The inclusion and exclusion of LGBTQ+ or LGBTQIA+ student-athletes in Sport

A Research Proposal

Priyana Kalita

Department of Kinesiology and Health

KNH 402

Fall 2020

Paper submitted as part of the capstone experience required for the Bachelor's of Science (B.S.) degree in public health in the Department of Kinesiology and Health at Miami University

The inclusion and exclusion of LGBTQ+ or LGBTQIA+ student-athletes in Sport

Inclusion in sport is a topic of discussion in today's world. Whether it is based on sex, race, gender, religion etc., it is essential for provision of an environment which is equal for all for everyone to have a platform to have the best sport experience. But there are times that necessary equality of sport has been violated by sport administrators, sport officials, coaches and my athletes themselves. According to the research article by researchers, Pariera, Brody, and Scott, named "Now that They're Out: Experiences of College Athletics Teams with Openly LGBTQ Players," LGBTQ+ athletes heard more homophobic languages in the gym, from the athletes on the opponent team and also from their teammates as well. The research also showed that they feared to be alienated from their own team as well. LGBTQ+ athletes not only get affected by the situations that they face on the field or court, but there are a lot of pressure coming from off the field and court as well. The research article by Lee and Cunningham, named "Gender, sexism, sexual prejudice, and identification," says that the pressure from fans can be sexist at times. The research study said that it is more difficult to "come out" for men in sport such as football and still be safe and respected. The research study also gave out the result about the tendency of men facing more sexist comments and remarks from fans when compared with women.

Although there has been significant amount of research and progress on sports, during this lot of athletes who belong to the LGBTQ+ and LGBTQIA+ community have come across the risk

of exclusion and discrimination in sporting activities. According to the 2012 Campus Pride LGBQT National College Athlete Report, 39 percent of LGBQ athletes had felt harassed because of their sexual identity during that year. 'The fact about an athlete being gay or lesbian has gone on to harm promising careers as well. Michael Sam, who played football for the University of Missouri and had come out as "gay" during college was, drafted by the then St. Louis Rams and then Dallas Cowboys and then was cut from both the teams. When asked about this to Michael, he says that things would surely have been different if he was not out (Loumena, 2015).' The notion of "out" here means telling the world that Michael was not a heterosexual or in popular culture a "straight" man. Another problem with LGBTQIA+ athletes in sport is mostly with trans and intersex athletes in their willingness and comfort to use team locker rooms and bathrooms. The participants in a research study by Owen, Hargie, David H Mitchell and Ian JA Somerville, felt anxious because they felt they were the "other gender" in the changing room. The changing rooms seemed to have an invisible norm of gender behavior which the participants didn't have experience with. This was because the participants feared the outcomes of their sexual organs not matching the assignment of the bathrooms that they were supposed to use.

For starters, the acronym LGBTQIA+ is the short form for L which stands for "Lesbian," G which stands for "Gay," B stands for "Bisexual," T stands for "Transgender," Q stands for "Queer/Questioning," I stands for "Intersex" and A stands for "Asexual." In general, women whose sexual preferences are other women tend to identify their sexual orientation as lesbian, men whose sexual preferences are other men tend to identify their sexual orientation as gay, people who sexually prefer both men and women tend to identify with the sexual orientation bisexual, people who transition from their sex at birth to their preferred gender are known as

trans or transgender people, queer or questioning is for people who still might not be sure about their sexual orientation and preferences yet, people who are born with several variation of sex characteristics which might not similar to cisgender male and female sex characteristics are known as Intersex people and people who might not be attracted to any gender or sex sexually tend to identify with the term asexual. The meaning of the acronym is not limited to this and the "+" defines that. The + in the acronym means that there are various other sexual orientations, gender representations and meanings of the acronym.

The purpose of this paper is to describe a proposed research project that would be conducted to examine the factors on what "out" LGBTQIA+ athletes get included and excluded from sporting activities. To provide a context for this proposed study, a review of some relevant research studies on this topic is provided in the next section.

The inclusion and exclusion of LGBTQ+ or LGBTQIA+ student-athletes in Sport

Prior research on the inclusion of LGBTQ+ athletes in sport has shown that a lot of LGBTQ+ athletes feel isolated, verbally abused and anxiety in a lot of athletic spaces. Therefore, each of the following seven research articles relates to these findings and show similar results. The eighth article shows findings on how athletes can be affected by the pressures coming from off-court or field as well.

The study conducted by Pariera and colleagues (Pariera, Brody & Scott, 2019) was designed to conduct a deep analysis of celebrations and controversies of "coming out" and examine actual experiences of LGBTQ athletes and their teammates. The study was carried out in the form of a survey with research questions and other open-ended questions for the participants to describe

their gender identity and sexual orientation. The hypothesis or two of the key expectations that the researchers had from this study was to know more about the effects of "coming out" as a varsity college athlete instead of focusing on the celebration and positivity of coming out which is portrayed and valued widely and incur more information about the effects of homophobic slurs within athletic premises on LGBTQ athletes with various identities, non-LGBTQ athletes and non-LGBTQ athletes with at least one LGBTQ teammate.

The participants of the Pariera et al. (2019) study included 259 current and former student athletes of which 70 identified with the acronym of LGBTQ and 189 were non-LGBTQ student-athletes. The participants of the study were recruited through social media platforms such as facebook, reddit pages, outsports etc., by former student athletes. The student athlete had to be a varsity athlete from any division, 18 years of age by 2006 and either identify with the LGBTQ acronym or had a teammate who identified with the same. This research was funded by a grant from Robert H. Brooks Sports Science Institute.

Before this research was published to the public the researchers engaged in cognitive interviewing with three LGBTQ individuals to establish validity of the survey items. The Pariera et al. (2019) study was also conducted based on review of research, athletics, press articles and policies which affect out athletes. The survey was filled out by both LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ student athletes. Similar questions with different wordings were presented to them. For example- if a person was an LGBTQ student athlete then they were asked, "Did the following worry you with regard to being 'out' as LGBTQ while you were a student-athlete?" and if a student athlete identified as being non-LGBTQ but at least had or has had one LGBTQ identifying teammate

then the following question was asked, “‘‘ Did the following worry you about the LGBTQ athletes you played with?”

The Pariera et al. (2019), study had come up with a survey with four specific questions and multiple other open ended questions for gender identifications and sexual orientation for the most effective results. The goals of the four main questions are as follows- the first question on the survey aimed at knowing concerns about playing with an LGBTQ athlete or a teammate, the second questions aimed at knowing more about if athletes hard homophobic language from people from their team or any other teams, the third question was related to how many people got bothered because of discriminatory practices towards LGBTQ athletes and the fourth question concentrated on being and playing an LGBTQ athlete. Next gender variations were tested through t-tests on each variable which is each LGBTQ student-athlete. For the sake of the study, the gender variations were put in a binary of men and women. Trans women and men were including in the binary as well. Open ended responses were accepted for the description for sexual orientations for the participants.

Analysis of the data obtained from this study Pariera et al. (2019) showed that the concerns of non- LGBTQ student athletes playing with an LGBTQ student-athlete were low. But one thing which came out of that was the researchers got to know that both LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ athletes were concerned about the alienation of LGBTQ athletes. If compared than more concern was shown by LGBTQ athletes in this case. When asked about the use of homophobic language within the team and in other teams, the overall response was low but when compared, LGBTQ athletes heard more homophobic language than non-LGBTQ athletes from their teammates and people from other teams etc. Both LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ athletes admitted to hearing the

least amount of homophobic language from their coaches, support staff and the members of the media. The researchers used the Chi square analysis to find out how many student-athletes were bothered by discriminatory practices against LGBTQ student athletes and found out that there were a least number of LGBTQ athletes reporting discriminatory events against them than the non-LGBTQ athletes who reported when their LGBTQ teammate faced a discrimination. In order to compare the effect for the LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ athletes who were bothered by the discriminatory practices, the researchers used a 5-point scale and the results were near or below the mid-point. But after this one thing came to their notice was that LGBTQ students were prevented and not encouraged when they spoke about their experiences or wanted to for a gay student athlete organization, in comparison to non-LGBTQ athletes. When asked about the experiences of being a LGBTQ student athlete or playing one, the non-LGBTQ student- athletes thought that the inclusion of out LGBTQ student-athletes didn't bother the diversity and inclusion of the University. The non-LGBTQ students showed concerns about out LGBTQ student athletes and feared that them being out will take the attention away from the team and be put on just the LGBTQ athlete. When considering gender variations, t-tests on each variable which is each LGBTQ student-athlete were used . Women were less concerned ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.20$) than men ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.02$) about alienation from their team and being a LGBTQ athlete. Considering homophobic language, women ($M=1.76$, $SD = .88$)were less likely than men ($M = 2.64$, $SD = .87$) to hear it from teammates ($t(64) = 4.03$, $p < .001$), and less likely to hear it from athletes on opposing teams than men were (women's $M = 1.68$, $SD = .81$, men's $M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.04$, $t(64) = 2.49$, $p = .02$). Women were more concerned than men over the negativity of being an LGBTQ athlete. Women ($M= 2.34$, $SD=1.32$) were more concerned than men ($M =$

1.50, SD = .96) to believe that LGBTQ athletes would damage relationships with alumni and donors ($t(64) = -2.86$, $p = .006$). Women more than men felt as if recruiting procedures will be harmed because of the LGBTQ athletes.

In discussing their results, Pariera et al. (2019) pointed out that there were other factors which went into the formation of the exclusion of LGBTQ student-athletes from sports. Factors such as reverse relative deprivation thesis, negativity bias, distraction and intergroup contact theory were found to be playing a role in this. Through the reverse relative deprivation, an athlete compares their experiences to yesteryears where things might have been worse, which leads to the ignorance or less attention to microaggression towards LGBTQ athletes that they experience currently. Negativity bias is related to exaggerated media portrayals of LGBTQ individuals in different forms of media which creates an antagonistic view in non-LGBTQ student athletes about LGBTQ student-athletes and that is where all the confusion and controversy starts. Collegiate athletic institutions use “distraction” as a way to LGBTQ athletes and LGBTQ athlete issues as those might distract the main purpose of collegiate athletics and put the attention just on the LGBTQ student athlete and the research study found out that intergroup dialogue between LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ student athletes has proven for better understanding of the experiences of the LGBTQ student athlete by a non-LGBTQ student athlete.

In interpreting the results of the study, Pariera et al. (2019) found out that there were too few trans individuals, there were no data taken on the interaction or views about a non-LGBTQ student-athlete on their LGBTQ teammate or vice versa, there is a requirement of more in-depth research on race, gender, immigration etc., with LGBTQ inclusion in collegiate sports and

further schools qualitative research in the form of in-depth interviews would help illuminate the results from this study.

With the growing world of athlete activism, Social Movement Organizations hold an important place. A SMO is “complex, or formal, organization, which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement those goals.” One such organization is Athlete Ally, which operates under the umbrella of the LGBTQ+ community and provides support and resources to athletes. The LGBTQ+ community is marginalized in the Athletic world. Therefore, Athlete Ally aims to accomplish equality for the LGBTQ+ community by fighting against the prevalence of transphobia and homophobia, through athletic leadership. The athlete leadership and activism is carried out by prominent past and present athletes. The athletes are known as the “Athlete Ambassadors" and some of the names are- Kenneth Faried from the NBA, Sue Bird from the WNBA, and Mollie Lensig from Major League Quidditch. Athlete Ally currently expands to over 150 athletes.

The main purposes of Schmidt and Colleagues’ (2020), research on Athlete Ally was, first, to look at Athlete Ally from a Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) (RMT, a subtheory of Social Movement Theory, focuses on the organizational unit of a social movement (Buechler, 1993), in order to know about what resources does Athlete Ally and SMOs use for the betterment of their organizational goals and attributes of those resources. Second, how do organizations acquire those resources? Third, the study aimed to look at the role of Social Movement organizations in regards with athlete activists who stand against injustice. This is because there are multiple numbers of SMOs and one of the examples is the Women’s Sport Foundation and the Players Coalition. All the SMOs have different goals which will be difficult to research at once.

Therefore, this is the reason why this study aimed at researching the relationship between athlete activists and SMOs and their interdependence.

Athlete Ally is a pro-LGBTQ, 501c-3 nonprofit organization that provides public awareness campaigns, pro-ally programming, and other tools to foster inclusive sport environments (Athlete Ally, n.d.-a). At the time of the study, the governing structure of Athlete Ally consisted of a 20-member board of directors, four directors and two coordinators, 22 advisory board members out of which only five people had full-time positions. The participants for the research study by Schmidth et. al (2020), were the Athlete Ambassadors of Athlete Ally which ranged from NCAA collegiate athletes in every division to professional and Olympic athletes and people involved in running the organization. Out of all of them 10 people from within the organization and 3 athlete ambassadors agreed to be a part of this study.

The research study by Schmidth et. al (2020), mostly relied on data collection by interviewing the participants. The research study was carried out in the form of a case study with the help of semi- interview questions, from the month of December in 2017 till the month of January in 2019. Scmidth et. al (2020), relied on the semi-structured interview in order to ask follow up questions. This is because Follow-up questions allow the researchers to research for more information and encourage the participants to define the world from their own perspectives, not only from the perspective of the researchers.

To start off with, first, the researchers listed down relevant themes such as resources given, forms of support etc., from Athlete Ally, in order to get the conversation started. Second, the relevant themes were turned into interview questions such as- “What resources does Athlete Ally

provide to its Athlete Ambassadors?" Third, the formation of the questions was paid attention and the phrasing was made more effective. Some of the final questions which were used as interview questions were- "What tangible (eg., physical and touchable) resources does Athlete Ally provide its Athlete Ambassadors?" "What intangible (non-physical) resources does Athlete Ally provide its Athlete Ambassadors?" What tangible resources do the Athlete Ambassadors provide to Athlete Ally?" What intangible resources do the Athlete Ambassadors provide to Athlete Ally?"

In addition to this, per the semi-structured interview format, follow up questions by the researchers were asked with the use of everyday language, avoidance of double negatives, avoidance of asking two questions at once and with preparation for any sensitive or difficult question. To make the case study which lasted from the December of 2017 till the January of 2019, results more effective more materials and documents were acquired from Athlete Ally and reviewed. The documents consisted of emails sent to public who signed up for alerts, social media tweets by Athlete Ally and its ambassadors, educational toolkit for holding a fundraiser by Athlete Ally, tool kit to start an Athlete Ally chapter on a college campus, a report between the founder of Athlete Ally Hudson Taylor and the National Collegiate Athletic Association and a financial statement from 2015. This data was collected on the organization's website, social media pages or obtained directly via email from Athlete Ally.

Trustworthiness was aimed to be established in this case study in several ways. In order to ensure the accuracy of the result, conversations with the organization were carried out via email and phone conversation. Member checking was ensured as well through allowing the participants

to review the accuracy of the results of the study. The final transcript for the review process was sent through an email to the participants.

For the study, 10 people from within the organization and 3 athlete ambassadors agreed to answer the interview questions. In order to keep their identities anonymous, pseudonyms were assigned to them. The positions of the people of the organization who participated included, 3 directors, 1 coordinator, 3 board members.

The study by Schmidth et. al (2020) yielded that for the resources Athlete Ally provided Athlete Ambassadors, first is that Athlete Ally served central point for unity and mobilization of LGBTQ issues. Both the athletes and employees pointed out that the organization's name and support for the cause, acted as an important point of continuity for the identity and the collective action for its constituents. The Athlete participants also pointed out in the interview questions that their association with Athlete Ally itself provided them with legitimacy and credibility in the form of a platform for them to stand up for equality and LGBTQ+ rights. Another crucial resource Athlete Ally provided its Athlete Ambassadors is coordinated activism via the specialized knowledge (e.g., tool kits, one-page summary sheets; Carty, 2002; della Porta & Diani, 2006; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Scott, 1981). Another point which was pointed out as a benefit was that the vast social media of Athlete ally which proved as a bigger platform for the athletes in their voices getting heard. Athlete ally also had effective marketing strategies and one of the example is creation of "SWAG" shirts which aims at creating a collective identity among athlete activists. SMOs served as the point of continuity for identity and collective action for its activists (della Porta & Diani, 2006). This point of identity is extremely important for Athlete Ally as creating a common identity in the LGBTQ movement creates internal cohesion, which

increases mobilization (Armstrong, 2002). By creating logos and distributing material resources with that logo, the collective identity can become easily identified. Athletes, who can be positively viewed as leaders in society (Cunningham et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2015), can be encouraged to wear the merchandise to benefit this organization.

In the case of Athlete Ambassadors providing Athlete Ally with resources, the study showed that the celebrity attention on them has proved to be beneficial for Athlete Ally. The promotion of SMOs and specifically Athlete by Athlete activists had proven to be the form of credibility and legitimacy for them. Athletes also provided Athlete Ally with access to a broad social network of other athletes. This is a benefit for Athlete Ally as it allowed more athlete recruitment to take place. Almost every participant, both employees and athletes, noted how the athletes' stories were a vital resource for the organization. Jess (employee) noted how the stories were used as a communication front and a fund-raising opportunity. From the communications standpoint, the professional athletes' story was meant to grab the reader's attention who is sifting through their email or social media page. As the studies from Agyemang et al. (2010) and Kaufman and Wolff (2010), the personal studies from athlete activists are extremely important as they lead to their direct source for wanting to engage in activism. These personal stories help to sell the authenticity (Ellcessor, 2016; Huliaras & Tzifakis, 2012) for their activism and should be utilized by the SMO for communications and fund-raising opportunities. This is particularly true as athlete activists oftentimes have their intentions questioned and efforts dismissed by the public (Frederick et al., 2018). The reputation of the athletes also proved to be an advantage for fundraising purposes of Athlete Ally.

The study by Schmidth et. al. (2020), didn't consider research on different identities based on race, class, ability, sport etc., focusing on various identities and their views on the interview questions was not the central idea for this case study. The roles of the athletes were generalized and not seen from various possible perspectives to find more accurate and results in-depth. This study only focused on one organization which narrows the transferability of results in the understanding of other SMOs. No followers of Athlete Ally were interviewed, instead employees of the organization were interviewed which proved to be a drawback as well.

Future studies should attempt to go beyond the five categories of resources in studying sport and social movements due to the uniqueness of sport and paucity of research. In addition, examining the intersectionality of the athletes and their activism is important. Few studies have started to take up this task (Lee & Cunningham, 2019). The athletes (and organizational members) interviewed in this study came from all walks of life and had their own stories. Those stories, as well as how they interact with SMOs is vital for examination.

Heterosexism, cissexism, homophobia, transphobia etc., are still prevalent in the world of sport. Therefore, this study by Toomey and colleagues (2018), aimed at two primary aims for their study. First, Toomey et. Al (2018) used LPA, to research and understand patterns of LGBTQ ally identity salience and engagement among college students. Second, we assessed how variation in affirmative attitudes about LGBTQ people, personal religious beliefs about LGBTQ people, social justice attitudes, a common fate with LGBTQ ideology, and how supportive a player's coach was of LGBTQ people were associated with the identified patterns of ally identity salience and engagement.

The researchers expected at least two quantitatively different profiles for the results. First, athletes would report high levels of ally identity salience, visibility, and engagement and second, athletes would report low levels of ally identity salience, visibility, and engagement. Considering prior research and literature on this topic and the topics surrounding it, the researchers expected that more affirmative beliefs and attitudes (personal and religious), and more social justice attitudes and common fate ideologies would be associated with athlete ally profiles that included higher levels of identity salience, engagement, and visibility at LGBTQ events. The researchers also expected that when athletes' reported that their coaches held more supportive attitudes of LGBTQ people that these attitudes would be associated with patterns of greater ally identity salience and engagement (Anderson & Bullingham, 2015; Griffin, 1998; Griffin & Taylor, 2013; Toomey et al., 2016, in press; Wernick, Kulick, & Inglehart, 2013, 2014).

The participants in the Toomey et. al (2018) study included 159 college athletes, who were enrolled in two public universities which enrolled 15000, approximately as a whole. The universities were in the Mountain West and North Central Midwest regions of the U.S., and both universities had NCAA Division I athletics programs. As for the distribution of the participants, almost half of the students responded as cisgender women (49.7%) and 95% of the participants identified as heterosexual with the exception of five participants who identified as lesbian and two women identified as bisexual. Racially, the population was predominantly white. Non-Latinos resulted in a percentage of 86.2% for the population. Socioeconomically the population was from upper middle class families of origin backgrounds (median income range was $75000 to $100,000). The average age of participants was 20.67 years old (SD D1.56; Range: 18 to 28 year), and they represented a diverse range of years of enrollment in school (i.e., 30.8% were

freshman, 20.1% were sophomores, 23.9% were juniors, and 19.5% were fourth year or fifth year seniors; 1.9% were attending graduate school and 3.8% did not answer the question about school enrollment). Most of the athletes were funded either by a full or a partial scholarship (76.7%) and represented a diverse number of sports such as basketball, golf, football, track and field, wrestling. The Majority of athletes in this study were from NCAA football (21.2%), track and field (24.5%), soccer (13.9%), or basketball (12.6%).

The research study by Toomey et. al (2018), was carried out through a Qualtrics survey and the participant athletes approximately took 15-20 minutes to complete the survey. In order to recruit student-athletes for this study, recruitment emails were sent by the Athletics directors and academic advisors to the student-athletes and reminder emails were sent at two-week intervals. The student-athletes who had taken the survey were automatically eligible to win 1 of the 10 $25 gift cards. This study and the protocol was approved by the institutional review board at North Dakota State University.

The Engagement in LGBTQ Ally Actions in Sports Scale (Toomey et al., 2016) was used to assess the degree to which athletes engaged in activities that are supportive of the LGBTQ community. The scale includes two subscales: Standing Up Engagement and Showing Up Engagement. The Standing Up subscale includes three items and represents engagement where athletes stood up for LGBTQ people or spoke up against LGBTQ-related bias (e.g., “I let teammates know that I don’t like to hear them use anti-LGBTQ slurs and explain why they are problematic”). The Showing Up subscale included four items and represents engagement where athletes attended LGBTQ-related events (e.g., “When offered, I regularly attend campus events that are intended to support the LGBTQ community [for example, activities associated with

Coming Out Week, Transgender Awareness Week, Pride Week]"). All items were rated on a four-point scale that ranged from Never to Often; higher scores reflect more frequent engagement in ally actions and attendance behaviors. Both subscales had acceptable internal reliability (a D. 80 and. 83, respectively).

An Ally Identity scale was created for the study to analyze the participants salience of ally-related values and beliefs. The scale consisted of seven items, for example- "Equality and fairness are my guiding moral principles and therefore I am involved in supporting the LGBTQ community as an ally," was one of them. The items on the 6-point scale ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Higher scores reflect a stronger salience of the values and beliefs related to why one identifies as an ally to the LGBTQ community. The current study also included personal and religious beliefs about LGBTQ people, perceived level of coach support for LGBTQ people, attitudes toward social justice, and common fate with LGBTQ people ideology.

Athletes' personal attitudes toward LGBTQ people were assessed using an adapted version of Worthen's (2011) attitudes measures. Our adaptation included combining attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual people into a single scale, rather than assessing these constructs separately, due to constraints on survey length. The adapted scale included 14 items (e.g., "It is alright with me if I see two men or two women holding hands") that were rated on a six-point scale (from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). This scale had acceptable reliability (a D 0.94). A single item assessed athletes' personal religious beliefs about LGBTQ people: "On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is extremely not accepting / affirming, how would you describe your religion's beliefs about LGBTQ people?" Further, a single item assessed athletes' perceptions of how supportive

coaches were of LGBTQ people, following the prompt: “For each of the groups of people listed below [note: an exhaustive list of various social/familial groups was listed for participants, including coaches], please select the answer that best represents how supportive you believe they are of LGBTQ people and issues using the provided scale.” The rating scale ranged from Not Supportive to Very Supportive. An adapted version of the Attitudes toward Social Justice Scale (Kizer, 2011) assessed athletes’ attitudes toward social justice (rather than the original scale’s focus on counselors’ attitudes toward social justice). The revised scale consisted of nine out of the original 10 items (one item could not be adapted for use with non- counselor populations, as it was specific to counseling profession ethics). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses revealed that two items did not significantly load onto the unidimensional construct (results are available upon request). Thus, participants rated the remaining seven items (e.g., “I am passionate about advocating for marginalized groups”) on a six-point scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Higher scores reflect greater social justice attitudes, and the scale had acceptable internal reliability in the current study (a D. 90).

Common fate ideology related to diverse sexualities and gender identities was assessed by an adapted version of a measure that assessed common fate ideology related to sex (Curtin, 2011; Gurin & Townsend, 1986). The three items (e.g., “How much do you feel you have in common with most LGBTQ people?”) were rated on a five-point scale, ranging from Hardly at All to Very Much. The revised scale had acceptable internal reliability (a D. 73).

The result from the study of Toomey et. al (2018), said that the largest number of participants who participated included people who had low ally identity salience, little to no standing up enagement and little to no showing up engagement. This group was labelled as “Not LGBTQ

Allies," which were 56.7% of the entire sample size. Then came the athletes who had moderate ally identity salience, moderate levels of standing up engagement and little to no showing up engagement. This group was labelled as, "Engaed but not visible LGBTQ Allies' ' which were 35.8% of the sample size. Lastly, the group had high levels of standing up engagement and high levels of showing up engagement. They were labelled as, "Engaged and Visible LGBTQ Allies' ' and ranged about 7.5% of the entire sample size. Cisgender men were over-represented in the Not Allies profile (88.5% compared to 25.9%) whereas cisgender women were over-represented in the Engaged but not Visible (63% compared to 7.7%) and Highly Engaged (11.1% compared to 3.8%). Student-athletes who perceived their coaches as being supportive of LGBTQ people were less likely to be in the Not LGBTQ Allies group and more likely to be in the Engaged but not Visible profile. This finding highlights the critical role that coaches can play in developing more positive and affirming beliefs and actions in student-athletes, and is congruent with the existing literature that argues that coaches play a significant role in influencing attitudes and behaviors of student-athletes (Adams & Anderson, 2012; Anderson, & Bullingham, 2015; Anderson et al., 2016; Griffin, 1998).

Surely, the study by Toomey et. al (2018), had its share of limitations as well. The study never looked at the views of coaches in regards with the effect that their athletes have on them. The study didn't look at if the participants had close relationships with coaches and other athletes who identified with the LGBTQ+ community. Future research is needed that explores the social networks of athletes in relation to their allied attitudes and behaviors. The population of the participants for the research study was not racially or geographically diverse. The research also focused on the LGBTQ community as a whole, rather than disaggregating attitudes, beliefs, and

behaviors for various subgroups within the community (e.g., bisexual, transgender). For example, transgender athletes may experience unique barriers in collegiate athletics that do not apply to sexual minority communities (e.g., access to participation, locker room access and safety; Buzuvis, 2016).

The purpose of the study by Roper and colleagues (2007) was the research and explore attitudes toward lesbian and gay men from a heterosexual perspective which included the participation of 371 heterosexual male and female collegiate student-athletes in the USA. Attitudes for this research study was assessed on the basis of relationship to the student athlete's gender, sport and contact.

The specific research question for this research was: What are self-identified heterosexual male and female student-athletes' attitudes towards gay Menand lesbians across gender, sport and contact? A three-part hypothesis for this research by considering, previous research on heterosexual attitude towards gay men and lesbians in sport was formulated. 1) hypothesis was that male student-athlete attitudes towards gay men and lesbians will be more negative than female student athletes, 2) attitude towards lesbians and gay men will be more negative among men's teams (basketball, lacrosse and soccer) compared to men's individual teams (tennis, track and field, swimming/diving), women's team (crew, soccer lacrosssem volleyball, softball, field hockey, cheerleading basketball) and women's individual sport (swimming/diving, track and field, tennis and 3) Contact experiences with gay men and lesbians will be associated with more positive experiences with the same.

389 student athletes consented to participate in this study. Out of all the 389 student athletes, 5 self-identified as lesbians, 3 as questioning and 371 as heterosexual. 10 student athlete's data were not considered for the this research study because of incorrect information. The 371-heterosexual student-athletes came from universities in the Northeast. Of these 59% (219) were female and 41% (152) were male. The participants were from Division 1 and Division 2 schools. Two of the universities were situated in suburban settings and one was situated in rural settings. As for the age, the participants ranged from 17 to 25 years with a mean of 19.24 years. For the racial distribution among the participants, 81.1% (301) self-identified as white, 11.1% (41) as African American/ Black, 3.2% (8) as Asian, 2.4% (9) as Hispanic and 2.2% (8) as others. For the distribution of the year in school for the participants, 34.0% (126) consisted of freshman, 31.0% (49) consisted of sophomores, 21.8% (81) were juniors and 13.2% (49) were seniors student-athletes. The participants were also asked to indicate the number of years that they had represented the particular college team that they were representing currently and the results are as follows- 40.7% (151) 1 year, 31.3% (116) 2 years, 18.3% (68) 3 years, 8.9% (33) 4 years and .8% (3) 5 years. 12 sports were represented in this research study and 69% (258) from the participating student-athletes indicated to have contact with an individual who identified as gay or lesbian.

The Athletic Directors of ten universities which comprised both D1 and D2 schools were contacted and asked for permission to contact their student-athletes and three of the ten universities gave permission to the first author to contact the coaching staff and 59 head coaches were contacted. Twenty seven of the fifty-nine head coaches provided the researchers with access to their teams. The head coaches were sent five hundred and forty envelopes of which 389

were filled and returned to the researchers by the teams. The envelope included information about how they should be distributed to the student-athletes and filled in. Each head coach was asked to give the envelope to their teams as a whole before or after practice. The head coaches were also asked to read a letter of confidentiality to the students before they started filling out the materials.

The envelopes which were given to the student-athletes consisted of a letter of information, a demographic form, the purpose of study and their potential involvement, a consent form and a copy of Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG-S) 10-question questionnaire. If the student-athletes wanted to participate then they were responsible for reading the information letter, signing the consent form, filling the demographic form, filling the questionnaire and then returning everything in the same envelope to their head coach. If they didn't want to participate then they were not needed to sign or fill anything but had to return the form to their head coach. The head coach was responsible to mail in all the envelopes regardless of whether they were filled or not, to the first author.

The demographic form asked each participant to inform their gender, sexual orientation, race, age, year in school, current sport, number of years on the current team and major. In order to have knowledge about whether the participants have had contact with gay and lesbian identified individuals in sport they were asked the following yes/no questions Do you have contact with any friend/family members/ teammates/ coaches that identify as gay or lesbian? Another question which was asked to the participants was about if they would want to participate in an in-depth interview of this study from a qualitative perspective and if they said yes then they were asked to put in their emails. The participants were also asked to fill out the ATLG-S

questionnaire which measures heterosexual attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. The questionnaire had 10 questions which took approximately 60 seconds for each one to be completed. Data analysis for the data collected was performed by the usage of sample t-tests, ANOVA test and a correlation analysis.

Result for the study by Roper et. al (2007), the results showed that in comparison with female student-athletes, male student-athletes expressed more negative attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. When compared heterosexual men student-athletes views on gay men and lesbians, they expressed more dislike towards gay men. Female field hockey players were more positive towards both gay men and lesbians. The researchers think this to be the case as the field hockey coach had informed the researchers that she herself was an "out" lesbian and the team knew about it which made the team to have more positive views about gay men and lesbians. If taken as a whole, more negative view towards gay men were found to be the case than towards lesbians

This research study by Roper et. al (2007) had some limitations. The way the research was conducted might not seem to be effective as most of the questions which went into analysis were open ended questions. Having contact with gay and lesbian athletes seem to have made a difference in the research results, but the extent of contact should have been considered as well. This leaves room for future research to be conducted on what kind of contact results in negative and positive views about gay men and lesbian student-athletes. Social identities of the student-athletes need to be looked at as well because that plays into the student-athlete's views on gay and lesbian athletes. Another thing which needs to be researched on is that why is it acceptable for heterosexual student-athletes to have negative views about gay and lesbian student-athletes? Not only heterosexual views on gay and lesbian student-athletes should be

conducted but more research also needs to be done on experience of gay and lesbian student athletes to know more about their views and life college sports.

There is a literature and research that can be found on the field of gender sexuality and sport, but the researchers of this study claim that there is a gap between researching into the lived experiences of transgender people in sport. Therefore, the study by Owen and colleagues (2017) aims at closing this research gap by researching and exploring transgender people experiences in relation with sports and physical activity.

10 transgender persons were the participants of this research study. The 10 participants self-identified as transgender people, which consisted of six female and four males. The age range was 25 to 62 years. The participants were recruited through Focus: The Identity Trust which is a support group in Belfast in Northern Ireland, for those who had been referred from a gender identity clinic or registered medical practitioner. All the participants were living their lives as their preferred gender but not all of them had undergone physical changes and transition. Therefore, for this reason, they were noted as "gender conforming" for this research study. Some of the participants felt that they could "pass" in public by their preferred gender more than others but all of them were insecure about their gender presentation.

The research by Owen et. al (2017) was conducted with the help of interviews which took place at the Ulster University. A member of this research team met with two leaders from the support group to explain the research goals and secure the participation of the potential participants. In order to follow the University's ethical process, all the participants had to sign a form in order to give consent. Then semi-structured interviews were asked to the participants for

the researchers to know more about their history and interest with sport, participation in sport and physical activity, incidences of inclusion and exclusion. The interviews lasted from about 30 mins to an hour. The researchers will fully aware of the fact that just being an transgender individual didn't define their ability and inclination towards participation in sport as other factors such as class, ethnicity, personality and various other factors come into consideration then. But the focus of this study was the transgender status of the participants. In order to analyze the research data, close reading and re-reading was conducted by the researchers along with the use of NVivo software in order to identify and compile certain themes on exclusion and inclusion. All the participants were comfortable to be referred to as man, women, trans male or trans women. For the purpose of the research study, the researchers used the term trans man and woman and gave all the participants pseudonyms to maintain their anonymity.

From the analysis of the collected data, four main themes emerged namely- problems experienced when using changing rooms, negative sports experiences at school; the difficulties of appearing in public; and, the impact of their exclusion from sport.

The discomfort in being in a changing room seemed to be the greatest barrier for the participants. First, the participants felt anxious because they felt they were the "other gender" in the changing room. The changing rooms seemed to have an invisible norm of gender behavior which the participants didn't have experience with. Paul, a participant in the research study, wanted to intermingle in the masculinized culture in the changing room. But he felt as if his transgender history held him back from doing so. Secondly, The respondents of the interviews felt as if their presence in the changing room can make others feel uncomfortable. This was because during transition, physical appearance and related concerns regarding attire, prosthetics

etc., resulted in heightened fear of the possibility of experiencing negative effects, anxiety and a feeling of being “exposed.” Another thing which seemed to be a concern for the participants in the research study was the fact about undressing in a changing room or bathroom which might shock. Third barrier is that a person who might not have transitioned yet were required to use the changing room which matched their natal sex which made them feel as if they were discarding their true identity.

In regards with school sports, the interviewees felt alienated specially from team sports. When asked about this to a participant Sandra (ages 20-30), they said that being in a sports team felt like a “concentration camp.” This trend seemed to be the case in regards to trans women who couldn’t live up to “masculine expectations” of team sports at school. This seemed to be the opposite case with individual sports. Participant Marry explained how she felt both less fear of gender exposure and a sense being able to oneself when competing individually: ‘The first time that I ever felt comfortable in a sport was athletics and that’s because it was individual and I could be me in here an no one could guess, you know what’s going on inside.’

We get to know from the study by Owen et. al (2017), being in public spaces seemed to be a cause of anxiety for the participants. Three themes emerged from this category as well. First, the feeling of being marginalized by just being in public. For example, on a walk at a well-known area of scenic beauty one of the participants had recently been verbally abused by a group of people. Interviewees highlighted the large amount of forward-planning required for any outing, careful selection of routes, possible dangers that could be encountered, and the related stress that they often felt even in contemplating it. Secondly, the fear of publicly being recognized or outed was a common theme for all the participants. The participant Connot said, “ ‘The thing about

going to public swimming pools or sports, somebody I know could be down there, I don't particularly want them to know, you know' The third theme seemed to be the unwillingness to be socialize in a group as participants explained it made differences more visible and enhanced "labelling confirmation." Labelling confirmation according to participant Roger was: ''They could maybe go, "is she or isn't she?" But if she's with someone else, they go, "oh they are". That confirms it'

Another result which was given out by this study was about the stress about rejection. People had to go through a two-year transition process to 'prove' themselves before they could undergo physical changes. Therefore, during that time, if someone's transition status was revealed then they automatically withdrew from certain activities such as sport and exercise to avoid consequences. They also feared unemployment. Participant Danielle, who lived and presented as a woman but not yet had physically gone through transition, reported that she was asked to leave her dance class when she reported that she would be attending the classes as a woman in the future. Danielle also reported, "'we tend to get very low paid jobs if we're lucky enough to get a job at all…so my disposable income to even partake in sports and things is a lot lower than it would be'. Interviewees also mentioned the increased expense of make-up and certain prosthetics they required, leading Joanne to conclude: 'There's more important things to be spending your money on than sports'.

The study by Owen et. al (2017), didn't have any limitation which was talked about but if asked to me personally, there is room for research to be done surely. The age range for this research study was vast which can make the results inaccurate. Research on current trans student athletes is needed to know for the comparison if the situation that the participants had faced in

the past has become better or not. Another thing which can be researched upon further is that being trans affects an athlete's chances of getting recruited into a college team. This is because trans people face a lot of discrimination at work. We know about it from the research study. Therefore, does the same phenomena go in recruitment?

The study conducted by Greenspan and colleagues (Griffith, Hayes, & Murtagh, 2019) was designed with one primary purpose in mind. The researchers wanted to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the experiences of LGBTQ+ youth and allies in school-based athletics. The study was driven by three research questions. First, what are the experiences of LGBTQ+ youth and allies in school athletic settings? Second, what is the relationship like between LGBTQ+ youth and allies and their coaches/P.E. teachers? Third, what factors would create a more positive school athletics environment for LGBTQ+ youth and allies? A convergent mixed method design that utilized surveys and focus group/interview modality to gather both qualitative and quantitative data was chosen to investigate these questions.

The participants in the Greenspan et al. (2019) survey portion of the study included responses from 73 students (62 paper surveys, 84.9%; 11 online surveys, 15.1%) who self-reported as LGBTQ+ or as non-LGBTQ+ allies. However, after cleaning the data to exclude surveys from participants that indicated demographic variables meeting exclusion criteria (e.g. younger than 13 years old), there were 58 responses in the survey sample (50 paper surveys, 86.2%; 8 online surveys, 13.8%). Authors employed surveys and focus groups at a LGBTQ+ youth conference; authors distributed online surveys to national LGBTQ+ organizations through the CenterLink database; and, authors employed surveys, focus groups, and interviews at two LGBTQ+ youth group meetings. Focus groups consisted of 13 LGBTQ+ youth who attended a school for whom

no demographic data was collected in the interest of privacy and comfort. The study was approved by the University of Massachusetts (UMass) Amherst institutional review board (IRB) with permission granted for participants to provide their own non-written assent (participants ages 13–17) or consent (participants age 18) in place of parent or guardian informed consent. Authors also obtained a waiver of signed documentation of consent to more effectively protect the identity of participants, assuming that not all participants would feel comfortable or safe signing a document containing their LGBTQ+ status. The LGBTQ+ youth conference and focus groups were held in the northeastern part of the United States.

The students who completed an assent/consent for participation in the survey portion of this study (Greenspan et al., 2019) were given a 49-question survey titled "LGBTQ Inclusive School Athletics Survey." The survey was distributed randomly at the aforementioned locations. Respondents self-reported as being lesbian (n=3, 5.2%), gay (n=1, 1.7%), bisexual (n=8, 13.8%), pansexual (n=6, 10.3%), questioning (n=3, 5.2%), queer, (n=3, 5.2%), straight (n=14, 24.1%), or other which was a combination of options or a write-in response (n=19, 32.7%). For the survey respondents who indicated their gender (n=57), they self-reported as cisgender female (n=35, 60.3%), cisgender male (n=9, 15.3%), other (n=6, 10.3%), trans female (n=2, 3.4%), trans male (n=3, 5.2%), or genderqueer (n=2, 3.4%). Respondents self-reported there racial/ethnic identity as white (72.4%), Hispanic (8.6%), Asian Pacific Islander (6.9%), other (6.9%), and Native American (1.7%). Participants who had consented to joining facilitated focus groups intended for about 10 participants per group. Each focus group/interview was facilitated by an author of the study with master's degrees in mental health counseling. Also present were a note taker with a master's degree in public health with a focus on community health education and a research

assistant doctoral student in psychology. In total, 13 students participated in the in-depth interviews or focus groups. The surveys, focus group, and interviews, were designed to collect both qualitative and quantitative data regarding the experiences of LGBTQ+ students in school athletic settings.

Greenspan et al. (2019) used their “LGBTQ Inclusive School Athletics Survey " which included four subscales. First, the demographics, physical activity routine, and athletics participation subscale was designed to gather data regarding the participants identities, physical activity engagement, and reasons for engaging in physical activity. Second, the sport perceptions subscale was adapted from Revised Physical Self-Perception Profile (Lindwall, Asci, & Hagger, 2011) to measure self-perceptions of individuals’ level of ability in and competence of physical activity, sport, and related topics. Third, the perceived safety subscale measured the degree to which individuals felt safe and included within different school athletic settings. Fourth, the perceived support subscale measured the degree to which individuals have support networks that encourage their school athletic experiences. Additional measures were included to collect data on sports liked and disliked, LGTBQ+ discriminatory practices in school athletic settings, places that are uncomfortable or avoided, and circumstances regarding gendered dress and use of locker rooms and bathrooms. For the focus group and interviews, the facilitator reviewed consent forms and asked for verbal consent for an audio recording of the sessions. The questions were semi-structured and included: (1) What are your experiences like as an LGBTQ+ individual in P.E. classes and/or after school sports?; (2) Can you tell me about your relationships with P.E. teachers/coaches in your school?; (3) What types of sports/physical activity/do you engage in

and how often do you engage in these activities?; and (4) What would make your school P.E./sport programming better for you?

Analysis of the data obtained from this study (Greenspan et al., 2019) showed that LGBTQ+ students do not experience equal access to school activities. A majority of participants (68.5%) reported not engaging in a weekly team sport activity nor did they engage in or only seldomly engaged in regular vigorous physical activity (39.7% reported “not true for me” and 27.6% reported “only a little true for me”). Reported reasons for engaging in physical activity were related to physical health (58.6%), mental health (41.4%), weight loss (55.2%), muscle gain (34.5%), to avoid something (20.7%), or “other” (15.35%). There was a preference for individual sports (35.2%); however, one third (33.3%) of participants reported no preference. Bathrooms, P.E./gym class, locker rooms, and school athletic fields were ranked highest among places to avoid. The participants reported generally low perceptions of their athletic abilities. Additionally, participants also reported moderate feelings of safety due to negative remarks, lack of positive conversations or supportive experiences with P.E/gym teachers about LGBTQ+ issues, lack of comfort discussing LGBTQ+ issues with P.E./gym teachers, and/or negative experiences with gendered clothing and/or locker room and bathroom prescriptions by school staff. These findings were reinforced by the focus groups and interviews. The four major themes identified in the in-depth interviews and focus groups included: institutional oppression (e.g. athletic biases, administrative policies, structural barriers particularly related to bathrooms and locker rooms, outright exclusion, conflicts with athletic instructors, administrative inaction and invalidation); ambivalence about athletic participation as manifested in sport context, sport type, and individuals involved with the sport; mental health concerns (e.g. isolation, exclusion, rejection,

low self-esteem, low self-confidence, and body image issues and body dysphoria); relationships as a predictor of positive or negative experiences; what helps in schools; the need for LGBTQ+ specific education and training among school staff; and, desire for change to be implemented to improve school athletic experiences. Regarding theme five, students generally identified five suggests to help in school. These include being provided with: (1) a private place for changing; (2) the use of their locker room of choice based on their gender identity; (3) the choice to wear a gender-affirming uniform; (4) gender neutral bathrooms; and (5) the option not to engage in a particular days' athletic activities.

In discussing their results, Greenspan et al. (2019) pointed out that the motor skill intervention program was successful in reducing the developmental delay in motor skills that are often observed in children from disadvantaged backgrounds. These results suggest that schools are important in the provision of safe and affirming athletic and physical activities for students that align with educational ideals of equality and inclusion. Furthermore, more trusted school administrators such as school mental health professional may be instrumental in fostering relationships with P.E./gym teachers for the implementation of LGBTQ+ affirming practices. Thus, it is recommended that schools undertake both interpersonal and systemic approaches to develop more inclusive and affirming school athletic/sport settings.

Greenspan et al. (2019) also suggested that future research is needed with more participants and more diverse ethnic and racial identities to allow for greater understanding of how these intersectional factors contribute to LGBTQ+ student school-based athletic experiences. Also, research is needed to further the understanding of experiences of gender expansive/gender diverse students and to determine what and to what level systemic interventions are beneficial for

to the development and implementation of affirming practices. The authors also noted some limitations to the study. These included a relatively small sample size, the presence of some subgroup results that were inconsistent with the larger body of related literature, and the sample skewing toward a white, female, cisgender, northeastern United States population. These limit the generalizability of this study. Structural limitations included the use of two different versions of the survey for data collection, the use of the non-specific word "teachers" instead of classroom teacher, and the lack of specific definitions for certain words such as "bullying" and "intervening." Finally, the authors identified limitations with using the conference to distribute surveys representing individuals from UMass Amherst. These included difficulty in controlling all aspects of survey distribution and promotional strategies and potential for skewing toward a college-bound/interested population. Thus, future research is needed to see whether the same results can occur with larger, more diverse samples.

The study by Denison and colleagues (2020), aimed at researching analyzing survey responses from both closeted and open LGB youth from six countries in order to know about whether LGB young people reported being targeted of behavior which might be homophobic (slurs, bullying, assaults etc.) in a team setting. Another aim of this research study was to find out about whether participants of this study who had come out to their teammates were more likely, less likely, equally likely to report targeted homophobic behavior than closeted athletes.

The participants of this research study by Denison et. al (2020) were recruited from a larger survey which examined homophobia and the experiences of LGB people in team sports. The age range of the participants werefrom15 to 21 years with the mean of 19.01 years and had reported to play a team sport. The participants were instructed to write about their sexual orientation in a

text box. Most male participants identified as gay (91.2%) with 8.8% identifying as bisexual. Most of the females identified as being lesbian (64.5%) with 35.5% identifying as bisexual. Participants were from six countries namely- United States (22.4%), United Kingdom (31.6%), Australia (17%), Canada (13%) and New Zealand (7.5%).

The data from the participants for this study by Denison et. al (2020), were collected from June of 2014 till January of 2015. The Data collected with the help of a 10 minute online survey carried out by Nielson Sports on behalf of various important corporate and non-governmental organizations namely- the Australian Government, International Gay Rugby, Bingham Cup Sydney 2014, International Federation of Gay Games, You can Play (charity), ACON (health charity) and the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. Participant were told that this was a "study into the lesbian, gay, bisexual, community's experiences, primarily in organized and competitive team sporty" and that their contribution will help understand issues affecting the LGB community. The survey was promoted by professional prominent athletes and encouraged people to "share their stories' ' through it. A lot of sport organizations such as World Rugby, Cricket Australia etc., promoted and shared the survey as well.

Informed consent was taken from all the participants who took part in this study and clearance by the Human Research Ethics Committee was obtained and the data contained no identifying information. Spearman's correlation coefficients were calculated in order to establish bivariate relationships variables. Multivariate models were used to test the relationship between homophobic behavior and demographic variables (gender, age, country), contact ball sports participation and coming out to teammates.

In the research study, female participants (92.9%) were more likely than male participants (78.2%) who reported playing on a sports team. Most of the participants reported that they hid their sexuality from most or all of their teammates. Majority of the participants reported not being it to anyone in the team with 20% reporting that they were out to everyone. More males reported to be playing contact ball sports than females. More males reported on experiencing homophobic behavior in team sport environments as well. Males were associated with receiving with more homophobic behavior when they came out to their teammates. Participants who partially came out to their teammates had 1.5 times higher odds, and those who came out to everyone had 2.2 times higher odds, of reporting they had been target of homophobic behavior, compared to participants who didn't come out at all.

In considering the bivariate or multivariate analyses, this study by Denison et. al (2020) found out that males are more like to come across homophobic behavior and also found out that for this reason a lot of males concealed their sexualities. The results of this studies were not consisted with previous studies which linked playing contact ball sports might be related to homophobic behavior.

There can be other various reasons why athletes engage in homophobic behaviors towards other athletes which needs to be considered and researched on. The sampling and recruitment technique used for this this study might have recruited more athletes who had faced homophobic behavior and wanted to talk about it. The homophobic behaviours mentioned in this study were not emphasized on. More emphasis and research needs to be done on the prevalence on the kind of homophobic behavior.

Sexual Prejudice can add a lot of negative factors for a part of the population of players in a sport but this factor is not looked upon from a sports fan side of things. The main purpose of this study by Lee and Colleagues (2016), aims at examining the relations of sexual prejudice, sexism, gender and identification with two sports, namely men's figure skating and US football. This study aims to research on sexual prejudice and fandom predominantly focused on fans language and how sexual prejudice is related to the identification of fans with different kinds of sports. Through this study the researchers aim to study the relations and effects of sexual prejudice and its effects on sexual minorities as well as the answer to the question how sexual prejudice is differently associated with fans identification with two gender typed sports: U.S football and men's figure skating.

In order to generate the hypothesis for this study, previous work by Herek's (2007,2009) sexual stigma and prejudice theory and McCormack and Anderson's (2014a, b) theory of homohysteria were used. A hypothesis of association of positive influence of sexual prejudice in relation with U.S football and negative association of the same with men's figure skating was drawn.

The participants of the study by Lee et. al (2016), included 150 students out of which 52 identified as women (34.7%) and 98 identified as men (65.3%). These students were enrolled at a large public university in the South West of the United States of America. These students were enrolled in physical activity classes. The racial composition of the participants for the research study was 7 African Americans (4.67%), 10 Asians (6.67%), 31 Hispans (20.67%), 2 Native Americans (1.33%), 100 Whites (66.67%). As for the year in college, 36 students from the sample size were first year students (24%), 45 students were sophomores (30%), 25 juniors

(16.67%), 42 seniors (28%) and 2 graduate students (1.33%). For the age of the participants , the mean age was 20.33 years.

The participants were asked to complete a questionnaire which asked them to provide their demographic information and to respond to items measuring their sexism, sexual prejudice and the degree to which they identify as fans of men's figure skating and football. Then the researchers calculated the mean of each variable or result for each question.

The study by Lee et. al (2016), used previously created scale to measure gender beliefs by Swim et. Al (1995). Some of the sample items on the scale were "I would be equally as comfortable having a woman or a man as a boss" and "When both parents are employed and their child gets sick at school, the school should call the mother rather than the father." The participants were asked to respond to these questionnaire questions on a 7-point scale from 1 being strongly disagree to 7 being strongly agree.

The researchers for this study used the 10 item Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale developed by Herek (1984) in order to examine the participants' level of sexual prejudice. Lee et. al (2016), decided to use this scale as this scale has been previously used in a lot of research studies and has been proven to be reliable. Sample items for this scale included, "Male homosexuality is a perversion" and "Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong." The participants were asked to respond on a 7 point scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agreeing.

Some of the examples of other questionnaire questions were, "Please think about the sport of men's skating [football] and respond to the following items, "First and foremost, I consider

myself a men's skating fan [football fan]" and "Men's figure skating [football] is my favorite sport." The participants responded on a 7-point scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agreeing.

In order to conduct the research study, the researchers had obtained permission and approval from the Institutional Review Board in order to conduct the research. The questionnaire packets, which included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research, were distributed to the students who were enrolled in physical activity classes, at the end of their classes. The participation of the students was completely voluntary. An approximate time of 10 mins for the completion of the questionnaire was estimated. No identifying information was included in the questionnaires and no compensation for the completion of the questionnaires were provided.

The study by Lee et. al (2016), the researchers calculated standard deviations and bivariate correlations for the entire sample for women and men only. The mean score of identification with football was higher than figure skating. Sexual prejudice, gender, held a positive association with football but held a negative association with figure skating. The participants who identified more with football were not likely to identify with figure skating. According to multivariate analysis that the researchers had conducted with the results from the questionnaire, in comparison, women expresses less sexism, sexual prejudice and identification with football than men. Women compared to men, expressed greater identification with men's figure skating.

According to the researchers, the positive relation of sexual prejudice with football might have been because of the assertiveness, violence and traditional forms of masculinity related with men's football. Men's figure skating lacks these qualities and there is not a form or method to

distance from homosexuality in figure skating and this might be the reason why there was a negative relation of sexual prejudice with men's figure skating. The results from the questionnaires also indicated that men experienced more sexual prejudice than women from a fan perspective. People who might hold sexist beliefs because of promotional activities, might express more sexual prejudice. Promotion here means appreciation and traditional ideas about gender roles and norms for men and women.

The participants of this study came from a single university. The age demographic ranged from only 18-24. Sexual prejudice was researched only on two sports which doesn't give us any information about how it might be with other sports such as, men' s rugby which is a more "masculine sport, men's gymnastic which is not considered a "traditionally masculine" sport and sports such as baseball which might fall somewhere in between.

Future research for this research is possible. Research can be done to know more about what people from sexual minorities and minority races feel about this. Researchers could also research on methods to reduce sexual prejudice among fans in relation with sport and see of that enhances them enhances their engagement with various kinds of sports. Sport policy makers and marketers have room to come up with policies for fans and players for reduction of sexual prejudice in sport.

Rationale for, and Overview of, Proposed Study

From the listed research studies, we come to know about the fear of exclusion in LGBTQ+ athlete by their teammates and coaches and the fear of using locker rooms and bathrooms by trans athletes, are two of the most prominent factors. The studies found that the fear of exclusion

was more in LGBTQ+ identifying athletes. The studies also found that public places were a form of anxiety for a lot of LGBTQ+ athletes with bathrooms and locker rooms prominent places to avoid for trans athletes.

The studies also revealed that LGBTQ+ athletes didn't receive equality of sports activities and also reported not participating in sports or physical activities at school which hampered their athletic abilities. And if they did engage in sport then they reported to receive homophobic and transphobic remarks in the Gym.

The first gap found in the research studies there was little variety in the racial groups and sexual orientations within the participants of the studies, which led to resulting of a generalized result for most of the studies.

The second gap in mentioned research studies there was little research on an important factor about the fear of hesitation of the use of bathrooms by trans and intersex athletes.

The purpose of the proposed research study is to find out the relation of hesitation using sporting facilities namely- gyms, locker rooms and bathrooms by athletes who might not be identifying as cisgender and heterosexual. It is hypothesized that the result of this study will give out the result of the majority of the targeted population being hesitant to use and be at the specified locations.

The participants of this study will be approximately 1000 LGBTQIA+ student-athletes from public universities all around the United States of America. A link to the anonymous research survey will be sent to all the public university athletic team coaches, around the country with the permission of required entities. The coaches will be asked to share the link with their athletes and

leave it up to them if they would want to fill out the survey and participate in the research study or not. A consent form will be the first thing before the survey can be viewed by the athlete. The athlete will have to give consent to participate in the survey by themselves if they are over 18 and with the help of their legal guardian if they are not.

As mentioned, this research study will be an "anonymous survey" with 10 questions asking the participants about their gender identification, birth sex, sport, race, ethnicity and questions about what their experiences related to working out in the gym and using the locker rooms and bathrooms at athletic facilities.

The time period for the data collection of research study will be of a year. If the targeted participants and target number of participants is met before the period of time, then the data analyzation process will be done within 3 months. The data collection time period will start from the January of the year. The anonymous research survey will be created through "Google forms" and that way the results of each and every survey completed will be received instantly. The documentation of the data will be conducted through "Google Sheets," with each column having each question of what is asked on the survey. Therefore, the Google sheet will have ten columns with ten questions and space for the responses to be added from the anonymous form.

The data on the google sheet from the anonymous survey will be drafted as a bar graph in order to know if the hypothesis was correct or not and to find out new findings. After this step sample t-tests, ANOVA test and a correlation analysis will be performed for further accuracy of the research findings.

Reference List

Denison, E., Jeanes, R., Faulkner, N., & O'Brien, K. S. (2021). The relationship between 'coming out'as lesbian, gay, or bisexual and experiences of homophobic behaviour in youth team sports. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *18*(3), 765-773.

Greenspan, S. B., Griffith, C., Hayes, C. R., & Murtagh, E. F. (2019). LGBTQ+ and ally youths' school athletics perspectives: A mixed-method analysis. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 16*(4), 403-434.

Hargie, O. D., Mitchell, D. H., & Somerville, I. J. (2017). '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.

Lee, W., & Cunningham, G. B. (2016). Gender, sexism, sexual prejudice, and identification with US football and men's figure skating. *Sex Roles, 74*(9-10), 464-471.

Loumena, D. (2015, September 26). Michael Sam hopes to play in NFL ; says coming out in college hurt chances. *Los Angeles Times*. https://www.latimes.com/sports/nfl/la-sp-michael-sam-return-to-nfl-20150925-story.html

Pariera, K., Brody, E., & Scott, D. T. (2021). Now that they're out: Experiences of college athletics teams with openly LGBTQ players. *Journal of homosexuality*, *68*(5), 733-751.

Roper, E. A., & Halloran, E. (2007). Attitudes toward gay men and lesbians among heterosexual male and female student-athletes. *Sex roles, 57*(11-12), 919-928.

Schmidt, S. H., Hancock, M. H., Frederick, E. L., Hums, M. A., & Alagaraja, M. (2020). Examining Athlete Ally Through Resource Mobilization Theory. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 44(*3), 214-243.

Toomey, R. B., & McGeorge, C. R. (2018). Profiles of LGBTQ ally engagement in college athletics. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 15*(3), 162-178.