

Nonbinary and Non-heterosexual Experiences in Sport Over the Life Course: Patterns and
Realized Costs and Benefits

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation *with Research Distinction* in
Sociology in the undergraduate colleges of The Ohio State University

by

Echo Joyce

The Ohio State University
April 2024

Project Advisor: Dr. Chris Knoester, Department of Sociology

Introduction

Sport profoundly influences many people over their lifetimes. In fact, oftentimes, children are affected as much through their experiences on the playing fields as they are in the classroom. And, unlike schools, sport continues to offer social interactions and messaging throughout adulthood, whether that be by adults participating in sports themselves, becoming involved with or funding their children's or community's events, or watching and following different sports as fans. The impacts of sport are nearly impossible to avoid (Kosciw, et al., 2022; Marivoet, 2014).

Crucially, the messages, interactions, and structures surrounding sport teach us about gender and sexuality: most prominently, they tend to naturalize and recommend gender role expectations, heteronormativity, and cisnormativity (English, 2017; Carter & Baliko 2017). They also reflect dominant notions that permeate society, which means that a focused study of gender and sexuality in sport can offer insights about how they are understood in our society. Sport can also lead to social changes, provided that sport is purposefully being used towards that end, merely maintaining the status quo will not result in substantial moves towards equity and inclusion (Marivoet, 2014).

As an institution, sport serves many roles: it educates, it provides structure, it entertains—it even regulates gender norms (Erikainen et al., 2020; Carter & Baliko, 2017). For example, the nature of most sport offerings, being divided into categories of male and female or of man and woman, makes rather explicit many gender norms that permeate society and are often overlooked (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Erikaninen et al., 2020; Macleod, 2022). This regulation of gender in sport makes it an especially poignant site for studying the experiences of those who do not

conform to the binary structure of sex and gender and identify as neither male nor female nor man nor woman.

Sexuality is also highly regulated within the institution of sport; there is persistent anti-queer sentiment within athletics as well as higher rates of mistreatment amongst non-heterosexual individuals in sports-related experiences (Knoester & Allison 2021, Kosciw et al., 2022). Even within queer sport spaces there is an element of regulation of sexuality and expression that negatively impacts athletes (Carter & Baliko 2017). The unwelcoming environment suggests that non-heterosexual individuals will see less benefit from their sport experiences.

While there is increasing politicization of transgender bodies in sport, and this has led to outsized attention to related dynamics, nonbinary experiences are often overlooked in studies of sport, gender, and sexuality—even within queer focused studies (Nagoshi et al., 2023). I seek to assess whether nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals are having drastically different experiences compared to their peers. In this study, I will focus upon this often-underrepresented group—whose very existence is under debate by some—in an attempt to increase understandings of nonbinary identities and experiences. I anticipate that nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities will be associated with fewer benefits of sport because of the institutionally gendered structure of sport as well as the pervasive anti-queer sentiments within sport. This will add to our understandings of queerness in sport because it illustrates the gendered dynamics of sport and demonstrates a pressing need for change.

Specifically, my empirical analysis utilizes data from the 2018-2019 National Sport and Society Survey ($N = 3,993$), a survey of adults across the United States that asks a variety of sport and society questions. The dependent variables within this study are measures of organized youth sport participation, experiencing mistreatment, and the impact of sport on the perceived benefits of sport including sense of belonging, self-esteem, connection to community, and social status. The independent variables within this study are gender (male, female, and nonbinary) and sexual orientation (heterosexual, gay or lesbian, bisexual, and another sexuality). I begin my analysis by examining the responses of those who selected “another gender.” I then use multinomial logistic regression analyses to investigate the relationships between nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities and the relative risks of never participating in organized youth sport, playing continuously while growing up, and playing and dropping out of youth sport. Next, I use binary logistic regression to predict experiencing sport related mistreatment. Then, I use ordinary least squares regressions to model reports of the perceived benefits of one’s athletic experiences, including their impact on one’s sense of belonging, self-esteem, connection to community, and social status.

Without proper understandings of a group of people, it is unlikely that there will be a concerted effort to provide room for them in a structure that was not built to accommodate them. This research points to a need to make sports and society a more accepting place for nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals.

Conceptual Framework

A variety of theories regarding the conceptualization of gender and sexuality, as well as gender and sexuality biases, are used to create the framework that I apply to analyze how gender

and sexuality are linked to sport experiences. Understanding gender as a personality trait allows me to integrate the experiences of transgender and cisgender individuals; these experiences are often considered to be completely different, but by understanding the gendering process as something that happens to everyone, not just transgender individuals, I connect transgender and cisgender experiences (Tate et al., 2014). My framework also applies a multifaceted approach to understanding gender identity which allows for a more complete understanding of gender identity (Tate et al., 2014). Transgender theory especially incorporates insights from the politicization of the trans experience (an occurrence that is becoming increasingly relevant in the area of sport) (Jones, 2023; Nagoshi et al., 2023; Shinde, 2023). And sexual stigma theory points to the ways that everybody (heterosexual and not, cisgender and not) is impacted by and contributes to the perpetuation of homophobic and transphobic ideas (Herek, 2007).

Gender As a Personality Trait

The framing of gender identity is often constructed around queer gender identity; cisgender identity remains relatively unexamined, as it is the norm. From this comes an assumption that a transgender gender identity is an identity of action and of motion; the prefix “trans” suggests an idea of moving across genders. In contrast, a cisgender gender identity is often conceptualized as a static gender identity; it is an identity that remains on the same side of the constructed and expected positionality of a location in the gender binary. Other terms such as Male to Female (MtF) and Female to Male (FtM) reinforce this idea of motion and the concept that transgender people are actively changing their gender whereas cisgender individuals are remaining stable. This notion is largely inaccurate (Tate et al., 2014). Gender identity is a trait that appears in childhood and continues throughout the life course and remains relatively stable

in self-reports of identity regardless of whether a person identifies as cis or trans; secondary reports, from family or friends, may have a less stable understanding of an individual's gender identity because they are viewing it through their own gendered views and gender expression is not always consistent with identity (Tate et al., 2014). By conceptualizing gender identity as a personality trait, Tate et al. (2014) are integrating the concepts of transgender and cisgender identity and framing the development of both identities as undergoing a similar gendering process over the life course. This framework illustrates how transgender identity is not something that suddenly occurs, it is something that develops in tandem with cisgender identities. This theory only accounts for the personal self-identification of gender and as such is a useful but incomplete view of gender within a sociological perspective (Tate et al., 2014).

The Gender Bundle

To further develop a more all-encompassing understanding of gender, beyond individual identification, Tate et al., (2014) propose a collection of characteristics that are used to determine gender within personal, social, and medical contexts; the gender bundle is a framework for understanding gender that views gender from five distinct perspectives. The first component is the assigned gender at birth (AGAB). This is most commonly determined by the physician present at birth who categorizes an individual as either male, female, or intersex based on external genitalia. The second characteristic is the currently held identity that a person has and uses to self-describe. This is commonly known as the concept of "being gender." It is the consideration of gender as a personality trait—the aspect of gender that is tapped in the data that I use for the present study. The third aspect of the bundle involves gender roles and expectations. These are the expectations that the individual finds relevant to themselves and is an aspect of

“doing gender.” The fourth aspect, which is also presented as a part of “doing gender,” is the social presentation of identity. This includes various signals including clothing and make-up choices, voice, name, and pronouns. Finally, the last portion of the gender bundle is the evaluation of society based on gender. This includes things such as gender bias, comparing oneself to others as either being in-group or out-group, beliefs, and behaviors. While the original conceptualizers of the gender bundle do not describe this as an aspect of “doing gender,” I consider it as such because it relates to the ways in which a person navigates the world in concordance with their gender identity and the way their gender has been experienced and perceived over their life course. When all five aspects of the gender bundle are in congruence, a person is typically considered to be cisgender; when they are not congruent, one might refer to themselves as transgender, nonbinary, genderqueer, gender nonconforming, or a variety of other identity labels (Tate et al., 2014).

Due to the nature of the data that I am using for this study, gender will be mostly understood within this thesis as the currently held gender identity of the respondents at the time of the survey. Yet, other aspects of gender as presented in the gender bundle will not be ignored as they are essential to understand the ways in which people move through the world. These concepts of doing gender will be reflected within this thesis throughout the variety of variables that are being examined, too, as they will reveal relationships between queer gender identities and different experiences within sports.

Transgender Theory

A tertiary theory for understanding gendered experiences within sport in my study is transgender theory (Nagoshi et al., 2023). This theory expands upon pre-existing theories of

gender that rely on social determinants and cognitive constructions and includes the physical embodiment of gender identity, the elements that were previously described as “doing gender.” Transgender theory recognizes the fluidity of gender identity and expression and the accompanying variance of identity and expression. It challenges heteronormative and cisnormative constructs of gender. This theory also works to unpack the politicization of transgender bodies that has been occurring at increased rates within the last few years (Fischer & McClearen, 2019) In fact, the politicization of trans bodies and identities within sports, in part, that necessitates an understanding of trans and nonbinary experiences in sport (Jones, 2023; Shinde, 2023).

Sexual Stigma Theory

Finally, sexual stigma theory, as presented by Herek (2007), emphasizes the institutional and individual manifestations of stigma against sexual minorities. The former is referred to as heterosexism. This heterosexism is present within all institutions including not only sport, but also government, religion, and medicine. Non-heterosexual identities are seen as a deviation from the norm and are unnatural—and therefore inferior to heterosexual identities and actions. Consequently, it is apparent that sport and other institutions systematically prioritize heterosexual masculinity and demonize queer expressions of gender and sexuality (Knoester & Allison, 2021; Cunningham & Pickett, 2018).

The individual manifestations of sexual stigma are differentiated by three categories. The first is enacted stigma. This includes discriminatory actions against individuals of non-heterosexual identities, the most severe of which include hate crimes against people and property. Enacted stigma within sport in the present study is measured within to a degree by

reports of mistreatment in sport experiences. The second manifestation of individual sexual stigma is referred to as felt stigma. Felt stigma takes into account the ways that an individual may alter their behavior in an effort to avoid enacted stigma. Felt stigma manifests within both heterosexual and non-heterosexual individuals because sexual orientation is not a visible characteristic and therefore, regardless of identity, people may alter their behavior to avoid association with a stigmatized group to protect themselves from enacted stigma. While felt stigma acknowledges the way that non-heterosexuality is stigmatized, internalized stigma is an internal acceptance of that stigma. This, too, occurs within both heterosexual and non-heterosexual individuals; it is referred to as self-stigma when it occurs with non-heterosexual identities. When internalized stigma occurs within heterosexuals it becomes sexual prejudice. Like any other institution within society, sport is comprised of individuals who manifest and are impacted by sexual stigma. The enactment of sexual stigma within sport can manifest as the mistreatment and alienation of queer athletes. Felt stigma can influence decisions to either participate or not participate in a sport, as well as decisions regarding personal conduct within athletics (Erikainen et al., 2020; Hargie et al., 2016; Macleod, 2022).

Literature Review

Policing Gender and Sexuality

In addition to the contributions of the theoretical frameworks that I draw upon, a review of the research literature indicates that the rules that govern sport also function to govern gendered roles and ideas within athletics and outside of them. The policing of gender impacts not only trans and nonbinary people, but queer people in general, and even cisgender and heterosexual individuals as well; it impacts every person who participates in society in some way

(Fischer & McClearen, 2019). In some instances these impacts are more apparent, such as within sports (Erikainen et al., 2020). Masculinity is the dominant force within athletics; attributes of masculinity such as physical strength, being brave, tough, confident, assertive, and self-sacrificing amongst many more are prominent virtues within sport (English, 2017). Those who exhibit these traits are deemed masculine, those who don't are deemed feminine. The perception of gender expression as a mutually exclusive dichotomy and the association of traits such as strength with masculinity leads to expressions of femininity being associated with the opposite of those traits, in this case, weakness. Therefore, there is little room for expressions of femininity by people of all genders within sport because it is associated with the opposite of the positively viewed masculine traits (Carter & Baliko, 2017; English, 2017). However, there exists a contradiction within sport where some typically "masculine" values within sport are actually attributes that in day-to-day life are far more expected of women, such as being self-sacrificing, having self-control, and being a good role model (McDermott et al., 2019). There is a clear prioritization of masculinity within athletics which indicates that those who do not conform to heterosexist expectations of masculinity will experience ostracization within sport (English, 2017; McDermott et al., 2019).

Even within predominantly queer spaces, gender and sexuality are still policed harshly and in line with larger societal expectations (Carter & Baliko, 2017; Erikainen et al., 2020). For example, Carter & Baliko (2017) found that while queer sport leagues may place a greater emphasis on the social and community aspects of sport rather than competitive ones, they are still ripe with issues such as biphobia and a lack of acceptance of bodies that deviate from the norm. These queer leagues are permeated with the stereotypes built from heterosexual and

cisgender norms; tension can still arise in situations where gender presentation, identity, and sexuality don't align in the expected ways. One instance cited within the research was a woman discussing her experiences as a feminine presenting lesbian in sports. She discussed the ways she would be told that she was "too pretty to be gay" or that she was "straight passing" because of the way she presented, and she connected this with being picked last within sports because of the way that femininity is associated with being unathletic by much of society, including the queer leagues she participated in.

Femininity within sports is regulated not only by mores and folkways, but also by actual rules that govern sport pertaining to who is deemed "woman enough" to participate with other women. This regulation is made to restrict the participation of transgender women in athletics, though it impacts cisgender and intersex women and nonbinary people as well. The perpetuated idea that women are athletically and physically inferior to men leads to a qualification for femininity and womanhood to be inferior to men, particularly within sport (Fischer & McClearen, 2019). The institution of sport mimics the legal sphere in its oppression of women, it is not maintained by a biological difference between men and women, but a hierarchical one; it is the social and political meanings of man and woman that maintain the order that is falsely deemed to be natural (MacKinnon, 2023). In order for transgender women to be perceived as sufficiently feminine, they must be inferior to men and must also lose to at least a few women, because if a trans woman were to win an athletic event, it would not be due to her skill, ability, or hard work, but due to some "innate physical superiority awarded at birth" (Fischer & McClearen, 2019). This assumption is demonstrated time and again when transgender women excel within sport (Shinde, 2023). The formalized regulations around participation in women's

sports are often focused on testosterone levels, despite there being considerable overlap between the amounts of testosterone found in men and women (Gillies & McArthur, 2010). These regulations regarding testosterone levels are based upon binary assumptions of sex and are therefore not easily applicable to intersex and transgender people (Erikainen et al., 2020). Furthermore, these regulations assume a linear and binary concept of transition, making them completely inapplicable to those who do not conform to the false assumption that transition is an all or nothing game. The prevalence of these assumptions and the regulation of femininity, in addition to masculinity, suggests that those who do not conform to cisnormative ideals are made to feel unwelcome within sport.

Qualitative studies regarding trans experiences within sport have repeatedly demonstrated the feelings of exclusion that transgender athletes experience (Cunningham & Pickett, 2018; Erikainen et al., 2020; Fischer & McClearen, 2019; Hargie et al., 2016; Macleod, 2022). Transgender men have reported not wanting to play on the men's team for fear of exclusion and experiencing alienation from the women's teams that they are regulated play on (Macleod, 2022). There are instances of cisgender women refusing to compete against transgender women and either asking them to sit out or withdrawing from competition all together (Jones, 2023). The treatment of transgender individuals within athletics creates an often-hostile environment in which genderqueer athletes operate. Interpersonal communication is a major factor in the creation of unwelcoming spaces for genderqueer people. Transgender and nonbinary individuals have reported frustrating language use as having a negative impact on their athletic experiences (Macleod, 2022). This language includes but is not limited to incorrect forms of address, both on an individual level (ie. deadnaming and misgendering) and within groups (ie. incorrectly

referring to an entire team as “ladies”), comments about appearances, and homophobic and transphobic comments including slurs. These anecdotal accounts indicate that there is a concerning prevalence of mistreatment of queer athletes.

Nonbinary individuals are in a unique position within athletics due to the binary nature of the gender segregation that occurs. The exclusion and alienation of nonbinary individuals is institutionalized; while there are a few exceptions, the vast majority of sports are divided into men’s and women’s competitive fields, this leads to a question of where nonbinary individuals fit into athletics as a whole. For genderqueer youths, this exclusion is often felt within the walls of their schools when asked to split into teams of girls and boys or having to use gendered changing rooms and bathrooms, leading to distress (Hargie et al., 2016; Erikainen et al., 2020). Those who had ambitions to continue their sport in college have reported that they felt that coming out while in high school would negatively impact their ability to play later in life (McLeod, 2022). One nonbinary individual reported publicly presenting themselves as a binary trans man because they felt that they would be taken more seriously that way (McLeod, 2022). The exclusion that nonbinary people face occurs both on the court and off with athletes reporting being hyperaware of the way others perceive them within changing spaces and that those spaces are largely unwelcoming for all queer people, not just nonbinary athletes (Hargie et al., 2016). This institutionalized exclusion of nonbinary people in sport suggests that nonbinary individuals will participate in sport at lower rates compared to cisgender individuals and that those who do participate may experience less of the perceived benefits of sport.

The Stigmatization of Queer Youth

The hypothesized relationship between sexuality, gender, and sport participation and experiences are built upon evidence of sexual stigma within youth spaces. The National School Climate Survey (NSCS) ($N = 22,298$ LGBTQ+ students aged 13-21 years) conducted by GLSEN is an assessment of the school environment for LGBTQ+ students in The United States. The latest report offers unique insights regarding differences between in-person, online, and hybrid learning due to its relation to the Covid-19 pandemic. Sport related findings of the survey include reports that 16% of respondents were prohibited from playing on the sport team of the gender with which they identified, 11.3% reported being discouraged by coaches to participate, and only 3.3% of trans and nonbinary respondents were able to participate fully in school sports that aligned with their gender identity (Kosciw, et al., 2022). Beyond the athletic sphere, over 90% of respondents reported hearing anti-LGBTQ remarks such as using the word “gay” in a pejorative way (97%), using the phrase “no homo” (95.1%), and other homophobic terms (89.9%) (Kosciw, et al., 2022). The majority (83.1%) of respondents who attended school in person at least parttime reported experiencing harassment or assault due to their sexual orientation, gender, or gender expression. Those who reported higher levels of anti-LGBTQ remarks and harassment were more likely to miss school, have lower grades, and to experience lower self-esteem and higher rates of depression as compared to those who did not report high levels of harassment (Kosciw, et al., 2022). While the exact proportions of occurrences vary slightly, these outcomes occur due to sexuality related harassment, gender identity related harassment, and gender expression related harassment. These adverse findings for queer youth, both in school and in sport are likely to impact sport participation and the benefits of a youth sport experiences, especially self-esteem.

Hypotheses

My conceptual framework and review of existing research led to three hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Compared to their binary gender and heterosexual counterparts, those with nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities will report lower levels of organized youth sport participation.

Hypothesis 2: Those with nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities will report having experienced higher rates of mistreatment (e.g., called names, been bullied, discriminated against, or abused) in sports.

Hypothesis 3: Those with nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities will report having received fewer benefits from their sport experiences. That is, they will report lower levels of having gained a sense of belonging, self-esteem, connections to their community, and social statuses from their sport experiences.

Data and Methods

My analysis utilizes data from the National Sport and Society Survey (N = 3,993), a large national study of U.S. adults aged 21-65 from 2018-2019 that asks hundreds of sports and society questions as part of one-hour online surveys. The data were collected from a sample of 4,000 individuals who were a part of the American Population Panel. The resulting sample had respondents from all 50 states and Washington D.C., though the sample is disproportionately white, female, midwestern, and educated (Knoester & Cooksey, 2020). This survey was constructed to encapsulate a wide range of sport-related experiences and beliefs, as such it is well suited for research pertaining to nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals in connection with a

variety of sports related areas. It is especially well suited for this study because it also provides retrospective accounts of childhood, a key area of interest in sport experiences of nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals.

The initial sample size (N=3,777) includes the respondents who responded to the questions pertaining to participation in youth sport. Listwise deletion of missing data was utilized to address missing data throughout this study, which stemmed from both refusals to answer a question and responses of “Don’t Know.”

Dependent Variables

The descriptive characteristics of all variables are presented in Table 1. The first dependent variables reference youth engagement in sport. Participation in youth sports is coded according to the questions “Did you ever play any formally organized sport while growing up (i.e., with coaches, adults in charge, and uniforms)?” and “While growing up, did you ever completely drop out of or stop playing organized sports?” Respondents who responded in the negative to the first question are coded as never having participated in organized sport. Those who responded in the positive to the first and second question are coded as having played and dropped out of organized sport. Respondents who responded in the positive to the first question and in the negative to the second are coded as having participated in organized sport continuously until adulthood.

(Table 1 about here)

A secondary dependent variable recognizes mistreatment. Mistreatment in sport is coded according to the question “As part of your sports interactions, have you been a victim of...” with

responses including “hate speech?”, “discrimination?”, “psychological or emotional mistreatment?”, “physical mistreatment?”, “sexual mistreatment?”, and “other mistreatment? (Please tell us what).” Those who selected any of the aforementioned categories were coded in the affirmative of a dichotomous variable.

Additional dependent variables offer assessments of the perceived benefits of sports. This includes the impact of sport on respondents’: a) sense of belonging, b) self-esteem, c) connection to the community, and d) social status among peers. The variables are coded according to the question “Has your athletic experience had a positive or negative effect on the following skills or qualities?” Responses include a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Very negative” to “Very positive.”

Independent Variables

The primary independent variables are gender and sexual identities. Gender identity is coded according to the question “What gender do you identify as?” Response options are “Male”, “Female”, and “Another gender (please tell us what);” the former two are initially combined to form the reference category. Further analysis is also done with male as the reference category to further understand differences between all three gender options presented within the survey. Within this study those who selected the third option as opposed to “male” or “female” are referred to as nonbinary. While there are a multitude of identities that fit within the category of “another gender” as will be discussed later, nonbinary is the most generalizable and precise term as it merely indicates an identification beyond the binary genders of male and female. Other terms, such as genderqueer, have been used in similar sociological research that involves the

study of transgender individuals (Tate et al., 2013), however, as genderqueer can incorporate both binary trans individuals and those who are gender nonconforming but cisgender, it is not the most precise word to use for identity outside of male or female.

Sexual identity is coded according to the question “Do you consider yourself to be...” with response options of Heterosexual or straight, Gay or lesbian, Bisexual, Other (Please tell us what). Heterosexual is used as the reference category.

Control Variables

Background characteristics including age, race/ethnicity, region, urbanicity, childhood socioeconomic class, education, and family structure are used as control variables within the analysis. Age is coded into the ordinal variables of 30 and under (reference), 31-40, 41-50, 51 and older. Race/ethnicity was coded using a select all question regarding race and ethnicity with (only) White (reference), (any) Black, (non-black) Latine, and other race/ethnicity. Region is categorized according to the U.S. census. Urbanicity is categorized as large city (reference), suburb near a large city, small city or town, and rural area. Self-reported identification of socioeconomic class as poor, working class, middle class, upper middle class, or wealthy in childhood was utilized to measure youth SES. Education is coded as having completed high school or less (reference), some college, or college or more. Family structure was first coded according to the question “while growing up, what kind(s) of family did you live in?” Respondents were able to select all those which applied to their youth living experiences. Those who selected only living with two biological parents, same-sex parents, or adoptive parents were coded as growing up in an intact two parent household, those who selected any of the other options were coded as not.

Data Analysis

First, I examine the responses from those who identify outside of the sex/gender binary as another gender in an effort to understand the variety of nonbinary identities that are represented within these data. Over 100 respondents identified outside of the gender binary, and some respondents reported living with a person that they recognized as nonbinary, and over 1,000 adults reported a non-heterosexual sexuality.

I then begin my quantitative analysis with the respondents' retrospective accounts of their childhood sport participation patterns. I utilize multinomial logistic regression analyses to investigate the relationships between nonbinary and non-heterosexual identities and the relative risks of never participating in organized youth sport, playing continuously while growing up, and playing and dropping out of organized youth sport. For the first model, those who identify as either male or female are used as the reference category. The second model utilizes male as the reference category to further illustrate differences between genders. Next, I use binary logistic regression to predict experiencing sport related mistreatment. The first model utilizes having a male or female identity as the reference category. The second model introduces youth sport participation as a control variable. Then, the third and fourth models utilize male as the reference category; the fourth model also incorporates youth sport experiences. Finally, I use ordinary least squares regressions to model reports of the perceived benefits of one's athletic experiences, including their impact on one's sense of belonging, self-esteem, connection to community, and social status. These models incorporate education as a control variable because level of education may impact the retrospective accounts of the benefits of sport. The first model utilizes a binary identity as the reference category. The second model incorporates both the history of

participation in youth sport and reports of sport-related mistreatment. For the third and fourth models, male is the reference category; the fourth model also incorporates histories of participation and mistreatment.

Preliminary Inquiry: Exploring “Another Gender”

Those who select “another gender” as a gender option throughout the survey were given the opportunity to describe their gender using their own words. 147 responses described a gender other than male or female in regard to either themselves, a household member, child, or partner. The modal response within these descriptions was nonbinary, also written as non binary, non-binary, and nb, ($N=75$). The majority of other responses describe other more specific identities that fall within the nonbinary umbrella. These identities include queer/genderqueer ($N=16$), agender ($N=12$), fluid/genderfluid ($N=11$), androgyne/androgenous ($N=3$), and bigender/both ($N=2$). Three respondents appear to reject specific labels all together with the responses “doesn’t matter” ($N=1$), and “n/a” ($N=2$). It is also a possibility that these responses should be grouped with other responses that appear to be either intentionally antagonistic ($N=3$) or otherwise unintelligible ($N=7$). Of the responses describing gender identity, 97 were descriptors from the primary respondents about themselves.

Due to the nature of the wording of the question, there were respondents that answered within the “another gender” category that may also identify with a binary gender. Due to differing interpretations of gender, sex, and transgender identity, it is unclear how respondents who answered with variations of trans/transgender/trans man/trans woman ($N=8$) intended their responses to be understood. One potential interpretation leading to these responses is that the words male and female were intended to include cis people only and as such they selected the

third option. Another possible interpretation is the respondents identify as both trans and nonbinary. I am inclined to move forward with the interpretation that these individuals identify both as transgender and nonbinary because they did select “another gender,” and will therefore include them amongst the nonbinary categorization within this study.

The utilization of the word nonbinary within this research is validated by it being the modal word utilized within the self-description. Attempting to utilize one word to describe a vast expanse of gender identity in a way that is both accurate and mutually exclusive is a nearly futile venture. However, within this study, this analysis of the responses indicates that nonbinary is the most reasonable term, but I do acknowledge the complexity of identity and that nonbinary is not always the most suitable word.

Results

The first hypothesis anticipated lower rates of participation in youth sports amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals as compared to binary identified and heterosexual individuals. There is some support for these expectations. As seen in Table 2, Model 2, there is some evidence that those who are nonbinary, versus male, are particularly more likely to drop out of organized sport as compared to playing until adulthood ($b = 0.63, p < 0.10$). Also, nonbinary individuals are more likely to not have participated in organized sport ($b = 0.84, p < 0.05$) compared to playing continuously. Those who identify as bisexual ($b = 0.55, p < 0.001$) and as another sexuality ($b = 0.72, p < 0.01$) are more likely to have dropped out of organized sport prior to adulthood, relative to playing continuously, when compared to heterosexuals. In addition, those who identify as bisexual ($b = 0.32, p < 0.05$) and those who identify as another

sexuality ($b = 0.60, p < 0.05$) are more likely to have never played organized sport, versus having played continuously, compared to heterosexual individuals.

(Table 2 about here)

The second hypothesis anticipated higher rates of sport related mistreatment amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals. The support for this hypothesis is mixed. Those who identify as nonbinary do not have a statistically significant difference in sport-related mistreatment as compared to binary identified individuals in general or compared to males. But, as seen in Table 3, Model 1, those who identify as gay or lesbian ($b = 0.58, p < 0.001$), bisexual ($b = 0.64, p < 0.001$), or as another sexual identity ($b = 0.70, p < 0.001$) are more likely to report experiencing mistreatment as compared to heterosexuals. These patterns remain when taking participation in youth organized sport into account and when using different ways of measuring gender.

(Table 3 about here)

Hypothesis three predicted that nonbinary and non-heterosexual people experience less of the perceived benefits of sport. There is quite consistent support for this hypothesis. As seen in Model 3 of Tables 4-7, nonbinary individuals are particularly more likely to report sports having a less positive impact on their sense of belonging ($b = -0.52, p < 0.001$), self-esteem ($b = -0.54, p < 0.001$), connection to community ($b = -0.40, p < 0.001$), and social status ($b = -0.53, p < 0.001$). These patterns were maintained when taking both youth sport participation and experiences of mistreatment into account. They were also apparent when using two category coding for gender (i.e., Models 1-2). Non-heterosexuals also largely reported having fewer

perceived benefits from sport. For gay and lesbian individuals, when referencing Model 3 results, sport has less of a positive impact on their sense of belonging ($b = -0.15, p > 0.01$), their self-esteem ($b = -0.20, p > 0.01$), their connection to the community ($b = -0.15, p > 0.01$), and social status ($b = -0.24, p > 0.001$). In Model 4, there is no longer evidence of a decline in a sense of belonging. This suggests that a combination of mistreatment and different durations of sport involvement may be particularly relevant for discrepancies in sense of belonging. Bisexual identity, even in Model 4, was associated with reports of sport having less of a positive impact on sense of belonging ($b = -0.26, p < 0.001$), self-esteem ($b = -0.25, p < 0.001$), connection to community ($b = -0.25, p < 0.001$), and social status ($b = -0.29, p < 0.001$). This pattern persists when considering participation in youth organized sport and mistreatment. Similarly, in Model 3, those who identify as another sexuality report sport having less of a positive impact on sense of belonging ($b = -0.45, p < 0.001$), self-esteem ($b = -0.43, p < 0.001$), connection to community ($b = -0.39, p < 0.001$), and social status ($b = -0.45, p < 0.001$). This pattern persists when taking youth sport participation and mistreatment into account.

(Table 4 about here)

(Table 5 about here)

(Table 6 about here)

(Table 7 about here)

Discussion

In this study I sought to evaluate the relationships involving gender, sexuality, and youth sport experiences. There is largely consistent support for the hypotheses that predicted less

organized sport participation, higher instances of mistreatment in sport related experiences, and fewer perceived benefits of sports amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals.

The lower rates of sport participation among nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals are consistent with the expectations laid out within this thesis in accordance with the literature review and conceptual framework. Sexual stigma theory purports that heterosexism is present within social institutions and leads to presumptions of heterosexuality as the norm, erasing those with queer sexualities and problematizing queerness when it does become visible (Herek, 2007). This anti-LGBTQ sentiment has been observed within sport (Knoester & Allison, 2021) and likely accounts, in part, for lower rates of participation. Furthermore, sexual stigma theory can apply similarly to gender identity, cisnormative assumptions lead to an erasure of transgender identities and problematizes transgender identities when they become visible. The higher rates of never having participated in organized youth sport amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals suggests that the stigmatization of queer identity and the binary structure of sport systems acts as a deterrent to beginning participation. Furthermore, the higher rates of dropping out prior to adulthood amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals indicates that the sexual stigma creates a less welcoming environment that may encourage disengagement from sport.

Non-heterosexual individuals' reports of higher occurrences of mistreatment compared to their heterosexual peers are consistent with past research (Knoester & Allison, 2021). This, too, is explained by sexual stigma theory and is reflective of the need to improve the inclusivity of queer individuals within athletics. Contrary to the proposed hypothesis, and past qualitative research with anecdotal accounts of mistreatment (Macleod, 2022 Erikainen, et al., 2020), there

is no statistically significant difference in reports of mistreatment between nonbinary and binary identified individuals. However, males were significantly more likely to report mistreatment than females indicating that the lack of significant difference between nonbinary and male rates of mistreatment is still cause for concern. Differences in gendered team experiences may be a factor in the differing experiences of mistreatment across genders; there may be a protective element within sport cultures of being non-male that females, and to a lesser degree nonbinary individuals, are seeing with their lower reports of mistreatment. As it is unclear what gendered sports team the nonbinary respondents have had experience participating in, generalizations about gendered team cultures impacting sport mistreatment cannot be made here. It is also a possibility that of the nonbinary individuals who did participate in gender segregated sports, there may have been near even amounts on male and female teams and this cancelled out any potential differences, but this is not an assumption that can be made and there is a need for further research about how being nonbinary can lead to different sport experiences in different contexts.

The reports of nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals perceiving fewer benefits from their athletic experiences suggest that nonbinary and non-heterosexuals are having sufficiently different experiences in sport to impact their views of them well into adulthood. Furthermore, the consistency in the models indicates that mistreatment and dropping out or never having played sports do not explain the discrepancies in perceived benefits. This indicates that even when nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals are not recognizing being actively mistreated within sport and are playing organized youth sports at comparable levels to others,

they are still less likely to receive the benefits examined within this study at the same rates as their male, female and heterosexual counterparts.

There are limitations to these findings. First, due to the structure of questions pertaining to gender within the survey, binary trans identities cannot be isolated to be considered apart from cisgender identities. Furthermore, the wording of the question itself is needlessly confusing as it asks the respondent to select their gender identity while providing the options “male,” “female,” and “another gender.” When discussing transgender identities terms such as male and female are often used to discuss sex, that is the biological characteristics that one has, rather than gender, the identity one holds. This does not directly impact my hypotheses; however, it does mean that I am not able to consider the lived differences in experience, both within athletics and beyond that, of cis men and trans men and of cis women and trans women. Ideally future research into the topic of non-cisgender individuals in sport would be able to delineate between the experiences of transgender identities.

Additionally, the number of respondents who selected “another gender” was comparatively small. With only about a hundred respondents reporting themselves as identifying as a gender other than male or female, the significance and validity of the results, as well as the generalizability of them, is impacted. However, the option to write in a personal label offered great insight into how these individuals conceptualize themselves and their gender.

Future research pertaining to transgender individuals should structure the questions pertaining to gender in a way that clearly differentiates whether they are inquiring about assigned sex at birth, current gender identity, or one of the many other factors that are considered in

gender that are discussed within the gender bundle. Tate et al. (2013) propose a two-question method of collecting gender related demographic information: one question pertains to current gender identity and the other to sex assigned at birth; they use the word “gender” in both questions to maintain consistency. With some modification, this proposed method of writing questions could provide a more precise understanding of the participants in a study.

Furthermore, by grouping gay and lesbian individuals together, I am not able to sufficiently exam the experiences of lesbians as compared to those of gay men who have historically had different interactions with sport. There are clearly observed differences in sport experiences by both gender and sexuality; further research can investigate the interaction between gender and sexuality regarding the perceived benefits of sport to better understand the ways that male non-heterosexuals, female non-heterosexuals, and nonbinary non-heterosexuals experience (or do not experience) the benefits of sport.

Nonetheless, this research has offered insight into the identities of nonbinary individuals and gender and sexuality within youth sport in regard to participation, mistreatment, and potential benefits. It demonstrates the need for conceptualizing of gender in a more complex way within future research that can better accommodate for transgender identity. Moreover, the present study demonstrates the applicability of Herek’s (2007) sexual stigma theory not only to non-heterosexual identities, but also to queer identity more broadly, including transgender and nonbinary identities.

The present study demonstrated consistently lower rates of participation in youth sport, higher rates of mistreatment within sport, and lower reports of perceived benefits of sport

amongst nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals. This indicates a great need for change in the way sports, and in particularly youth sports, are conducted. Radical changes need to be made to the institution of sport to improve, and seek to equalize, the experiences of queer athletes. Although there is some evidence that prejudice has been on the decline within athletics, and that this trend is likely to continue, sport is not improving at an acceptable rate and conscious decisions must be made to decrease homophobia, transphobia, and other gender and sexual identity-based discrimination within athletics (Cunningham & Pickett, 2018).

Steps to improve the environment for nonbinary and non-heterosexual individuals within sport would likely see an increase in the perceived benefits of sport. Potential ways to improve sports for all, not only queer individuals, would include moves towards degendering athletics where appropriate, emphasizing the social and physical benefits of sport over competition, and generally working towards being actively inclusive of all, regardless of gender identity and sexuality. Where it is not possible to degender sport, creating policy to allow athletes to participate on the team that better fits their identity has been shown to reduce discrimination based on participating on sport teams in school (Kosciw, et al., 2022). Still this does not resolve the discomfort that nonbinary individuals may experience participating on any gendered team, hence the need for developing sports beyond the binary.

Bibliography

- Carter, C., & Baliko, K. (2017). 'these are not my people': Queer sport spaces and the complexities of community. *Leisure Studies*, 36(5), 696–707.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2017.1315164>
- Cunningham, G.B., & Pickett, A.C. (2018). Trans Prejudice in Sport: Differences from LGB Prejudice, the Influence of Gender, and Changes over Time. *Sex Roles* 78, 220–227.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0791-6>
- English, C. (2017). Toward sport reform: Hegemonic masculinity and Reconceptualizing competition. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 44(2), 183–198.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2017.1300538>
- Erikainen, S., Vincent, B., & Hopkins, A. (2020). Specific detriment: Barriers and opportunities for non-binary inclusive sports in Scotland. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 46(1), 75–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723520962937>
- Fischer, M., & McClearen, J. (2019). Transgender athletes and the Queer Art of Athletic Failure. *Communication & Sport*, 8(2), 147–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479518823207>
- Gillies, G. E., & McArthur, S. (2010). Estrogen actions in the brain and the basis for differential action in men and women: A case for sex-specific medicines. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 62, 155–198. <https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.109.002071>

Hargie, O. D., Mitchell, D. H., & Somerville, I. J. (2016). 'people have a knack of making you feel excluded if they catch on to your difference': Transgender experiences of exclusion in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 52(2), 223–239.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690215583283>

Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 905–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x>

Jones, R. (2023, November 18). *Female boxer withdraws from tournament after learning opponent is transgender*. MSN. <https://www.msn.com/en-us/sports/other/female-boxer-withdraws-from-tournament-after-learning-opponent-is-transgender/ar-AA1kaedu>

Knoester, C., & Allison, R. (2021). Sexuality, sports-related mistreatment, and U.S. adults' sports involvement. *Leisure Sciences*, 45(8), 764–786.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2021.1895009>

Knoester, C., & Cooksey, E. C. (2020, November 12). The National Sports and Society Survey Methodological Summary. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/mv76p>

Kosciw, J. G., Clark, C. M., & Menard, L. (2022). The 2021 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of LGBTQ+ youth in our nation's schools. New York: GLSEN.

MacKinnon, C. A. (2023). A Feminist Defense of Transgender Sex Equality Rights. *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism*, 34(2), 88–96.

<https://doi.org/http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.13051/18252>

Macleod, M. (2022). Transgender and Non-binary Adults' Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to Participation High School Sport and Physical Activity: A Multiple Case Study. ms, San Diego.

Marivoet, S. (2014). Challenge of sport towards Social Inclusion and awareness-raising against any discrimination. *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research*, 63(1), 3–11.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/pcssr-2014-0017>

McDermott, R. C., Pietrantonio, K. R., Browning, B. R., McKelvey, D. K., Jones, Z. K., Booth, N. R., & Sevig, T. D. (2019). In search of positive masculine role norms: Testing the positive psychology positive masculinity paradigm. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 20(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000160>

Nagoshi, J. L., Nagoshi, C. T., & Pillai, V. K. (2023). Transgender theory revisited: Current applications to transgender issues. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 49, 101546.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101546>

Shinde, J. (2023, November 22). Fans react to trans swimmer breaking New Jersey college record in women's category. MSN. <https://www.msn.com/en-us/sports/other/fans-react-to-trans-swimmer-breaking-new-jersey-college-record-in-women-s-category/ar-AA1kkPop?cvid=3da728869ad6475e864307c558f075b3&ei=12>

Tate, C. C., Ledbetter, J. N., & Youssef, C. P. (2013). A two-question method for assessing gender categories in the social and Medical Sciences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(8), 767–776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.690110>

Tate, C. C., Youssef, C. P., & Bettergarcia, J. N. (2014). Integrating the study of transgender spectrum and cisgender experiences of self-categorization from a personality perspective. *Review of General Psychology, 18*(4), 302–312. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000019>

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	<u>M/%</u>	<u>(SD)</u>
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		
Did not play youth sports	36%	
Played youth sports and dropped out	41%	
Played continuously to adulthood	23%	
Recent sport involvement	4.21	(4.79)
Experienced mistreatment	38%	
Sense of belonging	3.90	(1.05)
Self-esteem	3.85	(1.10)
Connection to Community	3.64	(0.97)
Social status among peers	3.66	(1.03)
<i>Social Structure</i>		
(Male)	26%	
Female	72%	
Nonbinary	3%	
(Heterosexual)	72%	
Lesbian or Gay	9%	
Bisexual	14%	
Other sexual identity	4%	
(Age 30 or less)	25%	
Age 31-40	27%	
Age 41-50	22%	
Age 51+	27%	
(White)	75%	
Black	10%	
Latine	7%	
Other race/ethnicity	8%	
(Intact two-parent family)	67%	
Other family structure	33%	
(Northeast)	14%	
Midwest	36%	
South	33%	
West	17%	
(Raised in a large city)	19%	
Raised in a suburb near a large city	31%	
Raised in a small city	31%	
Raised in a rural area	18%	
Raised in a poor household	16%	
Raised in a working-class household	38%	

Raised in a middle-class household	32%
Raised in an upper-middle-class household	13%
Raised in a wealthy household	1%

Table 2. Results from multinomial logistic regression of youth sport participation

Variable	<u>Model 1</u> <u>dropped out</u>		<u>Model 1</u> <u>never played</u>		<u>Model 2</u> <u>dropped out</u>		<u>Model 2</u> <u>never played</u>	
	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coef.</i>	<i>SE</i>
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					0.14	0.10	0.54***	0.10
Nonbinary	0.53	0.37	0.44	0.39	0.63+	0.37	0.84*	0.40
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	0.12	0.15	0.09	0.16	0.17	0.15	0.26	0.16
Bisexual	0.56***	0.14	0.36*	0.15	0.55***	0.14	0.32*	0.15
Other sexual identity	0.73**	0.27	0.63*	0.28	0.72**	0.27	0.60*	0.28
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	-0.19	0.12	-0.09	0.13	-0.19	0.12	-0.10	0.13
Age 41-50	-0.41**	0.13	0.00	0.14	-0.42**	0.13	-0.02	0.14
Age 51+	-0.57***	0.13	0.24+	0.13	-0.56***	0.13	0.25+	0.13
Black	-0.78***	0.15	-0.30*	0.15	-0.78***	0.15	-0.32*	0.15
Latine	-0.19	0.16	0.13	0.17	-0.17	0.16	0.16	0.18
Other race/ethnicity	0.00	0.18	0.13	0.17	0.01	0.18	0.16	0.17
Intact two parent	-0.07	0.10	-0.08	0.10	-0.06	0.10	-0.06	0.10
Midwest	0.13	0.14	-0.18	0.14	0.14	0.14	-0.15	0.14
South	0.05	0.14	-0.02	0.14	0.05	0.14	-0.02	0.14
West	0.09	0.16	-0.03	0.16	0.09	0.16	-0.00	0.16
Raised in a suburb near a large city	0.07	0.13	-0.32*	0.13	0.06	0.13	-0.35**	0.13
Raised in a small city	-0.20	0.13	-0.45**	0.13	-0.21	0.13	-0.50***	0.13
Raised in a rural area	-0.32*	0.15	-0.56***	0.15	-0.33*	0.15	-0.61***	0.15
Class	-0.13**	0.05	-0.29***	0.05	-0.13**	0.05	-0.29***	0.05

Note: $N = 3,767$ + $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3. Results from Logistic Regression of Mistreatment

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					-0.30***	0.08	-0.30***	0.08
Nonbinary	0.30	0.23	0.28	0.24	0.07	0.24	0.06	0.24
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	0.58***	0.12	0.58***	0.12	0.48***	0.12	0.49***	0.12
Bisexual	0.64***	0.10	0.60***	0.10	0.66***	0.10	0.63***	0.10
Other sexual identity	0.70***	0.19	0.65**	0.19	0.72***	0.19	0.67***	0.19
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	-0.18+	0.10	-0.17+	0.10	-0.18+	0.10	-0.17+	0.10
Age 41-50	-0.24*	0.11	-0.18+	0.11	-0.22*	0.11	-0.17	0.11
Age 51+	-0.20+	0.10	-0.10	0.10	-0.21*	0.10	-0.12	0.10
Black	-0.45**	0.13	-0.39**	0.13	-0.45**	0.13	-0.38**	0.13
Latine	-0.41**	0.14	-0.38**	0.14	-0.42**	0.14	-0.40**	0.14
Other race/ethnicity	0.20	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.13
Intact two parent	0.13+	0.08	0.13+	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.08
Midwest	0.03	0.11	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.11	-0.00	0.11
South	0.02	0.11	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.11
West	0.27*	0.12	0.27*	0.13	0.26*	0.13	0.26*	0.13
Raised in a suburb near a large city	0.17	0.10	0.15	0.11	0.19+	0.11	0.17	0.11
Raised in a small city	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.11
Raised in a rural area	0.18	0.12	0.19	0.12	0.20+	0.12	0.22+	0.12
Class	-0.08*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04
<i>Sport histories</i>								
Played and dropped out			0.56***	0.09			0.57***	0.09
Never played			0.04	0.10			0.07	0.10

Note: $N = 3,675$ + $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 4. Results from OLS Regression of Sports' Impact on Sense of Belonging.

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					-0.03	0.04	-0.02	0.04
Nonbinary	-0.50***	0.12	-0.47***	0.11	-0.52***	0.12	-0.48***	0.12
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	-0.15*	0.06	-0.08	0.06	-0.15**	0.06	-0.08	0.06
Bisexual	-0.26***	0.05	-0.16**	0.05	-0.26***	0.05	-0.16**	0.05
Other sexual identity	-0.45***	0.09	-0.33***	0.09	-0.45***	0.09	-0.33***	0.09
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	0.25***	0.05	0.22***	0.05	0.25***	0.05	0.22***	0.05
Age 41-50	0.22***	0.05	0.18***	0.05	0.22***	0.05	0.18***	0.05
Age 51+	0.15**	0.05	0.13**	0.05	0.14**	0.05	0.13**	0.05
Black	0.36***	0.06	0.28***	0.06	0.36***	0.06	0.28***	0.06
Latine	0.24***	0.07	0.22**	0.06	0.24***	0.07	0.22**	0.06
Other race/ethnicity	-0.01	0.06	0.01	0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06
Intact two parent	-0.03	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.03	0.04
Midwest	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05
South	-0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05
West	-0.14*	0.06	-0.12+	0.06	-0.14*	0.06	-0.12+	0.06
Raised in a suburb near a large city	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05	-0.04	0.05
Raised in a small city	-0.05	0.05	-0.08	0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.07	0.05
Raised in a rural area	-0.05	0.06	-0.08	0.06	-0.04	0.06	-0.08	0.06
Class	0.07***	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.07***	0.02	0.04+	0.02
Some college	-0.05	0.06	-0.06	0.05	-0.05	0.06	-0.06	0.05
College and higher	-0.14**	0.06	-0.14*	0.05	-0.14**	0.06	-0.14*	0.05
<i>Youth Sport Experiences</i>								
Played and dropped out			-0.48***	0.04			-0.48***	0.04
Never played			-0.63***	0.04			-0.63***	0.04
Mistreated			-0.38***	0.03			-0.38***	0.03

Note: $N = 3,582$ + $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5. Results from OLS Regression of Sports' Impact on Self-esteem.

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					-0.07+	0.04	-0.07+	0.04
Nonbinary	-0.49***	0.12	-0.45***	0.12	-0.54***	0.12	-0.50***	0.12
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	-0.18**	0.06	-0.10+	0.06	-0.20**	0.06	-0.12*	0.06
Bisexual	-0.25***	0.05	-0.15**	0.05	-0.25***	0.05	-0.15**	0.05
Other sexual identity	-0.44***	0.10	-0.32**	0.10	-0.43***	0.10	-0.31**	0.10
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	0.23***	0.05	0.21***	0.05	0.23***	0.05	0.21***	0.05
Age 41-50	0.23***	0.05	0.19***	0.05	0.23***	0.05	0.20***	0.05
Age 51+	0.20***	0.05	0.17**	0.05	0.19***	0.05	0.17**	0.05
Black	0.44***	0.06	0.34***	0.06	0.44***	0.06	0.34***	0.06
Latine	0.31***	0.07	0.28***	0.07	0.31***	0.07	0.28***	0.07
Other race/ethnicity	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.06
Intact two parent	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.04
Midwest	-0.07	0.06	-0.06	0.05	-0.07	0.06	-0.07	0.05
South	-0.00	0.06	0.00	0.05	-0.00	0.06	-0.00	0.05
West	-0.10	0.06	0.08	0.06	-0.11+	0.06	-0.08	0.06
Raised in a suburb near a large city	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.05
Raised in a small city	-0.06	0.05	-0.09+	0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.08	0.05
Raised in a rural area	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.06
Class	0.07**	0.02	0.03+	0.02	0.07**	0.02	0.03+	0.02
Some college	-0.04	0.06	-0.05	0.06	-0.04	0.06	-0.05	0.06
College and higher	-0.12*	0.06	-0.11*	0.06	-0.12*	0.06	-0.11*	0.06
<i>Youth Sport Experiences</i>								
Played and dropped out			-0.53***	0.04			-0.52***	0.04
Never played			-0.66***	0.05			-0.65***	0.05
Mistreated			-0.43***	0.04			-0.43***	0.04

Note: $N = 3,584 + p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 6. Results from OLS Regression of Sports' Impact on Connection to Community.

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					-0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.04
Nonbinary	-0.38***	0.10	-0.37***	0.10	-0.40***	0.11	-0.39***	0.11
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	-0.14**	0.05	-0.09+	0.05	-0.15**	0.06	-0.10+	0.05
Bisexual	-0.25***	0.05	-0.18***	0.05	-0.25***	0.05	-0.18***	0.05
Other sexual identity	-0.39***	0.08	-0.30***	0.09	-0.39***	0.08	-0.30**	0.09
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	0.14**	0.04	0.11*	0.04	-0.14**	0.04	0.11*	0.04
Age 41-50	0.00	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.03	0.05
Age 51+	-0.07	0.05	-0.09*	0.05	-0.07	0.05	-0.09*	0.05
Black	0.44***	0.05	0.38***	0.05	0.45***	0.05	0.38***	0.05
Latine	0.33***	0.06	0.31***	0.06	0.32***	0.06	0.31***	0.06
Other race/ethnicity	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06
Intact two parent	-0.06+	0.03	-0.06+	0.03	-0.06+	0.03	-0.06+	0.03
Midwest	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.05
South	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05
West	-0.13*	0.06	-0.13*	0.06	-0.13*	0.06	-0.13*	0.06
Raised in a suburb near a large city	-0.07	0.05	-0.09*	0.05	-0.07	0.05	-0.09+	0.05
Raised in a small city	-0.01	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.00	0.05	-0.04	0.05
Raised in a rural area	0.02	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.02	0.05
Class	0.08***	0.02	0.05**	0.02	0.08***	0.02	0.05**	0.02
Some college	-0.08+	0.05	-0.09+	0.05	-0.08	0.05	-0.09+	0.05
College and higher	-0.13*	0.05	-0.12*	0.05	-0.13*	0.05	-0.12*	0.05
<i>Youth Sport Experiences</i>								
Played and dropped out			-0.40***	0.04			-0.40***	0.04
Never played			-0.47***	0.04			0.47***	0.04
Mistreated			-0.25***	0.03			-0.25***	0.03

Note: $N = 3,559$ + $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 7. Results from OLS Regression of Sports' Impact on Social Status.

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
<i>Gender</i>								
Female					-0.08*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04
Nonbinary	-0.47***	0.11	-0.44***	0.11	-0.53***	0.12	-0.50***	0.11
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Lesbian or Gay	-0.21***	0.06	-0.14*	0.06	-0.24***	0.06	-0.16**	0.06
Bisexual	-0.30***	0.05	-0.22***	0.05	-0.29***	0.05	-0.21***	0.05
Other sexual identity	-0.46***	0.09	-0.34***	0.09	-0.45***	0.09	-0.34***	0.09
<i>Background Characteristics</i>								
Age 31-40	0.18***	0.05	0.15**	0.05	0.18***	0.05	0.15**	0.05
Age 41-50	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08+	0.05	0.05	0.05
Age 51+	-0.00	0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.1	0.05	-0.03	0.05
Black	0.40***	0.06	0.33***	0.06	0.41***	0.06	0.33***	0.06
Latine	0.32***	0.06	0.30***	0.06	0.32***	0.06	0.29***	0.06
Other race/ethnicity	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.06
Intact two parent	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.04
Midwest	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.05
South	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.05
West	-0.14*	0.06	-0.13*	0.06	-0.15*	0.06	-0.13*	0.06
Raised in a suburb near a large city	-0.10*	0.05	-0.10*	0.05	-0.10*	0.05	-0.10*	0.05
Raised in a small city	-0.06	0.05	-0.09+	0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.09+	0.05
Raised in a rural area	-0.08	0.06	-0.12*	0.05	-0.07	0.06	-0.11*	0.05
Class	0.06**	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.06**	0.02	0.03	0.02
Some college	-0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.06	0.05	-0.05	0.05
College and higher	-0.15**	0.05	-0.14**	0.05	-0.14*	0.05	-0.13*	0.05
<i>Youth Sport Experiences</i>								
Played and dropped out			-0.42***	0.04			-0.42***	0.04
Never played			-0.51***	0.04			-0.50***	0.04
Mistreated			-0.36***	0.03			-0.37***	0.03

Note: $N = 3,573$ + $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.