

UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF STEREOTYPE CONSISTENCY IN COLLEGE  
ATHLETES' JUDGMENTS ABOUT TEAMMATES

by

Maxwell Steven Burns

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

Masters of Science

in

Psychological Science

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana

April 2015

© COPYRIGHT

by

Maxwell Steven Burns

2015

All Rights Reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of my advisor Dr. Jessi L. Smith and Dr. Jill Allen. Their guidance was truly invaluable throughout this entire process. I also owe thanks to my friends and family who have loved, supported and encouraged me throughout the entire process. It was with their help that I was able to push through the difficult times. I am grateful for all of their support and for them putting up with me throughout this process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. STUDY 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Gender Roles and Sports in the Development of Masculinity.....	4
Assessing Impressions of Others .....	8
Evaluating Sexual Prejudice .....	8
Prejudice Toward Stereotype Inconsistency .....	10
Prejudice Toward Stereotype Consistency .....	12
The Role of Threat in the Evaluation of Others .....	15
Project Overview .....	17
Study 1 .....	18
Study 1 Hypotheses.....	18
2. STUDY 1 METHOD.....	20
Participants.....	20
Procedure and Materials.....	21
Individual Differences.....	23
Athletic Background Filler Items.....	23
Bem Sex-Role Inventory.....	23
Inducing Threat- Memory Writing Task.....	24
Threat Check.....	24
Recruit Profile.....	25
Recruit’s Sexual Orientation Manipulation.....	26
Recruit’s Gender Role Interests Manipulation.....	26
Recruit Awareness Check.....	27
Likert Dependent Measures.....	27
Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth.....	27
Bogardus Social Distance Scale.....	28
Perceived Relatedness Scale.....	28
Ratio Dependent Measures.....	29
Official Visit.....	29
Perception of “Fit” With The Team.....	29
Positively Contributes to Team Dynamics.....	29
Likelihood of Receiving an Athletic Scholarship.....	30
Scholarship Type.....	30
Exploratory Measures Created for This Study.....	30

## TABLE OF CONTENTS- CONTINUED

Snaps Played.....	30
Likelihood of Becoming a Starter.....	31
3. STUDY 1 RESULTS.....	33
Analysis Overview.....	33
Likert Measures.....	34
Feeling Thermometer-Feelings of Warmth.....	34
Bogardus Social Distance Scale.....	36
Perceived Relatedness Scale.....	37
Ratio Measures.....	39
Official Visit.....	39
Perception of “Fit” With The Team.....	40
Positively Contributing to Team Dynamics.....	41
Likelihood of Receiving an Athletic Scholarship.....	42
Scholarship Type.....	43
Exploratory Measures Created for this Study.....	45
Snaps Played.....	45
Likelihood of Becoming a Starter.....	46
Summary.....	47
4. STUDY 1 DISCUSSION.....	50
5. STUDY 2 INTRODUCTION.....	54
Study 2 Hypotheses.....	54
6. STUDY 2 METHOD.....	55
Participants.....	55
Procedure and Materials.....	55
Individual Differences.....	57
Athletic Identification.....	57
Threat Manipulation.....	58
Threat Measure.....	58
Recruit’s Gender Role Interests Manipulation.....	59
Dependent Measures.....	59

## TABLE OF CONTENTS- CONTINUED

Bem Sex-Role Inventory.....	59
7. STUDY 2 RESULTS.....	60
Analysis Overview.....	60
Likert Measures.....	61
Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth.....	61
Bogardus Social Distance Scale.....	62
Perceived Relatedness Scale.....	64
Ratio Measures.....	66
Official Visit.....	66
Perception of “Fit” With the Team.....	68
Positively Contributing to Team Dynamics.....	69
Likelihood of Receiving Athletic Scholarship.....	71
Scholarship Type.....	72
Exploratory Measures Created for this Study.....	73
Snaps Played.....	73
Likelihood of Becoming a Starter.....	75
Testing a Replication of Results from Study 1.....	76
Summary.....	77
8. STUDY 2 DISCUSSION.....	79
9. GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	83
Limitations and Future Directions.....	86
The Role of Threat.....	87
The Role of Gender.....	91
The Role of Sports.....	93
The Role of Race.....	94
Implications of the Research.....	95
10. REFERENCE CITED.....	100
APPENDIX A: Recruit Profile for Study 1 and Study 2. The Profile Below Shows The Stereotype Consistent Feminine Gay Recruit.....	109

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Pearson Correlations of Likert and Ratio Scale Measures of Prejudice.....	32
2. Estimated means for Likert and Ratio Bias Directed Toward the Recruits as a Function of the Manipulated Recruit's Sexual Orientation and Gender Role Interests in Study 1.....	49
3. Estimated means for Likert and Ratio Bias Directed Toward the Recruits as a Function of the Manipulated Recruit's Gender Role Interest and Participant Threat Level in Study 2.....	78

## ABSTRACT

How do men use masculinity and sexuality norms to make judgments of other men? Past research provides mixed evidence in answer to this question. This project aimed to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality norms to examine differences in how stereotype consistent (masculine/straight; feminine/gay) and stereotype inconsistent (masculine/gay; feminine/straight) men are judged. Using the highly masculinized context of collegiate football, two studies were conducted, one with a highly relevant sample and the other with a more generalized sample. Study 1 (n=86) was a field study in which current collegiate football players made judgments about a potential athletic recruit after being put under threat. This study manipulated the information given about the (fictitious) recruit's sexual orientation and gender role interests. Participants then completed several judgment ratings about the recruit. Results indicated that the threat manipulation was not successful. However, results did reveal a consistent pattern in which the feminine gay recruit was the most derogated of all recruits. The other recruits were all rated equally. Study 2 (n=107) used a more general sample of male athletes and attempted to experimentally induce high versus low threat levels for participants before rating the gay recruit who was described as either masculine or feminine in their gender role interests. Again, the participant's threat levels were unchanged by the induction. Among this more general sample, results of Study 2 found no difference in prejudice directed toward the gay recruit as a function of the gender role interests. When threat was examined at the trait level, under high threat the feminine gay recruit was derogated the most. Taken together, results suggest acceptance was shown toward recruits who were either gay or feminine. It was only when the recruit was both gay and feminine that they were derogated. This suggests that the culture athletics, while not totally accepting, is becoming more accepting of gay athletes unless they're perceived as highly feminine. The findings from these studies provide evidence suggesting that men who reaffirm their manhood (either by being masculine or by being straight) are less derogated than men who are unable to reaffirm their manhood.

## INTRODUCTION

“I’m a 34-year-old NBA center. I’m black. And I’m gay.”

-Jason Collins

Monday April 29, 2013 in an interview with Sports Illustrated

Jason Collins was the first active player from the four major American sports to declare his status as a gay man. Since Collins’s announcement, other athletes have followed suit, with former University of Missouri and current NFL player Michael Sam and University of Massachusetts basketball player Derrick Gordon publicly announcing that they are gay. Soon after Sam announced that he is gay, ESPN.com’s NFL Nation and ESPN The Magazine conducted an anonymous survey asking 51 NFL players their thoughts on having a gay teammate. Of the players surveyed, 86% said they would be okay with having a gay teammate. However, only 49% of players believed that “an openly gay player would be comfortable in an NFL locker room” (Goessling, 2014).

While 86% of players surveyed say they would be okay with having a gay teammate, there have been a number of anti-gay remarks made by players that contradict the feelings of acceptance. In 2013 during Super Bowl media day, San Francisco 49ers cornerback Chris Culliver said he didn’t believe a gay player would be welcomed in the locker room: “We ain’t got no gay people on the team, they gotta get up out here if they do. Can’t be with that sweet stuff...Nah, can’t be...in the locker room, man” (ESPN, 2013). Similarly, former New Orleans Saint Linebacker Jonathan Vilma said “I think that he (a gay NFL player) would not be accepted as much as we think he would be

accepted.” Vilma cited having a gay player look at him while showering and changing as potential issues that could arise (Sieczkowski, 2014).

However, many players, including some of Sam’s teammates, do not feel that his sexual orientation is an issue. Rams linebacker Jo-Lonn Dunbar insists that the assumptions about player’s discomfort in the locker room are unfounded, saying, “Look, guys shower together, and Sam’s been showering with guys forever. We haven’t had any issues, and he’s been here a month...I don’t know what people think or what their perception is of a team shower, but it’s really not that cool...If everybody hasn’t moved on from this already, they should now” (Fleming, 2014, p. 99). While players who have spoken seem to be split in their opinions, only a small portion have voiced their opinions. It remains unknown how players will actually respond to a gay teammate. These evaluations could have a significant impact on young gay athletes and their comfort in coming out to their teammates, as well as the way their teammates embrace them coming out.

This project aims to examine how factors such as gender roles and gender stereotype consistency can influence the type of judgments that an athlete makes about a gay recruit. The current literature is mixed on the influence that masculinity and gender role stereotype consistency have in influencing people’s judgments about a target. The focus of this thesis is on how other people use masculinity and sexuality norms to perceive a man who is either stereotype-consistent or stereotype-inconsistent along gender role and sexuality dimensions.

Based on the current literature it is unclear what role masculinity and gender role stereotype consistency play in person perception. On the one hand, people direct less prejudice at others who are stereotype consistent (Rudman, 1998). For instance, some research shows a stereotype inconsistent masculine gay man (e.g., a gay man who likes to play football) was evaluated more negatively than a stereotype consistent feminine gay man (e.g., a gay man who was a nurse; Schimmel et al., 1999). On the other hand, Brescoll, Uhlmann, Moss-Racusin and Sarnell (2012) found more negative evaluations were given to the stereotype inconsistent man who was unable to affirm his masculine credentials, compared to a stereotype inconsistent man who was able to affirm his masculine credentials. These findings illustrate that within the current literature, mixed evidence leaves uncertainty as to how masculinity and stereotype consistency influences judgments of prejudice made toward individuals.

The overall aim of this study is to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality to examine differences in how stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay men are judged within a highly masculinized context. We situate the research questions within the context of collegiate American football to enhance the generalizability of the findings, and to address an emerging issue of gay players publicly acknowledging their sexuality while still actively playing on the team. Thus, within the realm of athletics we aim to examine how judgments of a stereotype consistent gay teammate (feminine gay man) and a stereotype inconsistent gay teammate (masculine gay man) compare to judgments about a stereotype consistent versus inconsistent straight

teammate. Given the role of threat it is believed that under threat (e.g. thinking about a time that they failed) should contribute to the type of judgments that people make.

### Gender Roles and Sports in the Development of Masculinity

Gender roles are highly prescriptive (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Within these roles we assume that men should be dominant, aggressive, and athletic (i.e., masculine; Bem, 1974; Prentice & Carranza, 2002) and women should be affectionate, soft spoken, and warm (i.e., feminine, Bem, 1974; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). People also expect men and women to act in a way consistent with these traits. Men and women learn about these expectations through various socialization techniques (Curry, 1991; O'Neil, 2013). Part of this socialization for men includes athletics, such as football, basketball, baseball and hockey (Anderson, 2011; Connell, 2008; Griffin, 1998).

Athletics allow for the development of masculinity which is a key aspect of the male gender role (Anderson, 2011; Curry, 1991; Griffin, 1998). Within our cultural definition of masculinity, it is believed that to be a man it is required that you are heterosexual (Herek, 1986; Theodore & Basow, 2000) and not feminine (Anderson & McGuire, 2010; Kimmel, 1998; Prentice & Carranza, 2002). For example, in one study participants were asked to assess how men's perceptions of themselves impacted their political beliefs. This was done by having undergraduate male students come into the lab and complete four questionnaires: the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) questionnaire which measured personal self-esteem, the Personal Attribute Questionnaire (OSQ) which measured perceived levels of masculinity and femininity ,

the Attribute Importance questionnaire (AIQ) which measured the importance of attributes to the participant, and the Attitude Towards Homosexuality (ATH) Scale. The attitude towards homosexuality scale was disguised as a political ideology survey (Theodore & Bassow, 2000). It was found that when participants placed high value in masculine attribute importance, this was the strongest predictor of homophobia; other strong predictors included high self-discrepancy along masculine attributes and feminine attribute importance. Participants with high self-discrepancy highly valued masculine attributes, but felt they did not strongly possess these attributes. This pattern of results suggested that male students who were highly sensitive to gender stereotypes and also evaluated themselves negatively because they felt they didn't fulfill the masculine stereotype were more likely to hold homophobic attitudes and beliefs (Theodore & Bassow, 2000). These findings also support the idea that when men feel it is important to possess high levels of masculine attributes and low levels of feminine attributes, they should believe in the American cultural worldview expectations of heterosexual masculinity more. A key component of heterosexual masculinity involves making negative judgments towards gay people and homosexuality (Theodore & Bassow, 2000; Herek, 1986). Within the realm of athletics, especially team sports, boys begin to learn masculine skills at a young age.

The skills developed through playing male-dominated sports include learning to be tough, competitive, and avoid expressing feelings of compassion (Griffin, 1998). Athletes in male-dominated sports are also taught to value physical strength and size, aggressiveness, and to develop the will to dominate others (Anderson, 2002; Anderson &

McGuire, 2010; Galli & Reel, 2009; Griffin, 1998; Martin & Govender, 2011; Steinfeldt, et al., 2011; Steinfeldt Gilchrist, Halterman, Gormory & Steinfeldt, 2011). The socialization of sports helps boys to learn to be men and prove their manhood. When boys fail to learn these essential concepts of traditional masculinity, they are labeled weak or soft, and often are ridiculed by others for their failure to do so (de Visser & McDonnell; Griffin, 1998). From this socialization process, some sports take on an air of exclusivity, and athletes often make a strong effort to keep all things feminine out (Griffin, 1998).

In other words, having women or elements of femininity in sports dilutes the importance of sports in the socialization of masculinity. This occurs because if women show they can develop these masculine qualities within sports, then the lines between masculinity and femininity become blurred, thus tainting sports importance in the socialization of the male gender role (Griffin, 1998). A part of keeping femininity out of sports includes keeping gays out of sports, as homosexuality implies femininity (Griffin, 1998; Herek, 1984; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Mills & D'Alfonso, 2007). Previous research has shown that gay men are stereotyped as possessing characteristics more similar to heterosexual females (Anderson & McGuire, 2010; Kite & Deaux, 1987) and being more effeminate (Herek, 1984). Therefore, gay men have often been excluded from some sports as a part of the effort in keeping femininity out of sports (Anderson & McGuire, 2010; Griffin, 1998).

Athletics are not the only place where men engage in efforts to avoid femininity. Because of the fear of appearing feminine, men often go to great lengths to avoid

situations, tasks, and jobs where there is a chance they might be perceived as gay (Allen & Smith, 2011; Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver & Wasti, 2009; de Visser, 2009). For example, when asked to participate in a medical task that was framed as either a nursing task or a doctor task, the results showed that when sexuality was made salient by having men complete a nursing task, they exhibited decreased performance on the task as well decreased intrinsic motivation compared to women completing the same task (Allen & Smith, 2011). When men behave inconsistently with the guidelines of masculinity (e.g., being perceived as having feminine traits like being quiet and thoughtful; de Visser, 2009), this serves as a potential threat to their masculinity. Men in this situation will often actively seek out ways to reaffirm their masculinity (Bosson et al., 2009).

Reaffirming one's masculinity can be accomplished by performing stereotypically masculine behaviors such as displaying physical aggression, performing a masculine task (i.e., shooting a basketball, Bosson et al., 2009), or even drinking alcohol or playing sports (de Visser & McDonnell, 2013). Indeed, in one demonstration of this, men gave qualitative answers in regards to hegemonic masculinity and other forms of masculinity. Participants were asked if they would describe themselves as a "manly man" and in response to this question, one participant said he was not a "manly man" because he was not an alpha male (de Visser, 2009). The participant continued on to say that he was not loud and dominant, but rather thoughtful, intuitive, and possessed more feminine attributes. These findings indicated that men feel that they are going to be judged as non-masculine or feminine if their behaviors are not consistent with that of hegemonic masculinity (de Visser, 2009). When this occurred, there were ways in which the

participant could compensate for their perceived non-masculinity. One such way was by performing stereotypically masculine behaviors. Performing these stereotypical behaviors can help men to accrue “man points” to help them defend against potential threats posed by performing stereotypically feminine behaviors (Anderson, 2002; de Visser, 2009; de Visser & McDonnell, 2013). The perception that a man is either masculine or feminine can greatly impact the judgments made toward them and how much prejudice is directed at them.

### Assessing Impressions of Others

Within the literature there are multiple ways to assess attitudes and impressions that people form of others. The most commonly used measurement techniques are subjective (Likert) measurements, where participants answer questions using scaled responses (e.g. how much did you like this person, using a 7-point scale). While these techniques can be effective, they do not account for subtle and implicit biases that people may hold and not even know they possess. This becomes especially true when evaluating sexual prejudices.

### Evaluating Sexual Prejudice

Sexual prejudice “refers to all the negative attitudes based on sexual orientation, whether the target is homosexual, bisexual or heterosexual” (Herek, 1986; Herek, 2000; Herek, 2007). These attitudes can be best understood when looking through our cultural lens and examining the psychological issues related to gay men and lesbians (Herek, 1984). Within our culture we have socially constructed the notion of heterosexual

masculinity. Therefore, being a “man” has become a key element of having a masculine, heterosexual identity and requires that men be successful, have status, be tough, independent, aggressive and dominant and straight (Herek, 1986). Although heterosexual masculinity dictates what a man should be, it also dictates that a man should not be feminine or homosexual (Herek, 1986). A byproduct of these requirements is homophobia, or holding negative attitudes toward gay people. Previous research has shown that heterosexuals typically have more negative attitudes towards gay people of their own sex, that more negative attitudes tend to be seen in straight men (Herek, 1984), and more negative attitudes are directed toward gay men than towards lesbians (Herek, 1984).

Historically, in the U.S., most adults expressed negative attitudes regarding homosexual people and behaviors (Herek & Capitano, 1996; Herek, 2000). However, over the past few decades, negative attitudes towards gay men and lesbians have become less extreme (Yang, 1997; Herek, 2000). As of May 2014, 58% of adults surveyed believed that homosexuality was morally acceptable, up from 40% in May 2001 (Gallup Inc., 2014). This may be partly due to it becoming increasingly less socially acceptable to have sexual orientation prejudice. Even if a person does not hold any blatant prejudices towards gays and lesbians, they may still possess subtle and implicit biases towards them (Herek, 1984; Herek, 1986; Herek, 2007). One of the most common forms that subtle prejudice takes is defense mechanisms. Defense mechanisms, such as unconscious hostility, occur when a person unconsciously perceives similarity between themselves and someone who is gay or lesbian (Herek, 1984). Subtle prejudices can

occur even when a person outwardly expresses positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians (Herek, 2007). With the existence of subtle and implicit biases it becomes crucial that the measures use Likert and ratio scales to get a less biased estimate of how participants feel, especially when making evaluations of sexual prejudice (Biernat & Manis, 1994; Biernat & Vescio, 2002).

### Prejudice Toward Stereotype Inconsistency

The current literature is mixed as to whether people have more negative attitudes about gender role stereotype consistent or gender role stereotype inconsistent men along the dimensions of sexuality. That is, it is unclear whether masculine gay men are more or less derogated than feminine gay men. For example, using the principals of terror management theory (TMT), some scholars find evidence that people are more prejudiced toward gay men who are stereotype inconsistent (masculine and gay) than stereotype consistent (feminine and gay; Schimel et al., 1999). To manipulate the stereotype consistency of the gay man, different descriptions of the person were given to the participants. In the stereotype consistent description the gay man was described as having a stereotypically feminine major (theater) and enjoying stereotypically feminine activities (e.g., visiting art galleries, going to discos and going shopping). Conversely, the stereotype inconsistent gay man was described as having a stereotypically masculine major (Engineering) and enjoying stereotypically masculine activities (e.g., restoring cars, playing basketball and lifting weights).

After receiving the description of the man, participants (both men and women) were then asked two questions about how much they liked the targeted person. Additionally, participants filled out several questionnaires such as the need for closure (NFC) which measured participants' need for cognitive closure to a question (Kruglanski et al., 1997). For example, participants who were high in NFC had greater needs to firmly validate their cultural worldviews and therefore rid themselves of ambiguity, than did participants with low NFC. The results indicated that the manipulations were effective. The stereotype consistent gay man was rated as being more feminine and the stereotype inconsistent gay man being rated as more masculine. It was also found that when participants were under threat (e.g., had been given mortality salience prompt) and were high in NFC they made more negative evaluations of the masculine gay target, and their evaluation of the feminine gay target did not significantly change (Schimel et al., 1999). However, when participants were not under threat (e.g., prompted to think about watching television) and were high in NFC, there were no significant differences between the evaluations made about the stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay targets. It was believed that this pattern of results occurred because, when faced with the threat of mortality, participants looked to affirm the validity of beliefs that imbue the world with order, stability, and predictability (i.e., stereotypes). While these findings were demonstrated in a very specific population, under the unique threat of mortality salience, they do illustrate that under certain conditions, threat can lead to increased prejudice toward stereotype inconsistent gay men.

Additional evidence for people exhibiting prejudice toward people who are stereotype inconsistent can be seen within the backlash literature. Rudman (1998) found that women who were more agentic and thus stereotype inconsistent received greater backlash, than women who were less agentic (i.e., stereotype consistent). A similar pattern was found for men who were stereotype inconsistent. It was found that men who were modest and therefore, stereotype inconsistent were derogated more than stereotype consistent men who were not modest (Moss-Racusin, Phelan & Rudman, 2010). These findings taken together with the findings of Schimel et al. (1999) suggest that stereotype inconsistent people experience more prejudice than stereotype consistent people.

#### Prejudice Toward Stereotype Consistency

Research shows people display more prejudice toward stereotype inconsistent gay men, especially under threatening conditions such as mortality salience (Schimel, et al 1999). At the same time, other evidence shows people direct less prejudice toward stereotype inconsistent gay men (Brescoll, Uhlmann, Moss-Racusin & Sarnell, 2012; Glick, Gangl, Gibb, Klumpner & Weinberg, 2007), especially when men are facing threats to their masculinity. Previous research has found that masculinity is “characterized by uncertainty, elusiveness, tenuousness and requirements of social proof,” thus making it precarious in nature (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford & Weaver, 2008). Because of this precarious nature, threats to one’s manhood can cause feelings of threat and lead men to actively seek out ways to reaffirm their masculine credentials (Vandello, et al., 2008). Masculinity can be reaffirmed through displays of

physical aggression (Bosson, et al., 2009; Vandello et al., 2008) performing masculine activities (e.g., watching football, working on cars, eating steak and drinking heavily; Bosson et al., 2009; Iwamoto, Cheng, Lee, Takamatsu & Gordon, 2011; Vandello et al., 2008) and having a muscular physique (Galli & Reel, 2009; Mills & D'Alfonso, 2007). By performing these acts men can accrue “man points;” these provide them with masculine credits that can help to offset any potential feminine behavior that occurs (de Visser & McDonnell, 2013).

One study providing support for the idea of stereotype inconsistency being less derogated than stereotype consistency is Brescoll et al (2012). In this study the effects of a perceived loss of masculinity were examined along with the effects of reestablishing masculine credentials. The perceived loss of masculinity was examined within the context of a man working for a gender atypical supervisor. While working for the gender atypical supervisor, some participants were given the opportunity to reestablish their masculine credentials. It was predicted that when men were able to reestablish their masculine credentials, it would help to lower the prejudice that they felt towards their supervisor (Brescoll, et al., 2012). In this study, both male and female participants made judgments about a subordinate working for either a gender stereotype incongruent supervisor (e.g., female construction site supervisor) or stereotype congruent supervisor (e.g., male construction site supervisor). The results indicated that males who worked for a gender stereotype incongruent supervisor were rated as being less masculine than males who worked for stereotype congruent supervisors. The finding of interest, however, was that when men working for stereotype inconsistent supervisors were able to reaffirm their

masculine credentials, they received more status and higher salaries than males who were not able to reaffirm their masculine credentials (Brescoll, et al., 2012). This finding suggests that judgments made towards a stereotype consistent feminine gay man would be more prejudiced than judgments made towards a stereotype inconsistent masculine gay man. The rationale is that a stereotype inconsistent (masculine) gay man would not pose as big of threat to one's masculinity and therefore the negative reactions would not occur as strongly.

Similarly, other studies have also found that people preferred the stereotype consistent feminine gay man to the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay man (Glick et al., 2007). For instance, in this study, Glick, Gangl, Gibb, Klumpner and Weinberg (2007) threatened male participants' masculinity by telling them that they scored high in femininity on a test. By telling male participants they had scored high in femininity, they were able to tap into the precarious nature of masculinity and make the participants feel as though their masculinity had been called into question (Glick et al., 2007). After receiving this feedback, participants were then asked to make evaluations towards gay men who were either stereotype consistent (i.e., were effeminate) or were stereotype inconsistent (i.e., were masculine). The results indicated that when men were given feedback saying they had scored high in femininity, they showed decreased liking for stereotype consistent gay men, but not for the stereotype inconsistent gay man (Glick et al., 2007). These studies, in combination with the studies supporting the idea that people prefer stereotype consistent gay men when reminded of death (Schimel et al. 1999), show there is mixed results in the literature, which leaves many questions unanswered. In the

current project, we examine how stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay men are judged within a highly masculinized context. One element that we believe may play a vital role in determining the type of judgments that people make towards stereotype consistent and inconsistent gay men is being under threat.

### The Role of Threat in the Evaluation of Others

Threat has been found to be an important factor in how people make judgments about others and eliciting potential threats is commonly used to induce threat in participants (Schimel et al., 1999; Brescoll et al., 2012). The threats can be generated from any number of sources, including mortality salience (Schimel et al., 1999), stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995) and threats to one's masculinity (Brescoll et al., 2012; Vandello et al. 2008). For example, drawing from terror management theory (Schimel et al., 1999), threat can be triggered by the uncertainty of death, which can be made salient with something as simple as writing about what they think will happen as they die or thinking about their own death (Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, & Lyon, 1989.). When threat is experienced, one coping response is to reaffirm one's world views by finding information consistent with the world view (Schimel et al., 1999). For example, when thinking about death, participants tend to look for things that are consistent with their cultural worldview. For example, participants may look for stereotype consistent information which acts as a way to reaffirm the self and protect against threat (Schimel, et al., 1999).

Masculinity itself can be a source of threat because of its precarious nature (Vandello, et al., 2008). To demonstrate this, participants completed a gender knowledge test and were then given feedback that either provided a gender threat or no threat on their performance. Following the feedback, participants were taken to a separate room and given a questionnaire that assessed their thoughts about physical or relational violence, followed by a filler task. It was found that when gender threats occurred, men completed more physically aggressive words during the Anderson, Carnagey and Eubank's (2003) Word Fragment Test. This finding illustrated that these threats to one's masculinity lead to a compensatory response in the form of increased availability of physically aggressive thoughts in order to reaffirm one's masculinity (Vandello et al., 2008).

One shared characteristic of the studies described above is that threat was presented to induce anxiety in participants. Threats to one's masculinity lead to feelings of anxiety. In fact, men under masculinity threat have been shown to have greater access to anxiety-related words (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). In the same sense, Lambert et al. (2014) found mortality salience manipulations increased self-reported anxiety in participants when using targeted measures of emotional states. Coryn, Beale and Myers (2004) found that participants with high anxiety levels following the terrorist attacks showed higher prejudice toward Arabs following September 11, 2001 compared to participants with low anxiety. This finding helps to illustrate that anxiety appears to play an important role in how judgments are made. As such, in the current project, threat is expected to impact the judgments that participants make about stereotype consistent and

stereotype inconsistent gay men within the context of football. The study attempted to use thoughts of personal failure as a source of threat for participants. The threat of failure has been linked to anxiety, such that the fear of failure leads people to become anxious (Hodapp, 1989). Additionally, failure was selected in part because it is a natural part of athletics, and all athletes at some point have failed.

Measuring perceptions of another person is not as straightforward as one might think. Within the shifting standards literature measures which they refer to as “objective” (ratio) measures are used to find stronger evidence of stereotyping and detect subtle prejudice, than subjective (Likert) ratings alone (Biernat & Manis, 1994; Biernat & Vescio, 2002). Research shows that the level of measurement can matter and that it is important to include both ratio and Likert ratings. Therefore, in this study, both types of measurements were included so that the most complete picture of prejudice could be formed.

### Project Overview

The overall aim of this study was to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality norms to examine the differences in how stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay men are judged within a highly masculinized context. Within the current literature, a majority of studies have examined these constructs separately (Brescoll, et al., 2012; Glick et al., 2007; Schimel, et al., 1999) while relatively few have examined them simultaneously (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). Additionally, previous studies used undergraduate psychology students who knew they would not be personally

impacted by the judgments they were making. In Study 1 of the current project, however, a highly relevant sample of college football players was used.

We situate the research questions within the context of collegiate American football to enhance the generalizability of the findings and to address an emerging trend of gay players publicly acknowledging their sexuality while still actively playing on the team. Thus, within the realm of athletics we aim to examine how judgments of a stereotype consistent gay teammate (feminine gay man) and a stereotype inconsistent gay teammate (masculine gay man) compare to judgments about a stereotype consistent versus inconsistent straight teammate. Given the role of anxiety on prejudice, it is believed that being under threat (i.e., thinking about a time that they failed) will contribute to the type of judgments that people make.

### Study 1

In Study One, keeping all participants under threat, the effects of stereotype consistency on judgments towards gay versus straight athletes was examined by placing all participants under threat. This was a 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) x 2 (recruit interest: masculine vs. feminine) between subjects design.

#### Study 1 Hypotheses

For Study One, there were two main hypotheses. Firstly, it was predicted that a main effect of the recruit's interest will emerge such that when an athlete is presented as having masculine interest, he will be judged more positively than his feminine counterpart regardless of the athlete's sexuality. Secondly, competing hypotheses were

created for the interaction. One possibility was that the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit and feminine straight recruit will be judged more negatively than the stereotype consistent recruits which would be in line with the findings from Schimel et al. (1999). Or it was possible that the stereotype consistent masculine straight recruit and feminine gay recruit will be judged more negatively than the stereotype inconsistent recruits, which would be in line with the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012). Lastly, one alternative hypothesis was derived. This hypothesis predicted that the feminine gay recruit would be derogated the most because they are doubly deviant (Glick et al., 2007).

## STUDY 1 METHOD

Participants

A total of 92 out of a possible 102 collegiate football players participated in a “sport psychology” study looking at “team dynamics.” The participants were recruited from an upper-tier, midsized, rural division 1 football championship subdivision (FCS) university, were current collegiate football players and completed the questionnaires in a large group setting during the fall camp, prior to their first game of the season. Six participants were excluded from the data set; five participants were excluded after indicating suspicion in their exit survey responses that they correctly guessed the purpose of the study. One participant was excluded from the data set as he self-identified as gay and it was important to keep the sample equalized as much as possible on both sexuality and gender role identification (see covariate information in results overview). The final sample included 86 participants (100% male, 68.6% White, 18.6% Black, 10.5% Tongan, 2.3% unspecified) with a mean age of 20.07 years (SD= 1.51). The majority of participants indicated they had been a member of the team for less than two seasons (60.5%), were currently not starters (68.6%) on the team, and were from out-of-state (55.8%). As expected, the number of offensive (46.5%) and defensive (47.7%) players who participated was nearly even. Additionally, 41.9% of players indicated that they were currently single and not actively dating. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs. straight) x 2 (recruit’s

interest: masculine vs. feminine) design. All participants completed the survey under threat.

### Procedure and Materials

To ensure buy-in by key stakeholders, the first procedural step was to communicate with the athletic coach to explain study goals and procedures. This was done in writing and in person. After permission was gained from the head football coach, we were given permission to come to a team meeting to get volunteers for the study. All participants were run in the central meeting area for the team after a regularly scheduled team meeting, following the final day of fall camp. Participants were informed that they could decline to participate and no compensation was offered. When the participants entered the meeting room they were told they were participating in a two part sports psychology study “investigating team dynamics” and that the purpose of the experiment “was to examine how student feedback on potential recruits can be used to improve the athlete selection process.” This was done to disguise the purpose of the experiment in an effort to alleviate subject demands (Orne, 1962). Additionally, participants were told that the experimenters hoped to learn how college athletes remember team events and how they prioritize different qualities influence team dynamics.

After the team meeting concluded, the head coach introduced the experimenter to the team and allowed the experimenter to introduce the study. Following a brief introduction explaining what this thesis project was about, participants were given informed consent forms to complete before continuing with the study. In the consent

form, participants were ensured that all of their responses would be confidential and that no individual's answers would be shared with the coaching staff. After these instructions, participants completed three short survey packets. To help aid in the experiment, a team of three research assistants were on hand to help answer questions and facilitate data collection by passing out and collecting the survey packets.

The first survey packet contained two surveys on the participants' athletic backgrounds. Once these two surveys were completed, participants were instructed to stop and were given the instructions for the writing task. The writing task was given as a way to experimentally induce a threatening situation for the participants. Participants were instructed to write for three minutes about a time they had failed athletically. After the three minutes were up, participants then completed a brief survey to indicate their current feelings. Upon completing the first survey packet, participants then completed the recruit evaluation packet. The recruit evaluation packet contained the questionnaires assessing the dependent variables (see below for details) presented in a counterbalanced order. Once participants completed the recruit evaluation packet they were given a second packet that contained the secondary measures detailed below, presented in a counterbalanced order. Participants were told that these questionnaires were included to provide information about recruits currently in the program and this information would help to strengthen the recruit's match with the program. Participants completed the study in approximately 40 minutes. Upon completion, participants were debriefed, completed a debriefing exit survey and thanked for participating. The exit survey was used to probe participants for suspicion about the study (e.g., "What was this study about?", "Was there

anything that stood out to you during the study?”). Following data collection and analyses, a report was sent to the head football coach giving a summary of the results. Additionally, resources were offered to the coach in the event that he wanted a speaker to come in and lead a diversity workshop for the team.

### Individual Differences

Athletic Background: Filler Items. First, participants completed basic demographic information about themselves as a player (e.g., “How many years have you been a member of your team?”, “Do you play offense or defense?” and “Are you currently a starter (yes or no)?”) and filler items to provide information about themselves [e.g., “What other sports have you previously played (i.e., high school or club teams)” and “What are your hobbies outside of your sport?”]. This information was collected for statistical purposes in describing the sample.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory. In order to evaluate how strongly participants endorsed masculine and feminine characteristics, they completed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory short form (BSRI; Bem, 1981). Participants answered questions using a 7-point scale (1= “never or almost never true” to 7= “always or almost always true”) to indicate how well each of the 30 traits (10 masculine, 10 feminine, 10 neutral) described them. Based on their responses, they were given a masculinity score and a femininity score, each ranging from 1 to 7. The masculinity and femininity scores were computed by averaging their responses to masculine and feminine traits. These composite scores were used as covariates in the analyses.

Inducing Threat - Memory Writing Task:

After the initial survey items, all participants then received a brief writing prompt. They were told that the prompt was part of a memory task, which examined their “ability to recall action versus passive stimulus team events.” Within the prompt, all participants were instructed to think about a time that they had failed in the context of athletics and to briefly write about it for three minutes. Writing about failure was used as a means to produce threat for the participants. This task was adapted from Baker & Gutterfreund’s (1993) written autobiographical recollection induction procedure on mood. Participants were told that the instances they wrote about would be compiled and used to examine how the athlete’s memories of these events impacted the dynamics within the team. A team of RAs coded the participants’ responses to ensure that they actually wrote about a time they had failed. In actuality, this memory task was used to attempt to create a threatening situation and put the participants under conditions of high threat.

Threat Check. After completing the memory task, participants were then given the six-item short-form of the Spielberger State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-6; Marteau & Bekker, 1992). In the STAI-6 participants used a 4-point scale (1= “not at all” to 4= “very much”) to answer the six items (e.g., “Right now, I am tense” and “Right now, I feel upset”). This measure was used to assess whether participants felt anxious following their writing prompt.

### Recruit Profile

Borrowing from research using a “resume” manipulation to illustrate biases (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Moss-Racusin, et al, 2012; Smith, Paul & Paul, 2007), participants were asked to examine a potential recruit’s profile. From past work the name Brian Miller was selected because the name has been shown in previous research to generate perceptions of neutral levels of competence and attractiveness. This task followed the “memory task” (used to create high threat as explained above). Specifically, they were instructed about part two of the study, which was explained to participants as a “2014 Player Evaluation Packet.” The participants were then told that they would be reviewing a new type of recruit profile designed by Northwest Sports Prep, a fictitious recruiting service, created by the experimenter and providing confidential input about the recruit’s potential with the program. The profile they reviewed was said to be that of a potential recruit from the 2015 recruiting class who had used the new recruiting service. Participants were led to believe that the new recruiting materials were shown to be effective from research with administrators, but that the firm was interested in receiving input from current college athletes on what they deemed to be key elements of team dynamics. This cover story was used to instill a sense of realism and personal relevance.

The player profile included basic information about the recruit (e.g., age, height, weight), the recruit’s performance metrics (e.g., 40 yard dash time, max squat and max bench press), the recruit’s season statistics for the previous season, the recruit’s athletic accomplishments, and an “about me” section that contained the recruit’s sexuality and masculinity manipulations described below. See Appendix A for a sample. After

reviewing the recruit's profile, participants were instructed to fill out a brief "memory for the recruit" (awareness check) assessment, which was included as the last page of the recruit profile. The awareness check allowed for the experimenters to evaluate how thoroughly the participants had reviewed the recruit profile.

Recruit's Sexual Orientation Manipulation. The player profile that participants reviewed conveyed the recruit's sexual orientation by including a short sentence in the "about me" section in which Brian in passing mentioned that he was currently in a relationship and either had a boyfriend or girlfriend. This was done by Brian saying "For my senior project I plan to start a community outreach program with my boyfriend" or "For my senior project I plan to start a community outreach program with my girlfriend." See Appendix A for an example.

Recruit's Gender-Role Interests Manipulation. The recruit profile was also manipulated to convey whether Brian was masculine or feminine. In the "about me" section, information about the recruit's major and hobbies was listed. In the *masculine condition* Brian wanted to major in Engineering (following research by Haemmerlie, Abdul-Wakeel, & Pomeroy, 1985) and his hobbies included watching football, hunting, wrestling and working out (similar to work by Brescoll et al., 2012, Iwamoto et al., 2011). In the *feminine condition*, Brian wanted to major in Nursing (Haemmerlie, Abdul-Wakeel, & Pomeroy, 1985) and his hobbies included dancing, painting, cooking and yoga (Schimel, et al., 1999). All of the other information in the player profile remained the same across conditions.

Recruit Awareness Check. Before continuing on to the rest of the player evaluation packet, participants completed a brief questionnaire about the information from the recruit profile (e.g., “What are your first impressions of the recruit?”, “In just one or two sentences, note what you see as the biggest weaknesses of the recruit” In addition to these questions of interest there were also filler questions (e.g., “What do you think of the recruit’s 40 time?”) that were used to gauge how thoroughly the participants reviewed the recruit profile. These were examined by a team of trained RAs for completeness. Although responses per se were not the topic for analyses, the goal of this measure was to help ensure that participants engaged with the material.

#### Likert Dependent Measures

In the “2014 Player Evaluation Packet” participants received several questionnaires at the beginning of the packet in which evaluations were made about the recruiting profile they had just reviewed. The following survey items were presented in a counterbalanced order within the player evaluation packets.

Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth. The feeling thermometer (Esses, Haddock & Zanna, 1993; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993) used a 101-point scale to illustrate how warm the participant felt toward the recruit. Specifically, they are asked to “Please imagine a thermometer ranging from extremely unfavorable to extremely favorable ratings of the recruit, with higher numbers indicating a more favorable evaluation of the recruit. Now, please mark any number on the line between 0 (extremely unfavorable) and 100 (extremely favorable) to indicate your overall evaluation of the

recruit, and write that number in the space provided below.” The use of the thermometer allowed for a subtle measure of prejudice to be collected with lower scores indicating more prejudice toward the recruit (Esses, Haddock & Zanna, 1993; Haddock, Zanna & Esses, 1993).

Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The next questionnaire that participants completed was the adapted version of Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1928), as adapted by Crandall, Glor and Britt (1997). This 7-item questionnaire was used as another measure of subtle prejudice. Participants responded to each item, such as “The recruit appears to be a likeable person” and “The recruit is the kind of person that I tend to avoid” (reverse scored), using a 7-point scale. Participants’ responses were reverse coded, summed and averaged to create a composite score ranging from 1 to 7, with a lower score indicating greater rejection (Cronbach’s alpha = .81).

Perceived Relatedness Scale. The last Likert measure included in the recruit evaluation packet was the Perceived Relatedness Scale (PRS, Richer & Vallerand, 1998; Stults-Kolehmainen, Gilson & Abolt, 2013). This questionnaire examined participant’s intimacy and acceptance toward the recruit. The intimacy subscale of the PRS consisted of five questions (e.g., “In relation to the recruit I feel close to him,” Cronbach’s alpha = .93) and the acceptance subscale of the PRS consisted of an additional five questions (e.g., “In relation to the recruit I feel supported,” Cronbach’s alpha = .87). Each participant responded using a 7-point scale (1= “not at all” to 7= “very strongly”).

Intimacy and acceptance composite scores were calculated for each participant by summing their responses on each subscale and dividing the total by five.

#### Ratio Dependent Measures.

Study 1 also utilized ratio measures in the recruit evaluation packet. Using ratio measures allowed for more subtle prejudice to be measured. The ratio questions that participants received asked them to use their best judgment to answer questions about the recruit's future with the program using a 0-100% scale (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines & Deaux, 2004) and were adapted from Gowen and Britt (2006) and Biernat and Vescio (2002). Each of these items was analyzed individually and included in the final analyses.

Official Visit. The first ratio measure participants answered was a single item questions about the recruit, asking about the recruit's likelihood of being invited to the university for an official recruiting visit (e.g., "There is a \_\_\_% chance the recruit will be brought in for an official visit to your university").

Perception of "Fit" With The Team. The second ratio measure participants answered was a single item question assessing the participants' beliefs about how well the recruit would "fit" with the team (e.g., "Compared to other recruits, this recruit would fit better than \_\_\_% other players at your university").

Positively Contributing to Team Dynamics. The third ratio measure participants answered was a single item asking them to judge how positively the recruit would add to

the team dynamics (e.g., “There is a \_\_\_% chance the recruit will positively add to the team dynamics of the university football team.”).

Likelihood of Receiving an Athletic Scholarship. The fourth ratio measure participants answered was a single item question assessing the likelihood of the recruit receiving an athletic scholarship (“The recruit has a \_\_\_% chance to receive a football scholarship at your university”).

Scholarship Type. The last ratio measure participants answered was a single item question assessing what type of scholarship they felt the recruit should be offered (e.g., “Which level of scholarship do you feel this recruit should be offered?”). Unlike the previous ratio measures, participants responded on a 7-point scale (1= “No Scholarship” to 7= “Full Scholarship”) to indicate which type of scholarship they felt was appropriate for the recruit. This was done because using the scale allowed for the full range of potential scholarships to be offered as well as no scholarship and walk-on opportunities as options.

#### Exploratory Measures Created for This Study

Snaps Played. The first exploratory measure created for this study was a ratio measure asking the participant about the amount of playing time the recruit would receive (Biernat & Vescio, 2002). Participants were asked “How many snaps per game do you expect the recruit to play (0-120).” The participants were given a scale of 0-120 because these numbers represented the minimum and maximum number of plays that a player

could potentially take part in during a game. By providing this range, it ensured that the participants gave a realistic response to the question.

Likelihood of Becoming a Starter. The second exploratory measure created for this study was a ratio measure asking participants about the likelihood of the recruit becoming a starter on the team (Biernat & Vescio, 2002). Participants were asked “The recruit has a \_\_\_% chance to become a starter for your university football team” and used a 0-100% scale to answer the question (modeled after items by Fuegen et al., 2004).

Table 1. Pearson Correlations of Likert and Ratio Scale Measures of Prejudice.

Note. \*\* indicates correlation is significant at  $p < .01$  (2-tailed).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth	-									
2. Bogardus Social Distance Scale	.60**	-								
3. Perceived Relatedness- Intimacy	.52**	.69**	-							
4. Perceived Relatedness- Acceptance	.51**	.67**	.76**	-						
5. Official Visit	.51**	.57**	.56**	.59**	-					
6. Perception of “fit” with the team	.48**	.59**	.53**	.50**	.59**	-				
7. Positively add to team dynamics	.48**	.67**	.68**	.72**	.68**	.65**	-			
8. Likelihood of receiving athletic scholarship	.43**	.50**	.42**	.51**	.67**	.52**	.55**	-		
9. Snaps played	.41**	.42**	.40**	.51**	.53**	.49**	.54**	.60**	-	
10. Likelihood of becoming a starter	.33**	.47**	.48**	.51**	.65**	.52**	.64**	.85**	.69**	-

## STUDY 1 RESULTS

### Analysis Overview

This thesis project aimed to examine how factors such as gender and sexuality norms and gender stereotype consistency influenced the type of judgments that a participant makes about a potential recruit. Specifically, it examined what role the recruit's sexual orientation (e.g., gay or straight) and the recruit's interests (e.g., masculine or feminine interests) had on the judgments the participants made about the recruit. As described in the participant section, the sample overwhelmingly identified as heterosexual, and the data from the one person who identified as gay was not included in analyses. We also wanted to take into account possible pre-existing differences in the participants' self-reported ratings of masculinity and femininity. These differences were accounted for by using the participants' BSRI trait masculinity and the participants' BSRI trait femininity scores as covariates (Bem, 1981).

By controlling for differences between participants in their own masculinity and femininity, it helped to ensure that the differences that emerged between groups were due to the independent variables and not due to trait characteristics. To do this, we used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) on the various dependent measures, unless otherwise specified. The following section examines several Likert measures of prejudice: feeling thermometer, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Perceived Relatedness Scale, as well as several measures of ratio prejudice which examined the likelihood of the recruit: having an official visit, fitting in better than other recruits, positively adding to team

dynamics, the number of snaps played per game, becoming a starter and receiving an athletic scholarship. For all significant results, alpha was set at  $p < .05$ , and follow up tests were conducted using simple effect analyses unless otherwise noted. As a measure of effect size, partial eta squared was used, which has as conventions that a value of .01 is a small effect, .06 is a medium effect, and .14 is a large effect (Cohen, 1988; Richardson, 2011).

To analyze the efficacy of the memory task in inducing threat participants' STAI-6 scores were analyzed. To score the STAI-6 participants' mean scores were calculated and a one sample  $t$ -test compared the participants' mean STAI-6 score to the test value of 2.5 which represented the midpoint or neutral point on the 1 to 4 scale. A significant difference was found ( $t(85) = -6.10, p < .05$ ) and the overall mean was 2.33 ( $SD = .26$ ), suggesting participants were significantly lower in self-reported anxiety compared to neutral. These results indicate that the memory task was not successful at invoking threat, and thus, participants were not under conditions of high anxiety. Therefore, all results reported below are for participants under conditions of low to neutral levels of anxiety.

### Likert Measures

#### Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth

The first Likert measure of prejudice examined participants' overall evaluations of how warmly they felt about the recruit on a 0 to 100 feeling thermometer, with lower scores indicating higher prejudice. A 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) x 2

(recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the independent variables on feeling thermometer ratings, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. Participants' BSRI masculinity scores were not significantly related to participants' feelings of warmth toward the recruit on the feeling thermometer ( $F(1, 85) = .47, p = .49, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), however participants' BSRI femininity scores were significantly related to their feelings of warmth toward the recruit on the feeling thermometer ( $F(1, 85) = 6.59, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ) such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores exhibited greater levels of warmth. Higher BSRI femininity scores indicate the extent to which the participant endorses feminine characteristics as being self-relevant ( $b = 4.35, SE = 2.26, p < .05$ ). Both covariates were retained in the analysis below.

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 85) = .45, p > .05, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of warmth toward the recruit. A significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation emerged ( $F(1, 85) = 9.17, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .10$ ) and as seen in Table 2, simple effect follow up tests showed that participants reported less warmth toward gay recruits compared to straight recruits, indicating sexual prejudice. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations ( $F(1, 85) = 5.76, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ). As seen in Table 2, simple effect analyses showed that compared to all other groups, the stereotype consistent recruit (gay and feminine) was given significantly lower ratings of warmth by the participants relative to all other recruits.

### Bogardus Social Distance Scale

This questionnaire was used as a measure of subtle prejudice as operationalized as participant's rejection of the recruit using a 7-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater prejudice. A 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) x 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the independent variables on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The participants' BSRI masculinity scores were not significantly related to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale scores ( $F(1, 85) = .927, p = .34, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The participants' BSRI femininity scores were also not significantly related to Bogardus Social Distance Scale scores ( $F(1, 85) = 3.37, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 85) = 3.43, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participant's rejection of the recruit. A significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation emerged ( $F(1, 85) = 18.75, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .19$ ) and as seen in Table 2, follow up analyses show participants are more likely to distance themselves from the gay recruit compared to straight recruits. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations ( $F(1, 85) = 4.39, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ). Similar to the findings of the feeling thermometer, simple effect analyses showed that compared to all other groups participants distanced themselves more from the stereotype consistent gay recruit (gay and feminine).

### Perceived Relatedness Scale

This Likert measure of prejudice examined participants' intimacy and acceptance towards the recruit by examining two separate subscales. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the PRS intimacy subscale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The participants' BSRI masculinity scores were not significantly related to PRS intimacy subscale scores ( $F(1, 83) = 1.73, p = .19, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ). The participants' BSRI femininity scores were significantly related to the PRS intimacy subscale scores ( $F(1, 83) = 6.72, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ), such that participants with higher femininity exhibited greater levels of intimacy toward the recruits ( $b = .31, SE = .14, p < .05$ ).

Here, a significant main effect of recruit interests emerged ( $F(1, 83) = 3.99, p < .049, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ), as seen in Table 2. The recruit's masculine or feminine interests significantly impacted the participants' feelings of intimacy toward the recruit, with participants showing significantly less intimacy towards recruits with feminine interests, indicating greater prejudice. A significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation also emerged ( $F(1, 83) = 7.11, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ) such that the recruit's sexual orientation, having either a boyfriend or girlfriend, significantly impacted the participants' feelings of intimacy toward the recruit. Similar to the findings from the feeling thermometer and the Bogardus Social Distance scale, follow up analyses found that participants exhibited less intimacy towards the recruits with boyfriends than the recruits with girlfriends, indicating greater prejudice. Unlike the other two measures, however, the interaction between the

recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations was not significant ( $F(1, 83) = 1.82, p = .18, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) on participants' PRS intimacy scores.

A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was also conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the PRS acceptance subscale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The participants' BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to PRS acceptance subscale ( $F(1, 83) = .77, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The participants' BSRI femininity score was significantly related to PRS ( $F(1, 83) = 4.76, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores exhibited greater levels of acceptance toward the recruits ( $b = .25, SE = .13, p < .05$ ).

For the PRS acceptance subscale, no significant main effect of recruit interests emerged ( $F(1, 83) = .54, p = .46, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of acceptance towards the recruit. Departing from the findings from the feeling thermometer, the Bogardus Social Distance scale, and the PRS intimacy subscale, no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation emerged ( $F(1, 83) = 1.43, p = .24, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) for the PRS acceptance subscale. The recruit's sexual orientation, having either a boyfriend or girlfriend, did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of acceptance towards the recruit. Consistent with the PRS intimacy subscale, the interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations was not significant ( $F(1, 83) = 2.27, p = .14, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) on participants' PRS acceptance scores.

## Ratio Measures

### Official Visit

This ratio measure of prejudice examined participants' ratings of the likelihood of the recruit being brought in for an official visit. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on likelihood of receiving an official visit, covarying out the effect of the participants' own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The participants' BSRI masculinity scores were not significantly related to the recruit receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 85) = 1.19, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The participants' BSRI femininity scores were also not significantly related to likelihood of receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 85) = .06, p = .80, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 85) = .34, p = .56, \eta_p^2 = .004$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the likelihood of recruit receiving an official visit. There was also no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation on the likelihood of the recruit receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 85) = 2.18, p = .14, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ). However, in line with the findings from the feeling thermometer, and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, there was a significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations ( $F(1, 85) = 4.05, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ). As seen in Table 2, simple effect analyses showed that compared to all other groups the stereotype consistent gay recruit (gay and feminine) was significantly less likely to be considered for an official campus visit than all other recruits, indicating greater prejudice.

### Perception of “Fit” With The Team

This ratio measure of prejudice examined to what extent participants felt that the recruit would fit in with the team. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the recruit fitting in better, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to the recruit fitting in better ( $F(1, 85) = 2.81, p = .09, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to the recruit fitting in better ( $F(1, 85) = 8.23, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores said the recruit would fit better with the team than others ( $b = 5.75, SE = 2.67, p < .05$ ).

One again, the main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 85) = .49, p = .484, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit’s interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. In line with the findings from the official visit measure, no significant main effect of recruit’s sexual orientation emerged ( $F(1, 85) = 3.42, p = .68, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) such that the recruit’s sexual orientation, having a boyfriend or girlfriend, did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. Importantly, however, results were qualified by an interaction among the two independent variables ( $F(1, 85) = 5.25, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ). As seen in Table 2, simple effect analyses showed that similar to the previous findings for the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale and likelihood of receiving an

official campus visit, follow up analyses showed that compared to the masculine gay and the feminine straight recruits, the stereotype consistent gay recruit (gay and feminine) was rated significantly lower than other recruits on how well they would fit in compared to other recruits, indicating greater levels of prejudice.

### Positively Contributing to Team Dynamics

This ratio measure of prejudice examined participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics. A 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) x 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics ( $F(1, 85) = .00, p = .99, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was not significantly related to participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics ( $F(1, 85) = 3.37, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 85) = .19, p = .667, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics. Additionally, there was no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation ( $F(1, 85) = 2.08, p = .153, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ), therefore, the recruit having a boyfriend or girlfriend did not impact the participants ratings of how the recruit would positively

add to the team dynamics. Once again, a significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations emerged ( $F(1, 85) = 4.416, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ). As seen in Table 2, simple effect analyses showed that compared to the stereotype inconsistent feminine recruit (straight and feminine), the stereotype consistent feminine recruit (gay and feminine) was rated significantly lower on how well the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics, indicating greater levels of prejudice. These results add to the converging evidence of findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, official visit, and fitting in measures.

#### Likelihood of Receiving an Athletic Scholarship

Following research that looks at salary and promotion bonuses from the gender bias literature (Brescoll et al., 2012; Fuegen et al., 2004; Gowen & Britt, 2006; Klawitter, 2015); we created a ratio item of prejudice that assessed how likely the participants felt the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship ( $F(1, 84) = .84, p = .36, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship ( $F(1, 84) = 3.47, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 84) = .05, p = .82, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. There was also no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation ( $F(1, 84) = .002, p = .96, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ) such that the recruit having a boyfriend or girlfriend did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. As has been the case with the vast majority of other analyses, a significant interaction emerged between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations ( $F(1, 84) = 5.23, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ). As seen in Table 2, simple effect analyses showed participants reported that the stereotype consistent gay recruit (gay and feminine) was less likely to receive an athletic scholarship compared to the stereotype inconsistent recruits (masculine gay and feminine straight). The other conditions were statistically equal each to other.

### Scholarship Type

Finally, a one item ratio measure of prejudice examined the type of scholarship that participants awarded to the recruit. Chi-square analyses were conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit. A chi-square test was performed and no relationship was found between recruit's interest (masculine vs. feminine) and the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit,  $\chi^2(6, N= 84) = 7.65, p = .27$ . Indicating that the recruit being masculine or feminine did not impact the type of scholarship that the participant felt the recruit should be awarded. A separate chi-square test was performed and no relationship was found between the recruit's sexual

orientation and the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit,  $\chi^2 (6, N= 84) = 4.41, p = .62$ . Indicating that the recruit having a boyfriend or girlfriend did not impact the type of scholarship that the participant felt the recruit should be awarded.

Being that the chi square analyses were non-significant; the scholarship type was turned into a dichotomous variable. The categorical nature of the item (0 = no scholarship awarded, 1= partial to full scholarship awarded) required a logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression was performed to examine the effects of the recruit's interest (0 = Masculine, 1= Feminine, the recruit's sexual orientation (0= Straight, 1= Gay), BSRI femininity scores ( $M= 4.74, SD = 1.05$ ), and BSRI masculinity scores ( $M= 5.18, SD= .80$ ) on the likelihood of awarding a scholarship. The model was marginally significant,  $\chi^2 (1) = 3.60, p = .058$ . The model explained 17.5% of the variance in scholarship type awarded to the recruit and correctly classified 71.1% of cases. Within this model the recruit's interest ( $b = .82, SE = .89, p = .36$ ), the recruit's sexual orientation ( $b= .08, SE = .78, p = .92$ ), the participant's BSRI femininity score ( $b= .32, SE = .26, p = .22$ ), and the participant's BSRI masculinity score ( $b = -.51, SE = .35, p = .14$ ) did not significantly add to the model. However, the interaction of the recruit's interest and the recruit's sexual orientation ( $b = -2.11, SE= 1.13, p = .06$ ), was marginally significant. At mean levels of BRSI masculinity and femininity, when the recruit had feminine interests and was gay they were 2.11 times less likely to receive an athletic scholarship, compared to all other recruits. Consistently, across two measures of awarding a scholarship, results showed that the stereotype consistent gay recruit (gay and feminine) was the least likely to receive an athletic scholarship.

### Exploratory Measures Created for this Study

#### Snaps Played

We created an item to assess how many snaps per game the participant believed that the recruit would play, if the person joined the team. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on snaps played per game, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to snaps played per game ( $F(1, 81) = .01, p = .91, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to snaps played per game ( $F(1, 81) = 4.61, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores said the recruit would play more plays per game ( $b = 5.54, SE = 3.05, p < .05$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 81) = .08, p = .78, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the snaps per game played by the recruit. There was also no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation ( $F(1, 81) = 3.711, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ), with the recruits sexual orientation not impacting the number of snaps per game played for the recruit. Unlike the previous measures, there was no significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations ( $F(1, 81) = 2.14, p = .15, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ) on the number of snaps played per game.

### Likelihood of Becoming a Starter

A single item was included to examine the participant's ratings of how likely it would be for the recruit to become a starter, if the person joined the team. A 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation: gay vs straight) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on how the likelihood of becoming a starter, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to how likely the recruit would be to become a starter ( $F(1, 84) = .22, p = .64, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to how likely the recruit would be to become a starter ( $F(1, 84) = 4.31, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores said the recruit was more likely to become a starter ( $b = 5.09, SE = 2.80, p < .05$ ).

The main effect of recruit interests was not significant ( $F(1, 84) = .17, p = .69, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's ratings of how likely the recruit would be to become a starter. There was also no significant main effect of recruit's sexual orientation ( $F(1, 84) = .04, p = .84, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ) the recruit being gay or straight did not significantly impact the recruit's likelihood of becoming a starter. A significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and sexual orientation manipulations emerged ( $F(1, 84) = 4.64, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ). Unlike the snaps per game measure and consistent with the findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, official visit, and fitting in measures, simple effect analyses showed that the stereotype consistent (gay and

feminine) recruit was rated as least likely to become a starter for the team than both stereotype inconsistent recruits, indicating greater levels of prejudice (see Table 2).

### Summary

All told, results on the validated Likert items taken from past research show that under these conditions of neutral to low threat, the stereotype inconsistent recruits (Feminine straight; and masculine gay) were preferred to the stereotype consistent (gay and feminine) recruit who was judged most negatively by the male football college athletes in this study. The normative straight masculine recruit was rated equally positive to the stereotype inconsistent recruits. The ratio measures showed similar findings such that stereotype consistent (gay and feminine) recruit was less likely to get an official visit to the university and was judged as being a worse fit with the program than the other recruits. The likelihood of receiving a scholarship also showed similar findings. Specifically, the stereotype consistent (feminine and gay) recruit was seen as being the least likely to become a starter of the recruits and was also the least likely to receive an athletic scholarship. The stereotype consistent recruit was also viewed as adding the least to team dynamics, but only compared to the stereotype inconsistent (straight and feminine) recruit.

The exploratory items were more mixed in the results. The exploratory item of snaps played showed no difference between the recruits. While the likelihood of becoming a starter showed a pattern of results consistent with the previous findings, illustrating that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was viewed as being the

least likely of all the recruits to become a starter. All told, results suggest support for Brescoll et al., (2012). Our findings suggest that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was the least liked of the recruits, and these results were under low levels or neutral levels of threat. The failure of the writing task to create a momentary elevation in self-reported anxiety still leaves open the possibility that differing levels of threat may impact the judgments of potential recruits. The aim of study 2 was to attempt to replicate our findings from Study 1, while systematically manipulating the threat level of the participants, which will allow us to examine if a participants threat level (high vs. low) impacts the judgments made about a gay teammate.

Table 2. Estimated means for Likert and Ratio Bias Directed Toward the Recruits as a Function of the Manipulated Recruit's Sexual Orientation and Gender Role Interests in Study 1.

<i>Recruit's Gender Role Interest</i>	<i>Recruit's Sexual Orientation</i>							
	<u>Straight</u>				<u>Gay</u>			
	<u>Masculine</u>		<u>Feminine</u>		<u>Masculine</u>		<u>Feminine</u>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>
Feeling Thermometer-Feelings of Warmth	63.72 <sup>a</sup>	(4.90)	68.33 <sup>a</sup>	(4.56)	59.58 <sup>b</sup>	(4.21)	46.23 <sup>c</sup>	(4.41)
Bogardus Social Distance Scale	4.57 <sup>a</sup>	(.22)	4.51 <sup>a</sup>	(.21)	4.07 <sup>b</sup>	(.19)	3.27 <sup>c</sup>	(.20)
Perceived Relatedness-Intimacy	4.14 <sup>a</sup>	(.30)	3.73 <sup>a</sup>	(.28)	3.68 <sup>b</sup>	(.27)	2.74 <sup>b</sup>	(.28)
Perceived Relatedness-Acceptance	4.34 <sup>a</sup>	(.29)	4.38 <sup>a</sup>	(.27)	4.37 <sup>a</sup>	(.26)	3.76 <sup>a</sup>	(.27)
Official Visit	54.72 <sup>a</sup>	(6.68)	61.71 <sup>a</sup>	(6.22)	57.36 <sup>a</sup>	(5.74)	41.59 <sup>b</sup>	(6.01)
Perception of "Fit" With the Team	37.78 <sup>a</sup>	(5.90)	41.71 <sup>a</sup>	(5.50)	38.00 <sup>a</sup>	(5.07)	22.36 <sup>b</sup>	(5.30)
Positively Add to Team Dynamics	50.56 <sup>ab</sup>	(7.50)	58.86 <sup>a</sup>	(6.98)	54.00 <sup>ab</sup>	(6.45)	37.05 <sup>b</sup>	(6.75)
Likelihood of Receiving Athletic Scholarship	41.67 <sup>ab</sup>	(6.84)	51.29 <sup>a</sup>	(6.37)	54.93 <sup>a</sup>	(5.87)	39.38 <sup>b</sup>	(6.30)
Snaps Played	31.22 <sup>a</sup>	(6.84)	38.86 <sup>a</sup>	(6.38)	27.35 <sup>a</sup>	(6.44)	20.00 <sup>a</sup>	(6.15)
Likelihood of Becoming a Starter	33.17 <sup>a</sup>	(6.44)	45.52 <sup>b</sup>	(6.00)	43.96 <sup>b</sup>	(5.53)	34.52 <sup>a</sup>	(5.94)

*Note:* Means not sharing a subscript differ at  $p < .05$ .

## STUDY 1 DISCUSSION

This study aimed to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality by examining how stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay men were judged within a highly masculinized context. This was done by examining judgments made of a stereotype consistent gay teammate (feminine gay man) and a stereotype inconsistent gay teammate (masculine gay man) compared to judgments about a stereotype consistent versus inconsistent straight teammate. The findings of Study 1 show that for both Likert and ratio measures of prejudice, the stereotype consistent gay (feminine and gay) recruit received the lowest evaluations compared to other recruits. The results indicated that the stereotype consistent gay recruit was viewed less warmly by participants, was given more distance by participants, was viewed as being less likely to receive an official campus visit, less likely to positively add to team dynamics, and was less likely to receive an athletic scholarship. These findings support the alternative hypothesis.

The hypothesis of a main effect of the recruit's interest was largely unsupported by the current findings. The recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not impact participants evaluations of the recruit with the exception of the participant's feelings of intimacy on the PRS. The PRS-intimacy subscale was the only measure where the predicted main effect of the recruit's interest emerged such that participants showed significantly less intimacy toward the feminine recruits compared to the masculine recruits. The second prediction of competing hypotheses for the interaction of recruit's sexual orientation and the recruit's interest would occur was partially supported. It was predicted that the stereotype consistent straight (masculine and straight) recruit

would be judged most positively by participants. However, the current findings do not support this prediction. Although, the current findings do illustrate that the stereotype consistent gay recruit would be judged most negatively.

The current findings illustrate that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was consistently judged more negatively than the stereotype inconsistent gay recruit. These findings offer support refuting the notion that people have preferences for stereotype consistent individuals (Schimel et al., 1999) or stereotype consistent people (Brescoll et al., 2012; Glick et al., 2007). As was seen in the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012) and Glick et al. (2007) the stereotype inconsistent recruits were consistently seen to be judged more positively than the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit. As suggested by Glick et al. (2007), the dislike of the stereotype consistent gay recruit could be due to the recruit being viewed as doubly deviant. The stereotype consistent gay recruit is doubly deviant because he has stereotypically feminine interests, which deviates from the stereotypical masculine gender roles and his sexual orientation is gay, which deviates from the ideals of hegemonic masculinity which heteronormativity. Being doubly deviant, the feminine gay recruit had no masculine credentials. Whereas, all of the other recruits were able to show they had some masculine credentials whether it was shown through having a girlfriend or through their gender role interest being more masculine.

One caveat to the current results is that the memory task used to place participants under threat and produce conditions of threat was unsuccessful. Thus, all of the judgments being made toward the stereotype consistent and inconsistent recruits were

being made under neutral conditions. Therefore, the current findings cannot fully confirm the pattern of results from Brescoll et al (2012) or Schimel et al. (1999). In order to fully support these hypotheses participants would need to be under conditions of threat. While Schimel et al. (1999) did have a control condition, the results from the control condition showed no significant differences between the judgments made toward stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay targets. Although their results did reveal a trend which showed people derogated the stereotype consistent gay target more than the stereotype inconsistent target. Despite the trend seen in the control condition, the results of Schimel et al. (1999) cannot be used to support the findings from Study 1. With the failure to induce threat in participant future research should aim to examine how varying levels of threat (high vs. low) impact the judgments people make toward stereotype consistent and inconsistent recruits. Being able to see if threat influences the judgments will help to further generalize the findings and explore possible mechanism behind prejudice toward stereotype consistent and inconsistent targets.

While the memory task in Study 1 failed to invoke threat in participants in Study 1, it is worth noting that significant differences emerged in how the recruits were evaluated. The implications of the present findings suggest the stereotype consistent gay recruit was judgment most negatively compared to the other recruits. However, the dislike for the recruit does not appear to be solely due to the fact that the recruit is gay. It appears that for the stereotype inconsistent gay (masculine and gay) recruit, being masculine may help act as a buffer against prejudice. Because the masculine gay recruit has provided evidence of their masculinity, this may act as a way for them to bolster their

masculine credentials and thus help to eliminate bias toward them. Being that these findings were found in a highly relevant population of college football players, they give us direct insight into how a gay recruit would be accepted by fellow football players.

## STUDY 2

Study 2 was used as a follow-up study to Study 1 and conducted in a laboratory setting. In this study, all judgments were made about a gay athlete. This study used a 2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat: high vs. low) between subjects design.

### Study 2 Hypotheses

The main hypothesis for Study 2 was that under conditions of low threat we would see a replication of our Study 1 findings. Specifically, it was predicted that when threat was low, the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit would be derogated the most. Our secondary hypothesis once again set up competing predictions regarding what would occur under conditions of high threat. One possibility was that the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit would be judged more negatively than the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit, which would be in line with the findings of Schimel et al. (1999). Or the other possibility was that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit would be judged more negatively than the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit, which would be in line with the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012).

## STUDY 2 METHOD

### Participants

A total of 112 male undergraduate psychology 100 students took part in a “sport psychology” study looking at “team dynamics.” Five participants were excluded from the data set; one participant was excluded because they were a member of the football team and had taken part in Study 1. Another participant was excluded from the data set for writing about the incorrect prompt. The other three participants were excluded for incomplete data. This left 107 participants (100% male, 100% straight, 86.9% white, 5.6% black, 3.7% Hispanic) with a mean age of 19.65 years to participate in the study. Additionally, a majority of participants indicated that they were currently freshmen (54.2%) and most participants indicated they were single and not actively dating (46.7%). Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 (Recruit’s gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat: high vs. low) design. All participants evaluated a recruit who was gay and received partial course credit in exchange for their participation. Up to six participants were run in each session.

### Procedure and Materials

Due to the nature of the study and the emphasis it places on sports, it was important that the participants in the study were highly self-identified as athletes. In study 1, we knew all participants identified as athletes because they were college football players. In order to obtain participants who were highly self-identified as athletes, in this

more general sample of college students, prescreen restrictions were placed on the study. For the purpose of prescreening participants, three questions (“To what extent do you think athletics are important to the sense of who you are?”, “How important is it for you to be good at athletics?”, “How much do you value being an athlete?”; Schmader & Major, 1998; Smith & White, 2001) were embedded as a part of a larger prescreening survey that all introductory psychology 100 students were required to complete at the beginning of the semester. To be eligible for the study, participants were required to be male, and score 5 or higher on a 7-point scale (1= “Strongly Disagree” to 7= “Strongly Agree”) for two of the three prescreen questions. Eligible participants entered the lab and were told they would be participating in a two part, sports psychology study “investigating team dynamics” and that the purpose of the experiment “was to examine how student feedback on potential recruits can be used to improve the athlete selection process.” This was done to disguise the purpose of the experiment in an effort to alleviate subject demands (Orne, 1962). Like Study 1, participants were told that the experimenters hoped to learn how college athlete’s memory for team events impacted team dynamics. As well as examining how athletes prioritize different qualities to influence team dynamics. Following a brief introduction, participants were given informed consent forms to complete before continuing with the study. In the consent form, participants were ensured that all of their responses would be confidential and that they could decline to participate and skip any questions they were unwilling to answer. After these instructions, participants completed three short survey packets.

As in Study 1, the first survey packet contained two surveys on the participants' athletic backgrounds. Once these two surveys were completed, participants were instructed to stop. Next, the threat manipulation was introduced as a memory recall task. Participants were given instructions for the writing task and told to write for three minutes about a time they had failed athletically (high threat) or to write about the weather (low threat). After three minutes, participants then completed a brief survey that was used as the threat manipulation check. Upon completing the first survey packet, participants then completed the recruit evaluation packet. The recruit evaluation packet contained the questionnaires assessing the dependent variables (see Study 1 methods for details) which were presented in a counterbalanced order. Once participants completed the recruit evaluation packet they were given a second packet which contained the secondary measures detailed above in Study 1, presented in a counterbalanced order. Participants were told that these questionnaires were included to provide information about recruits currently in the program and that using this information would help to strengthen the recruit's match with in the program. Participants completed the study in approximately 40 minutes. Upon completion, participants were debriefed, completed a debriefing exit survey and thanked for participating.

### Individual Differences

Athletic Identification. First, participants completed basic demographic information about themselves as athletes (e.g., "How many years have you been a member of your team?", "Do you play offense or defense?" and "Are you currently a

starter (yes or no?)” and filler information about themselves (e.g., “What other sports have you previously played (i.e., high school or club teams)” and “What are your hobbies outside of your sport?”).

Threat Manipulation. After the initial survey items, all participants then received a brief writing prompt. They were told that the prompt was part of a memory task, which examined their “ability to recall action versus passive stimulus team event memories.” Within the prompt, all participants were instructed to write about a time that they had failed athletically (high threat) or write about the weather (low threat) for three minutes. Writing about failure was used as a means to produce a threat to participants and induce threat, while writing about the weather was used a low threat condition (Baker & Gutterfreund, 1993). Participants were told that the instances they wrote about would be compiled and used to examine how the athlete’s memories of these events impacted the dynamics within the team. Participants told to write about the weather were told that their responses would be used to help give incoming recruits information about the town. A team of RAs coded the participant’s responses to ensure that they actually wrote about a time they had failed or about the weather.

Threat Measure. After undergoing the threat manipulation, participants were then given the same six-item short-form of the Spielberger State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-6; Marteau & Bekker, 1992) used in Study 1.

Recruit's Gender Role Interests Manipulation. The recruit profile was manipulated the same as it was in Study 1 to convey whether Brian had more masculine typical or feminine typical interests.

Dependent Measures. All other Likert and ratio measures in Study 2 were the same measures used in Study 1 (see Study 1 for details).

Bem Sex-Role Inventory. In order to evaluate how strongly participants endorsed masculine and feminine characteristics, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory short form was administered (BSRI; Bem, 1981). As in Study 1, the masculinity and femininity scores were computed by averaging their responses to masculine and feminine traits. These composite scores were used as covariates in the analyses.

## STUDY 2 RESULTS

### Analysis Overview

Study 2 aimed to examine how gender role norms interact with threat (high vs. low) to influence the type of judgments that a participant makes about a potential gay athletic recruit. Specifically, it examined what role the recruit's gender role interests (e.g., masculine or feminine interests) and the participant's threat level (high vs. low) had on the judgments the participants made about the recruit. As described in the participant section, 100% of the sample identified as heterosexual. We also wanted to take into account possible pre-existing differences in the participants' self-reported ratings of masculinity and femininity as we did in Study 1. These differences were accounted for by using the participants BSRI trait masculinity and the participants BSRI trait femininity scores as covariates (Bem, 1981), like Study 1, we used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) on the various dependent measures, unless otherwise specified. For all significant results, significance was set to  $p < .05$ , and follow up tests were conducted using simple effect analyses unless otherwise noted.

To analyze the efficacy of the threat manipulation participants STAI-6 scores were analyzed. To score the STAI-6 participants mean scores were calculated and an independent samples  $t$ -test compared the high and low threat conditions to test for significant differences. No significant difference was found ( $t(104) = -.08, p = .93$ ), suggesting participants in the high threat condition ( $M = 2.34, SE = .24$ ) were not significantly more anxious than participants in the low threat condition ( $M = 2.34, SE =$

.18). These results indicate that the threat manipulation was not successful and thus, participants were not under conditions of high anxiety or low threat.

### Likert Measures

#### Feeling Thermometer- Feelings of Warmth

The first Likert measure of prejudice examined participants overall evaluation of how warmly they felt about the recruit on a 0 to 100 feeling thermometer, with lower scores indicating higher prejudice. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on feeling thermometer ratings, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores.

Participants' BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to participants' feelings of warmth toward the recruit on the feeling thermometer ( $F(1, 106) = 2.00, p = .16, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ), participants' BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to participant's feelings of warmth toward the recruit on the feeling thermometer ( $F(1, 106) = 1.37, p = .24, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). Both covariates were retained in the analysis below.

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .55, p = .46, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of warmth toward the recruit. The main effect of the participant's threat level was also non-significant ( $F(1, 106) = .04, p = .84, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), indicating that the participant's threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of warmth towards the gay recruit. There

was also no significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and the participant's threat level ( $F(1, 106) = 1.71, p = .20, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

Threat level was also analyzed at the trait level. The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 105) = .02, p = .88, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of warmth toward the recruit. The main effect of the participant's trait threat level was also non-significant ( $F(7, 105) = .61, p = .75, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ), indicating that the participant's trait threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of warmth towards the gay recruit. There was also no significant interaction between the recruit's interest (masculine or feminine) and the participant's trait threat level ( $F(4, 105) = 1.10, p = .36, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ).

#### Bogardus Social Distance Scale

This questionnaire was used as a measure of subtle prejudice as operationalized as participant's rejection of the recruit using a 7-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater prejudice. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participant's BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale ( $F(1, 106) = 2.66, p = .11, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to Bogardus Social Distance Scale ( $F(1, 106) =$

7.16,  $p < .05$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .07$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores showed less distancing from recruits ( $b = .14$ ,  $SE = .06$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .09$ ,  $p = .77$ ,  $\eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participant's rejection of the gay recruit. There was not a significant main effect of participants' threat level ( $F(1, 106) = .87$ ,  $p = .35$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that participant's threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of rejection toward the gay recruit. Additionally, no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participants' threat level emerged on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale ( $F(1, 106) = .27$ ,  $p = .60$ ,  $\eta_p^2 < .01$ ).

Analyzing threat at the trait level, the main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .06$ ,  $p = .80$ ,  $\eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participant's rejection of the gay recruit. There was not a significant main effect of participants' trait threat level ( $F(7, 106) = 1.12$ ,  $p = .36$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .08$ ), such that participant's trait threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the participants' feelings of rejection toward the gay recruit. Additionally, no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participants' threat level emerged on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale ( $F(4, 106) = .55$ ,  $p = .70$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

### Perceived Relatedness Scale

This Likert measure of prejudice examined participant's intimacy and acceptance toward the recruit, by examining two separate subscales. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the PRS intimacy subscale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participant's BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to PRS intimacy subscale ( $F(1, 106) = .23, p = .64, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to the PRS intimacy subscale ( $F(1, 106) = 10.23, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores showed greater intimacy toward the recruits ( $b = .35, SE = .11, p < .05$ ).

Again, no significant main effect of recruit interests was seen ( $F(1, 106) = .87, p = .35, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of intimacy toward the gay recruit. There was also no significant main effect of the participants' threat level ( $F(1, 106) = 1.22, p = .27, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) such that the participant's threat level being high or low, did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of intimacy toward the recruit. Similar to the findings from the feeling thermometer and the Bogardus Social Distance scale, the interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .49, p = .49, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) on participants' PRS intimacy scores.

When examining threat at the trait level, no significant main effect of recruit interests was seen ( $F(1, 106) = 1.41, p = .24, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of intimacy toward the gay recruit. There was also no significant main effect of the participants' trait threat level ( $F(7, 106) = 1.73, p = .11, \eta_p^2 = .12$ ) such that the participant's trait threat level being high or low, did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of intimacy toward the recruit. Similar to the findings from the feeling thermometer and the Bogardus Social Distance scale, the interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations was not significant ( $F(4, 106) = 2.02, p = .10, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ) on participants' PRS intimacy scores.

A2 (recruit interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was also conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the PRS acceptance subscale, covarying out the effect of the participant's own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to PRS acceptance subscale ( $F(1, 106) = 1.20, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was significantly related to PRS ( $F(1, 106) = 4.30, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores showed greater acceptance toward the recruits ( $b = .34, SE = .17, p < .05$ ).

For the PRS acceptance subscale, no significant main effect of recruit's gender role interests emerged ( $F(1, 106) = .10, p = .76, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of acceptance

towards the gay recruit. In line with the findings from the feeling thermometer, the Bogardus Social Distance scale and the PRS intimacy subscale, no significant main effect of the participant's threat level emerged ( $F(1, 106) = .001, p = .97, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ) for the PRS acceptance subscale. The participant's threat level, being either high or low, did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of acceptance toward the recruit.

Consistent with the PRS intimacy subscale, the interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .06, p = .80, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ) on participant's PRS acceptance scores.

Study 2 also examined threat at the trait level. There was no significant main effect of recruit's gender role interests emerged ( $F(1, 106) = 2.60, p = .11, \eta_p^2 = .11$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's feelings of acceptance towards the gay recruit. Examining threat level at the trait level did however yield a significant main effect of trait level threat ( $F(7, 106) = 3.39, p < .05$ ), such that participants with high trait levels of threat showed less acceptance. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction of the recruit's gender role interest and the participant's trait level threat ( $F(4, 106) = 4.02, p < .05$ ), such that participants with high trait levels of threat showed less acceptance toward the feminine gay recruit.

### Ratio Measures

#### Official Visit

This ratio measure of prejudice examined participant's ratings of the likelihood of the recruit being brought in for an official visit. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests:

masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables of likelihood of receiving an official visit, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to the recruit receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 106) = .67, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to likelihood of receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 106) = 1.17, p = .29, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .01, p = .93, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the likelihood of recruit receiving an official visit. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's threat level on the likelihood of the recruit receiving an official visit ( $F(1, 106) = .19, p = .66, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). In line with the findings from the feeling thermometer, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the PRS-intimacy scale, there was no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations ( $F(1, 106) = 1.05, p = .31, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

Examining trait level threat for the official visit measure, the main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .45, p = .50, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the likelihood of recruit receiving an official visit. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's trait threat level on the likelihood of the recruit receiving an official visit ( $F(7, 106) = .61, p = .75, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ). However, there was a significant

interaction of the recruit's gender role interest and the participant's trait level threat ( $F(4, 106) = 4.25, p < .05$ ) such that participants with high threat levels derogated the feminine gay recruit more than the masculine gay recruit.

### Perception of "Fit" With the Team

This ratio measure of prejudice examined to what extent participants felt that the recruit would fit in with the team. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the recruit fitting in better, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participant's BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to the recruit fitting in better ( $F(1, 106) = .16, p = .69, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participant's BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to the recruit fitting in better ( $F(1, 106) = .99, p = .32, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

Once again, the main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = 2.30, p = .13, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. In line with the findings from the official visit measure, no significant main effect of participant's threat level emerged ( $F(1, 106) = 1.32, p = .25, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ) such that the participant's threat level, being high or low, did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. Additionally, there was no significant interaction among the two independent variables ( $F(1, 106) = 1.11, p = .29, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

Examining threat at the trait level once again, the main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .94, p = .34, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. Additionally, there was no significant main effect of participant's trait threat level emerged ( $F(7, 106) = .93, p = .49, \eta_p^2 = .07$ ) such that the participant's trait threat level, being high or low, did not significantly impact the participants feelings of how well the recruit would fit in compared to other recruits. There was also no significant interaction among the two independent variables ( $F(4, 106) = .25, p = .91, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

#### Positively Contributing to Team Dynamics

This ratio measure of prejudice examined participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics ( $F(1, 106) = 1.72, p = .19, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ). The covariate, participant's BSRI femininity score was not significantly related to participant's beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics ( $F(1, 106) = 2.11, p = .15, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .04, p = .85, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants' beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics. Additionally, there was no significant main effect of participant's threat level ( $F(1, 106) = .12, p = .73, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), therefore, the participant's threat level being high or low did not impact the participants' ratings of how likely the recruit would be to positively add to the team dynamics. Once again, there was no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations ( $F(1, 106) = .72, p = .40, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). These results are consistent with the findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, PRS intimacy scale, PRS acceptance scale, official visit, and fitting in measures.

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .17, p = .68, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the participants' beliefs about how the recruit would positively add to the team dynamics. Additionally, there was no significant main effect of participant's threat level ( $F(7, 106) = .80, p = .60, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ), therefore, the participant's trait threat level being high or low did not impact the participants' ratings of how likely the recruit would be to positively add to the team dynamics. Once again, there was no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant threat manipulations ( $F(4, 106) = .16, p = .96, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ). These results are consistent with the findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, PRS intimacy scale, and fitting in measures.

### Likelihood of Receiving an Athletic Scholarship

This ratio measure of prejudice assessed to the likelihood of receiving an athletic scholarship. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to the likelihood of the recruit receiving an athletic scholarship ( $F(1, 106) = .002, p = .97, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship ( $F(1, 106) = 1.90, p = .17, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = 1.36, p = .25, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's threat level ( $F(1, 106) = 2.51, p = .12, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ) such that the participant's threat level being either high or low did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. As has been the case with the vast majority of other analyses in Study 2, no significant interaction emerged between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's threat manipulations ( $F(1, 106) = .93, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

Examining threat at the trait level, there was no main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = 1.01, p = .32, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), such that the

recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's trait threat level ( $F(7, 106) = .47, p = .86, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ) such that the participant's trait threat level being either high or low did not significantly impact how likely the recruit was to receive an athletic scholarship. As has been the case with the vast majority of other analyses in Study 2, no significant interaction emerged between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's trait threat level manipulations ( $F(4, 106) = 1.48, p = .21, \eta_p^2 = .06$ ).

### Scholarship Type

Finally, a one item ratio measure of prejudice examined the type of scholarship that participants awarded to the recruit. Chi-square analyses were conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit. A chi-square test was performed and no relationship was found between recruit's interest (masculine vs. feminine) and the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit,  $\chi^2(6, N=107) = 4.16, p = .66$ . Indicating that the recruit being masculine or feminine did not impact the type of scholarship that the participant felt the recruit should be awarded. A separate chi-square test was performed and no relationship was found between the participant's threat level and the type of scholarship awarded to the recruit,  $\chi^2(6, N=107) = 7.38, p = .29$ . Indicating that the participant writing about failure or the weather did not impact the type of scholarship that the participant felt the recruit should be awarded.

Being that the chi square analyses were non-significant; the scholarship type was turned into a dichotomous variable. The categorical nature of the item (0 = no

scholarship awarded, 1= partial to full scholarship awarded) required a logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression was performed to examine the effects of the recruit's gender role interest (0 = Masculine, 1= Feminine, participant's threat level (0= low threat, 1= high threat), Recruit's gender role interest x Participant threat interaction, BSRI femininity scores ( $M = 4.88$ ,  $SD = .96$ ), and BSRI masculinity scores ( $M = 5.07$ ,  $SD = .91$ ) on the likelihood of awarding a scholarship. The model was not significant,  $\chi^2(1) = 6.98$ ,  $p = .22$ . The model explained 11.5% of the variance in scholarship type awarded to the recruit and correctly classified 94.6% of cases. Within this model the recruit's gender role interest ( $b = .45$ ,  $SE = 1.32$ ,  $p = .73$ ), participant's threat level ( $b = -.29$ ,  $SE = 1.09$ ,  $p = .79$ ), participant's BSRI femininity score ( $b = .82$ ,  $SE = .46$ ,  $p = .07$ ), participant's BSRI masculinity score ( $b = .18$ ,  $SE = .54$ ,  $p = .74$ ) and Recruit interest x Participant threat interaction ( $b = .55$ ,  $SE = 1.90$ ,  $p = .77$ ), did not significantly add to the model. At mean levels of BSRI masculinity and femininity, the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit and the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit were equally likely to be awarded an athletic scholarship (regardless of the participant's threat level).

### Exploratory Measures Created for this Study

#### Snaps Played

We created one item to assess how many snaps per game the participant believed that the recruit would play, if the person joined the team. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat level: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on snaps played per game,

covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to snaps played per game ( $F(1, 107) = .01, p = .94, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participants BSRI femininity score was also not significantly related to the snaps played per game ( $F(1, 107) = .46, p = .50, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 107) = .15, p = .70, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the snaps per game played by the recruit. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's threat level ( $F(1, 107) = .78, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .01$ ), with the participant's threat level being either high or low not impacting the estimated number of snaps per game. Unlike the previous measures, there was a significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's threat manipulations ( $F(1, 107) = 4.91, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ) on the number of snaps played per game. Specifically, when the participants evaluated the masculine gay recruit and were under high threat conditions, they believed the recruit would play more snaps per game ( $M = 48.07, SD = 32.41$ ) than the masculine gay recruit who was evaluated under conditions of low threat ( $M = 30.22, SD = 24.33$ ).

When examining threat at the trait level, the main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .14, p = .71, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ), such that the recruit's interests being either masculine or feminine did not significantly impact the snaps per game played by the recruit. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's trait threat level ( $F(7, 106) = 1.62, p = .14, \eta_p^2 = .11$ ), with the participant's trait threat

level being either high or low not impacting the estimated number of snaps per game. There was also no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's trait threat level manipulations ( $F(4, 106) = 1.07, p = .38, \eta_p^2 = .05$ ) on the number of snaps played per game.

### Likelihood of Becoming a Starter

A single item was included to examine the participant's ratings of how likely it would be for the recruit to become a starter, if the person joined the team. A 2 (recruit's gender role interests: masculine vs. feminine) x 2 (participant threat: high vs. low) ANCOVA was conducted to test the effects of the manipulated variables on how the likelihood of becoming a starter, covarying out the effect of the participants own BSRI masculinity and BSRI femininity scores. The covariate, participants BSRI masculinity score was not significantly related to how likely the recruit would be to become a starter ( $F(1, 107) = .21, p = .65, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The covariate, participant's BSRI femininity score was significantly related to how likely the recruit would be to become a starter ( $F(1, 107) = 4.22, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .04$ ), such that participants with higher BSRI femininity scores said the recruit was more likely to become a starter ( $b = 4.77, SE = 2.38, p < .05$ ).

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 107) = .11, p = .74, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's ratings of how likely the recruit would be to become a starter. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's threat level ( $F(1, 107) = 1.87, p = .18, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ), such that the participant's threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the recruit's likelihood of becoming a starter. There was also no

significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's threat manipulations ( $F(1, 107) = .15, p = .70, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). These findings are inconsistent with the snaps per game measure and are consistent with the findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, PRS intimacy, PRS acceptance, official visit, and fitting in measures.

The main effect of recruit's gender role interests was not significant ( $F(1, 106) = .14, p = .71, \eta_p^2 < .01$ ). The recruit's masculine or feminine interests did not significantly impact the participant's ratings of how likely the recruit would be to become a starter. There was also no significant main effect of the participant's trait threat level ( $F(7, 106) = 1.08, p = .39, \eta_p^2 = .08$ ), such that the participant's trait threat level being high or low did not significantly impact the recruit's likelihood of becoming a starter. There was also no significant interaction between the recruit's gender role interest (masculine or feminine) and participant's trait threat level manipulations ( $F(4, 106) = .60, p = .66, \eta_p^2 = .03$ ). These findings are consistent with the findings from the feeling thermometer, Bogardus Social Distance Scale, PRS intimacy, fit better, team dynamics, scholarship, snaps per game, and fitting in measures.

### Testing a Replication of Results from Study 1

To examine whether under the same threat writing condition used in Study 1 (write about a time you failed athletically) participants in this more general sample derogated the stereotype consistent (feminine gay) recruit more than the stereotype inconsistent (masculine gay) recruit, a planned contrast was performed on the main Likert

and ratio dependent variables. However, the results showed no significant differences between the amount of prejudice directed at the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit and the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit. Therefore, we were unable successfully replicate the findings from Study 1.

### Summary

All told, results on the validated Likert items taken from past research consistently showed that there was no difference between the masculine and feminine gay recruits, regardless of the participant's threat level. Similarly, the ratio measures showed similar findings such that there was no difference between the recruits in their likelihood to get an official visit to the university, likelihood of fitting in better than other recruits or likelihood of receiving a scholarship regardless of the participant's threat levels. The exploratory items were more mixed in the results. The exploratory item of snaps played showed a significant difference between the recruits in the number of snaps per game they would play, such that the masculine gay recruit evaluated under conditions of high threat was believed to play significantly more snaps per game than the masculine recruit evaluated under conditions of low threat. Whereas the exploratory item of likelihood of becoming a starter showed results consistent with the other findings (no difference between the recruits in likelihood of becoming a starter). All told, results of Study 2 were not consistent with the results from Study 1. Therefore, these results do not offer support for Brescoll et al., (2011) or Schimel et al., (1999)

Table 3. Estimated means for Likert and Ratio Bias Directed Toward the Recruits as a Function of the Manipulated Recruit's Gender Role Interest and Participant threat level in Study 2.

<i>Recruit's Gender Role Interest</i>	<i>Participant Threat Level</i>							
	<u>High Threat</u>				<u>Low Threat</u>			
	<u>Masculine</u>		<u>Feminine</u>		<u>Masculine</u>		<u>Feminine</u>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>
Feeling Thermometer-Feelings of Warmth	76.56	(2.99)	70.47	(3.05)	72.08	(2.94)	73.75	(2.89)
Bogardus Social Distance Scale	4.27	(.10)	4.24	(.11)	4.31	(.11)	4.40	(.11)
Perceived Relatedness- Intimacy	4.12	(.27)	3.77	(.22)	4.20	(.21)	4.15	(.21)
Perceived Relatedness- Acceptance	4.81	(.32)	4.99	(.33)	4.90	(.32)	4.92	(.32)
Official Visit	71.77	(3.55)	68.40	(3.68)	69.66	(3.55)	73.62	(3.49)
Perception of "Fit" With the Team	39.16	(4.32)	37.16	(4.48)	48.73	(4.32)	37.57	(4.24)
Positively Add to Team Dynamics	67.02	(4.84)	61.96	(5.02)	64.56	(4.84)	67.75	(4.75)
Likelihood of Receiving Athletic Scholarship	55.98	(4.29)	46.81	(4.45)	58.67	(4.29)	57.77	(4.21)
Snaps Played	47.88 <sup>a</sup>	(5.59)	33.28 <sup>ab</sup>	(5.79)	30.46 <sup>b</sup>	(5.59)	40.77 <sup>ab</sup>	(5.48)
Likelihood of Becoming a Starter	43.87	(4.59)	40.53	(4.76)	48.36	(4.59)	48.63	(4.50)

*Note:* Means not sharing a subscript differ at  $p < .05$

## STUDY 2 DISCUSSION

Study 1 demonstrated that participants displayed the most prejudice toward the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit. However, Study 2 attempted to follow up this study by conducting a laboratory experiment that experimentally manipulated threat by putting participants under threat in order to see how participant's judgments toward stereotype consistent and inconsistent gay recruits differed under high versus low threat. Unfortunately, the findings from Study 2 were unable to extend the findings from Study 1 because the results consistently showed that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit and stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit received equal amounts of prejudice. However, in Study 1 the results consistently showed that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit received the most prejudice, which supported the idea that the recruit was judged most negatively because they were doubly deviant.

Based on the findings from Study 2, both of the hypotheses were not supported. The first hypothesis predicted that under conditions of low threat, judgments of the stereotype inconsistent gay recruit would be more positive than the judgments made about the stereotype consistent gay recruit. However, the results showed the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit and stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit received equal amounts of prejudice on almost all of the measures. The only significant findings from Study 2 showed that when under high threat, participants were said the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit would play more snaps than when the same recruit was evaluated after writing about the weather. Although significant, this finding did not support either of the hypotheses. These results were not in line with the

findings from Study 1. Had the findings been in line with those from Study 1, under conditions of low threat the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit would have received the more prejudice than the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit. If this pattern of results had emerged, this would have provided support for the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012). The second hypothesis looked to examine whether under conditions of high threat, judgments of the stereotype inconsistent gay recruit would be judged more positively or more negatively than the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit. This hypothesis was not supported by the current findings. The manipulation of threat was not successful in putting participants under conditions of high threat and there no judgments could be rendered. Had this hypothesis been supported by the results from Study 2, this would have offered support to the findings of Schimel et al. (1999). If the pattern of results would have extended the findings from Study 1, it would have been expected that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit would have received the most prejudice when under conditions of high threat. In addition to supporting the findings from Study 1, this pattern of results would have also supported the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012).

However, when examining trait level threat the results for the PRS acceptance and official visit measures showed that under conditions of high threat, participants derogated the feminine gay recruit more than the masculine gay recruit. This pattern of results was consistent with the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012), such that under conditions of high anxiety participants derogated the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit more than the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit.

A key shortcoming of Study 2 was the failure of the threat manipulation to invoke threat in the participants. The manipulation check revealed there was no significant difference between people in the high and low threat conditions. Additionally, a one sample *t*-test was used to compare participants overall mean STAI-6 scores to the test value of 2.5 which represented the midpoint or neutral point on the 1 to 4 scale. A significant difference was found ( $t(105) = -7.74, p < .05$ ), the overall mean was 2.34 ( $SD = .21$ ) suggesting participants were significantly lower in self-reported threat compared to neutral, regardless of the writing prompt they were given during the threat manipulation. The failure to induce threat in the participants meant that all participants were actually making judgments about the recruits under conditions of low to neutral threat.

Based on the current literature two prevailing hypotheses were formed for this experiment. Without the high threat condition, the effects of high threat on prejudice cannot be seen, and therefore, we are unable to truly test our hypotheses. Had the threat manipulation been successful in invoking threat in the participants, differences in prejudice could have been examined for the stereotype consistent feminine gay man and the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay man. Based on previous research it was expected that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit would receive less prejudice under conditions of high threat; because they are consistent with people's cultural world views and thus help to reassure these cultural world views (Schimmel et al., 1999). Or conversely it could have been that the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit would receive less prejudice under conditions of high threat (Brescoll et al., 2012). There was some evidence that emerged when examining threat at the trait level that did allow us

to examine participant's judgments under conditions of high threat. These results suggested that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was derogated more than the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit. These results offer some support for the hypothesis that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit being derogated against more.

Additionally, differences may have emerged in Study 2 due to the demographics of the participants. In Study 1, the participants were all currently collegiate football players. Whereas, in Study 2, the participants were not currently members of an athletic team, although, they did still self-identify as athletes. While both groups self-identified as athletes, there are fundamental differences between being a current member of the football team and self-identifying as an athlete. Being a member of the football team means that the participant would be interacting with the recruit in a drastically different manner than someone who self-identified as an athlete in Study 2 would be interacting with the recruit.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

The current project aimed to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality norms to examine differences in how stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay men are judged. Past research had provided evidence that stereotype consistent gay men are derogated against more than stereotype inconsistent gay men (Brescoll et al., 2012; Glick et al., 2007) whereas other research had shown that stereotype inconsistent gay targets are derogated against more than stereotype consistent gay men (Schimel et al., 1999). Thus leaving mixed evidence for whether stereotype consistent or stereotype inconsistent gay men are derogated against more. In the highly masculinized context of collegiate American football, two studies were conducted to examine how men use gender role and sexuality information to perceive a potential athletic recruit under conditions of high threat. Study 1 examined this question among men in a highly self-relevant context; actual college football players. Study 2 examined this question among men in a more generalized context. All participants looked at a (fictitious) football recruit's profile and made judgments and reported their attitudes. It was expected that the normative stereotype consistent player (straight and masculine) would be judged most favorably. Otherwise, it was unclear based on the two different findings from past research what to predict for the judgments of the stereotype consistent (gay and feminine) versus stereotype inconsistent (gay and masculine; straight and feminine) conditions.

One important dimension of the mixed evidence in prior work is the role of threat. Study 1 tested attempted to induce threat among all football players before having them

make their judgments; however this induction was unsuccessful. In Study 2, we attempted to manipulate the relative levels of threat, but this was again unsuccessful. As such, results from both studies must be interpreted as occurring under moderate to low levels of threat. We return to the role of threat in the limitations and future direction section below.

Findings from the self-relevant group in Study 1 showed that in comparison to all other recruits, the stereotype consistent feminine and gay man was derogated the most. These findings point to the notion that prejudice experienced by gay men football players is more complex than simply being gay; rather it appears to depend on the combination of being both gay and feminine which results in greater prejudice. These results build on the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012) who found that men who were able to reaffirm their masculinity were less derogated against than men who were unable to reaffirm their masculinity. This suggests that in the face of clear feminine gender role interests, being a football player in and of itself is not enough to “affirm” masculinity when gay, resulting in derogation. However, affirming one’s masculine gender role interests does seem to be enough to counter prejudice such that the masculine gay football recruit and the feminine straight recruit was rated just as high as the normative masculine straight recruit.

Study 2 looked to replicate the findings of Study 1 while generalizing them to a broader less relevant population. This was done by examining introductory psychology 100 male students who self-identified as athletes. Here, participants were only asked to rate the gay football recruit who was described as either holding masculine gender role interests or feminine gender role interests. The results of Study 2 did not replicate the

findings of Study 1. The pattern of results shown in Study 2 consistently showed that there was no difference in the ratings between the masculine and feminine gay recruit. This could either be interpreted optimistically to mean that there is no prejudice against gay football players no matter their gender roles among this general sample; or more pessimistically it could mean that the gay recruit was equally derogated no matter their gender roles; in this case the masculine role did not reaffirm the recruit's masculinity. Looking at Table 2 and Table 3 shows us that the general sample displayed less prejudice toward the gay recruits regardless of their gender roles compared to the football sample.

It is also important to consider that each study intentionally used very different samples. The football recruit was much more personally relevant to participants in Study 1 who thought they would have to play with this person in the next season. Previous research has shown that when information is more personally relevant it has a greater impact on the judgments people make compared to judgments made about information that is not personally relevant (Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981). In Study 1, the information about the recruit is of much greater relevance to the participants. Being current collegiate athletes, the participants would be in close contact with the recruit on a day-to-day basis if they were to come to their university. Because of this the high personal relevance of recruit, the information being presented about the recruit would have received more thought from the participants (Petty et al., 1981). For example, the relevance is evident in the potential sharing of the locker room with the gay recruit. It is believed that the locker room will be one of the last places to accept gay men (Kian & Anderson, 2009). The relevance extends beyond the locker room as well, it has been

suggested that sports help to provide men with a context which allows for acceptable forms of male bonding (Griffin, 1998). Within the context of sports, men can express love of their teammates, and show physical affection without ridicule or questioning of their sexuality (Griffin, 1998). These are elements that would not be personally relevant to the participants in Study 2 when considering a gay football recruit at the university. Future research could examine this question more head on by manipulating whether the recruit was being considered for the player's own sport or was being considered for a different college sport at the same university. It could be that tolerance is lower when relevance is higher versus lower.

#### Limitations and Future Directions

Upon the completion of the current project, it became evident that there were several limitations which future research should aim to address. The first limitation that should be addressed is that this project did not have a neutral gender role condition. Having no neutral gender role condition limits the research because without this condition, we are unable to distinguish the directionality of the effect. Having a neutral gender role condition would allow the researchers to make comparisons of how the masculine and feminine gender role conditions compare to neutral. This problem could be addressed by future research by the inclusion of a neutral gender role condition. In this condition the recruit's profile could state that the recruit plans to major in Sociology or Communications (Savage & Fouad, 1994) and their interests include cycling, and listening to music, (Drouin, Varga., & Gammage, 2008; Fitzgerald, Joseph, Hayes, &

O'Regan, 1995). Previous research has shown these majors and activities are gender neutral. Creating a neutral gender role condition like this would allow researchers to determine if compared to this recruit, the masculine and feminine recruits were experiencing more or less prejudice.

The Role of Threat. The current project used a writing task to attempt to induce threat in participants by placing them under threat. In Study 1 all participants wrote about a time in which they had failed athletically, and in Study 2 half of the participants wrote about this same prompt, while half wrote about the weather. It was expected that under conditions of high threat negatively impacted participant's perceptions of the recruit. However, it was found that in both studies, the induction (Study 1) and manipulation (Study 2) of threat was unsuccessful based on results from the self-reported threat measure.

The failure of the threat manipulation used to invoke threat was a major limitation of the current project. Across both studies it was seen that participant's threat levels were relatively neutral. In Study 1 despite the participants threat levels being relatively neutral significant results still emerged, indicating that the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was derogated against the most. The failure of the threat manipulation was particularly problematic for Study 2, which aimed to examine the effects of high versus low threat levels on the perception of a gay recruit who were either stereotype consistent (feminine) or stereotype inconsistent (masculine). Without the manipulation successfully changing the participant's threat levels, this study was unable to determine whether the participant's threat level being high or low impacted their perception of the gay recruit.

Manipulations of negative mood and anxiety are often difficult. For example, in classic research by Schacter and Singer (1962) found that when participants are able to attribute the source of their emotions to emotionally irrelevant sources, then their emotional state will be reduced. While there are many mood induction procedures which have been shown to be effective in changing participant's moods, there are varying success rates. Some techniques such as Velten and Facial Expression manipulations have been shown to be effective only 50 percent of the time (Martin, 1990; Westermann, Spies, Stahl, & Hesse, 1996). In a meta-analysis of mood induction techniques, Westermann, Spies, Stahl, and Hesse (1996) found that current procedures for mood induction have varying success rates, while some techniques, such as the use of film clips, have been shown to be highly effective and other techniques have not. These findings illustrate the difficulties that exist for researchers attempting to experimentally induce varying mood states.

Due to the difficulty of successfully inducing mood changes, future research should aim to address this issue by using a stronger manipulation of anxiety. For example, previous research has found task such as the speech stressor task (Sayette, Martin, Perrott, Wertz & Hufford, 2001) has successfully provoked anxiety in participants. In this task participants are told they would be filmed giving a three minute speech about what they like and dislike about their bodies, which would later be evaluated by graduate students in the clinical psychology department. Anxiety has also been successfully induced through the use of threatening film clips (Straube et al., 2010). In this task participants watched four brief anxiety provoking movies scenes, selected from American horror movies. Threat provoking measures such as these would offer

stronger manipulations of threat which could be used in future research. Using a stronger manipulation of anxiety would hopefully allow the researchers to examine if the participant's anxiety level did in fact impact the judgments they made toward the gay recruits. If threat was found to impact participants judgments researchers could determine which line of past research the results supported. A preference for stereotype inconsistency under threat would support for the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012) and Glick et al. (2007) who found under conditions of threat from masculinity threat participants preferred stereotype inconsistency. Whereas, a preference for stereotype consistency would offer support for the findings be more in line with Schimel et al. (1999) who found that under conditions of mortality salience anxiety participants preferred stereotype consistency.

Being that threat has been shown to be successful in inducing anxiety, two other alternative strategies for inducing anxiety in participants would be to use a mortality salience threat manipulation such as Schimel et al. (1999) or to use a masculinity threat such as Brescoll et al. (2012) used. Schimel et al. used a mortality salience induction of anxiety which is a unique induction technique. Mortality salience has been shown to create anxiety which is not seen when compared to other anxiety provoking thoughts such as going to the dentist (Schimel et al., 1999). We opted not to use one in the current study in an attempt to use a more likely common experience of failure among our college samples. However, by not using this death-thoughts induction we cannot say for certain that culture worldview defense includes derogating versus preferring a stereotype consistent gay football player was occurring in a highly personally relevant sample.

Schimel et al. (1999) used a sample of psychology undergraduate students, opposed to actual football players in their study. Therefore, within our highly personal relevant sample of football players, we cannot fully address the issue of cultural worldview defense. From the current findings, it is unclear if at higher levels of anxiety prejudice would emerge toward the recruits as was found in Schimel, or if the same pattern of results would hold among a highly relevant sample.

Had we decided to use mortality salience like Schimel et al. (1999) as our threat induction technique we would have expected similar results to what they found. It would be expected that in the control condition when participants were instructed to think about watching TV, that participants would show no difference in their evaluations of the recruits. However, when participants were given the mortality salience prompt, it would be expected that for participants high in need for closure we would see them displaying more prejudice toward the stereotype inconsistent recruits in Study 1. In Study 2, had we used mortality salience as our threat induction, we would have expected a replication of Schimel et al.'s. (1999) findings. With the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit receiving greater prejudice than the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit.

Another possible way that participants could have been put under threat to invoke anxiety would have been threatening participant's masculinity (Brescoll et al., 2012; Vandello et al., 2008). Had this induction technique been used participants could have taken a gender knowledge test (Vandello et al., 2008) and then received gender threatening feedback. The gender threatening feedback would tell the participant that they were in the 27<sup>th</sup> percentile for men and that they had a higher feminine gender identity. In Study 1,

had we used masculinity threat as our threat induction, we would have expected that similar to the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012), the stereotype inconsistent recruits would receive less prejudice. In Study 2, the type of feedback participants received would be manipulated such that half the participants got the threatening feedback and half the participants would receive non-threatening feedback (i.e., they scored in the 73<sup>rd</sup> percentile for men). Once again using a masculinity threat as our threat induction, we would expect the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay recruit receive less prejudice than the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit. These findings would be in line with the findings of Brescoll et al. (2012).

The Role of Gender. An additional limitation of the current project is that only male participants were examined. While this is a useful initial step in assessing how men use sexuality and gender role norms to perceive stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent individuals, it only allows for us to see part of the equation. Previous research has shown that men are typically more prejudice toward gay men than women are (Griffin, 1998; Herek, 1984; Herek, 1986). Straight men's stereotype of gay men includes believing that they are more similar to straight women than they are to straight men (Kite & Deaux, 1987). This idea in particular could help to explain the results seen in Study 1. If the participants in Study 1 were viewing the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit as being more similar to a straight woman, they may have been more derogated against in an effort to keep this highly feminine athlete out of sports, especially football (Anderson, 2002; Griffin, 1998). This idea opens the door for potential gender differences between men and women in the way they make judgments of the recruits.

Previous research has shown that women are less likely than men to hold sexual prejudice (Lim, 2002; Parrott & Gallagher, 2008). Therefore, another direction that future research could examine is gender differences in the amount of sexual prejudice women, directed toward stereotype consistent and inconsistent targets. Past research such as Schimel et al. (1999) and Brescoll et al. (2012) both used male and female participants in their studies. Whereas, Glick et al. (2007) used male participants only and similarly to Study 1 found that participants derogated the stereotype consistent feminine gay target more than the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay target when completing a survey of attitudes toward different types of gay men, following a threat to their own masculinity.

Thus, examining both men and women's judgements toward the recruits could help allow potential changes in prejudice that were not seen in the current studies to emerge. Based on current literature future research could test to see if factors such as level of prejudice and adherence to traditional gender roles in women decreased the amount of prejudice directed at the recruits. Past research has shown differing levels of sexual prejudice in men and women (Lim, 2002), with women displaying lower levels of sexual prejudice. Additionally, previous research has also shown that women adhere to traditional gender role beliefs less than men and this lower adherence also leads to decreased sexual prejudice (Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markman, & Snyder, 2006, Saratore & Cunningham, 2007). Based on these findings if future research were to find that when women were included as participants, lower levels of prejudice was seen, these mechanisms could be a potential explanation for the effects.

The Role of Sports. Another possible future direction for researchers to take would be examining how people use sexuality and gender role norms to make judgments of stereotype consistent versus stereotype inconsistent targets within other contexts. Within the realm of athletics, attempting to replicate Study 1 in the context of another sport would help to offer support for the findings. Being that American football is viewed as highly masculine (Griffin, 1998) if similar findings emerged across sports, this would help to strengthen the findings and illustrate the effect is not just a product of the sport. One potential way in that future research could look to examine this would be by examining less masculine sports such as men's figure skating. Choosing a less masculine sport like this would allow these concepts to be examined outside of team sports and contact sports which are typically viewed as more masculine (Griffin, 1998). If similar patterns of results could be seen in more feminine sports, this would help to provide more clues as to what is driving these effects. It was also help to generalize the findings by showing that they occur in less masculine domains as well. To further generalize the context of the results future research should also look to examine this same line of research within women's sports. One way in which researchers could examine these concepts with women would be to examine women's hockey. As is seen in men's sports, female athletes also work to provide evidence they are straight and avoid being labeled as lesbians (Griffin, 1998). Extending the current research to female sports, would also help to further disentangle the roles of sexuality and gender norms in people perception.

Being that some athletics are viewed as highly masculine and highly unaccepting of gays (Anderson, 2002; Anderson & McGuire, 2010; Griffin, 1998; Kidd, 2013;

Kimmel, 1997) many gay athletes may not feel comfortable coming out while playing. One avenue which could be examined by future research is the effectiveness of the stereotype inoculation model (Dasgupta, 2011) for improving diversity within athletics. According to Dasgupta (2011) providing minority groups, such as gay athletes, with role models who are high achievers within their domain can help them to view themselves more positively. Since April 29, 2013 when Jason Collins (NBA) came out of the closet, Michael Sam (NFL), Derrick Gordon (college basketball), and Chip Sarafin (college football) have all publicly acknowledged that they were gay. These athletes are all competing at high levels within their respective sports and therefore, could be used as role models for gay athletes. By offering these athletes with successful, high achieving role models to look up to this could help allow gay athletes feel as though they could come out and still be successful within their sport. If found to be successful, the stereotype inoculation model (Desgupta, 2011) could be an effective tool in helping gay athletes feel comfortable coming out while playing sports and simultaneously improving diversity within sports.

The Role of Race. One final direction, which future research could examine what type of effect the race of the target has on judgments people make. In the current project, all targets examined were white males. For example, recent research has found greater sexual prejudice toward lesbians and gay men among heterosexual Black men compared to heterosexual White men (Daboin, Peterson & Parrott, 2015; Herek & Capitano, 1995). It is believed that the racial differences in sexual prejudice may arise from cultural differences; within these cultures heterosexuality is valued while homosexuality is looked

down upon (Daboin et al., 2015; Rosario, Schrimshaw & Hunter, 2004; Whitley, Childs & Collins, 2011). Previous research also suggests that typically White males are more likely to be thought of as gay, than are Black males (Cunningham & Melton, 2012; Daboin, et al. 2015; Herek & Capitano, 1995; Whitley, et al, 2011). Therefore, manipulating the race of the target could help to provide insight into racial differences in prejudice, as well as illustrating any potential racial differences that exist in regard to how masculinity and sexuality are used to make judgments.

### Implications of the Research

Overall, the current project attempted to further untangle gender role norms from sexuality norms. A majority of past work has focused on manipulating gender role norms or sexuality (Brescoll et al., 2012; Glick et al., 2007; Schimel et al., 1999). However, a limited number of studies have manipulated both sexuality and masculinity (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). Similar to the current findings, Lehavot & Lambert (2007) found that the stereotype consistent feminine gay target was derogated the most. Whereas, the stereotype inconsistent masculine gay target was not derogated against to the same extent, indicating that simply being gay in itself may not lead to prejudice. Instead it may be a more complex process in which both gender role and sexuality norms contribute to prejudice. In the past five years, we have begun to see a shift in the way our culture views gender role and sexuality norms. In 2010, President Obama signed a repeal of the “Don’t ask, don’t tell” military policy, taking the policy out of effect and allowing openly gay men and lesbian women to serve. Additionally, there has also been increased

legalization of gay marriage, with 37 states now allowing same-sex marriage. These cultural changes show that boundaries in gender role and sexuality norms are beginning to shift. At a broad level, this study offers implications of how gender role and sexuality norms are used within sports to make judgments of gay athletes. Judgments of gay athletes show a shift is beginning to take place within American sports, especially at the collegiate level.

Worldwide millions of people each year attend and watch various sporting events from football to soccer to cricket. The 2014 FIFA World Cup in Brazil had more than one billion fans join their Global Stadium by using one of FIFA's official digital platforms (e.g., the official FIFA mobile app) to follow the tournament (FIFA.com, 2014). The United States of America sports are wildly popular, with numerous networks (e.g. ESPN, NBC Sports, NFL Network) dedicated to solely covering sports and providing viewers with live games, highlights and analysis. At the top of the U.S.A's sporting hierarchy is football. Football is so popular that according to the Television Bureau of Advertising (TVB) the top two syndicated programs in the 2012-2013 season for adults ages 25-54 were NFL football games (TVB, 2013). Worldwide, the only rival to the popularity of sports is the popularity of the athletes themselves. These athletes are believed to embody the ideals of masculinity, athletes are muscular, athletic, powerful, competitive and until recently they were thought to be heterosexual (Griffin, 1998; Kidd, 2013; Steinfeldt, Gilchrist, Halterman, Gomory & Steinfeldt, 2011; Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag & Steinfeldt, 2011). This notion of athletes being perceived as heterosexual changed with Jason Collins publicly acknowledging he was gay and therefore becoming

the first openly gay athlete within the four major American sports. In doing so Jason Collins opened the door for other athletes to follow suit and come out to their teams. As more athletes begin to do so it will become essential that coaches and athletic departments ready themselves to properly handle the situation.

Having knowledge of how willing athletes are to accept a gay teammate would be important information for both coaches and athletic departments to have. By having knowledge about how athletes deal with having a gay teammate, this would allow programs to be put in place to appropriately handle the situation. By install appropriate trainings, this would allow for a gay athlete to feel welcomed on the team and in the locker room. One potential technique for athletic departments to implement in order to address issues of sexual prejudice toward gay athletes would be teaching athletes to stand up and confront sexual prejudice. This has been shown to be one of the most effect ways to fight prejudice. It is especially effective when the confrontation of prejudice comes from someone who is not being derogated against (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Kroeper, Sanchez & Himmelstein, 2014; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010).

The findings from the current project help to untangle the conflation of masculinity with heterosexuality within the literature. To our knowledge Study 1 is one of few study to examine stereotype consistent and stereotype inconsistent gay and straight men in the same study (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). Examining both gender role and sexuality norms simultaneously (Allen & Smith, 2011; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007) is becoming more popular within the literature as both factors are believed to be important components to sexual prejudice. However, a majority of past research has separated the

two. For example Schimel et al. (1999) and Glick et al. (2007) all judgments were made in regards to stereotype consistent versus inconsistent gay men. Whereas, Brescoll et al. (2012) all of the judgments being made were in regards to stereotype consistent versus stereotype inconsistent straight men. While these studies allowed for various comparisons to be made, they did not allow for comparisons to be made across both sexuality and masculinity simultaneously. The current study allowed us to make examinations across both dimensions and to make direct comparisons between all recruits at once. Doing so allowed for any potential issues of social desirability to be addressed as well by making comparisons of both gay and straight recruits. Research shows that sexual prejudice is commonly expressed publicly (Herek & Berrill, 1990; Kroeper et al., 2014) and often done so with no recourse for doing so (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003; Kroeper et al., 2014). Although it is still acceptable to be higher in sexual prejudice, this is changing with research showing more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbians in the United States (Herek, 2000). The results seen in Study 1, add to the current literature on sexual prejudice by illustrating the role that masculinity plays in people's perceptions of gay targets. The findings suggest that a person's masculinity may play a crucial role in determining how much prejudice is directed toward a target, with masculine qualities helping to mitigate the negative consequences.

Taken together the current study helps to shed light on masculinity, gender role norms and sexuality norms factor into person perception. The current findings show that just because an athlete is gay does not automatically mean they will be derogated against. In Study 1, only the stereotype consistent feminine gay recruit was derogated against.

This may be occurring because of the four recruits that were evaluated; the feminine gay recruit was the only recruit who had no masculine credentials. All of the other recruits were able to show that they had some sort of masculine credentials, whether it was shown by having a girlfriend or shown by their gender role interests being more masculine. While not ideal, this does suggest two things. Firstly, it suggests that there may be increasing tolerance for non-normative individuals in sports (e.g. straight feminine recruit and masculine gay recruit). On a broader level these results could indicate that a paradigm shift may be occurring in sports such that barriers which previously kept non-normative athletes excluded from sports may now be breaking down. The breakdown of these barriers would help to enhance the overall diversity within sports and provide better access to sports participation by previously underrepresented groups, like gay athletes.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, J., & Smith, J. L. (2011). The influence of sexuality stereotypes on men's experience of gender-role incongruence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(1), 77-96. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019678>.
- Anderson, E. (2002). Openly gay athletes: Contesting hegemonic masculinity in a homophobic environment. *Gender & Society, 16*, 860-877. doi: 10.1177/089124302237892.
- Anderson, C. A., Carnagey, N. L., & Eubanks, J. (2003). Exposure to violent media: The effects of songs with violent lyrics on aggressive thoughts and feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(5), 960-971. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.960>
- Anderson, E., & McGuire, R. (2010). Inclusive masculinity theory and the gendered politics of men's rugby. *Journal of Gender Studies, 19*(3), 249-261. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2010.494341>.
- Baker, R. C., & Gutterfreund, D. G. (1993). The effects of written autobiographical recollection induction procedures on mood. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*(4), 563-568. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/618469361?accountid=28148>
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0036215>.
- Biernat, M., & Fuegen, K. (2001). Shifting standards and the evaluation of competence: Complexity in gender-based judgment and decision making. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 707-724. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00237>
- Biernat, M., & Vescio, T. K. (2002). She swings, she hits, she's great, she's benched: Implications of gender-based shifting standards for judgment and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(1), 66-77. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202281006>.
- Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., & Wasti, S. A. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623-634. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167208331161>.

- Brescoll, V. L., Uhlmann, E. L., Moss-Racusin, C., & Sarnell, L. (2012). Masculinity, status, and subordination: Why working for a gender stereotype violator causes men to lose status. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 354-357. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.005>.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Collins, J. (2013, April 29). Why NBA center Jason Collins is coming out now. *Sports Illustrated*.
- Coryn, C. L., Beale, J. M., & Myers, K. M. (2004). Response to September 11: Anxiety, patriotism, and prejudice in the aftermath of terror. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 9*(12) Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/620485880?accountid=2814>
- Crandall, C. S., Glor, J., & Britt, T. W. (1997). Aids-related stigmatization: Instrumental and symbolic attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*(2), 95-123. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/619039317?accountid=28148>
- Cunningham, G. B., & Melton, N. (2012). Prejudice against lesbian, gay, and bisexual coaches: The influence of race, religious fundamentalism, modern sexism, and contact with sexual minorities. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 29*(3), 283-305. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1437969609?accountid=28148>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-803. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784>
- Daboin, I., Peterson, J. L., & Parrott, D. J. (2015). Racial differences in sexual prejudice and its correlates among heterosexual men. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038444>*
- Dasgupta, N. (2011). Ingroup experts and peers as social vaccines who inoculate the self-concept: The stereotype inoculation model. *Psychological Inquiry, 22*(4), 231-246. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2011.607313>
- de Visser, R. O. (2009). "I'm not a very manly man": Qualitative insights into young men's masculine subjectivity. *Men and Masculinities, 11*(3), 367-371. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X07313357>.

- Drouin, B., Varga, H., & Gammage, K. L. (2008). The positive exerciser stereotype: The role of gender stereotype of the activity. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 13*(3), 143-156.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9861.2008.00032.x>
- ESPN. (2013, January 30). Chris Culliver issues apology. Retrieved June 27, 2014, from [http://espn.go.com/nfl/playoffs/2012/story/\\_/id/8898839/2013-super-bowl-chris-culliver-san-francisco-49ers-apologizes-anti-gay-comments](http://espn.go.com/nfl/playoffs/2012/story/_/id/8898839/2013-super-bowl-chris-culliver-san-francisco-49ers-apologizes-anti-gay-comments)
- Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie, & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137 – 166). New York: Academic Press.
- FIFA.com. (2014, July 14). Attendance in FIFA's Global Stadium exceeds 1 Billion fans. Retrieved September 19, 2014, from <http://www.fifa.com/worldcup/news/y=2014/m=7/news=attendance-in-fifa-s-global-stadium-exceeds-1-billion-fans-2404624.html>
- Fitzgerald, M., Joseph, A. P., Hayes, M., & O'Regan, M. (1995). Leisure activities of adolescent schoolchildren. *Journal of Adolescence, 18*(3), 349-358.  
Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/618975362?accountid=28148>
- Fleming, D. (2014, July 8). Nothing to see here: The team show is a place of celebration, fellowship and naked dance-offs. What it's not? A place hostile to Michael Sam. *ESPN The Magazine, 94*-100.
- Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: How gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues, 60*(4), 737-754.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00383.x>
- Gallup Inc. (2014, May 12). Gay and Lesbian Rights. Retrieved September 19, 2014, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1651/gay-lesbian-rights.aspx#1>.
- Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles, 57*(1-2), 55-59.  
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3>

- Gowen, C. W., & Britt, T. W. (2006). The interactive effects of homosexual speech and sexual orientation on the stigmatization of men: Evidence for expectancy violation theory. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 25*(4), 437-456. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0261927X06292769>.
- Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sports*. (pp. 16-191). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(6), 1105-1118. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1105>.
- Haemmerlie, F. M., Abdul-Wakeel, A., & Pomeroy, M. (1985). Male sex bias against men and women in various professions. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(6), 797-798. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617254607?accountid=28148>.
- Herek, G. M. (1984). Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*(1-2), 1-21. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617072883?accountid=28148>.
- Herek, G. M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*(5), 563-577. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617276469?accountid=28148>.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*(1), 19-22. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00051>
- Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*(4), 905-925. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x>.
- Herek, G. M., & Berrill, K. T. (1990). Documenting the victimization of lesbians and gay men: Methodological issues. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*(3), 301-315. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617889939?accountid=28148>

- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1995). Black heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men in the united states. *Journal of Sex Research, 32*(2), 95-105. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/618980494?accountid=28148>.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(4), 412-424. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/618823640?accountid=28148>
- Hodapp, V. (1989). Anxiety, fear of failure, and achievement: Two path-analytical models. *Anxiety Research, 1*(4), 301-312. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617718027?accountid=28148>
- Iwamoto, D. K., Cheng, A., Lee, C. S., Takamatsu, S., & Gordon, D. (2011). "Man-ing" up and getting drunk: The role of masculine norms, alcohol intoxication and alcohol-related problems among college men. *Addictive Behaviors, 36*(9), 906-911. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.04.005>
- Kian, M., & Anderson, E. (2009). John amaechi: Changing the way sport reporters examine gay athletes. *Journal of Homosexuality, 56*(7), 799-818. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918360903187788>
- Kidd, B. (2013). Sports and masculinity. *Sport in Society, 16*(4), 553-564. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2013.785757>.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1997). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. (pp. 223-242) Taylor & Frances/Routledge, Florence, KY. Retrieved From <http://search.proquest.com/docview/619265026?accountid=28148>.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(1), 83-96. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617429490?accountid=28148>.
- Klawitter, M. (2015). Meta-analysis of the effects of sexual orientation on earnings. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy & Society, 54*(1), 4-32. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/irel.12075>

- Kroeper, K. M., Sanchez, D. T., & Himmelstein, M. S. (2014). Heterosexual men's confrontation of sexual prejudice: The role of precarious manhood. *Sex Roles, 70*(1-2), 1-13. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0306-z>
- Kruglanski, A. W., Atash, M. N., DeGrada, E., Mannetti, L., Pierro, A., & Webster, D. M. (1997). Psychological theory testing versus psychometric nay-saying: Comment on neuberg et al.'s (1997) critique of the need for closure scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(5), 1005-1016. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.5.1005>
- Lambert, A. J., Eadeh, F. R., Peak, S. A., Scherer, L. D., Schott, J. P., & Slochower, J. M. (2014). Toward a greater understanding of the emotional dynamics of the mortality salience manipulation: Revisiting the "affect-free" claim of terror management research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(5), 655-678. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036353>
- Lehavot, K., & Lambert, A. J. (2007). Toward a greater understanding of antigay prejudice: On the role of sexual orientation and gender role violation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*(3), 279-292. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973530701503390>
- Lim, V. K. G. (2002). Gender differences and attitudes towards homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(1), 85-97. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01\\_0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01_0).
- Martin, M. (1990). On the induction of mood. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*(6), 669-697. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/617931705?accountid=28148>
- Mills, J. S., & D'Alfonso, S. R. (2007). Competition and male body image: Increased drive for muscularity following failure to a female. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 26*(4), 505-518. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2007.26.4.505>
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(41), 16474-16479.
- Moss-Racusin, C., Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). When men break the gender rules: Status incongruity and backlash against modest men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(2), 140-151. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a001809>.

- Orne, M. T. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, *17*(11), 776-783. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/615424965?accountid=28148>
- Parrott, D. J., & Gallagher, K. E. (2008). What accounts for heterosexual women's negative emotional responses to lesbians?: Examination of traditional gender role beliefs and sexual prejudice. *Sex Roles*, *59*(3-4), 229-239. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9436-0>
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*(5), 847-855. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.41.5.847>
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(4), 269-281. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066>.
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(1), 8-16. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>
- Ratcliff, J. J., Lassiter, G. D., Markman, K. D., & Snyder, C. J. (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*(10), 1325-1338. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167206290213>
- Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1989). Evidence for terror management theory: I. the effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who violate or uphold cultural values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(4), 681-690. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.4.681>
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(3), 629-645. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629>.
- Savage, C. T., & Fouad, N. A. (1994). Traditionality of college major and attitudes towards work-family balance: Vocational correlates. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *2*(2), 163-178. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/619362273?accountid=28148>

- Sayette, M. A., Martin, C. S., Perrott, M. A., Wertz, J. M., & Hufford, M. R. (2001). A test of the appraisal-disruption model of alcohol and stress. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62(2), 247-256. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/619687303?accountid=28148>
- Schachter, S., & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review*, 69(5), 379-399. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0046234>
- Schimmel, J., Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Waxmonsky, J., & Arndt, J. (1999). Stereotypes and terror management: Evidence that mortality salience enhances stereotypic thinking and preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(5), 905-926. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.905>.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of african americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797-811. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.797>.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Foltz, B. D., Mungro, J., Speight, Q. L., Wong, Y. J., & Blumberg, J. (2011). Masculinity socialization in sports: Influence of college football coaches. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12(3), 247-259. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020170>.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Gilchrist, G. A., Halterman, A. W., Gomory, A., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2011). Drive for muscularity and conformity to masculine norms among college football players. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12(4), 324-338. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024839>
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Vaughan, E. L., LaFollette, J. R., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2012, January 23). Bullying Among Adolescent Football Players: Role of Masculinity and Moral Atmosphere. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a002664.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Wong, Y. J., Hagan, A. R., Hoag, J. M., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2011). A contextual examination of gender role conflict among college football players. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12(4), 311-323. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023722>

- Straube, T., Preissler, S., Lipka, J., Hewig, J., Mentzel, H., & Miltner, W. H. R. (2010). Neural representation of anxiety and personality during exposure to anxiety-provoking and neutral scenes from scary movies. *Human Brain Mapping, 31*(1), 36-47. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/622103543?accountid=28148>
- Stults-Kolehmainen, M., Gilson, T. A., & Abolt, C. J. (2013). Feelings of acceptance and intimacy among teammates predict motivation in intercollegiate sport. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 36*(3), 306-327. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1468569208?accountid=28148>.
- Television Bureau of Advertising. (2013, August 26). Top Syndicated Programs, 2012-2013 Season: Adults 25-54. . Retrieved July 11, 2014, from [http://www.tvb.org/media/file/TVB\\_Measurement\\_Syndicated\\_Programs\\_A25-54\\_2012-2013.pdf](http://www.tvb.org/media/file/TVB_Measurement_Syndicated_Programs_A25-54_2012-2013.pdf)
- Theodore, P. S., & Basow, S. A. (2000). Heterosexual masculinity and homophobia: A reaction to the self? *Journal of Homosexuality, 40*(2), 31-48. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v40n02\\_03](http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v40n02_03).
- Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 101-113. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029826>.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325-1339. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012453>.
- Westermann, R., Spies, K., Stahl, G., & Hesse, F. W. (1996). Relative effectiveness and validity of mood induction procedures: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*(4), 557-580. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/618865470?accountid=28148>
- Whitley, B. E., Jr., Childs, C. E., & Collins, J. B. (2011). Differences in black and white american college students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles, 64*(5-6), 299-310. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9892-1>.

APPENDIX A

RECRUIT PROFILE FOR STUDY 1 AND 2. THE PROFILE DISPLAYED  
BELOW SHOWS THE STEREOTYPE CONSISTENT  
FEMININE GAY RECRUIT

## Brian Miller

Defensive Back

Bellevue, WA (Bellevue High)

Ht: 6-0 | Wt: 180 | Age: 18

**CLASS OF 2015**

### Measurables:

40: 4.57

3-Cone Shuttle: 7.5

Shuttle: 4.75

Vertical: 32



Broad Jump: 122     Max Bench: 275

Max Squat: 340

### About me:

My name is Brian Miller and I play defensive back and return punts for the Bellevue High Wolverines. In 2013 as a junior, I was a first-team All-KingCo at defensive back and second-team All-KingCo punt returner. In addition to playing football I am a two time letter winner for Wrestling and a three time letter winner in track. I have a 3.46 GPA and plan to major in Nursing. In my free time I like to paint, cook, dance and do yoga. For my Senior project I plan to start a community outreach program with my boyfriend that will offer flag football camps to Elementary school children who are not yet able to participate in youth leagues. The camp will be held on Saturday mornings and we plan to have around 5 to 6 co-ed coaches and teams participate. If our project works well we hope that we will be able to coordinate with the YMCA to keep it going once I am gone.

### Highlights:

2012 season- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eT2k3t-f3N4>

2013 season- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fKkT2upt6Ow>

### Stats:

Year	GP	GS	Tackle	INT	PBU	FF	FR
2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013	14	14	62	6	27	3	4
2012	14	7	29	3	14	1	1
Total	28	21	91	9	41	4	5

### **Athletics:**

#### **Football:**

2012 Washington State 3A Champions  
 2012 Third-team All-KingCo punts returner  
 2012 Honorable mention All-KingCo defensive back  
 2013 Washington State 3A Champions  
 2013 First-team All-KingCo defensive back  
 2013 Second-team All-KingCo punts returner

#### **Wrestling:**

6<sup>th</sup> place 2012 Wrestling 152 lbs.  
 3<sup>rd</sup> place 2013 Wrestling 171 lbs.

#### **Track:**

6<sup>th</sup> place 2011 100  
 5<sup>th</sup> place 2011 200  
 3<sup>rd</sup> place 2011 4x100  
 3<sup>rd</sup> place 2012 100  
 3<sup>rd</sup> place 2012 200  
 2<sup>nd</sup> place 2012 4x100  
 5<sup>th</sup> place 2012 4x400  
 2<sup>nd</sup> place 2013 100  
 4<sup>th</sup> place 2013 200  
 1<sup>st</sup> place 2013 4x100  
 4<sup>th</sup> place 2013 4x400