* **27,** 261-275.

Ilgen, D. R. & Youtz, M. A. (1986). Factors affecting the evaluation and development of minorities in organizations. *Personnel and Human Resources Management,* **4,** 307-337.

Inzlict, M., & Ben-Zeev, T. (2000). A threatening intellectual environment: Why females are susceptible to experiencing problem-solving deficits in the presence of males. *Psychological Science,* **11,** 365-371.

Jacoby, A., Snape, D, & Baker, G. A. (2005). Epilepsy and social identity: the stigma of a chronic neurological disorder. *Lancet Neurology,* **4,** 171-178

Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In. N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A. H., Markus, H., Miller, D. T., & Scott, R. A. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships.* New York, NY: Freeman.

Johnson, C. (1995). Sexual orientation as a diffuse status characteristic: Implications for small group interaction. In B. Markovsky, K. Heimer, J. O'Brien (Eds.), *Advances in group processes.* (pp. 115-137). United States: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 498-509.

Karacanta, A., & Fitness, J. (2006). Majority support for minority out-groups: The roles of compassion and guilt. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 2730-2749.

Karras, R. M. (2000). Active/passive, acts/passions: Greek and Roman sexualities. *American Historical Review, 105,* 1250-1262.

Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). (pp. 303-342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

King, J. R. (2004). The (im)possibility of gay teachers for young children. *Theory Into Practice, 43,* 122-127.

King, E. B., Shapiro, J. R., Hebl, M. R., Singletary, S. L., & Turner, S. (2006). The stigma of obesity in customer service: A mechanism for remediation and

bottom-line consequences of interpersonal discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **91,** 579-593.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., Martin, C.E., & Gebhard, P.H. (1949). Concepts of normality and abnormality in sexual behavior. In P.H. Hock, & J. Zubin (Eds.), *Psychosexual Development in Health Disease*, (pp. 11-32). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.

Kite, M. E., Stockdale, G. D., Whitley, Jr., B. E., & Johnson, B. T. (2005). Attitudes toward younger and older adults: An updated meta-analytic review. *Journal of Social Issues,* **61,** 241-266.

Kite, M. E., & Whitley, Jr., B. E. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues: Vol. 4. Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.* (pp. 39-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knight, J. L., & Giuliano, T. A. (2003). Blood, sweat, and jeers: The impact of the media's heterosexist portrayals on perceptions of male and female athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior,* **26,** 272-284.

Knoppers, A., Bedker-Meyer, B., Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1990). Dimensions of

Power: A question of sport or gender? *Sociology of Sport Journal, 7,* 369-377.

Knoppers, A., Bedker-Meyer, B., Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1991). Opportunity and

work behavior in college coaching. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 15,* 1-20.

Koivula, N. (2001). Perceived characteristics of sports categorized as gender-neutral,

feminine, and masculine. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 24,* 377-393.

Kolnes, L. J. (1995). Heterosexuality as an organizing principle in women's sport.

International Review for Sociology of Sport, 30, 61-77.

Krane, V. (1997). Homonegativism experienced by lesbian collegiate athletes. *Women

in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 6,* 141-164.

Krane, V. (2001). We can be athletic and feminine, but do we want to? Challenging

hegemonic femininity in sport. *Quest, 53,* 115-133.

Krane, V., & Barber, H. (2003). Lesbian experience in sport: A social identity

perspective. *Quest, 55,* 328-346.

Krane, V., & Barber, H. (2005). Identity tensions in lesbian intercollegiate coaches.

Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76, 67-81.

Labouvie-Vief, G., Orwoll, L., & Manion, M. (1995). Narratives of the mind, gender,

and the life-course. *Human Development, 38,* 239-264.

Lantz, C. D., & Schroeder, P. J. (1999). Endorsement of masculine and feminine

gender roles: Difference between participation in and identification with the

athletic role. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22,* 545-557.

Laumann, E. O., & Mahay, J. (2002). The social organization of women's sexuality. In G. M. Wingwood & R. J. DiClemente (Eds.), *Handbook of women's sexual and reproductive health.* (pp. 43-70). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Leary, K. (1999). Passing, posing, and "keeping it real." *Constellations,* **6,** 85-96.

Lenskyj, H. (1991). Combating homophobia in sport and physical education. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, **8,** 61-69.

Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. (1998). Ethnic identity, legitimizing ideologies, and social status: A matter of ideological asymmetry. *Political Psychology,* **19,** 373–404.

Levin, S. (2004). Perceived group status differences and the effects of gender, ethnicity, and religion on social dominance orientation. *Political Psychology,* **25,** 31–48.

Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Clarke, E. G., & Kuang, J.C. (2006). Stigma consciousness, social constraints, and lesbian well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* **53,** 48-56.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Cannella, G. S. (2004). Qualitative research, power, and the radical right. *Qualitative Inquiry,* **10,** 175-201.

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology,* **27,** 363-385.

Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. (1988). The role of gender in leadership positions in female sport programs in Texas colleges. *Journal of Sport Management,* **2,** 106-117.

Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. D. (1994). "Good old boys" and "good old girls" clubs: Myth or reality? *Journal of Sport Management,* **8,** 27-35.

Lubensky, M. E., Holland, S. L., Wiethoff, C., & Crosby, F. J. (2004). Diversity and sexual orientation: Including and valuing sexual minorities in the workplace. In M. S. Stockdale & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* (pp. 206-223). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Maguire, D. C. (2000). Religion and reproductive policy. In K. M. Sands (Eds.), *God forbid: Religion and sex in American public policy* (p. 185-202). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Major, B. (1994). From social inequality to personal entitlement: The role of social comparisons, legitimacy appraisals, and group membership. In M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 293-355). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Major, B., Spencer, S., Schmader, T. Wolfe, C., & Crocker, J. (1998). Coping with negative stereotypes about intellectual performance: The role of psychological disengagement. *Personality and social Psychology Bulletin,* **24,** 34-50.

Major, B., Gramzow, R. H., McCoy, S. K., Levin, S., Schmader, T., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Perceiving personal discrimination: The role of group status and legitimizing ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* **82,** 269-282.

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology,* **56,** 393-421.

Marmor, J. (1998). Homosexuality: Is etiology really important? *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy, 2,* 19-28.

Masters, W., & Johnson, V. (1966). *Human sexual response.* Boston: Little, Brown.

McLeod, A., & Crawford, I. (1998). The postmodern family: An examination of the psychosocial and legal perspectives of gay and lesbian parenting. In G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues: Vol. 4. Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.* (pp. 211-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McIntosh, M. (1968). The homosexual role. *Social Problems, 16,* 182-192.

McKinney, B. A. & McAndrew, F. T. (2000). Sexuality, gender, and sport: Does playing have a price? *Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research, 5,* 152-158.

McLaughlin, M. E., Bell, M. P., & Stinger, D. Y. (2004). Stigma and acceptance of persons with disabilities: Understudied aspects of diversity. *Group & Organizational Management, 29,* 302-333.

Messner, M. A. (1988). Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 5,* 197-211.

Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 36,* 38-56.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 674-697.

Miller, N. (2006). *Out of the past: Gay and lesbian history from 1869 to the present.* New York: Alyson Books.

Nye, R. A. (2004). Sexuality. In T. A. Meade & Wiesner, M. E. (Eds.), *A Companion to Gender History* (pp. 11-25). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Oakes, P. J. (1987). The Salience of Social Categories. In J. C. Turner (Eds.), Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Oldmeadow, J. (2007). Status generalization in context: The moderating role of groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* **43,** 273-279.

Oldmeadow, J. A., Platow, M. J., Foddy, M., & Anderson, D. (2003). Self-categorization, status, and social influence. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* **66,** 138-152.

Olson, L. R., Cadge, W., & Harrison, J. T. (2006). Religion and public opinion about same-sex marriage. *Social Science Quarterly,* **87,** 340-360.

Operario, D. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Stereotypes: Content, structures, processes, and context. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes* (pp.22-44). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Overstreet, M., & Yule, G. (2001). Formulaic disclaimers. *Journal of Pragmatics,* **33,** 45-60.

Palmer, T. L. (2003). Family matters: Establishing legal parental rights for same-sex parents and their children. *Human Rights: Journal of the Section of Individual Rights & Responsibilities, 30,* 9-12.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1991). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 475-486.

Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 114-128.

Pinel, E. C., & Paulin, N. (2005). Stigma consciousness at work. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27,* 345-352.

Pinel, E. C., Warner, L. R., & Chua, P. P. (2005). Getting there is only half the battle: Stigma consciousness and maintaining diversity in higher education. *Journal of Social Issues, 61,* 481-506.

Plummer, D. (2006). Sportophobia: Why do some men avoid sport? *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 30,* 122-137.

Powers, B. (1996). The impact of gay, lesbian, and bisexual workplace issues on productivity. In A. L. Ellis & E. D. B. Riggle (Eds.), *Sexual Identity on the Job: Issues and Services* (pp. 79-90). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Pratto, F., Tatar, D. G., & Conway-Lanz, S. (1999). Who gets what and why: Determinants of social allocations. *Political Psychology, 20,* 127–150.

Pratto, F., Liu, J. H., Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Shih, M., Bachrach, H., & Hegarty, P. (2000). Social dominance orientation and the legitimization of inequality across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31,* 369–409.

Puhl, R. M., & Brownwell, K. D. (2003). Psychosocial origins of obesity stigma: Toward changing a powerful and pervasive bias. *Obesity Reviews, 4,* 213-227.

Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 6,* 1244-1261.

Riemer, B. A., & Visio, M. E. (2003). Gender typing of sports: An investigation of Metheny's classification. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 74,* 193-204.

Riggle, E. D. B., Rostosky, S. S., & Prather, R. A. (2006). Advance planning by same-sex couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 27,* 758-776.

Renfrow, D. G. (2006). Sexuality as social status (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66* (12-A), 4535-4776. (UMI No. 3198842).

Reskin, B. F. (2000). The proximate causes of employment discrimination. *Contemporary Sociology, 29,* 319-328.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, **5,** 631-660.

Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Legitimizing ideologies: The emergence of status beliefs. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives*

on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations (pp. 257-306). New York: Cambridge: University Press.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith-Lovin. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25,* 191-216.

Riordan, C. M. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. *Personnel and Human Resources Management, 19,* 131-173.

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6,* 88-106.

Roberson, L., & Block, C. J. (2001). Racioethnicity and job performance: A review and critique of theoretical perspectives on the causes of group differences. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 23,* 247-325.

Rowatt, W. C., Tsang, J., Kelly, J., LaMartina, B., McCullers, M., & McKinley, A. (2006). Associations between religious personality dimensions and implicit homosexual prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 45,* 397-406.

Rowley, S. J., Kurtz-Costes, B., Mistry, R., & Feagans, L. (2007). Social status as a predictor of race and gender stereotypes in late childhood and early adolescence. *Social Development, 16,* 150-168.

Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarifications. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2,* 40-62.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 743-762.

Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to countersterotypical behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 157-176.

Rupp, D. E., Vodanovich, S. J., & Cred, M. (2006). Age bias in the workplace: The impact of ageism and causal attributions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,* 1337-1364.

Ruppenicker, M. R. A. (2002). Lesbian appearance stereotypes: A preliminary study of the personality characteristics of the butch femme dimension (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Women's University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62* (12-B), 6012-6230. (UMI No. 3035265).

Rush, L. L. (1998). Affective reactions to multiple social stigmas. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 138,* 421-430.

Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 21,* 1–24.

Sack, A. L., Singh, P., & Thiel, R. (2005). Occupational segregation on the playing field: The case of Major League Baseball. *Journal of Sport Management, 19,* 300-318.

Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G. B. (2004). Treatment discrimination in college coaching: Its prevalence and impact on the career success of assistant basketball coaches. *International Sports Journal, 8,* 76-88.

Scheid, T. L. (2005). Stigma as a barrier to employment: Mental disability and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 28,* 670-690.

Schmalz, D. L., & Kerstetter, D. L. (2006). Girlie girls and manly men: Children's stigma consciousness of gender in sports and physical activities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 38,* 537-557.

Schope, R. D., & Eliason, M. J. (2004). Sissies and tomboys: Gender role behaviors and homophobia. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 16,* 73-97.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (2003). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research.* (292-331). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shaw, S., & Hoeber, L. (2003). "A strong man is direct and a direct woman is a bitch": Gendered discourses and their influence on employment roles in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management, 17,* 347-375.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Mitchell, M. (1994). In-group identification, social dominance orientation, and differential intergroup social allocation. *Journal of Social Psychology, 134,* 151-167.

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Federico, C., & Pratto, F. (2001). Legitimizing ideologies: The social dominance approach. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of*

legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations (pp. 307-331). New York: Cambridge: University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology, 25,* 845-880.

Simon, A. (1998). The relationship between stereotypes of and attitudes toward lesbians and gays. In G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues: Vol. 4. Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.* (pp. 62-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Simon, B., Auderheide, B., & Kampmeier, C. (2004). The social psychology of minority-majority relations. In M. B. Brewer & Hewstone, M. (Eds.). *Self and social identity: Perspectives on social psychology.* (pp. 278-297). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Smith, N. G., & Ingram, K. M. (2004). Workplace heterosexism and adjustment among lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: The role of unsupportive social interactions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,* 57-67.

Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women's math performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35,* 4-28.

Stangl, J. M., & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 8,* 47-60.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 797-811.

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype threat and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 34,* 379-440.

Stein, T. S. (1998). Social constructionism and essentialism: Theoretical and clinical considerations relevant to psychotherapy. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy, 2,* 29-49.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Thorp, J. (1992). The social construction of homosexuality. *Phoenix, 46,* 54-61.

Towler, A. J., & Schneider, D. J. (2005). Distinctions among stigmatized groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 1-14.

Tropp, L. R., & Brown, A. C. (2004). What benefits the group can also benefit the individual: Group-enhancing and individual-enhancing motives for collective action. *Group Process & Intergroup Relations, 7,* 267-282.

Tsui, A. S., & Gutek, B. A. (1999). *Demographic differences in organizations: Current research and future directions*. New York: Lexington Books.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A., III (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37,* 549-579.

Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1989). Self-categorization theory and social influence. In P. B. Paulus (Eds.), *The Psychology of Group Influence* (2nd ed., pp. 233-275). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

Vaggione, J. M. (2005). Reactive politicization and religious dissidence: The political mutations of the religious. *Social Theory and Practice, 31,* 233-255.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 1008-1022.

Veri, M. J. (1999). Homophobic discourse surrounding the female athlete. *Quest, 51,* 355-368.

Wagner, D. G., & Berger, J. (1997). Gender and interpersonal task behaviors: Status expectation accounts. *Sociological Perspectives, 40,* 1-32.

Waldo, C. R. (1999). Working in a majority context: A structural model of heterosexism as minority stress in the workplace. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46,* 218-232.

Webster, M., & Driskell, J. E. (1978). Status generalization: A review and some new data. *American Sociological Review, 43,* 220-236.

Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual.* New York: St. Martin's.

White, M. J. (2006). Implicit and explicit occupational gender stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 55,* 259-266.

Whitley, B. E., & Kite, M. E. (1995). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: A comment on Oliver and Hyde (1993). *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 146-154.

Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A., III (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 20, pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Williamson, I. R. (2000). Internalized homophobia and health issues affecting lesbians and gay men. *Health Education Research: Theory & Practice, 15,* 97-107.

Wilson, T. (1996). Compliments will get you nowhere: Benign stereotypes, prejudice, and Anti-Semitism. *Sociological Quarterly, 37,* 465-479.

Woods, S. E., & Harbeck, K. M. (1991). Living in two worlds: The identity management strategies used by lesbian physical educators. *Journal of Homosexuality, 22,* 141-166.

Wright, S. C. (2001). Strategic collective action: Social psychology and social change. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.). *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes.* (pp. 410-430). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wright, S. C., & Tropp, L. R. (2002). Collective action in response to disadvantage: Intergroup perceptions, social identification, and social change. In I. Walker, & H. J. Smith (Eds.). *Relative deprivation: Specification, development, and integration.* (pp. 200-236). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, A. (1997). Trends: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *Public Opinion Quarterly,* **61,** 477-507.

Yodyk, D. J. A., & Prentice, D. A. (2005). Am I an athlete or a student? Identity salience and stereotype threat in student-athletes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology,* **27,** 329-336.

Zipkin, D. (1999). The myth of the short-haired lesbian. *Journal of Lesbian Studies,* **3,** 91-101.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Pseudonym	Age	Sex	Race	Status	Orientation
Laura	27	F	Caucasian	Single	Heterosexual
Amy	31	F	Caucasian	Engaged	Heterosexual
Yvonne	37	F	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Emily	36	F	Caucasian	Married	Lesbian
Nancy	54	F	Caucasian	Divorced	Heterosexual
Elizabeth	30	F	Caucasian	Married	Lesbian
Alice	35	F	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Erin	36	F	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Elise	42	F	Caucasian	Divorced	Heterosexual
Edwin	36	M	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Nicholas	61	M	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Holly	30	F	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Roger	70	M	Caucasian	Married	Heterosexual
Carl	27	M	African American	Single	Heterosexual

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL AND QUESTIONS

Background information

       Name, age, sex, race, ethnicity

       Sexual orientation

       Relationship status, children

       Educational background

       Current job position

       State, city, school

       How long have you been teaching?

Sport:

       Did you play sports in high school?

       If so, which sport(s)? How did you decide on these sports?

       What were your experiences?

       Did you play sports in college?

       If so, which sport(s)? How did you decide on these sports?

       What were your experiences?

       Do you have any role models?

          If so, who?

       Do you consider yourself feminine? Masculine?

       What does it mean to be feminine? Masculine?

Health and kinesiology:

How did you decide on your current profession?

Have you ever experienced any difficult as a woman in your field? (female)

How do you feel the field regards women as a whole?

How does the field regard lesbians?

How do you feel about females in health and kinesiology? (male)

How do you feel about lesbians in health and kinesiology?

There are societal stereotypes and expectations regarding gender roles in sport. Do these affect your job? Do you feel pressure to act in accordance with gender roles?

  If so, how?

Within your department have you ever come across persons speaking negatively about females in sport and sport careers?

  If so, how did you handle this situation?

Within your department have you ever come across persons speaking negatively about lesbians in sport and sport careers?

  If so, how did you handle this situation?

Are you aware of any (other) lesbians in your department?

Have you ever felt uncomfortable?

What is your relationship with your coworkers?

Has sexual orientation ever been discussed?

Do you know the sexual orientation of your coworkers?

Do they know your sexual orientation?

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM

You have been asked to participate in a research study concerning the lesbian stigma within health and kinesiology department academia. You were selected as a possible participant because of your position as a health and kinesiology department faculty member. A total of fourteen people have been asked to participate in this study, the purpose of which is to investigate the meaning of lesbianism and the impact of the lesbian label within health and kinesiology departments through the voice of health and kinesiology department faculty members.

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to answer a series of questions regarding your past, present, and anticipated future experiences within sport and the health and kinesiology profession. Your responses will be recorded on an audio tape and subsequently coded to maintain confidentiality. The interview will take 60-90 minutes. As this is a potentially sensitive topic, there are minimal, yet possible psychological implications for discussing your experiences. However, discussing this topic may not only provide crucial insight regarding an important topic within an unexplored domain as well as extend the current literature, but it may also be somewhat therapeutic to discuss such your experiences in a completely confidential context.

You will receive no monetary compensation for participation.

This study is confidential. Your responses will be coded and identifying characteristics modified to ensure confidentiality. The records of this study will be kept private and no identifiers linking you to the study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only I and my advisor will have access to the data and records. The audio recordings of you interview responses will be used for the sole purposes of this investigation, kept for a period of three years to ensure complete and appropriate interpretation, and then destroyed. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University. If you decide to participate, you are free to refuse to answer any of the questions that may make you uncomfortable and may completely withdrawal at any time without the threat of negative repercussions. You can contact Melanie Sartore by phone at 979-862-1703 (office) or 979-220-0496 (home/cell) or at msartore@hlkn.tamu.edu with any questions about this study.

This research study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional review Board through Ms. Melissa McIlhaney, IRB Program Coordinator, Office of Research Compliance, 979-458-4067, mcilhaney@tamu.edu.

Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the consent form for your records. By signing this document, you consent to participate in the study.

Signature _____

Date_____

VITA

Melanie L. Sartore

Laboratory for Diversity in Sport
Dept. of Health and Kinesiology
Texas A&M University
TAMU 4243
College Station, TX 77843-4243
Email: msartore@hlkn.tamu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.   Texas A&M University, August 2007
         Major: Sport Management
         Emphasis: Sociology

M. S.   Indiana University, May 2003 (Dual Degree)
         Major: Sport Management
         Major: Applied Sport Science

B. S.   Western Illinois University, May 2000
         Major: Physical Education/Exercise Science
         Minor: Business Management

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

August, 2004 – present: *Graduate and Research Assistant,* Department of Health
and Kinesiology, Texas A&M University

August, 2003 – July, 2004: *Adjunct Instructor,* Department of Health and
Kinesiology, Indiana University

July, 2002 – August, 2003: *Apparel Manager Graduate Assistant,* The
President's Challenge Physical Activity and Fitness Award Program,
Bloomington, IN