

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

7-22-2015

The Effect of an LGB Affirmative Sports Video on Student Athlete Knowledge and Attitudes Toward LGB Individuals

Christine Marie Jehu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Jehu, Christine Marie, "The Effect of an LGB Affirmative Sports Video on Student Athlete Knowledge and Attitudes Toward LGB Individuals" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1210.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/1210>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khhgerty@memphis.edu.

THE EFFECT OF AN LGB AFFIRMATIVE SPORTS VIDEO ON STUDENT
ATHLETE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD LGB INDIVIDUALS

by

Christine Marie Jehu

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Counseling Psychology

The University of Memphis

August 2015

Copyright © Christine Marie Jehu
All rights reserved

Dedication

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to my father Richard Jehu. My father always encouraged me to unequivocally be myself. He taught me the value of hard work, dedication, and how to never give up. He was diagnosed with cancer the summer before I started this Ph.D. journey. He was by far my number one supporter and encourager. After every scan, he would call me to verify the date of graduation and each time saying, “Don’t worry about me. Go work hard. I’ll be at graduation to see what floppy hat you get to wear.” My father was a fighter. He fought courageously for four and a half years, looking cancer in the face with determination to live life fully every day. Thankfully this crazy journey moved me back home with the internship match and we were able to share three more loving and supportive months. He died in October of my internship year, the last year of this Ph.D. program. So to the man who gave me the strength to see this journey through, this work is for you. I love you. You will always be my hero.

Acknowledgements

I will be forever thankful for the important people who have supported me through the dissertation process and graduate school in general. I would like to acknowledge four outstanding women who have touched my life in very different and influential ways. I acknowledge Dr. Lease, my chair and advisor, for never giving up on me, pushing me when I needed to be pushed, and supporting me through the many highs and lows I experienced during this program. For seeing my potential, providing me opportunities, and for supporting my leadership growth and development. I acknowledge my mother, Barbara Jehu who encouraged me as long as I can remember to go to college, dream big, and never let anyone tell me I could not do something because I am a woman. You taught me the beautiful balance of how to be fierce while also being loving and supportive. I acknowledge my dear friend Dr. Archandria Owens for your unconditional love and support the past five years. From “intervening vigorously” to cycling to shared tears, you were, and continue to be, a grounding force in my life. I am thankful for this crazy Ph.D. program that brought us together and fostered one of the most amazing friendships in my life. I acknowledge my beautiful partner, Tabitha Stevens, you may have joined this crazy journey at the tail end (lucky you!), but you have helped me see this dream through to the very end. Thank you for jumping in feet first and being supportive with no questions asked! Thank you for giving me time on weekends to write, for listening as I freaked out through the process, and for making sure I took care of myself during this last year. Your love and support has truly kept me going.

Abstract

Jehu, Christine Marie. PhD. The University of Memphis. August, 2015. The effect of an LGB affirmative sports video on student athlete knowledge and attitudes toward LGB individuals. Major Professor: Suzanne Lease, PhD.

Hegemonic masculinity has deep roots within sports making it difficult for lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) athletes to be openly out. Many LGB athletes have experienced verbal and physical harassment and assault from teammates and other athletes or social isolation on their teams. The You Can Play Project (YCPP) is an online media campaign focused on eliminating homophobia in sports and making sport a safe space for LGB athletes. However, there has been no empirical evaluation of whether the YCPP changes attitudes toward LGB individuals. The current study evaluated the effectiveness of the YCPP videos on decreasing homonegativity within a sample of self-identified heterosexual NCAA female ($n = 120$) and male ($n = 28$) athletes. Athletes were randomly assigned to watch one of three one-minute videos: YCPP, generic anti-bullying, or sleep hygiene. Most athletes in the study had not heard of the YCPP or seen their videos. Significant differences in homonegativity were found between female and male athletes with men reporting more negative attitudes. Using data from only the female athletes; there were no significant differences in homonegativity attitudes by video condition. Knowledge of LGB history was associated with more positive attitudes toward LGB individuals for both female and male athletes. Female athletes who reported close contact with an LGB family member or friend reported significantly greater internal affirmativeness toward LGB individuals. Results of the study suggest a shift is taking place within the NCAA with female athletes holding more positive attitudes toward LGB individuals than previously reported. This finding may not be true for male athletes. Continued efforts are needed in examining the effectiveness of the YCPP.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
Dominant Cultural Masculinity and Sport	6
Research Questions	11
2. Literature Review	13
Hegemonic Masculinity in Sports	13
College Student Attitudes Toward LGB Individuals	19
Athlete Attitudes Toward LGB Athletes	21
Experiences of LGB Athletes	26
Awareness Campaigns	34
Limitations in the Current Literature	36
Focus of the Current Study	38
3. Method	39
Participants	39
Measures	41
Demographics	41
Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS)	42
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH)	43
Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS)	45
Procedure	46
Control Video	47
Experimental Group A Video	47
Experimental Group B Video	48
4. Results	49
Primary Analyses	49
Analysis of Intervention Effect	51
Descriptive and Correlational Analyses	54
5. Discussion	57
Limitations	61
Clinical Implications	63
Directions for Future Research	63
Conclusions	65
References	66
Appendices	78
A. Demographic Questionnaire	78
B. Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS)	83

C. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH)	85
D. Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS)	88
E. Recruitment Email	89
F. Institutional Review Board Approval	92

Chapter 1

Introduction

There is increased media and political attention surrounding lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) issues in the United States. States are voting on and legalizing gay marriage (Lowery, 2014; Reuters, 2012; Yaccino, 2013), the Supreme Court heard arguments related to the Federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) overturning the ban on same-sex marriage (Hurley & Ingram, 2013; Marcus, 2013; Matthews, 2013), the Supreme Court is currently considering the constitutionality of same-sex marriage (Human Rights Campaign, 2015a; Liptak, 2015); and leaders in politics (Associated Press, 2012; O'Connor, 2015), business (Keane, 2014), religion (Mentz, 2015; Tuohy, 2012), and sports (Borden, 2013; Garcia, 2013) are publicly coming out as LGB or expressing their support as allies of LGB individuals (e.g., via movements like www.athleteally.com).

These positive changes appear to be coming more slowly in the world of sport. In the spring of 2013, the National Football League (NFL) was anticipating the public coming out of one or more current players (Chase, 2013; O'Keeffe, 2013). However, no current NFL players have publicly come out, and it is reported that the individuals who were planning to come out following signing with a team were not signed for the 2013-2014 NFL season (Freeman, 2013). In February 2014, University of Missouri linebacker Michael Sam publicly came out after coming out to his teammates in August 2013 (Wire, 2014). During the 2014 NFL draft, Sam was picked up by the St. Louis Rams during the seventh round and then cut prior to the start of the season. He signed to the Dallas Cowboys practice squad for the 2014 NFL season (Archer, 2014). Sam, currently

unsigned, continues to pursue a career in the NFL, and has been provided the opportunity to play in the Canadian Football League with the Montreal Alouettes (Stone, 2015). At present, there is no publicly out active player in the NFL. The first active player in the National Basketball Association (NBA), Jason Collins, publically came out in 2013 (McClam, 2013), as did Major League Soccer player Robbie Rogers (Brydum, 2013), and Puerto Rican professional boxer Orlando Cruz (Associated Press, 2013). Unfortunately, following his public coming out, Jason Collins remained unemployed in the NBA (Freedman, 2013) until the Brooklyn Nets signed him in February 2013 (Murphy, 2014). In November 2014, Collins announced his retirement after 13 years in the NBA (Murphy, 2014).

Professional tennis player Billie Jean King and advocate of women's professional sport participation, was publically outed as bisexual in 1981 (Schwartz, n.d.). Fellow tennis player Martina Navratilova came out publically in 1981 and reported a loss in endorsements as a result (Lavers, 2013). Navratilova retired from her successful tennis career in 2006 and recently married her longtime partner in December 2014 (Clarey, 2015). Sheryl Swoopes, the first woman to be signed to the Women's National Basketball League (WNBA) in 1996, publically came out in an article she wrote and published in *Sports Illustrated* (Swoopes, 2006), and continued her career in the WNBA until 2011. Additionally, current and former members of the U.S. women's national soccer team Megan Rapinoe and Natasha Kai are publically out (Hess, 2014). Rapinoe is an active advocate for LGBT rights, noting the responsibility of athletes and sports leagues to encourage and provide a welcoming environment for other professional athletes to come out publically without damage to their career (Madden, 2015).

Even in light of the increased openness by some LGB athletes, the sports literature is consistent in stating that homophobia in sports and the oppression of LGB athletes remain systemic problems that are slow to change (Anderson, 2011a), and discrimination against LGB athletes is present at all levels. LGB athletes in grade school reported being bullied or harassed due to their sexual orientation in physical education classes and on the athletic fields, and experienced formal and informal dismissal from sports teams under the guise that it would be problematic to have an out LGB athlete on the team (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, 2013).

LGB athletes have experienced verbal (i.e., being called “dyke” or “faggot”) and physical harassment and assault from teammates and other athletes; experienced social isolation within their teams; experienced institutional discrimination by way of being cut from a team or refused membership to a team; and have been forced to remain closeted in the sports environment due to their sexual orientation (Brackenridge, Rivers, Gough, & Llewellyn, 2007). A former collegiate lesbian athlete described her experiences prior to coming out to her teammates as being full of personal distress, and she experienced negative physical and emotional consequences including weight loss, inadequate sleep, and fear of having a mental breakdown from the stress of concealing her sexual orientation (Stoelting, 2011). Similarly, gay male athletes have reported experiencing depression, stress, worry, identity confusion, isolation, and feeling “rare” or “strange” due to their sexual orientation and status as an athlete (Gough, 2007). Thus, homophobic attitudes and language, verbal harassment, and physical violence toward LGB or suspected LGB athletes are prevalent in sports (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education

Network, 2013; Southall, Nagel, Anderson, Polite, & Southall, 2009), and create a hostile and unsafe environment for LGB athletes that has yet to be adequately addressed.

The silencing, or lack of awareness, acknowledgement, and conversation regarding homophobia within sports continues to perpetuate these struggles for LGB athletes and is rooted deep in the sporting structure among the players, coaches, and fans, to the support and administrative staff (Anderson, 2011a; Brackenridge et al., 2007; Eng, 2008; Hardin & Whiteside, 2010; Wolf-Wendel, Toma, & Morpew, 2001).

Traditionally, sport has been perceived to be a heterosexual man's game (Anderson, 2009) going as far back as the founding of the Olympic Games in Greece, where men were glorified for their extreme physical ability and chiseled bodies (www.olympic.org). The tradition of sport as a "man's world" increases the difficulty for women and men who do not fit the definition of traditional masculinity to be accepted into and equally respected in sports.

Even with the advent of Title IX of the Educational Assistance Act that increased women's participation in athletics, the dominance of men in sport continues to be exemplified in many ways. For example, gender determines what sport athletes are able to participate in. Men are the only individuals who play college and professional football, a sport characterized by the demonstration of strength, dominance, and masculinity (Anderson, 2009). Women are not permitted to play college and professional football, thus maintaining a clear distinction of gender boundaries within sport.

Distance running has a long history of restricting women's participation in events and continues to have shorter distance requirements of women runners. During the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome, men were able to participate in 16 running events, while

women were restricted to eligibility in five events due to being too “frail” to participate in the longer events (Sebor, 2015). Between 1961 and 1972, the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) banned women from officially participating in United States road races (Sebor, 2015). In 1972 women were permitted to participate in marathons; however, they were required to start at a different time or from a different starting line than the men (Sebor, 2015). Women’s Olympic marathon running was added to the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Games (Sebor, 2015). Currently, race distances for student athlete runners within the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) differ by gender. The 2015-2016 NCAA rulebook for track and field requires the season course length for males to be at least 4,000 meters and at least 3,000 meters for females, and championship courses for males are required to be between 8,000 – 10,000 meters for males and 5,000 – 6,000 meters for females (NCAA, 2014). Additionally, within the NCAA hurdle heights for female athletes are lower than those for male athletes by 6 – 8 in. depending on the event (NCAA, 2014).

Women’s softball differs from men’s baseball in field size, ball size, and the level to which women are able to advance in the sport. Following the 2008 Olympic Games, softball was removed from the list of team sports in the Olympics due to the lack of teams at the international level, making collegiate softball the highest rung of participation possible for female softball players (Rhoden, 2005) and increasing the gap in opportunities for sport participation between male and female athletes. Lacrosse participation does not extend beyond college participation for either gender; however, rules have been changed for female lacrosse players. Men’s lacrosse is marked by physical contact and requires protective gear, whereas only limited stick and physical

contact is permitted in women's lacrosse (US Lacrosse, 2009). Gender is highly visible in the uniforms of female lacrosse players, who play in athletic skirts emphasizing femininity and further differentiating them from male athletes.

These examples demonstrate how gender differences are built into the structure of sport. Men also continue to hold more administrative and coaching positions within higher levels of sport, including the higher paying positions, and men advance at higher rates than women (Anderson, 2009; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). This highly gendered structure of sport glorifies strength, dominance, and masculinity and is thought to apply only to heterosexual men, contributing to the invisibility of lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual female athletes, as well as gay and bisexual male athletes.

Dominant Cultural Masculinity and Sport

The theory of cultural hegemony provides a framework for understanding the struggle for openness and inclusion of LGB athletes within sports. Cultural hegemony refers to the rules and customs of a culture that are reinforced to maintain a status hierarchy within a particular culture or group, and it can be extended to hegemonic masculinity within sport (Hardin & Whiteside, 2010). Hegemonic masculinity dictates that sports pursuits are for strong, masculine, men – not for females or weak men. Persons who do not fit this definition, in this case all women regardless of sexual orientation and gay or bisexual men, are viewed as not belonging in sports. Anderson (2002) noted:

Sport only tolerates openly gay athletes as long as they are valuable to the mantra of athletics – winning. Otherwise, sport uses homophobic discourse, the threat of physical violence toward gay athletes, and the silencing of gay identities to

maintain the virility of masculine hegemony and to prevent the acceptance of homosexuality in general, as well as to prevent the creation of a gay identity that shows homosexuality and athleticism as compatible. (pp. 862-863)

Those athletes who contribute to the win are permitted to remain and compete as long as they remain mostly closeted. The “don’t ask, don’t tell” attitude of sports forces the athlete to have fragmented identities (Anderson, 2002, 2011). The individual can be an athlete or LGB, but not both within sports. These athletes who remain on a team under a “don’t ask, don’t tell” blanket tolerate the dismissal of their sexuality in order to compete and maintain their athletic identity (Anderson, 2002, 2011; Griffin, 1999).

Some athletes’ sexual identity is ignored or dismissed following coming out to their team, while others are embraced either immediately or with time (Anderson, 2002; Gough, 2007). Reflecting on the coming out experience, some athletes have noted that they would have come out sooner had they known reactions from their team would not be negative (Anderson, 2002), and others dismissed their negative experiences within their team in light of the comfort and acceptance they currently experience (Anderson, 2002). Athletes commonly struggle with the decision to come out (Gough, 2007; Stoelting, 2011), and some come out gradually to teammates who are identified as safe (Kauer & Krane, 2006; Stoelting, 2011). Many athletes decide to remain closeted regardless of knowing of other athletes coming out due to their team culture, sport culture, or immediate environment (Gough, 2007; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Stoelting, 2011). These findings highlight that regardless of the positive experience some athletes are having after coming out, the overall environment within sports is not fully conducive to athletes being open about their LGB sexuality.

Unlike gender or race, an athlete's sexual orientation can be concealed, decreasing the immediate systemic pressure to acknowledge the negative experiences of LGB athletes in sports (Gough, 2007; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). In order to increase accepting attitudes toward LGB athletes, it is necessary to understand aspects of the culture and hierarchical structure of sport that support their oppression.

One current way of maintaining silence around LGB issues in sports is negative recruiting, when coaches or athletic administrators speak poorly of other schools' athletic programs in efforts to make their own program appear superior (Griffin, 1998). Common forms of negative recruiting involve using the stereotyped and stigmatized lesbian or gay label in a way to discourage athletes from considering playing at a rival school. In speaking with prospective athletes and their parents, coaches may slander another team for having a LGB coach or having one or more LGB players on a team, whether or not accusations are true. They do this to emphasize the superiority of their team and highlight their program's disapproval and intolerance of LGB athletes (Griffin, 1998). A notable negative recruiting case within the NCAA is that of Renee Portland, the head women's basketball coach at Pennsylvania State University. She managed her team with strict rules of, "no alcohol, no drugs, no lesbians" and created a strong culture of intolerance (Hardin & Whiteside, 2010, p. 17). Portland's philosophy was known within the basketball community, but not contested, until a star player was dismissed from her team in 2005 for reasons other than athletic performance. With the growing civil rights movement surrounding LGB issues, the athlete felt empowered to file a lawsuit, bringing to light Portland's blatant discrimination of sexual minorities in sport. However, Portland was not

dismissed as head coach for her actions, and the case quickly died in the media, further silencing the issues of homophobia and discrimination for LGB athletes.

Negative recruiting perpetuates the silence within sports by forcing LGB athletes to remain closeted if they want to play on a particular team that does not support them as individuals, yet values their athletic skill. It assures heterosexual athletes and parents that they will not be on a team that recruits LGB athletes and models that discrimination based on sexual orientation and derogatory homophobic language within sports is acceptable (Griffin, 1998; Hardin & Whiteside, 2010; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). The lesbian and gay label is powerful, and the stigmatization associated with the label impacts women and men of all sexual orientations (Anderson, 2008; Griffin, 1998; Satore & Cunningham, 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001), further reinforcing that sports are not an acceptable or safe place for LGB individuals.

Language within sports represents another way of maintaining a hegemonic masculine environment. On the rugby pitch, male college athletes have been found to use gendered and sexualized language to reference winning and losing (Muir & Seitz, 2004). These athletes speak of winning in terms of “penetrating” the loser. This language places the winning team in the dominating male sexual position of penetrating the weaker submissive woman, or losing team. This language among the athletes is part of the rugby cultures and is tolerated by officials during games, who ignore the comments or rarely address the athletes’ use of such language (Muir & Seitz, 2004). Additionally, accepted or tolerated homophobic language on the rugby pitch such as “faggot” and “queer,” further silences LGB individuals and their allies. Homophobic language is deeply entrenched in the structure of the sports, and speaking up against it involves taking a

stance against hegemonic masculinity and risking being ostracized and discriminated against for having different beliefs.

Active challenges are needed to counter hegemony and reduce homophobia within sports. Two campaigns have recently been launched to raise awareness of the presence of LGB athletes in sports, highlight difficulties LGB athletes face, and work toward decreasing homophobia in sports. The National Hockey League (NHL) launched the “You Can Play Project” in 2011 (www.youcanplayproject.org). The You Can Play Project began with producing videos featuring NHL players and teams who have pledged to be part of the campaign to create an open and inclusive environment for all athletes regardless of their sexual orientation. The campaign has grown to include video pledges from high school, college, and national teams across the country representing many different sports.

Athlete Ally (www.athleteally.com) is a non-profit organization founded on the mission to increase awareness and acceptance of LGB individuals, particularly LGB athletes, and eliminate homophobic language within sports. An ally is an individual with membership in the dominant social group who supports ending oppression against a minority group and works toward social change for these individuals (www.hrc.org). Through campus visits, Athlete Ally strives to educate individuals about homophobia and the specific impacts within sports. They have created a network of campus allies and ambassadors committed to the vision of ending homophobia in sports, coupled with a strong online presence on social media outlets such as Facebook and Twitter.

There are a growing number of organizations that have developed programming focused on promoting inclusivity in sports, but there is limited empirical information

regarding the effectiveness of these campaigns. It is not known if campaigns like You Can Play Project, Athlete Ally, or similar public awareness interventions are effective in changing attitudes; therefore they need to be empirically examined. Additionally, the current campaigns address sports in general, not specifically college student athletes. The current study evaluated the effectiveness of an LGB affirmative video in reducing homophobic attitudes held by self-identified heterosexual college student athletes.

Research Questions

The current study had two main purposes. First, in light of the changing political and social attitudes toward LGB issues, it described current LGB knowledge and attitudes (including levels of LGB hate, attitudes toward LGB Civil Rights, religious conflict, and internalized affirmativeness) that heterosexual NCAA student athletes have towards LGB athletes and examined the associations among the knowledge and attitudes constructs. The current study did not include attitudes regarding transgender athletes. Second, the study evaluated the effectiveness of a You Can Play Project video in increasing positive LGB attitudes among heterosexual NCAA student athletes. The data from this project could potentially be used to inform the development of such programs as Safe Zone or Ally Training tailored specifically toward college athletic populations.

This study asks the following questions:

1. Does an intervention (i.e., video by straight professional athlete ally) designed to promote and increase an open and accepting sporting environment for LGB athletes change heterosexual NCAA student athletes' attitudes about LGB individuals?

- a. It was hypothesized that heterosexual NCAA student athletes who watched the LGB affirming sports video would have more positive LGB attitudes than athletes who viewed a control video (i.e., a sleep hygiene video).
 - b. It was hypothesized that heterosexual NCAA student athletes who watched a general anti-bullying campaign video would have more positive LGB attitudes than athletes who viewed a control video, but less positive attitudes than athletes who watched the LGB affirming sports video.
2. What are the current levels of LGB knowledge and attitudes held by heterosexual NCAA student athletes, and are there associations between knowledge of LGB history and specific attitudes toward LGB individuals (LGB civil rights, religious conflict, LGB hate, and internalized affirmativeness) assessed by the subscales of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals scale and the Modern Homonegativity Scale? These are descriptive questions and no hypotheses were tested.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter reviews the literature on the hegemonic structure of sports, with specific focus on heterosexual perceptions of LGB individuals. The chapter begins with an exploration of hegemonic masculinity and its deep roots within sports, with a particular focus on homophobia and heterosexism. Second, a review of attitudes toward LGB college students and the overall campus climate for sexual minority students is provided, followed by an exploration of attitudes toward LGB athletes specifically. Third, this chapter explores the unique experiences of LGB athletes, highlighting areas for intervention. The current study only focuses on lesbian, gay, and bisexual athletes. The literature on the experience of transgender individuals is a separate body of work and is outside the scope of this study.

Hegemonic Masculinity in Sports

Hegemonic masculinity, the rules and customs that maintain a culturally normative ideal for men and their behaviors, strongly influenced the creation of a hierarchy within sports that is firmly rooted in heterosexism and homophobia. As early as the first modern Olympic Games, successful athletes were defined as powerful, heterosexual men who presented themselves in a traditionally masculine way. The modern sports structure is grounded in status, praise, and success based on embodying and maintaining hegemonic masculinity (Morrow, 2002). Glorification of heterosexual men dictates the position of all women (lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual), and gay or bisexual men at the lower ends of the sports hierarchy, as they are groups viewed as less masculine and out of place in sports (Griffin, 1998). Institutionalized homophobia within

sports maintains masculinity and heterosexuality at the top of the hierarchy and uses fear tactics to reinforce hegemonic masculine athletic customs through the silencing and invisibility of LGB athletes.

By definition, in a hegemonic masculine heterosexist society women are viewed as feminine and weak; therefore, participating in sports is undesirable. If they do participate in sports, women are to maintain their femininity inside and outside of the sports environment. The characteristics celebrated in male athletes, such as strength, masculinity, or aggression, are viewed with suspicion when exhibited by female athletes. Athletic women viewed as masculine violate the dominant discourse and are often branded with the lesbian label regardless of their sexual orientation, further solidifying the position of men, particularly masculine heterosexual men, at the top of the athletic hierarchy (Griffin, 2012). The lesbian label can limit women from entering sports or pursuing sports to an elite level, and limits heterosexual females from stepping forth as allies for the LGB community in sports for fear that they will be labeled as lesbian due to their support of LGB athletes (Griffin, 2012).

Homophobia is the fear of LGB individuals or the hatred of LGB individuals simply due to their sexual orientation (Griffin, 1993). Homophobia is used as a policing agent in maintaining the status quo hierarchy in sports. Anderson (2012) coined the term 'homohysteria' to describe the widespread fear of appearing or being thought to be gay. Due to homohysteria, individuals, particularly men, regulate their appearance and behavior to appear overly masculine in efforts to protect themselves from being labeled gay. For males, the type of sport they participate in can provide protection from the gay label. Closeted male athletes may choose to play a traditionally more masculine sport

such as football, wrestling, or rugby to appear more masculine and heterosexual, concealing their true sexual orientation (Anderson, 2012).

A similar phenomenon is seen within women's sports. Griffin (1998) describes the lesbian 'boogywoman,' a construct grounded in irrational fears and lack of knowledge about LGB individuals, particularly lesbians. These fears include the beliefs that athletics is a breeding ground for lesbians; particular sports attract lesbians more than others; lesbians are sexual predators and are a dangerous presence in the locker room; lesbian women will come together with the goal of discriminating against heterosexual female athletes; and lesbians are not normal females due to their unnatural masculinity and will have an unfair advantage over heterosexual female athletes (Griffin, 1998). Lesbian women in sport have had to manage their appearance, language, and relationships to protect themselves against homophobia within sports. Dressing in more feminine attire, living with a "roommate," or even entering into a heterosexual relationship in order to deflect questions about their sexual orientation are some ways lesbian athletes have managed the lesbian boogywoman stereotype (Griffin, 1998). Each time a woman in sports, lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual, has to defend her sexuality, appearance, or her athletic prowess, the position of women on the bottom rungs of the sports status hierarchy is further solidified and the discussion of sexual orientation and homophobia in sports continues to be silenced.

In contrast to the discourse on sexual orientation, discussions in sport surrounding race and gender could not be avoided due to the visibility of those identities. The race barrier in sport was crossed with notable breakthroughs such as the 1945 contract signing of Jackie Robinson as the first African American man competing in Major League

Baseball (Baseball Almanac, 2013). Today, across sports, African American athletes are as prominent and revered as White athletes. An increase in female athletic participation ensued following the 1972 passage of Title IX of the Educational Assistance Act, which required all secondary schools and colleges receiving federal funding to provide equal sporting opportunities to females and males (West, 1998). Official intercollegiate competition for women was sporadic at best prior to 1966 when the Commission on Intercollegiate Sports for Women – renamed in 1967 the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women – was founded (Bell, 2007). In 1980, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) overtook the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (NCAA, 2012). Today, female athletes are present in all levels of sports from recreational to high school, college, and the Olympics.

Great strides continue to be made in relation to gender and racial equality in society and in sports. There is increasing gender and racial diversity within sports among athletes, coaching staff, and administration. Although progress is being made, men continue to hold higher administrative positions within sports organizations and collegiate athletic departments (Whisenant et al., 2002). Women continue to operate within the system at a lower status level than men (Anderson, 2009). Many women's sports teams at every level of competition clearly designate gender in their name (i.e., Lady Tigers, women's soccer, Women's National Team), whereas men are only classified by their sport. The gender specification in team name denotes difference and places women's sports teams, and women athletes, below men on the sports hegemonic hierarchy. The ongoing status system makes it more difficult to break down the barriers of sexism and heterosexism within sports.

While race and gender have been two historically important equality campaigns in United States history, laws and regulations relevant to equal civil rights of LGB individuals and countering homophobia are central to the current public equality issues in the United States (HRC, 2013). However, the desire to be inclusive of sexual orientation in sports in the United States seems to be lacking (Cunningham, 2012). Further, the lack of professional athletes, coaches, and administrators who identify as LGB and are publicly out makes it difficult for an LGB individual to visualize a career in athletics due to their difference and absence of LGB role models. Hegemonic masculinity and homophobia reach all levels of sports, maintaining the position of women and LGB athletes below masculine heterosexual men on the sports status hierarchy.

Media exposure may create another barrier to working toward a more inclusive environment in sport for LGB athletes. Television, social media, and print exposure of men emphasize their athletic ability and focus less on their personal life. The opposite is true for women in sports. Media exposure in the United States of women on professional, Olympic, and collegiate sports teams places a greater emphasis on their sexuality, personal life, the sacrifices they are making for their family, and evaluating their ability to uphold traditional female roles within a heterosexual family or relationship while competing in their sport at an elite level (Christopherson, Janning, & McConnell, 2002; Cooky, Wachs, Messner, & Dworkin, 2010). This media attention sends the message to all people watching sports that women who are competitive athletes must be heterosexual, be a mother (or desire to be a mother), maintain a strong thriving home life, and still be able to compete at the level demanded of their sport. This is problematic for women in sports who are not heterosexually married and who are lesbian or bisexual.

Women are receiving the message that in order to be successful within their sport, gain media exposure, and obtain sponsorship or scholarship support, they must adhere to the hegemonic masculine cultural standard that may be inconsistent with their individual identity.

Other overt and covert rules that work to maintain hegemonic masculinity in sports in the United States include such notions as “there’s no I in team,” the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy regarding homosexuality, an emphasis on athlete sameness within a team, and a focus on winning at all costs. Commonality rather than uniqueness is valued within the sports culture, particularly within team sports (Southall et al., 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). Team messages focus on working for the collective rather than the individual, stressing the importance of team culture, and emphasizing that deviations from team norms and culture will be harmful to the individual athlete and the team as a whole (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). Athletes are frequently told that winning is a team effort and disciplinary action is often enforced on the whole team when one member deviates from team rules or norms. Athletes are pressured with the messages that identities that are different or stand out from the team norm (i.e., a gay, lesbian, or bisexual sexual orientation) will negatively impact the whole team, ultimately jeopardizing the team’s success. These messages help maintain homophobia within sports.

Sexual orientation is not a visible piece of an individual’s identity and therefore can easily be ignored, covered up, and avoided. Sports organizations have not been forced to address the issues of LGB persons in sport as they have been with race or gender. Individuals, teams, and organizations have not been required to reconcile their

differences on the matter of homosexuality as quickly and as openly as they had to with race (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). The lack of conversation about sexual orientation in sports allows LGB athletes to continue to compete; yet requires them to remain silent about their sexual orientation in order to maintain their position within sports. The silencing and invisibility of LGB athletes hurts the individual athlete, the team and organization, sports as a whole, and society at large.

College Student Attitudes Toward LGB Individuals

A number of studies have explored the attitudes college students in the United States hold toward LGB individuals, and the literature is consistent in reporting men hold more negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian individuals than do women (Roper & Halleran, 2009; Southall et al., 2009). Previous contact with a LGB individual has been shown to reduce negative attitudes toward LGB individuals (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; Roper & Halleran, 2009). To investigate hegemonic masculinity and attitudes toward gay men in a college population, Wilkinson (2004) surveyed 159 undergraduate heterosexual men at a Midwestern university. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (93.7%) with an average age of 19.4 years ($SD = 1.6$). Consistent with Anderson's (2012) notion of homophobia, the men in this study who ascribed to higher levels of masculinity endorsed a greater fear of appearing feminine, a characteristic attributed to gay men and not desired by heterosexual masculine men. Data revealed the fear of appearing feminine had a significant direct relationship with antigay attitudes, explaining about 11% of the observed variance. Heterosexual undergraduate men who ascribed to masculine hegemony were less likely to have positive attitudes toward gay individuals.

Attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women often differ, with attitudes toward gay men being less positive. A sample of heterosexual undergraduate men revealed significantly more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbian women (Keiller, 2010). For the men in this sample, greater conformity to traditional masculine gender role norms was significantly related to negative attitudes toward gay men, but not toward lesbian women. More positive evaluations of lesbian women than gay men may be related to sexual objectification of lesbian women, rather than an acceptance of their sexuality (Keiller, 2010). Additionally, the negative attitudes toward gay men in this sample were related to the participants' fear of appearing gay and their desire to maintain power and privilege of heterosexual men over gay men. The hierarchy of gender and sexual orientation seems to be consistent in and outside of sports: heterosexual masculine men at the top followed by heterosexual females, bisexual and lesbian women, and last, bisexual and gay men.

College is a time marked with sexual exploration and it offers an opportunity to challenge personal beliefs and biases. Living in college residence halls is a unique experience for students when individuals of varying backgrounds come together to live in close proximity. A sample of male and female students at a university in the Midwest reported knowing significantly more LGB individuals after coming to college than prior to attending (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001). Students who reported that an out LGB individual lived in their dorm reported their personal comfort with LGB individuals as significantly more positive than individuals who reported no LGB individuals living in their dorm. The majority of the sample (82.2%) reported that no LGB individuals lived in their dorm. These results may indicate that college dorms are not viewed as a safe space

for LGB individuals to be open about their sexual orientation. It is possible that these students chose to live in off campus housing that might provide a more safe and supportive environment.

Living off campus may not be an option for LGB student athletes. Student athletes are typically required to live on campus and share a room or suite with teammates. Therefore, the sports environment for college athletes extends beyond the traditional athletic spaces (i.e., playing field, weight room, locker room, athletic training room) and into their home. An LGB athlete immersed in a homophobic sports environment would not be able to gain safety away from homophobic teammates at home, explore their same-sex sexual orientation in their home, or find connections in the LGB community within the residence hall or campus community due to homophobic attitudes and heterosexist pressures from their teammates. Inclusive sporting environments in the collegiate setting would support LGB athletes not only on the court, field, or pitch, but also in their home and general campus community.

Athlete Attitudes Towards LGB Athletes

Few quantitative studies have evaluated the collegiate climate for LGB student athletes. Southall et al. (2009) conducted research on four schools within the NCAA (three Division I schools and one Division III school) investigating gender differences in athletes' attitudes toward LGB athletes. Data were collected from 698 student athletes (363 male and 335 female) representing 16 NCAA sports. The majority of the sample identified as heterosexual (97%) followed by lesbian (1%), gay (.86%), and bisexual female (.86%). Same sex sexual behavior was reported by 7.3% of the total sample. Measurement items were derived from previously used campus climate research and

included real-world scenarios for the athletes to respond to. Female athletes reported more willingness to accept a LGB teammate (96.4%) than males (61.5%). More male athletes identified being homophobic (25.9%) than female athletes (2.7%). Only three female athletes reported that they would or have harassed a lesbian or bisexual teammate, whereas 28% of the male athletes reported that they would or have harassed a gay or bisexual teammate. Males reported using more derogatory language to belittle LGB athletes (70.8%) than females (37%), and males felt more uncomfortable sharing a bed with an LGB athlete while traveling for away games (78.2%) than the female athletes (41.2%). There were no differences regarding a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy between the male and female athletes. Both genders were roughly split on their agreement with taking a “don’t ask, don’t tell” stance. The research supports that women in sports are more accepting of sexual orientation, although it still reveals some discomfort among female athletes.

A follow up study exploring the role of race in NCAA male athlete’s attitudes toward lesbian and gay athletes (LG), suggests that African American male athletes hold more negative attitudes toward LG athletes than do Caucasian male athletes (Southall, Anderson, Nagel, Polite, & Southall, 2011). The sample was composed of 397 male athletes from five Southeastern NCAA schools (four Division I universities and one Division III university). Fifty-two percent of the sample represented team sports, 61% of the athletes were Caucasian and 20% were African American. Six Caucasian athletes identified as gay and five reported that they hid their sexual orientation from their teammates. Fifteen athletes (4%) identified as heterosexual and reported having engaged in same-sex sex (5 African American, 7 Caucasian, and 3 of another ethnic group).

Roughly 10% of the sample reported that they know a teammate is gay. Consistent with hegemonic masculinity and homophobia, 21% of the sample reported engaging in “ultra-masculine” behaviors in order to demonstrate their heterosexual sexual orientation (37 African American, 46 Caucasian) and 32% reported engaging in somewhat masculine behavior to demonstrate their heterosexual sexual orientation (26 African American, 102 Caucasian).

Although nearly 53% of the sample reported behaving in ways to prevent themselves from being mislabeled as gay, 66% of the sample reported that they would accept a gay teammate (30 African American, 180 Caucasian). In contrast, 28% of the male athletes reported they would or do reject gay teammates and 6% reported that they would or do harass gay teammates. Specific to sport, 57% of the football players reported they would or do reject a gay teammate (40 African American, 17 Caucasian) and 30% of the baseball players reported that they would or do harass a gay teammate. Additionally, a larger percentage of African American football players (69%) than Caucasian football players (41%) reported that they would reject or do reject a bisexual teammate. Thirty-five percent of the total sample self-identified as homophobic (28% Caucasian, 43% African American). In regards to sharing a bed with a teammate while traveling, 77.8% of the sample reported that they would feel uncomfortable sharing a bed with a gay teammate (62 African American, 192 Caucasian). The studies by Southall and colleagues (2009, 2011) support the need for interventions targeted at creating a safe and inclusive environment within sports for LGB athletes.

Similarly to the findings of Southall et al. (2009), Roper and Halloran (2009) found that women in sports have more positive attitudes toward LGB athletes. The

authors examined the attitudes of straight student athletes toward gays and lesbians with a rationale grounded in social identity theory. It was hypothesized that male student athletes would have less favorable attitudes toward gay and lesbian individuals, that attitudes would vary based on sport, and that knowing an individual who identified as gay or lesbian would influence the student athletes' attitudes. Data were collected from NCAA Division I and Division II male and female athletes at universities in the Northeastern United States. Three hundred and seventy-one self-identified heterosexual athletes completed the survey. Gender participation was nearly even (59% female), the majority of participants were white (81.1%), and 69% indicated having contact with a gay or lesbian individual. Athletes' ages ranged from 17 to 25 ($M = 19.4$, $SD = 1.22$) and all class years were represented. Athletes completed paper-pencil versions of the Attitudes Toward Lesbian/Gay Questionnaire Short Form (Herek, 1984), which was administered by their coach.

Results indicated that male athletes held significantly more negative attitudes toward gay and lesbians than the female athletes. There were no significant differences between sports on attitudes toward gay or lesbian athletes. Although the differences in attitudes between sports were not statistically significant, athletes from four of the men's sports reported the most negative attitudes: soccer, basketball, golf, and track and field. Athletes who had contact with a gay or lesbian individual held significantly more positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians. The attitudes of the field hockey participants were significantly more positive than all other athletes in the sample, which could be accounted for by the fact that their coach was an openly out lesbian. The contact with an

individual in position of power, who is comfortable with their sexual orientation, may have a positive impact on athletes' attitudes.

The literature appears to be consistent in reporting that homophobic attitudes are held by male and female NCAA athletes, with males reporting more negative attitudes than females, and contact with an LGB person being related to decreased levels of homophobia or negative attitudes toward LGB individuals. Further, negative attitudes toward LGB individuals have also been reported in collegiate club sport athletes, those that participate in competitive athletics in college, but not at the varsity NCAA level (Anderson & Mowatt, 2013). A sample of 391 club sport athletes (187 male, 199 female) at a Midwestern university representing 38 sports responded to the Attitudes Toward Gay and Lesbian Scales providing a full attitude score (ATLG) and individual gay (ATG) and lesbian (ATL) scores (Herek, 1984). Males reported statistically significant higher scores on the overall ATLG and ATG scales than female club sport athletes. Within this club sport sample, baseball players reported significantly higher ATLG scores than athletes in cycling, fencing, rugby, softball, and swing dance. There were no significant differences between team and individual sports. Thirty-three percent of the sample reported having a LG teammate and individuals who reported contact with an LG individual reported significantly more positive attitudes toward LG individuals. This research indicates homophobia is present in the competitive club level of collegiate sports. Although the percentage of participants who were aware of a LG teammate was low (33.9%) in this sample, it is greater than the 10% of athletes in Southall et al.'s (2011) sample of NCAA athletes who reported having a gay teammate. This may suggest that as an athlete moves up in competitive levels within sports, homophobia is greater and LGB athletes are more

likely to remain closeted. Therefore, the current study focused on the attitudes of NCAA athletes.

Experiences of LGB Athletes

The average age an individual recognizes their same sex attraction is about age nine for women and about age 7 or 8 for men (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). In the coming out process, there is, on average, a ten-year time gap between first attraction and self-labeling as LGB or disclosing one's sexual orientation to others for both women and men (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). The average age of self-labeling and first disclosure for men is 16.4 years ($SD = 2.9$) and 17.9 years ($SD = 2.4$) respectively and for women 17.6 years ($SD = 2.1$) and 17.9 years ($SD = 1.9$) respectively (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). Self-identification and disclosure happens, on average, prior to or at the beginning of the college years, a time marked socially and developmentally by sexual exploration and the beginning stages of mate selection (Erikson, 1968). This stage of development and the process of sexual exploration and development may be more difficult for an individual who has yet to self-identify or disclose as LGB if the environment they are in is heterosexist and homophobic.

Negative experiences within sports begins early for some LGB students. A 2011 national survey of LGBT youth revealed both positive and negative experiences within sports and physical activity, along with considerable barriers (GLSEN, 2013). The sample consisted of 8,584 LGBT students in grades 6 through 12, with ages ranging from 13 to 20. Students were from all 50 states and the District of Columbia and identified as White/European American (67.9%), gay or lesbian (61.3%), and female (49.6%). Students in this sample experienced bullying and harassment due to their sexual

orientation (52.8%) or gender expression (50.9%) in physical education settings. Students reported being harassed or assaulted due to their sexual orientation (27.8%) or gender expression (29.4%) in the sports outside of physical education classes. Less than a quarter of the sample (23.2%) reported participating in formal interscholastic or intramural sports beyond the required school physical activity courses. However, LGBT students participating in formalized sports reported beneficial factors such as higher grade point average (GPA), greater self-esteem, and an increased sense of belonging than their LGBT peers who did not participate in formalized sports beyond school physical education courses. Despite the beneficial factors, LGBT students involved in school-based physical activity reported avoiding locker rooms (39%), avoiding athletic fields and facilities (22.8%), and not feeling comfortable speaking with teachers or coaches about LGBT issues (79.4%). Experiences of discrimination and verbal and physical harassment may be keeping LGB students from participating in sports and experiencing the benefits of athletic participation.

The experiences of LGB athletes can be summarized within seven themes: stereotypes of athletes, image maintenance, experience of invisibility and isolation, identities, distraction from sexual orientation, coming out, and the role of the audience and environment. Many of these themes overlap, creating a complex system of experiences related to sexual orientation that resembles the overall multilevel, intertwined structure of sports. As noted previously, this structure values dominance, strength, and masculinity (Anderson, 2009), dismissing and devaluing any person or characteristic that falls outside of that mold.

Stereotypes emerge from the framework of hegemonic masculinity and compulsory heterosexuality that impact both women and men, and LGB and heterosexual athletes. Some sports are stereotyped as attracting lesbian or gay athletes (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). Receiving the gay label due to a sexual orientation stereotype based on team membership was experienced by male cheerleaders in a qualitative study by Anderson (2008). These athletes noted most people they encounter expected them to be gay, because they were men participating in a traditionally female sport. Additionally, softball and female basketball players were assumed to be lesbians because of their membership on the team (Kauer & Krane, 2006). Female athletes who are seen as violating the gender traditional view of women as weaker, emotional, needing protection must also be in violation of sexual orientation norms. Many female athletes engage in heightened management of their feminine appearance in efforts to deflect this stereotype (Anderson, 2008; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Krane, 2001).

Female collegiate Division I athletes identified stereotypes of female athlete to be the opposite of the traditional college woman who is expected to be feminine in appearance, passive, and not aggressive (Kauer & Krane, 2006). One athlete noted, “we’re known as the jock girls, not the sorority prissy girls” (Kauer & Krane, 2006, p. 47). Apparel is used as a way for both women and men to manage their image inside and outside of sports. The male cheerleaders interviewed by Anderson (2002) made careful choices in the attire they wore around campus, traveling, and at cheer events. Those male athletes who were members of cheerleading teams that were open and inclusive of LGB individuals more often wore clothing that announced their cheer team membership or wore shorter, form-fitting women’s cut t-shirts. In contrast, the male athletes on teams

that were guided more by hegemonic masculinity wore men's fit t-shirts (i.e., longer and not form fitting) and ball caps that announced their school affiliation, rather than announcing their cheer team membership. Similarly, female athletes interviewed by Kauer and Krane (2006) described elevating their feminine appearance while on campus to manage their image through emphasizing their gender rather than their status as an athlete. These women purposefully wore feminine clothing in place of athletic apparel, they would wear make-up regularly on and off the athletic field, and wear ribbons in their hair while participating in their sport. Adding feminine touches to a female athlete's appearance comes from both the greater sporting structure and the individual's desire to emphasize femininity over athleticism. Within the sports hierarchy, female coaches are encouraged to wear skirts or suits and heels during competitions, and uniforms for female athletes often include athletic skirts, short shorts, and form fitting jerseys (Griffin, 1998; Krane, 2001).

Managing image and negotiating the stereotypes of sexual orientation impact the LGB athlete and their navigation through sports. The lesbian or gay label is a powerful negative (Griffin, 1998), resulting in themes of invisibility and isolation within sports (Anderson, 2002; Gough, 2007; Griffin, 1999; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Muir & Seitz, 2004). Fears associated with coming out as an LGB athlete reach beyond individual acceptance of teammates and coaches. It involves the risk of rupturing relationships with corporate sponsors for professional athletes, the loss of an athletic scholarship for collegiate athletes, and the ability to be recruited for teams at the collegiate and professional levels, both of which could negatively impact an athlete's career (Griffin, 1999). For these reasons, many LGB athletes choose to remain closeted to preserve their

career. Female athletes may choose to live alone or with a 'roommate' rather than fabricating a heterosexual relationship (Griffin, 1999). Female collegiate athletes have reported concealing their sexual orientation by limiting personal information shared with teammates, making comments about men in a sexual manner, or explicitly lying about their sexual orientation (Kauer & Krane, 2006). These various strategies of managing sexual orientation lead to feelings of isolation as noted by a number of elite male athletes (Gough, 2007). Their isolation lead to feelings of guilt, denial, and fear of being outed as a gay male athlete. Fear of coming out is not irrational, as many athletes experience harsh, derogatory language within sports including being called a "dyke" or "faggot" either directly or in the general course of play (Anderson, 2002; Muir & Seitz, 2004). The limited disciplinary action for using this language within sports reinforces the structure of hegemonic masculinity and accepted homophobia, creating an unsafe and often hostile environment for LGB athletes. This environment is not inviting for athletes to reveal their sexual orientation, requiring athletes to continue negotiating their identity in this environment.

Life as an athlete introduces a unique way of developing identity both as an athlete and as an individual, particularly on a team sport where conformity to the team goals over the individual is emphasized (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). As individuals continue their development as an athlete, immersing further into the athletic culture, the increased focused training time reduces the athlete's exposure to different types of people, interests, and activities. Limited exposure can lead to stunted personal, social, and academic development, which could lead to early foreclosure in career exploration for all athletes. Particularly for LGB athletes, the emphasis on uniformity and conformity to the

norms and rules of the sport and team adds to the difficulty in negotiating a way to fit in with their team, while balancing their perceived, real, or imagined unaccepted difference within the world of sport. Anderson (2002) highlighted the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ notion within sports as athletes navigate their place and consider their identities as gay male athletes. Male athletes are revered for their incredible athletic prowess and are accepted on a team regardless of their sexual orientation if they are able to contribute to the win with their athletic talents (Anderson, 2002, 2011). The ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ stance provides a veil under which LGB athletes can continue to perform, offering themselves and those around them a distraction from sexual orientation (Anderson, 2002; Gough, 2007).

This idea of sport as a distraction from sexual orientation is another theme that emerges in the literature. The gay athletes in Gough’s (2007) study reported entering sport as a way to fit in with other males – sport is what boys do, so in an effort to not stand out further as a sexual minority, they joined in. Some athletes described using sports as an excuse for not dating women, noting the time demands of sports did not allow them free time to date. One athlete described a conversation he had with his mother, “‘you need to get a girlfriend.’ I tell her, ‘Mom I don’t want to. I don’t have time’” (Gough, 2007, p. 164). Another athlete expressed the relief sports gave him from his sexual orientation,

Skiing provided a focus in my life that made it easy to spend time thinking about the sport rather than agonizing over whether or not I was gay. At the time, I didn’t think about the fact that my position as an athlete would later be one of the greatest barriers to my coming out. (p. 165)

Similarly, Griffin (1999) described sports as a place where lesbians have experienced freedom even while in the closet. Female athletes have been rewarded for their masculinity, aggression, and less than feminine qualities, so lesbian athletes made, and some continue to make, sacrifices, such as remaining closeted, in order to continue sport participation.

Some movement has been made toward the acceptance of LGB athletes in sports since Griffin's (1998, 1999) work. This progress is recognized through experiences of athletes who have made the choice to come out during their athletic careers (Anderson, 2002, 2011b; Stoelting, 2011). All of the previously mentioned themes, particularly those of image management, isolation, and struggling with identities, are relevant in an athlete's decision to come out. The experiences of 16 NCAA lesbian athletes whom Stoelting (2011) interviewed emphasized the importance of identity, audience, and context in their deliberation about whether to disclose their sexuality within their sport. These athletes viewed the coming out process as an opportunity to normalize their experiences, gain more self-acceptance through disclosure, and to be honest with themselves and their teammates. Several of the athletes reported that remaining closeted within sports resulted in negative physical and mental health effects such as weight loss, lack of sleep, and contemplating suicide. On the whole, these lesbian athletes saw the opportunity to develop deeper relationships with their teammates through disclosing their sexual orientation, which strengthened the bond of trust on and off the field or court.

Notably, these athletes described their sporting environment as being a safe space to come out. Other athletes or coaches were openly out and they viewed their sports environment and the overall campus community as a safe place for LGB individuals. One

athlete reported that other out teammates were “just role models and helped me understand where I was, and how people would treat me, so I knew I could make it” (Stoelting, 2011, p. 1206). Likewise, the gay male athletes in Anderson’s studies (2002, 2011b) identified other out athletes as supports and models in coming out. These athletes reported finding support through online communities of athletes who shared about their coming out process. Of the athletes interviewed, their coming out experiences were generally positive, with athletes receiving support from important people in their lives and their coaches and teammates. Interestingly, Anderson (2002) noted that while many of the athletes viewed their coming out stories as positive, they were in fact replete with messages of homophobia and heterosexism. In a follow-up study in 2011, Anderson interviewed 26 different out male athletes who described positive coming out experiences in sports. This 2011 cohort was composed of noticeably less accomplished athletes than the 2002 cohort who were all high achieving athletes, and they did not feel their athletic ability played a role in their acceptance by teammates. There were differences, however, in the 2011 cohort’s experiences with older adults, including parents and sport administrators, as being less accepting and not feeling comfortable being out with them.

These first-hand experiences of LGB athletes demonstrate that hegemonic masculinity and compulsory homophobia are deeply rooted in the structure of organized sports. Some athletes experience supportive and welcoming communities as they come out, such as major league soccer players Robbie Roberts (Brydum, 2013) and Megan Rapinoe (Buzinski, 2012), NBA player Jason Collins (McClam, 2013), WNBA players Sheryl Swoopes (Swoopes, 2006) and Brittney Griner (Hess, 2014), and boxer Orlando Cruz (Associated Press, 2013). However, others feel the pressures of recruitment,

professional careers, and corporate sponsorships and endorsements looming and hindering them from coming out during their careers such as major league soccer player David Testo, NBA player John Amachi, and NFL player Esera Tuaolo (Hess, 2014). Although the social climate is beginning to show change, the literature is consistent in showing that heterosexual individuals hold negative attitudes toward LGB individuals (Ensign, Yiamouyiannis, White, & Ridpath, 2011; Gill, Morrow, Collins, Lucey, & Schultz, 2006; Harry, 1995; Roper & Halloran, 2007; Southall et al., 2009) and that hegemonic masculinity is at play within sports (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; Gill et al., 2006; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Southall et al., 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). These athletes continue to experience the negative impacts of homophobia within sports (Anderson 2002, 2008; 2011b; Gough, 2007; Kauer & Krane, 2006) by way of stereotyping (Anderson, 2002, 2008; Gough, 2007; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Muir & Seitz, 2004), rejecting teammates (Southall et al., 2009), homophobic language (GLSEN, 2013; Muir & Seitz, 2004; Southall et al., 2009), and silencing of LGB issues (Gough, 2007; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). The literature has yet to explore the effectiveness of interventions aimed at decreasing heterosexual athletes' negative attitudes toward LGB athletes. This study addressed this void by examining the effect of a public service announcement campaign within sport.

Awareness Campaigns

A public service announcement (PSA) is a targeted advertisement focused on issues such as discrimination, stigma, and public health initiatives (Corrigan, 2012). PSAs are often part of multilevel awareness campaigns delivered through a number of media outlets such as television commercials, radio, print media, and videos posted on

online social media sites. Little empirical research on the effectiveness of PSAs exists; therefore, the effectiveness of such interventions is generally unknown (Corrigan, 2012). Companies or groups that launch PSAs engage in research that evaluates the impact factor of their announcements by examining the number of internet hits on their videos and websites. Simply reviewing the number of hits to a website does not provide information on what visitors learned and how, or if, the information is then translated into attitude change in their lives.

A content analysis of 274 YouTube videos on bullying revealed that videos grounded in behavior theory (i.e., The Theory of Planned Behavior and the Health Belief Model) received significantly more views than videos not grounded in theory (Lister, Brutsch, Boyer, Hall, & West, 2013). Generic bullying was addressed most often in the selected videos (87.87%), followed by LGBT targets of bullying (14.39%). Methods of communicating within the videos included emotional appeals (51.14%), strictly information (41.67%), celebrity appearance (18.18%), scare tactics (10.6%), and humor (5.3%). Self-efficacy is a main component of the various theories coded for in this study, and one-fourth of the videos evaluated had components of self-efficacy in their message content. Self-efficacy was portrayed in videos by characters discussing the importance of standing up against bullying and developing the confidence to stand up against bullying. It is unknown if the self-efficacy content affects the effectiveness of awareness campaigns. This content analysis of anti-bullying videos on YouTube seems to suggest that PSAs grounded in behavior change theory attract a large number of viewers and seem to be an important element in developing a successful PSA video launched through social media.

Research supports the use of explicit messaging over implicit messaging in increasing viewer self-efficacy through PSA videos (Shadel, Fryer, &Tharp-Taylor, 2010). A study of 110 adolescents (55% female) with an average age of 14.1 ($SD = 1.8$ years) asked the participants to rate their self-efficacy to resist smoking if offered a cigarette after viewing PSA videos. Participants viewed PSA videos containing content with a negative emotional tone, disturbing imagery, or both. The anti-smoking content was delivered explicitly or implicitly. Compared to implicit anti-smoking PSA videos, those videos with an explicit anti-smoking message were associated with increased smoking resistance self-efficacy.

PSAs that offer an explicit message are capable of influencing change. Additionally, those PSAs that address psychological aspects of the desired target behavior and are based on empirical evidence are more effective than those created from intuition and an artistic vision (Nolan, Schultz, & Knowles, 2009). The focus of the You Can Play Project PSA videos is to create respect and safety for LGB athletes within the sporting environment. The videos provide an explicit message encouraging athletes, coaches, and fans to openly support LGB athletes. The goal of You Can Play Project is equality and inclusion of LGB athletes in all sports and at all levels. It is expected that the You Can Play Project PSA video with an explicit message welcoming athletes of all sexual orientations will result in increased positive attitudes toward LGB athletes.

Limitations in the Current Literature

Although, the body of literature on attitudes toward LGB athletes is relatively consistent, it is quite small. There are a number of limitations in the literature, particularly related to the generalizability of the data. The vast majority of the literature is

qualitative in nature. This information provides a rich account of athlete experiences, providing more detailed information than could be gathered from a quantitative study. However, sample sizes in qualitative research are small and are not representative of the overall athlete population. Qualitative studies and the current quantitative studies are limited to particular geographic regions. Larger scale studies from the northeastern part of the United States tend to show more positive attitudes toward LGB individuals overall (Roper & Halloran, 2007) as might be reflected due to cultural differences with more states having legalized same sex marriage in that part of the country (Human Rights Campaign, 2013a). Similarly a large-scale study with a sample from the southern part of the United States (Southall et al., 2009) reflects the cultural landscape of that area as being less open and accepting of LGB individuals reflected in their laws restricting marriage to one man and one woman (Human Rights Campaign, 2013b). As of June 2015, 37 states plus the District of Columbia have passed laws allowing same sex marriages (Human Rights Campaign, 2015b). However, since 2000, 13 states have voted on constitutional amendments limiting marriage to one man and one woman, many of which are in the southern and midwestern parts of the country (Human Rights Campaign, 2015a).

The work of Anderson (2009, 2011a, 2011b, 2012) reflects a positive shift in the experiences of gay men within sports; however, the results of his research should be interpreted with caution. Anderson's samples largely come from athletes in California and areas of Europe that are socially and politically more open and accepting of LGB individuals, and this social acceptance is largely reflected in the qualitative data of his research. Finally, a handful of smaller studies have been conducted in the Midwest where

political attitudes toward LGB individuals seem to be mixed. In these studies, samples were homogeneous in terms of ethnicity, further limiting the ability to generalize to larger groups of individuals (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; Kauer & Krane, 2006; Wilkinson, 2004). A larger study representative of all major regions of the United States is needed, along with a sample that is representative of the ethnic diversity within sports.

Focus of the Current Study

The lack of research that evaluates interventions designed to alter attitudes and behaviors toward LGB individuals is a significant void. The focus of research up to this point has been on exploring LGB climate in colleges and collegiate athletics and understanding the attitudes toward LGB individuals within different areas of sports (i.e., athletes, coaches, athletic trainers; Ensign et al., 2011; Gill et al., 2006; Vargas-Tonsing & Oswalt, 2009; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2001). Advocacy movements in the past five years have taken advantage of technology and have disseminated public service announcement videos through the internet and social media outlets with the goal of decreasing homophobia in sports. Research has not evaluated the efficacy of such videos. The current study seeks to address this gap in the literature by evaluating the effectiveness of one of these campaigns in increasing positive attitudes toward LGB individuals in a sample of heterosexual National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) athletes.

Chapter 3

Method

Participants

Participants of the current study included 148 self-identified heterosexual female ($n = 120$) and male ($n = 28$) athletes competing on varsity NCAA Division I, II, and III sports teams throughout the United States who indicated their willingness to participate in the research prior to completing the online survey. An a priori power analysis indicated that a total sample of 99 participants, 33 in each of the three conditions, would be necessary for power of 0.80 and an alpha level of 0.05, assuming an effect size of 0.30 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). The final sample met that criterion. The athletes ranged in age from 18 to 23 years with an average age of 19.64 years ($SD = 1.17$). The majority of the sample identified as Caucasian/White ($n = 128$) followed by African American/Black ($n = 7$), Latino American/Hispanic American ($n = 7$), Asian American/Pacific Islander ($n = 2$), Biracial/multiracial ($n = 2$), other ($n = 1$), and no response ($n = 1$). The sample included athletes in all academic class years: 37.2% freshman, 26.4% junior, 23.0% sophomore, 12.2% senior, and 1.2% graduate student. The majority of the sample reported attending a co-ed university (95.3%) and five of the female athletes reported attending a single sex female university (3.4%).

Athletes were from 26 different home states and four countries, and were attending colleges/universities in 11 different states. Participants represented 16 different NCAA varsity sports. Participants indicated their average time on their current NCAA sport team was 2.11 years ($SD = 1.41$). All three division levels of the NCAA were represented in the sample: Division I – 45.9%, Division II – 20.3%, and Division III –

33.1%. One athlete reported being unsure of division level (0.8%). The majority of the sample reported receiving no athletic scholarship to their university (49.3%), followed by athletes who reported receiving partial athletic scholarship (37.2%), and athletes who reported receiving full athletic scholarship (13.5%).

The majority of the sample reported that they had had an opposite sex sexual experience (83.8%). The majority of the sample reported they had not had a same sex sexual experience (90.5%). Two participants did not report if they had a same sex sexual experience (1.4%) and 12 participants reported having had a same sex sexual experience (8.1%). Information on participants' contact with LGB individuals in their personal life (i.e., close family member or friend) and within sports (i.e., past or current teammate, coach or assistant coach) is provided in Table 1, along with information regarding harassment of LGB teammates.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Contact with LGB and Harassment of LGB Teammate

Variables	Yes	No	Unsure	Missing Data
<i>Life Contact</i>				
Family	26	114	5	3
Friend	100	42	3	3
<i>Sport Contact</i>				
Current Teammate	80	51	14	3
Past Teammate	89	45	11	3
Current Coach	22	109	14	3
Past Coach	45	90	9	4
Would Harass LGB	1	144	--	3
Do Harass LGB	3	142	--	3

Note. Coach includes head coach and/or assistant coach(es).

Measures

Demographics. As noted above, participants were asked to provide information regarding: age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, same sex sexual experience, opposite sex sexual experience, home state, and current academic year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, 5th year, graduate student). They were asked to provide the following information related to athletic participation: current NCAA sport, number of years on current team, NCAA Division level, athletic scholarship status (full,

partial, or none), the state in which their university or college is located, and if their university is co-ed or single sex. To assess previous and current contact with a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person (LGB) within their personal life and in sports, the athletes were asked to respond yes, no, or unsure to the following questions: Do you have a close family member(s) who identifies as LGB? Do you have a close friend(s) who identifies as LGB? Do you currently have a teammate who identifies as LGB? Have you had a teammate in the past who identified as LGB? Do you currently have a coach or assistant coach who identifies as LGB? Have you had a coach or assistant coach in the past who identified as LGB? To measure incidence of harassment, athletes were asked to respond yes or no to the following two questions: Would you harass a teammate who was out as LGB or suspected to be LGB? Are you currently harassing a teammate who is out as LGB or suspected to be LGB? This information was used to describe the sample.

Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS). The Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002) is a 12-item, unidimensional measure of homonegativity based in a modern, social, and political context rather than on religious or moral beliefs, or misconceptions. Items are normally answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*) with scores ranging from 12-60 with high scores indicating higher levels of modern homonegativity. Due to a survey construction error, the measure was inadvertently converted to a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*) with scores ranging from 12-84. Research has shown little difference in results when 5-point and 7-point scales are used (Dawes, 2007); therefore, the decision was made to use the 7-point recognizing that previously established psychometric properties might not apply. Example items include: “Many gay

men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges” and “Lesbians who are ‘out of the closet’ should be admired for their courage.” MHS scores have high internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .93 in a sample of 353 self-identified heterosexual university students (Morison & Morison, 2002). The scores were not correlated with a measure of social desirability (Morrison & Morrison, 2002), indicating that it may provide a more accurate measure of homonegativity. Evidence of construct validity has been demonstrated by positive correlations with scores of political conservatism, religious behavior, and modern sexism (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). For the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha estimate of internal consistency was high at 0.90.

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH). The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH; Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005) is a 28-item multidimensional measure of heterosexuals’ attitudes and knowledge toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. The LGB-KASH has five subscales measuring Hate (avoidance, hatred, and violence; “I sometimes think about being violent toward LGB people”), Knowledge of LGB History (basic knowledge of LGB history, symbols, and organizations; “I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement”), LGB Civil Rights (marriage, child rearing, health care, and insurance; “I think marriage should be legal for same sex couples”), Religious Conflict (conflicting beliefs and ambivalent homonegativity; “I can accept LGB people even though I condemn their behavior”), and Internalized Affirmativeness (personal affirmativeness and willingness toward LGB social action; “I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights”). Items are scored on a 6-point Likert-type

scale ranging from 1 (*very uncharacteristic of me*) to 6 (*very characteristic of me or my views*). There are no reverse scored items. Items in each subscale are averaged to provide individual subscale scores; there is no overall scale score. In the event of missing data, subscale scores are calculated using the items that have responses. Higher subscale scores indicate greater levels of endorsement of the area (i.e., LGB hate, LGB knowledge, LGB civil rights, religious conflict, internalized affirmativeness).

In a sample of heterosexual adults ages 18 to 57, including individuals of all educational backgrounds, the factor analysis revealed an acceptable fit for a five factor model with the following Cronbach's alphas: Hate .81, Knowledge of LGB History .81, LGB Civil Rights .87, Religious Conflict .76, and Internalized Affirmativeness .83 (Worthington et al., 2005). Similar high internal consistencies were demonstrated on all subscales in a sample of 574 self-identified heterosexual individuals (undergraduate students; graduate students; professional students; and university faculty, staff, and administrators): Hate .78, Knowledge of LGB History .80, LGB Civil Rights .88, Religious Conflict .73, Internalized Affirmativeness .74 (Worthington et al., 2005). A 2-week test-retest evaluation with a sample of 45 self-identified heterosexuals revealed adequate reliability over time: Hate .76, Knowledge of LGB History .85, LGB Civil Rights .85, Religious Conflict .77, Internalized Affirmativeness .90 (Worthington et al., 2005). In the current study, the coefficient alphas of the subscales were: Hate .71, LGB knowledge 0.79, LGB civil rights 0.88, religious conflict 0.77, and internalized affirmativeness 0.75.

LGB-KASH scores were related to heterosexual attitudes toward LGB individuals measured by scores on the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (ATLG;

Herek, 1984) and Attitudes Regarding Bisexuality Scale (ARBS; Mohr & Rochlen, 1999). Inverse correlations were found between LGB Civil Rights, LGB Knowledge, and Internalized Affirmativeness scale scores and negative attitudes toward LGB individuals on the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (Herek, 1984) and the Attitudes Regarding Bi-Sexuality Scale (Mohr & Rochlen, 1999). The Religious Conflict and Hate scale scores were positively correlated with scores on a measure of negative attitudes toward LGB individuals. The scale scores have shown high construct validity in a sample of LGBT and heterosexual participants (Worthington et al., 2005). LGBT individuals scored higher than heterosexuals on LBG Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized Affirmativeness and lower on Hate and Religious Conflict.

Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS). This measure was used as a distractor measure and was not analyzed as part of the current study. The Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS; Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993) is a 10-item measure of identifying with the athlete role. Items are answered on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Scores range from 10-70 with high scores indicating a stronger athletic identity. Example items include: “Sport is the most important part of my life” and “I would be very depressed if I were injured and could not compete in sport.” AIMS scores have acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 in a sample of 449 undergraduate psychology students and a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 in a sample of 90 collegiate football players (Brewer et al., 1993). In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.86. Evidence of construct validity has been demonstrated by positive correlations with scores of the role of the self in sport, sport

related competitiveness, sport win orientation, and sport goal orientation (Brewer et al., 1993).

Procedure

IRB approval was received and data were collected through an online survey platform. Recruitment emails and survey link were sent directly to NCAA athletic directors, coaches, and athletes. Emails were sent to the primary researcher's personal contacts who were asked to distribute the recruitment email and survey link to NCAA coaches and student athletes with whom they had contact. Additionally, the recruitment email and survey link were posted on the listserves of the American Psychological Association (APA) Division 47 (Sport and Exercise Psychology) and the Association of Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) asking members of the lists to distribute the survey to NCAA coaches and athletes.

The study utilized a randomized post-test only design. Using the features of the Qualtrics online survey platform, block randomization was used to assign participants to one of three conditions: control, experimental group A, or experimental group B. Participants responded to demographic items, and then watched one of three short videos, roughly one minute in length. The control group watched a video about sleep hygiene, experimental group A watched a generic anti-bullying video that has no relation to a sports or to the LGB population, and experimental group B watched a video featuring professional athletes promoting an open and inclusive sporting environment for LGB athletes (i.e., the You Can Play Project video). Following the video, participants responded to a set of condition check items asking if they had seen the video in the

survey prior to taking the survey, if they had seen videos produced by the You Can Play Project, and if they had heard of the You Can Play Project.

Participants then completed the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS; Brewer et al., 1993) scale, which was included primarily as a distractor measure. Participants then responded to the Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002) and Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH; Worthington et al., 2005) scales. At the end of the survey, participants were provided the option to be directed to another survey where they could provide an email address to be entered into a drawing for one of four \$25 Amazon gift cards.

Control Video. Participants in the control group watched a one minute long video featuring a neurologist providing information on the important benefits of sleep (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cc7mf_vl9Hw). The video highlights effects of sleep on the brain, such as influences on learning, memory, and reaction time. Suggestions on improving sleep hygiene are included in the video. This video was selected as the control video due to its similarity in length to the experimental videos, the content was relevant for college students, particularly student athletes, and the video content was not related to sports, bullying, or LGB issues.

Experimental Group A Video. Participants in experimental group A watched a one minute and one second in length video depicting personal negative impacts of bullying (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MIQf-wtOm-8>). It featured the song “Fuckin’ Perfect” by P!nk and used a slide-show type video format. The full video is in black and white, and begins with the words “pain, sadness, and hurt” in bold white

lettering appearing against a black background, one at a time. These words are followed by alternating images of young adults who look sad, hurt, or alone, and statistics about bullying (i.e., “Bullying is the most common form of violence in our society,” “One out of every ten students who drop out of school does so because of repeated bullying,” “71% of students report incidents of bullying as a problem at their school.”). The video ends emphasizing the main message encouraging viewers to speak up against bullying.

Experimental Group B Video. Participants in experimental group B watched a video produced by the You Can Play Project featuring an all-star athletic cast of male professional athletes from the Bay Area in California (<http://youcanplayproject.org/videos/entry/you-can-play-crisp-davis-reece-thompson-thornton-wondolowski-zito>). The video is one minute and one second long and all athletes in the video are clearly identified by their name, sport, and team affiliation. Baseball, football, basketball, and soccer are represented in the video. The message of the video explicitly states that the athletes are focused on winning and are not worried about a teammate’s sexual orientation. The following message is repeated during the video, “Gay, straight, bi, whatever. We don’t care. If you can play, you can play. On our team.” The You Can Play Project agreed to the use of their video in the study.

Chapter 4

Results

The following chapter presents the statistical analysis used to examine the research questions presented in Chapter 1. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 22.0. Data were checked for missing values, appropriate range and frequencies, and the normality of the distributions. Sixty-nine participants with substantial missing data (i.e., those who did not complete the full survey or those who were missing substantial data in measures) were removed from the analysis leaving the final sample size of 148. Forty-two participants dropped out of the survey following the demographic questions, 23 dropped out following the video, and 4 participants dropped out in the middle of the study questionnaires leaving insufficient responses for inclusion in the analyses. Ranges and frequencies were within normal limits, and the data met underlying assumptions of normality. Examining the skew in data, three cases of statistical outliers were found with a Mahalanobis distance greater than 16.27 (Stevens, 2002). The cases were removed and analyses were rerun revealing no significant difference in outcome. Responses for the three cases were evaluated and there was no theoretical reason to remove them. Therefore, the cases were placed back in the data set and included in the study analyses.

Preliminary Analyses

Based on literature documenting that men frequently report more negative attitudes toward LGB individuals (Ensign et al., 2011; Gill et al., 2006; Hary, 1995; Keiller, 2010; Roper & Halloran, 2007; Southall et al., 2009), preliminary analyses examined whether there were gender differences on the measures of homonegativity and knowledge and attitudes. The overall level of homonegativity for the full sample assessed

by the MHS was $M = 36.50$ ($SD = 14.37$). An independent sample t -test revealed a significant difference between female ($M = 34.63$, $SD = 14.21$) and male ($M = 44.50$, $SD = 12.34$) participants on overall homonegativity measured by the MHS $t(146) = -3.39$, $p < .01$. Given the large difference in sample sizes (females $n = 120$, males $n = 28$), a random sample of 28 female participants was selected and another independent sample t -test was calculated. Results revealed a significant difference between females ($M = 33.61$, $SD = 12.70$) and males ($M = 44.50$, $SD = 12.34$) on overall homonegativity, $t(54) = -3.26$, $p < .01$.

A MANOVA was conducted to examine gender difference on the subscales of the LGB-KASH. Results revealed a significant difference at the multivariate level between female and male participants [Pillai's Trace = .13, $F(5, 142) = 4.23$, $p = .001$]. Significant results at the univariate level were found on the subscales of LGB hate [$F(1, 146) = 10.56$, $p < .05$] and internal affirmativeness [$F(1, 146) = 15.16$, $p < .05$]. Again because of the large difference in sample sizes for women and men, a random sample of 28 female participants was selected and another MANOVA was calculated. Similar to the analysis on the full sample, results revealed a significant difference at the multivariate level between female and male participants [$\lambda = .75$, $F(5, 50) = 3.27$, $p < .05$]. Significant results at the univariate level were found on the subscales of LGB hate [$F(1, 54) = 6.58$, $p < .05$] and internal affirmativeness [$F(1, 54) = 12.30$, $p < .05$]. Due to the significant differences on the dependent variables, the data from female and male participants cannot be combined. Subsequent descriptive results present findings separately for female and male participants. Due to the small number of male participants, tests of the effectiveness of the intervention used data from only the female participants. A chi square test of

independence on the subsample of female participants was conducted to examine if female participants differed by intervention group. Results indicated no relationship between condition and if the participants had seen the intervention You Can Play video ($\chi^2 [2, N = 120] = 0.86, p > .05$), had heard of the You Can Play project ($\chi^2 [2, N = 120] = 1.17, p > .05$), or had previously seen any You Can Play video ($\chi^2 [2, N = 120] = 0.49, p > .05$).

Analysis of Intervention Effect

Using block randomization, participants were randomly assigned to one of the three video conditions: You Can Play (females $n = 44$; males $n = 7$), sleep (females $n = 40$; males $n = 10$), and anti-bullying (female $n = 36$; males $n = 11$). The majority of the sample had not seen the video in the condition they were randomly assigned to (93.2%). All participants were asked if they had heard about the You Can Play project; 83.1% indicated that they had not heard of the You Can Play project and 90.5% indicated that they had not seen a video produced by the You Can Play project. Analyses testing the effect of the intervention condition were conducted with data from only the female participants as there was an insufficient number male participants in the three condition to examine their responses separately from the female participants and they differed too much on the measures to have their data combined.

To address the research question of whether an intervention designed to promote and increase an open and accepting sporting environment for LGB athletes would change heterosexual NCAA student athletes' attitudes about LGB individuals, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated to test whether participants in the three conditions differed on overall levels of homonegativity measured by the MHS. A multivariate

analysis of variance (MANOVA) was calculated to test if groups differed on four of the five subscales of the LGB-KASH. The subscale of LGB knowledge was removed from the analyses because the intervention video did not provide any factual information on LGB history. It is unlikely that the video would change participants' level of LGB knowledge as measured by the subscale.

Results of the ANOVA revealed a non-significant main effect of the video intervention on overall homonegativity as measured by the MHS [$F(2, 120) = .29, p > .05$]. Results of the MANOVA revealed a non-significant main effect of the video condition on the subscales of the LGB-KASH, with the knowledge subscale removed, [$\lambda = .92, F(8, 228) = 1.29, p > .05$]. The hypotheses of the study were not supported. Means and standard deviations by condition are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables by Condition for Female Participants (n = 120)

	You Can Play		Anti-Bullying		Control	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
LGB-K	1.99	.93	1.96	.92	2.04	.95
LGB-H	1.41	.62	1.40	.44	1.38	.60
LGB-CR	5.27	.86	4.79	1.37	4.98	1.26
LBB-RC	2.99	1.12	2.73	1.12	2.67	1.24
LGB-IA	3.15	.86	3.04	1.31	3.28	1.33
MHS	34.34	12.83	36.08	13.99	33.65	16.00

Note. LGB-K = LGB-KASH Knowledge Subscale; LGB-H = LGB-KASH Hate Subscale; LGB-CR = LGB-KASH Civil Rights Subscale; LGB-RC = LGB-KASH Religious Conflict Subscale; LGB-IA = LGB-KASH Internal Affirmativeness Subscale; MHS = Modern Homonegativity Scale

Post hoc analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) and multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) were run examining the effects of the intervention video controlling for LGB contact in life (i.e., close family member or friend) and in sport (i.e., past or current teammate/coach/assistant coach) for the female athletes. Results of the ANCOVA analyses indicated no significant main effect on overall level of homonegativity assessed by the MHS total score when controlling for life contact [$F(2, 117) = .29, p > .05$] or sport contact [$F(2, 117) = .38, p > .05$]. Results of the MANCOVA analyses revealed a significant main effect of the covariate of LGB life contact on the set of means of four LGB-KASH subscales (LGB knowledge subscale was removed), [$\lambda = .90, F(4, 112) = 3.19, p < .05$] explaining 10.2% of the variance ($\eta^2 =$

.10). Significant findings at the univariate level were found on the internalized affirmativeness subscale [$F(1, 115) = .18, p < .05$] explaining less than 1% of the variance ($\eta^2 = .002$). Results of the MANCOVA controlling for sport contact revealed a non-significant main effect of the covariate of LGB sport contact on the set of means of four LGB-KASH subscales [$\lambda = .94, F(4, 115) = 1.82, p > .05$].

Descriptive and Correlational Analyses

The second research question addressed the current level of knowledge of LGB history and attitudes held by heterosexual NCAA student athletes and examined any associations between knowledge of LGB history and attitudes toward LGB individuals. Associations between knowledge of LGB history and specific attitudes toward LGB individuals were examined via Pearson correlation coefficient analyses. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the study variables for female and male participants are reported in Table 3. Scores of homonegativity measured by the MHS fall in the range of 12-84, with a midpoint of 48. Data for the female participants had a good range of variance and scores on the MHS indicate a lower level of homonegativity within this sample. Data for the male participants had a good range of variance and scores on the MHS indicate a moderate level of homonegativity within this sample. Scores for the subscales of the LGB-KASH fall in the range of 1-6, with a midpoint of 3.5. Females and males in this study reported low levels of knowledge of LGB history and low levels of LGB hate. Data on both scales had a positive skew. Females and males reported high levels of LGB civil rights, with females reporting slightly more. Females reported low to moderate levels of religious conflict and males reported moderate levels of religious conflict with a slight negative skew in the data. Females reported moderate level of

internal affirmativeness and males reported lower levels of internal affirmativeness with a slight negative skew in the data.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Study Variables for Female (n = 120) and Male Participants (n = 28)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	Means	SD
1 LGB-K	--	-.10	-.08	.37	.10	.37	1.83	1.00
2 LGB-H	.15	--	-.55**	-.23	-.26	.54**	1.83	.93
3 LGB-CR	.21*	-.53**	--	-.09	.63**	-.70**	4.63	1.25
4 LGB-RC	-.06	.44**	-.43**	--	-.19	.20	3.12	.88
5 LGB-IA	.50**	-.28**	.61**	-.47**	--	-.53**	2.34	1.04
6 MHS	-.33**	.39**	-.64**	.54**	-.63**	--	44.50	12.34
Means	2.00	1.39	5.03	2.81	3.16	34.54		
SD	.93	.56	1.17	1.16	1.17	14.21		

Note. Lower triangle includes correlations among female athletes. Upper triangle includes correlations among male athletes. LGB-K = LGB-KASH Knowledge Subscale; LGB-H = LGB-KASH Hate Subscale; LGB-CR = LGB-KASH Civil Rights Subscale; LGB-RC = LGB-KASH Religious Conflict Subscale; LGB-IA = LGB-KASH Internal Affirmativeness Subscale; MHS = Modern Homonegativity Scale

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

For the female participants, knowledge of LGB history was significantly correlated with LGB civil rights ($r = 0.21, p < 0.05$), internal affirmativeness ($r = 0.50, p < 0.01$), and overall homonegativity ($r = -0.33, p < 0.01$). For the male participants, knowledge of LGB history was not significantly correlated with any of the other dependent variables although this could be the result of the small sample size. For the female participants, MHS was significantly correlated with all of the other dependent

variables. For the male participants, MHS scores were significantly correlated with LGB hate, LGB civil rights, and internal affirmativeness.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The goal of the current study was to describe the current climate in NCAA athletics in terms of heterosexual student athletes' attitudes toward LGB individuals and to examine the effectiveness of an intervention video intended to promote an open and inclusive environment in sport for LGB athletes. Results of the current study found that self-identified female NCAA athletes have significantly lower levels of homonegativity than self-identified male NCAA athletes, which is consistent with previous literature (Roper & Halloran, 2007; Southall et al., 2009). Previous literature has shown that harassment within sports based on sexual orientation is common (Brackenridge et al., 2007; GLSEN, 2013), and male athletes engage in harassment more than female athletes (Southall et al., 2009). In general, student athletes in this current study did not report engaging in harassment of known or suspected LGB teammates (3 out of 148 athletes reported they did harass). Similarly, the current study did not find gender differences on amount of harassment; however, it is possible that the small number of male athletes in the study did not capture the full picture of harassment among male athletes within the NCAA. It is also possible that the results of the current study indicate a shift within NCAA athletics toward less harassment based on sexual orientation.

A potential reason for greater tolerance and affirmation for minority or outgroups in general is increased contact with members of those groups (Bieschke, Perez, & DeBord, 2010; Sue & Sue, 2013). Most of the athletes in the current study reported having contact with an LGB person in their personal life (i.e., a close family member or friend) or within sport (i.e., a past or current teammate, coach, or assistant coach). As

with multicultural literature on other diverse groups, previous research indicates that contact with an LGB individual is related to less negative attitudes toward LGB individuals (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; Roper & Halleran, 2009), but contact with an LGB individual within sports has not been measured. Based on results of the covariate analyses, the current research suggests that contact with a close family member or friend who identifies as LGB may have an influence on increased internal affirmativeness. However, the results did not support similar impact of contact with an LGB teammate and/or coach. It is reasonable to conclude that having a close family member or friend who identifies as LGB would expose an individual to more information about LGB history and civil rights, and influence that individual's personal reflection and growth in terms of hate, religious conflict and internal affirmativeness of LGB individuals.

The measures used in the current study allowed for a multidimensional understanding of homophobia and homonegativity that has not been previously explored in a population of NCAA student athletes. Correlations between knowledge of LGB history and the four other subscales of the LGB-KASH and MHS revealed differences between women and men in the current study. For women, knowledge of LGB history (i.e., the meaning behind the pink triangle, significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement, knowledge of the PFLAG organization history and mission) was associated with higher levels of internalized affirmativeness, increased levels of support for LGB civil rights, and lower levels of homonegativity. As noted earlier, correlations between knowledge and these scales were not significant for men, but this could be partially due to the smaller number of men in the sample. If the correlations between knowledge and religious conflict or homonegativity are squared for a rough estimate of

the proportion of variance of one variable that is predictable from the other variable, then 13.7% of the variance in religious conflict and 13.7% of the variance in homonegativity was related to LGB knowledge. This would compare to 4.41% and 10.89% for the women in the sample, suggesting that a larger number of men in the sample would have resulted in statistically significant correlations similar to those in the female sample.

Correlations between the measure of homonegativity and the subscales of the LGB-KASH were generally similar for men and women in the current study. Homonegativity was found to be significantly correlated with all subscales of the LGB-KASH for women and several for men. Previous research with athletic populations has not used the LGB-KASH scale, so the findings of the current study added to the literature providing a more detailed look into the various dimensions of homophobia and homonegativity that the scale evaluates.

The findings suggest that knowledge of LGB history and awareness of unique civil rights issues faced by LGB individuals may be important factors to include in advocacy efforts. Specific trainings, interventions, or awareness campaigns aimed at athletes, particularly female athletes, may be more successful if they included facts about the gay rights movement. Including personal stories of LGB athlete's experiences in sports, including personal and political struggles they faced, may enhance effectiveness for both female and male athletes. The recent increase in media coverage on the fight for marriage equality could be having a positive influence on decreasing homonegativity by way of increasing awareness of LGB civil rights issues and potentially providing information on LGB history. A recent poll has indicated that 6 in 10 Americans are in

support of same sex marriage, and support among individuals under age 30 has increased from 57% in 2005 to 78% in 2015 (Clement & Barnes, 2015).

The video produced by the You Can Play Project was the main intervention video of interest in this study. This is the first study to investigate the effectiveness of You Can Play Project videos and, to the researcher's knowledge, the first study to investigate an intervention intended to reduce homophobia in sports at the NCAA level. The current study did not detect a significant change in NCAA female athletes' attitudes toward LGB individuals following viewing the video. There are several possible explanations for this finding. Consistent with the previous literature (Ensign et al., 2011; Gill et al., 2006; Roper & Halloran, 2007; Southall et al., 2009), the females in this study reported lower levels of homonegativity and negative attitudes overall. Given their generally positive attitudes and restricted range in the data, it could be difficult to detect an impact of the intervention video. An additional potential explanation is the study design. Data were collected immediately following viewing the video. It is possible that more time is needed for processing the video message. The sleeper effect suggests that allowing time for processing following a persuasive message leads to more desirable results than when measured immediately following exposure to the message (Kumkale & Albarracin, 2004). Future research with a delayed follow up is needed. Participants viewed the intervention video one time. In a real world scenario, multiple exposures to public service announcements are more likely. Future research should also examine the impact of repeated exposure to the intervention video.

The videos produced by the You Can Play project all share the same message that all athletes are welcome to play regardless of their sexual orientation. It is possible that a

basic welcoming message is not strong enough to change the attitudes of athletes who hold more negative views. The campaign may consider including information about LGB history and civil rights into their messages to strengthen the impact. Additionally, the professional athletes in the video were all men, which might have minimized the impact of social modeling for the all female sample (Bandura, 1977). Athletes in the current study represented a variety of NCAA sports, at all three division levels of the NCAA, competing at colleges and universities across the country; however, 83% of the athletes had not heard of the You Can Play Project. This simple finding highlights that there is still work to be done in disseminating the videos and message of the You Can Play Project and similar campaigns.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations in the current study. The measures were self-report and participants may have realized the constructs of interest in the study and responded in a socially desirable way, particularly given the topic's current social relevance. In effort to decrease the likelihood of socially desirable responses, participants completed the measures through an online platform that ensured their confidentiality and contact with the researcher was limited to the initial recruitment email. Additionally, previous research had shown that scores on the Modern Homonegativity Scale were not related to scores on a social desirability measure. Still, it is not possible to rule out the possibility of socially desirable responses.

Participant sampling technique is another limitation of the current study. Individuals within NCAA athletics contacted by the researcher had to be willing to disseminate the study information; this may have impacted the type of athletes sampled.

Individuals who agreed to pass on the link may be more invested in the research topic and may have sent it to those who would also be viewed as interested or positive toward the topic. Individuals may have read the recruitment email and agreed or declined to pass on the survey given the stated topic of the study (i.e., interest in student athlete's attitudes toward sexuality). Clearly, the small number of men in the sample and the inability to include them in the test of the intervention is a large limitation. Traditionally men are more difficult to recruit for research participation, so future research should focus on approaches that might increase their participation.

A post-test only design with immediate assessment of homonegativity following the intervention video was chosen for the study due to sensitivity to demands on student athletes' time and the difficulty in getting student athletes to complete the study measures at two time points while maintaining their confidentiality. An ideal design for this study would be a pre-test post-test design with a time delay between the intervention video and the post-test measures. Although this design would be more challenging to carry out with limited resources, future research on the effectiveness of similar media campaigns should consider a more rigorous design.

The majority of the sample identified as Caucasian, which limits the generalizability of the findings to athletes of diverse racial identities. The sample was primarily female, which limited testing the effects of the intervention to women. Finally, the high level of contact with LGB individuals in this study, particularly within the sample of female athletes, further limits the generalizability of the findings.

Clinical Implications

Currently there are two campaigns that the researcher is aware of that focus specifically on combating homophobia and creating an open and inclusive environment in sports for all athletes: the You Can Play Project and Athlete Ally. Results of this study indicate that these campaigns may not be reaching NCAA student athletes since few participants had heard of or viewed the YCPP videos. This provides an opportunity for advocacy at the university level. Current ally training programs at universities such as Safe Zone have an opportunity to expand their trainings and advocacy efforts to athletics departments. Trainings and advocacy efforts should be tailored to sports and the specific athletic culture of the university and its affiliated athletic conference as much as possible. Individuals working to bridge the gap to an athletics department would benefit from completing a needs assessment to further understand the culture of the university athletics department and teams. As the current research suggests, the cultures and knowledge base of female and male teams are likely to be different; therefore, advocacy and training efforts may require different approaches with female and male athletes and coaches.

Collaborating across universities and with You Can Play and Athlete Ally projects would be a great way to extend advocacy efforts, share ideas, learn from each other's challenges and successes, and to begin to work together to combat the hegemonic masculine hierarchy within sport that helps to maintain the deep rooted homophobia.

Directions for Future Research

There are a number of directions for future research based on the findings of this study. It would be important for research in this area to include a larger sample of self-identified male NCAA student athletes. Given the brief duration of the intervention, a

longitudinal study with multiple exposures to videos produced by the You Can Play project using a pre-test post-test design to measure the influence of the video on homonegativity over time would provide a strong study design. Research with a sample of female athletes might consider using the sport measure Heterosexist Attitudes in Sports-Lesbian (HAS-L; Mullin, 2013) that includes a measure of avoidance of the lesbian label, a construct unique to sport culture. Including this measure would provide further understanding of heterosexual athletes' experience and the interplay of homophobia and heterosexism in sports. Given the current findings on the relationship between knowledge of LGB history and more positive LGB attitudes, future interventions presenting information on LGB history would be important to evaluate.

The measure of athletic identity was used as a distractor measure in the current study; future research could look at the relationship between athletic identity and homonegativity within a student athlete population. Given the strength of hegemonic masculinity in sports, it is possible that acceptance of LGB individuals in sports could pose a threat to heterosexual athletes' athletic identities, particularly heterosexual male athletes.

The current study focused on NCAA student athletes. Other populations that might benefit from the intervention include coaches, athletic administrators, and athletic support personnel (i.e., athletic trainers, strength and conditioning coaches). Additionally, research could focus on the impact of the intervention videos on decreasing levels of internalized homophobia in self-identified lesbian, gay, or bisexual athletes, coaches, and administrators.

Measures are often reevaluated for use across cultures and with more diverse populations. Future research could include development of a sport specific measure of homophobia, potentially building a subscale into the LGB-KASH to consider some of the unique aspects of sports such as the emphasis on sameness and group cohesion.

Conclusions

In summary, heterosexual female NCAA student athletes have lower levels of homonegativity than heterosexual male NCAA student athletes. Contact with an LGB individual continues to be an important factor influencing lower levels of homonegativity, particularly among female athletes who have close friends or family who identify as LGB. The You Can Play Project one-minute video intervention was not an effective intervention for reducing levels of homophobia in heterosexual female NCAA student athletes. Based on the current study, it is still unknown if the intervention would be effective with heterosexual male NCAA student athletes. It seems that sports environments at the NCAA level for female athletes may be more open and accepting of lesbian and bisexual athletes, and possibly coaches, suggesting a possible shift within the athletic culture that challenges the dominant hegemonic masculine framework of sports. Continued advocacy and outreach is needed within sports to combat homophobia, to educate athletes about LGB history, and to encourage more athletes, coaches, and administrators to voice their support welcoming all athletes, regardless of sexual orientation.

References

- Anderson, A. R., & Mowatt, R. A. (2013). Heterosexism in campus recreational club sports: An exploratory investigation into attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Recreational Sports Journal, 37*, 106-122.
- Anderson, E. (2002). Openly gay athletes contesting hegemonic masculinity in a homophobic environment. *Gender & Society, 16*(6), 860-877. doi: 10.1177/089124302237892
- Anderson, E. (2008). "Being masculine is not about who you sleep with..." Heterosexual athletes contesting masculinity and the one-time rule of homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 58*, 104-115. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9337-7
- Anderson, E. (2009). The maintenance of masculinity among the stakeholders of sport. *Sport Management Review, 12*, 3-14. doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2008.09.003
- Anderson, E. (2011a). Masculinities and sexualities in sport and physical cultures: Three decades of evolving research. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*, 565-578. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2001.563652
- Anderson, E. (2011b). Updating the outcome: Gay athletes, straight teams, and coming out in educationally based sports teams. *Gender & Society, 25*, 250-268. doi: 10.1177/0891243210396872
- Anderson, E. (2012). The changing relationship between men's homosexuality and sport. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), *Sexual orientation and gender identity in sport: Essays from activists, coaches and scholars* (pp. 35-45). College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.

- Archer, T. (2014, October 21). Michael Sam waived by Cowboys. *ESPN*. Retrieved from <http://espn.go.com>
- Associated Press. (2012, November 7). Democrat Tammy Baldwin wins Wisconsin senate seat, becoming first openly gay US senator. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <http://foxnews.com>
- Associated Press. (2013, August 15). Gay boxer Orlando Cruz to marry. *ESPN Boxing*. Retrieved from <http://espn.go.com>
- Athlete Ally. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.athleteally.com>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Baseball Almanac. (2013). Black famous baseball firsts. Retrieved from <http://www.baseball-almanac.com>
- Bell, R. C. (2007). A history of women in sport prior to Title IX. *The Sport Journal*, *10*(2). Retrieved from <http://www.thesportjournal.org>
- Bieschke, K. J., Perez, R. M., & DeBord, K. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender clients* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: The American Psychological Association.
- Borden, S. (2013, April 18). Female star comes out as gay, and sports world shrugs. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Bowen, A. M., & Bourgeois, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: The contribution of pluralistic ignorance, dynamic social impact, and contact theories. *Journal of American College Health*, *50*, 91-96. doi: 10.1080/07448480109596012

- Brackenridge, C., Rivers, I., Gough, B., & Llewellyn, K. (2007). Driving down participation: Homophobic bullying as a deterrent to doing sport. In C. C. Aitchison (Ed.), *Sport and Gender Identities: Masculinities, Femalities, and Sexualities*. New York: Routledge.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (1993). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or Achilles heel? *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24, 237-254.
- Brydum, S. (2013, May). Robbie Rogers becomes first openly gay Major League Soccer player. *Advocate*. Retrieved from <http://www.advocate.com>
- Buzinski, J. (2012, July 2). U.S. Olympic soccer player Megan Rapione makes it official: She's a lesbian. *Outsports*. Retrieved from <http://www.outsports.com>
- Chase, C. (2013, April 5). Could four gay NFL players come out at the same time? *USA Today Sports*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com>
- Christopherson, N., Janning, M., & McConnell, E. D. (2002). Two kicks forward, one kick back: A content analysis of media discourses on the 1999 women's World Cup soccer championship. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19, 170-188.
- Clarey, C. (2015, January 13). Martina Navratilova adds coach and wife to list of titles. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Clement, S., & Barnes, R. (2015, April 23). Poll: Gay-marriage support at record high. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Cooky, C., Wachs, F. L., Messner, M., & Dworkin, S. L. (2010). It's not about the game: Don Imus, race, class, gender, and sexuality in contemporary media. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 27, 139-159.

- Corrigan, P. W. (2012). Where is the evidence supporting public service announcement to eliminate mental illness stigma? *Psychiatric Services, 63*, 79-82.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2012). Bridging the gap: Researchers and activists pursuing LGBT equality in sport. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), *Sexual orientation and gender identity in sport: Essays from activists, coaches and scholars* (pp. 69-77). College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.
- Dawes, J. (2007). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales. *International Journal of Market Research, 50*, 61-77.
- Eng, H. (2008). Doing sexuality in sport. *Journal of Homosexuality, 54*, 68-102. doi: 10.1080/00918360801951962
- Ensign, K. A., Yiamouyiannis, A., White, K. M., & Ridpath, B. D. (2011). Athletic trainers' attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual national collegiate athletic association student-athletes. *Journal of Athletic Training, 46*, 76-81. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-46.1.76
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.
- Freedman, M. (2013, November 20). The inside story of how the NFL's plan for its 1st openly gay player fell apart. *Bleacher Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.bleacherreport.com>.

- Garcia, M. (2013, February 15). Soccer player Robbie Rogers comes out, retires. *The Advocate*. Retrieved from <http://www.advocate.com>
- 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.
- GLSEN (2013). *The experiences of LGBT students in school athletics (Research Brief)*. New York: GLSEN.
- Gough, B. (2007). Coming out in the heterosexist world of sport: A qualitative analysis of web postings by gay athletes. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy, 11*, 153-174. doi: 10.1300/J236v11n01_11
- Griffin, P. (1993). Homophobia in women's sport: The fear that divides us. In G. L. Cohen (Ed.), *Women In Sport, Issues and Controversies* (pp. 193-203). London, England: Sage.
- Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Griffin, P. (1999). Lesbian and bisexual women in sport. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 70*(4), 53-55.
- Griffin, P. (2012). LGBT equality in sports: Celebrating our successes and facing our challenges. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), *Sexual orientation and gender identity in sport: Essays from activists, coaches and scholars* (pp. 1-12). College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.
- Hardin, M., & Whiteside, E. (2010). The Rene Portland case: New homophobia and heterosexism in women's sports coverage. In H. L. Hundley & A. C. Billins

(Eds.), *Examining identity in sports media* (pp. 17-36). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 39-51.

Hess, A. (2014, February 10). 17 Extraordinary gay and lesbian athletes. *Takepart*. Retrieved from <http://www.takepart.com>

Human Rights Campaign. (2013a, November 13). Marriage equality and other relationship recognition laws. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/statelaws>

Human Rights Campaign. (2013b, November 13). Statewide marriage prohibitions. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/statelaws>

Human Rights Campaign. (2015a, June 5). What's at stake: Potential for nationwide marriage equality following Supreme Court ruling. Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org/blog>

Human Rights Campaign. (2015b, June 8). Maps of stat laws and policies. Retrieved from http://www.hrc.org/state_maps

Hurley, L., & Ingram, D. (2013, March 26). Supreme Court indicates it may strike down marriage law. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com>

Kauer, K. J., & Krane, V. (2006). "Scary dykes" and "feminine queens": Stereotypes and female collegiate athletes. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 15*, 42-55.

Keane, E. (2014, October 30). Tim Cook comes out: Here's why it matters when public figures are open about their sexuality. *Salon*. Retrieved from <http://www.salon.com>

- Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*, 38-52. doi: 10.1037/a0017540
- Krane, V. (2001). We can be athletic and feminine, but do we want to? Challenging hegemonic femininity in women's sport. *Quest, 53*, 115-133.
- Kumkale, G. T., & Albarracin, D. (2004). The sleeper effect in persuasion: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 1*, 143-172. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.143
- Lavers, M. K. (2013, August 28). Martina Navratilova: Coming 'full circle.' *Washington Blade*. Retrieved from <http://washingtonblade.com>
- Liptak, A. (2015, April 28). Gay marriage arguments divide Supreme Court Justices. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Lister, C., Brutsch, E., Johnson, A., Boyer, C., Hall, P. C., & West, J. (2013). It gets better: A content analysis of health behavior theory in anti-bullying YouTube videos. *International Journal of Health, 1*, 17-24.
- Lowery, W. (2014, June 14). Same-sex marriage is gaining momentum, but some advocates don't want it on the ballot in Ohio. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Madden, A. (2015, March 14). Gay athletes call on others to come out. *Time Warner Cable News*. Retrieved from <http://www.twcnews.com>
- Marcus, R. (2013, March 26). Supreme Court seems to be inching toward marriage equality. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://washingtonpost.com>

- Matthews, D. (2013, June 26). The Supreme Court struck down party of DOMA. Here's what you need to know. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- McClam, E. (2013, April 29). NBA center Jason Collins comes out: 'I'm black. And I'm gay.' *NBC News*. Retrieved from <http://usnews.nbcnews.com>
- Mentz, C. (2015, January 5). Escape from the ex-gay movement. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- Mohr, J. J., & Rochlen, A. B. (1999). Measuring attitudes regarding bisexuality in lesbian, gay male, and heterosexual populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 353-369. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.46.3.353
- Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2002). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality 43*(2), 15-37. doi: 10.1300/J082v43n02_02
- Morrow, D. (2002). Olympic masculinity: An analysis of Canadian newspapers during the 1976, 1988, and 2000 Olympic Games. *International Symposium for Olympic Research, 123-134*.
- Muir, K. B., & Seitz, T. (2004). Machismo, misogyny, and homophobia in a male athletic subculture: A participant-observation study of deviant rituals in college rugby. *Deviant Behavior, 25*, 303-327. doi: 10.1080/01639620490267294
- Mullin, E. M. (2013). Scale development: Heterosexist attitudes in women's collegiate athletics. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 17*, 1-21. doi: 10.1080/1091367X.2013.741357

- Murphy, M. (2014, November 9). Jason Collins retires: Veteran big man was the league's first openly gay player. *NBA*. Retrieved from <http://www.nba.com>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2012). History. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2014). *Cross country/track and field: 2015 and 2016 rules*. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.
- Nolan, J. M., Schultz, P. W., & Knowles, E. S. (2009). Using public service announcements to change behavior: No more money and oil down the drain. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*, 1035-1056.
- Official website of the Olympic Movement. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.olympic.org>.
- O'Connor, L. (2015, April 30). Anti-gay GOP politician comes out after being caught sending explicit photos on Grindr. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- O'Keeffe, M. (2013, April 5). Could four gay NFL players come out at the same time? Ex-Baltimore Ravens LB Brendon Ayabadejo says it's possible. *The New York Daily Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nydailynews.com>
- Reuters. (2012, December 30). Supreme Court to hear two cases on same-sex marriage. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Rhoden, W. C. (2005, July 9). U.S. dominance caused softball's Olympic demise. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>

- Roper, E. A., & Halloran, E. (2009). Attitudes toward gay men and lesbians among heterosexual male and female student-athletes. *Sex Roles, 57*, 919-928. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9323-0
- Satore, M. L., & Cunningham, G. B. (2009). The lesbian stigma in the sport context: Implications for women of every sexual orientation. *Quest, 61*(3), 289-305. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2009.10483617
- Schwartz, L. (n.d.). Billie Jean won for all women. *ESPN*. Retrieved from <http://www.espn.go.com>
- Sebor, J. (2015). The history of women's running. *Active.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.active.com>
- Shadel, W. G., Fryer, C. S., & Tharp-Taylor, S. (2010). Tobacco industry manipulation messages in anti-smoking public service announcements: The effect of explicitly versus implicitly delivering messages. *Addictive Behaviors, 35*, 526-529. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.12.023
- Southall, R. M., Anderson, E. D., Nagel, M. S., Polite, F. G., & Southall, C. (2011). An investigation of ethnicity as a variable related to US male college athletes' sexual-orientation behaviours and attitudes. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 34*, 293-313. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2010.495409
- Southall, R. M., Nagel, M. S., Anderson, E. D., Polite, F. G., & Southall, C. (2009). An investigation of male college athletes' attitudes toward sexual-orientation. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 2009 Special Issue*, 62-77.
- Stevens, J. (2002). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (4th Ed.). Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.

- Stoelting, S. (2011). Disclosure as an interaction: why lesbian athletes disclose their sexual identities in intercollegiate sport. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 1187-1210. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2011.605731
- Stone, A. (2015, March 31). Montreal Alouettes GM says team has 50/50 chance of signing Michael Sam. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.ftw.usatoday.com>
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse* (6th Ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Swoopes, C. (2006, April 12). Outside the arc. *ESPN*. Retrieved from <http://sports.espn.go.com>
- The Human Rights Campaign. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.hrc.org>
- Tuohy, L. (2012, December 30). Gene Robinson: First gay Anglican bishop reflects on tenure in New Hampshire. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com>
- US Lacrosse. (2009). About the sport: Overview. Retrieved from <http://www.uslacrosse.org>
- Vargas-Tonsing, T. M., & Oswalt, S. B. (2009). Coaches' efficacy beliefs towards working with gay, lesbian, and bisexual athletes. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 3(2), 29-42.
- West, R. V. (1998). The female athlete: The triad of disordered eating, amenorrhea, and osteoporosis. *Sports Medicine*, 26(2). 63-71.
- Whisenant, W. A., Pedersen, P. M., & Obenour, B. L. (2002). Success and gender: Determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles*, 47, 485-491. doi: 10.1023/A:1021656628604

- Wilkinson, W. W. (2004). Authoritarian hegemony, dimensions of masculinity, and male antigay attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*, 121-131. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.121
- Wire, C. (2014, February 12). Michael Sam squashes status quo. *CNN Opinion*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com>
- Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Toma, J. D., & Morpew, C. C. (2001). How much difference is too much difference? Perceptions of gay men and lesbians in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 465-479.
- Worthington, R. L., Dillon, F. R., & Becker-Schutte, A. M. (2005). Development, reliability, and validity of the lesbian, gay, and bisexual knowledge and attitudes scale for heterosexuals (LGB-KASH). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 104-118. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.104
- You Can Play. (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.youcanplayproject.org>

Appendix A
Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions.

1. Your age
2. Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?
 - a. Caucasian/White
 - b. African American/Black
 - c. Asian American/Pacific Islander
 - d. Latino American/Hispanic American
 - e. Native American/American Indian
 - f. Biracial/multiracial
 - g. International, please specify
 - h. Other, please specify
3. What is your home state or country?
 - a. Dropdown box provided
4. What state is your university located in?
 - a. Dropdown box provided
5. My university is best described as:
 - a. Co-ed (both male and female undergraduates)
 - b. Single sex, only males
 - c. Single sex, only females
6. What is your current academic year?
 - a. Freshman

- b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
 - e. 5th year
 - f. Graduate student
7. What is your current NCAA sport? If you play two NCAA sports please select the one you identify with more strongly.
- a. Drop down box provided with all NCAA sports
8. How many years have you been a member of the team indicated above?
9. What NCAA Division level do you play in?
- a. Division I
 - b. Division II
 - c. Division III
 - d. Unsure
10. Do you have an athletic scholarship?
- a. Yes, full athletic scholarship
 - b. Yes, partial athletic scholarship
 - c. No athletic scholarship
11. Have you ever had an opposite sex sexual experience?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
12. Have you ever had a same sex sexual experience?
- a. Yes

- b. No

13. What is your gender?

- a. Female
- b. Male
- c. Transgender
- d. Other, please specify

14. Sexual orientation

- a. Straight/heterosexual
- b. Gay
- c. Lesbian
- d. Bisexual
- e. Queer
- f. Questioning
- g. Other, please specify

The following condition check items will be asked following the corresponding video.

Condition Check Questions (Sleep Hygiene and Anti-Bullying Conditions):

1. Select all that apply.
 - a. I have seen the video I just watched prior to today.
 - b. I have heard of the You Can Play Project.
 - c. I have seen videos produced by the You Can Play Project.

Condition Check Questions (Experimental):

2. Select all that apply.

- a. I have seen the video I just watched prior to today.
- b. I have heard of the You Can Play Project.
- c. I have seen videos produced by the You Can Play Project prior to today.

The following demographic items will be asked at the end of the study so as not to bias the results.

15. Do you have a close family member(s) (e.g., parent, sibling, etc.) who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
 - i. Please specify your relationship:
- b. No
- c. Unsure

16. Do you have a close friend(s) who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

17. Do you currently have a teammate who identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

18. Have you had a teammate in the past that identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

19. Do you currently have a coach or assistant coach who identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

20. Have you had a coach or assistant coach in the past that identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

21. Would you harass teammate who was out as LGB or suspected to be LGB?

- a. Yes
- b. No

22. Do you currently harass a teammate who is out as LGB or suspected to be LGB?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Appendix B

Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS)

Instructions: Please use the scale below to respond to the following items. Select the number that indicates the extent to which each statement you strongly disagree or strongly agree. Please try to respond to every item.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

(Noun = Gay men/lesbians)

1. Many gay men/lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.
2. Gay men/lesbians seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are the same.
3. Gay men/lesbians do not have all the rights they need.*
4. The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian Studies is ridiculous.
5. Celebrations such as “Gay Pride Day” are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.
6. Gay men/lesbians still need to protest for equal rights.*
7. Gay men/lesbians should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people’s throats.
8. If gay men/lesbians want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.
9. Gay men/lesbians who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage.*
10. Gay men/lesbians should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society, and simply get on with their lives.

11. In today's tough economic times, tax dollars shouldn't be used to support gay men's/lesbian organizations.

12. Gay men/lesbians have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.

* Items are reverse scored.

Appendix C

Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH)

Instructions: Please use the scale below to respond to the following items. Select the number that indicates the extent to which each statement is characteristic or uncharacteristic of you or your views. Please try to respond to every item.

Very uncharacteristic of me or my views Very characteristic of me or my views

1 2 3 4 5 6

Note: LGB = Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual

Please consider the ENTIRE statement when making your rating, as some statements contain two parts.

1. I feel qualified to educate others about how to be affirmative regarding LGB issues.
2. I have conflicting attitudes or beliefs about LGB people.
3. I can accept LGB people even though I condemn their behavior.
4. It is important to me to avoid LGB individuals.
5. I could educate others about the history and symbolism behind the “pink triangle.”
6. I have close friends who are LGB.
7. I have difficulty reconciling my religious views with my interest in being accepting of LGB people.
8. I would be unsure what to do or say if I met someone who is openly lesbian, gay or bisexual.

9. Hearing about a hate crime against a LGB person would not bother me.
10. I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement.
11. I think marriage should be legal for same sex couples.
12. I keep my religious views to myself in order to accept LGB people.
13. I conceal my negative views toward LGB people when I am with someone who doesn't share my views.
14. I sometimes think about being violent toward LGB people.
15. Feeling attracted to another person of the same sex would not make me uncomfortable.
16. I am familiar with the work of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
17. I would display a symbol of gay pride (pink triangle, rainbow, etc.) to show my support of the LGB community.
18. I would feel self-conscious greeting a known LGB person in a public place.
19. I have had sexual fantasies about members of my same sex.
20. I am knowledgeable about the history and mission of the PFLAG organization.
21. I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights.
22. I try not to let my negative beliefs about LGB people harm my relationships with lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals.
23. Hospitals should acknowledge same sex partners equally to any other next of kin.
24. LGB people deserve the hatred they receive.
25. It is important to teach children positive attitudes toward LGB people.

26. I conceal my positive attitudes toward LGB people when I am with someone who is homophobic.

27. Health benefits should be available equally to same sex partners as to any other couple.

28. It is wrong for courts to make child custody decisions based on a parent's sexual orientation.

Scoring:

Hate: 4, 24, 8, 14, 9, 18

Knowledge: 20, 10, 16, 5, 1

Civil Rights: 27, 23, 11, 28, 25

Religious conflict: 26, 12, 22, 7, 3, 13, 2

Internalized Affirmativeness: 19, 15, 17, 6, 21

There are no reverse scored items. Subscale scores are obtained by averaging ratings on the items receiving a response for each participant. As such, if item #19 is not rated by a specific respondent, only the remaining four items on the internalized affirmativeness subscale are used to obtain the average, and so on. This method ensures comparable scores when there is missing data.

Appendix D

Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS)

For the following questions, please indicate the number that best reflects the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement regarding your sport participation.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

1. I consider myself an athlete
2. I have many goals related to sport.
3. Most of my friends are athletes.
4. Sport is the most important part of my life.
5. I spend more time thinking about sport than anything else.
6. I need to participate in sport to feel good about myself.
7. Other people see me mainly as an athlete.
8. I feel bad about myself when I do poorly in sport.
9. Sport is the only important thing in my life.
10. I would be very depressed if I were injured and could not compete in sport.

Appendix E

Recruitment Email

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for taking the time to read about our research study. This study is only open to current NCAA student athletes who are age 18 or older. We are interested in understanding student athletes' attitudes toward sexuality and their post-college career ambitions. Your responses can help us do that. We would greatly appreciate your taking time from your busy schedule to participate in this study. At the end of the study you will have the opportunity to enter your email address for a drawing for one of four \$25 gift cards to Amazon (you have approximately a 1 in 64 chance of being drawn for the gift card). Your email address will not be linked to your responses to the survey questions. An official at the NCAA has verified that it is permissible for student-athletes to receive survey incentives.

Participation in the research project involves completion of the on-line survey and watching a one-minute video; participation should take approximately 10 minutes. The survey is hosted on the Qualtrics site, which uses current security standards for data storage and transmission.

To ensure confidentiality, no personally identifying information will be associated with the responses. All analyses will be performed on group data only and confidentiality of data will be maintained within the limits allowed by law. The results of this research may be published. However, no participant will be identified by specific description in any such publication. Your participation in this research study is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time without consequence. As you answer questions

about your sexual attitudes, you may become aware of some things you hadn't thought about before. It is expected that any discomfort you experience as a result of answering these questions will be minimal. However, if you do experience discomfort as a result of responding to the questions, we encourage you to contact a local behavioral health provider (psychologist, counselor) to discuss these issues. There are also resources available at the Psychology Help Center (<http://www.apa.org/helpcenter>). If you are unsure how to contact needed support, most yellow pages have listings of telephone support services that can be located under Crisis Intervention or Hotlines. There is no compensation for participating in this study. The University of Memphis does not have any funds budgeted for compensation for injury, damages, or other expenses.

If you have any questions about this study, please e-mail the principle investigators: Christine Jehu, M.S. at cmjehu@memphis.edu or Suzanne H. Lease, Ph.D., slease@memphis.edu. If you have additional questions regarding research rights, Beverly Jacobik, Administrator for the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects may be contacted at (901) 678-2705.

Your completion and submission of the questionnaire indicates that you have read this informed consent page, that you have been informed that your data will remain confidential within limits allowed by law, that you will allow the researchers to include your data in the aggregate data set, and that you understand you may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. Please read the questions carefully as the response options for the questions do change depending on the question. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Christine Jehu, M.S., Doctoral Candidate

Suzanne H. Lease, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research

College of Education

The University of Memphis

I meet the criteria for this study (current NCAA student athlete, 18 years or older) and have read the informed consent. I agree to take this survey. *This question is required

Appendix F

Institutional Review Board Approval

Hello,

The University of Memphis Institutional Review Board, FWA00006815, has reviewed and approved your submission in accordance with all applicable statuses and regulations as well as ethical principles.

PI NAME: Christine Jehu

CO-PI:

PROJECT TITLE: The Effect of an LGB Affirmative Sports Video on Student Athlete Knowledge and Attitudes Toward LGB Individuals

FACULTY ADVISOR NAME (if applicable): Suzanne Lease

IRB ID: #3272

APPROVAL DATE: 6/4/2014

EXPIRATION DATE:

LEVEL OF REVIEW: Exempt

RISK LEVEL DETERMINATION:No more than minimal

Please Note: Modifications do not extend the expiration of the original approval

Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

- 1. If this IRB approval has an expiration date, an approved renewal must be in effect to continue the project prior to that date. If approval is not obtained, the human consent form(s) and recruiting material(s) are no longer valid and any research activities involving human subjects must stop.**
- 2. When the project is finished or terminated, a completion form must be completed and sent to the board.**
- 3. No change may be made in the approved protocol without prior board approval, whether the approved protocol was reviewed at the Exempt, Exedited or Full Board level.**
- 4. Exempt approval are considered to have no expiration date and no further review is necessary unless the protocol needs modification.**

Approval of this project is given with the following special obligations:

Thank you,

Pamela M. Valentine

Interim Institutional Review Board Chair

The University of Memphis.

Note: Review outcomes will be communicated to the email address on file. This email should be considered an official communication from the UM IRB. Consent Forms are no longer being stamped as well. Please contact the IRB at IRB@memphis.edu if a letter on IRB letterhead is required.