

# Gender Concerns As Viewed By Coaches And Athletes

ELMER M. LABAD<sup>1</sup>, RONEL S. PEROMINGAN<sup>2</sup>, EMIE S. MISIL<sup>3</sup>, MA. FLOR JESSAMINE M. ANDAJAO<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>WESTERN MINDANAO STATE UNIVERSITY College of Sport Science and Physical Education  
Zamboanga City, Philippines, ORCID: 0000-0002-4185-7372, [labadelmer19@gmail.com](mailto:labadelmer19@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>ZAMBOANGA PENINSULA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY Physical Education Department Zamboanga  
City, Philippines, ORCID: 0000-0003-4468-2894, [ronelperomingan@zppsue.edu.ph](mailto:ronelperomingan@zppsue.edu.ph)

<sup>3</sup>ZAMBOANGA PENINSULA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY Physical Education Department  
Zamboanga City, Philippines, ORCID: 0000-0002-8999-5782, [esmisil@zppsue.edu.ph](mailto:esmisil@zppsue.edu.ph)/[misileim001@gmail.com](mailto:misileim001@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup>ZAMBOANGA PENINSULA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY Physical Education Department  
Zamboanga City, Philippines, ORCID: 0000-0001-6633-6197, [jessamineandajao10@gmail.com](mailto:jessamineandajao10@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

This study has dealt with gender concerns viewed by coaches and athletes of select team sports among State Colleges and Universities (SUCs) in Zamboanga City. These included views and perceptions that confronted coaches and athletes on gender concerns such as entry in the team, first game line-up, training routines, treatment during pre, actual, and post games, and quartering. It utilized a descriptive-correlational analysis method of research, employing quantitative and qualitative approaches. The results yielded a high over-all level of perception among coaches on athletes having different sexual orientation. The over-all mean value however still gives a positive impression that coaches did not see a problem or a concern when aspiring athletes especially those with different gender preferences express their desire to join their team. In terms of fielding athletes in the first-line –up, coaches still preferred good record and performance and that gender preferences came as the least consideration. There was a high result implied in this study which revealed that LGBT athletes in the team were not exempted from performing these activities because there are physical and health benefits that can be derived from these which in turn are useful in the actual conduct of games. Further, the high perception in the indicator for treatment in the pre, actual, and post games revealed that coaches practice fair and equal treatment among their athletes and made sure that team rules and policies were observed. Lastly, the indicator/factor (quartering) yielded a high mean value implied that in this indicator, quartering of athletes generally was not an issue or concern as coaches perceived these as a safe space for everyone. The over-all result has manifested a general perception of acceptability among team coaches, hence, the playing partnership among coaches and members in the team was not affected. In order to give recognition to the LGBT athletes as a unique organization among the SUCs in Zamboanga, the proposed action plan incorporating variety of activities are deemed necessary to be implemented.

**Keywords:** Different gender differences, Gender concerns and identity, Coaching, LGBT athletes, Training routines, Sexual Orientation, Equal treatment, Entry line up team, first line up team, quartering, and raining routines.

## INTRODUCTION

Being male or female brings with it expectations about how one should feel and act, and there is little room for gender questioning. Athletes of different gender preferences are seen all over the world. It is quite unusual nowadays that a school brings in a competing delegation with no LGBT members in the team. The entry of LGBT athletes in the different team sports has created both positive and negative relationship-effect among the athletes, the coaches, and even their team mates. Zamboanga City has notably been getting recognition as one of the cities in the Philippines that produce elite athletes in the local, national, and even international arena. A number of these athletes are enrolled in schools and universities that have active sports programs and actively participate in invitational sports. Having to work as member of the screening and secretariat for years in local, regional, and national competitions, the researcher has observed the participation of LGBT athletes in different team events. This prompted the researcher to pursue this study with the attempt to discover how these athletes and their coaches viewed each other being part of the team. One fascinating observation made was the increasing number of LGBT athletes in team sports, particularly in volleyball men and women, basketball women, soccer football women and softball women. This was evident in the entry forms submitted to the screening committee. One qualification being checked among athletes is their sex, and since pictures submitted create confusions and doubts, the screening committee would request the coach to bring in their athletes for face to face screening. To emphasize the importance of perfecting a particular skill, the researcher also observed that athletes to include the LGBT need or are required to perform all the warm-ups, drills and routines, regardless these activities become intense and physically exhausting. The coaches are often unmindful of the possible risk or danger for the

athletes. During casual conversations and after post game evaluation for all officials, coaches and athletes in particular, LGBT athletes would often share about their thoughts and their experiences like having to be shouted in public especially during crucial games and other related forms of discrimination. The coaches, on the other hand, have their reasons to justify their decisions and the manner on how they deal and treat with their athletes. More so, this research tackled issues and concerns that were deemed to be a silent yet acceptable dilemma among members in the team. According to Kolnes (1995), sport is predominantly a sex-segregated social institution based on conventional gender divisions and heterosexuality as a central organizing principle.

## Methodology

### Research Design

Quantitative and Qualitative design were employed in this study. Quantitative-Correlational method was used as this attempted to explain relationships and differences between the variables of interests such as the views of coaches and athletes and its predictors or indicators such as the coaches' age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as coach, number of related trainings, and the athletes' age, gender, and number of years as athlete. The Key Informant Interview (KII) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) were utilized for the qualitative method. The KII was done for coaches and the FGD was conducted to the athletes with a moderator who facilitated the discussion. These methods helped in the attempt to draw information and views from coaches and athletes on gender concerns, which are deemed vital and important to support the quantitative results.

### Research Environment

The respondents of this study were coaches employed and athletes enrolled in the three (3)

State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Zamboanga City. There were tagged as School A, B and C for confidentiality. School A has 15 colleges, and two autonomous campuses offering undergraduate and postgraduate courses specializing in education, engineering, nursing, arts and humanities, social work, science and mathematics. At present the university registered 16,149 enrolled students in the second semester of school year 2015-2016. On the other hand School B is a state college in Zamboanga City. The School/college is mandated to provide advanced instruction and professional training in science and technology and other related fields, undertake research and extension services, and provide progressive leadership in these areas as

cited. Last was the School C, These schools would often bring delegations particularly team events to participate in the city, regional, national and even private invitations. Because of these, athletes are carefully selected, trainings are vigorous, and weekend- practice would require athletes to stay overnight in their schools. The possibility of gender issues is strong and very evident, thus, the pursuance of this study.

### Research Respondents

204 athletes and 17 coaches comprised as respondents of this study. These student athletes were enrolled in the Second Semester, School Year 2015-2016 as shown in table 1.1 and 1.2 below

**Table 1.1 The SUCs and the number of athletes per Team Sports**

SUC	School A		School B		School C		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
<b>Baseball</b>	12	-	13	-	-	-	<b>204</b>
<b>Basketball</b>	11	11	15	-	13	-	
<b>Football</b>	16	13	-	-	-	-	
<b>Sepak Takraw</b>	7	-	7	-	8	-	
<b>Softball</b>	-	9	-	12	-	-	
<b>Volleyball</b>	8	12	14	8	8	7	
<b>Total</b>	54	45	49	20	29	7	

**Table 1.2 Number of Coaches per Team Sports**

SUC	School A		School B		School C		TOTAL
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
<b>Baseball</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	<b>17</b>
<b>Basketball</b>	-	1	1	-	1	-	
<b>Football</b>	1	1	-	-	-	-	
<b>Sepak Takraw</b>	1	-	1	-	1	-	
<b>Softball</b>	-	1	1	-	-	-	
<b>Volleyball</b>	1	1	1	-	2	-	
<b>Total</b>	4	4	5	0	4	0	

### Research Instrument

A self-structured questionnaire was constructed to gather information about the respondents,

specifically their views as coaches and athletes regarding gender issues and concerns.

The different statements in the questionnaire were based on questionnaires used in different researches and modified to suit the subjects and locale of the study. These statements were subjected to content validity by a panel of experts. These statements were also pilot tested to 30 athletes and 10 coaches who were not part of the main study to test its reliability. The data was collated and analyzed using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient tool and resulted to **0.846** which means that all items used in the questionnaire have relatively high internal consistency.

The key Informant Interview (KII) method was used for the coaches and the Focus Group Discussion (FGD), for the athletes. The KII utilized a questionnaire guide and the FGD was facilitated by a moderator who solicited responses and views from the respondents.

### Source of Data

To address the main objectives of the study, the following statistical tools were utilized. Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was used to test and analyze the reliability or objectivity of the 25-item list of questions. Factor- Analysis – This multivariate technique was applied to the responses obtained from the 25-item views of athletes and coaches on gender concerns. Extracted factor was labelled for analysis. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences between and among group means. Correlational measures were calculated using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient to assess in particular, the relationships of coaches and athlete's views and other variables.

### Results and Discussion

**Table 2.1 Factor 1 Entry in the Tea**

Coaches' Views	Mean	SD	Interpretation
<b>Entry in the Team</b>			
1. Athletes who got slots in my team but who are of different sexual orientation was not an issue.	3.47	0.80	<b>Very High</b>
2. I usually prefer skilled and experienced athletes regardless of their sexual orientation.	3.38	0.89	<b>Very High</b>
3. I have preferred and prioritized athletes who are "straight" to compose my team.	2.54	1.12	<b>High</b>
4. Athletes with different sexual orientation have created inconvenience with other members who are "straight".	2.63	0.66	<b>High</b>
5. Having athletes with different sexual orientation will just make it difficult for me to deal with.	3.35	0.70	<b>Very High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>High</b>

In Table 2.1, the indicator/factor **entry in the team** which yielded a mean value of 3.07 (SD = 0.43) implied that coaches have **high** level of perception among athletes with different sexual preferences when they recruit members in their team. This result agrees to a case study made and published in a blog "Hate Free Zone," whereby sport coaches who are directly involved with

homosexual athletes are more tolerant, accepting, and understanding of the lifestyle of these athletes. However, there were some views that seemed to be alarming as this resulted to high level of perceptions among coaches. These are in statement no. 3 with a mean value of 2.54, which states, "I have preferred and prioritized athletes who are "straight" to compose my team", also in

statement no. 4 with a mean value of 2.63, which states, “Athletes with different sexual orientation have created inconvenience with other members who are “straight”, and in statement no. 5 with a mean value of 3.35 and which states, “Having athletes with different sexual orientation will just make it difficult for me to deal with”.

These views revealed that coaches manifested some forms of hesitance when these athletes came over for try-out since they still carried with them the general notion of inconvenience and difficulty to deal with LGBT. With these perceptions, coaches have to be reminded to be gender sensitive and LGBT athletes who aspire to become part of any team sports are to be given the

opportunities to participate in try-outs and be given a positive reception.

The coach holds all the cards and power with a huge influence on the athlete’s future. If a coach is described to be homophobic, the athlete may be forced to stay silent about his or her sexuality.

The over-all mean value however still gives a positive impression that coaches did not see a problem or a concern when aspiring athletes especially those with different gender preferences express their desire to join their team. The high result of this study also agrees with the advocacy of Per Hudson, a heterosexual wrestling star athlete and who happened to be a collegiate wrestling coach at the same time who have moved for proactive steps to end homophobia in sports.

**Table 2.1 Factor 2 First Game Line-Up**

<b>First Game line-up</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
6. Athletes with different sexual orientation have high tolerance on stress and pressure during crucial games.	2.76	0.83	<b>High</b>
7. Athletes of different sexual orientation that are included in the first game line-up create crowd reaction and this affects the focus of the team.	2.81	0.83	<b>High</b>
8. Athletes having different sexual orientation distract my focus and game plan because of their ways and behaviors.	2.82	1.01	<b>High</b>
9. Sexual orientation is not my criteria in choosing players to be included in the first game line-up.	2.53	1.07	<b>High</b>
10. Good performance record and experience are my considerations to include athletes in the first line-up.	3.71	0.47	<b>Very High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>High</b>

In Table 2.2 indicator/factor (**first game line-up**) yielded a mean value of 2.93 (SD = 0.40) and indicated a **high** level of perception among coaches on their athletes who have different sexual preference. First game line-up, or starting game requires a thorough selection of athletes, and this means fielding athletes that have the ability to advance the team over its opponent. The finding in this research revealed that athletes who have different sexual orientation proved no basis as their being chosen or selected in the

composition of the coaches’ line-up. There were also some negative views or statements from among coaches that resulted to high perceptions, and it has to do with some forms of hesitance with the presence of LGBT athletes in the team. These are found in statement no. 6 with a mean value of 2.76, which states, “Athletes with different sexual orientation have high tolerance on stress and pressure during crucial games”, allso in statement no.7, with a mean value of 2.81, which states,” Athletes of different sexual orientation that are

included in the first game line-up create crowd reaction and this affects the focus of the team”, and with statement no.8 with a mean value of 2.82, which states “Athletes having different sexual orientation distract my focus and game plan because of their ways and behaviors”. According to Leichenger (2014), among the most resistant barriers to tolerance and inclusion of LGBT athletes, is the idea that heightened sensitivity to them diminishes the toughness of teams or that gay athlete will become a distraction to their teammates. Yet as more athletes come

out, the myth becomes easier to debunk, and the benefits of creating open and tolerant atmospheres become easier to see. However, he further stressed that there is still a long way to go — and many fights to face to ensure that sports fully open their doors to the LGBT community. The over-all all high perception in this indicator as perceived by coaches further revealed that in terms of fielding athletes in the first-line –up, coaches still preferred good record and performance and that gender preferences came as the least consideration.

**Table 2.3 Factor 3 Training Routine**

<b>Training Routine</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
11. During practice-training, I treat all the athletes the same regardless of their sexual orientation.	3.41	1.00	<b>Very High</b>
12.I give equal opportunities to my athletes to lead in the warm-up and cool down activities.	3.59	0.51	<b>Very High</b>
13.Good game plan equates to hard physical training, thus I expose all players to the same training without exemption.	3.47	0.94	<b>Very High</b>
14. Athletes with different sexual orientation will not be given special treatment such as choosing only training routines they find convenient and easy to perform.	3.35	1.06	<b>Very High</b>
15. As coach, I feel accomplished when all athletes, particularly those with sexual orientation performs and finishes all routines that I have instructed.	3.53	0.72	<b>Very High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>Very High</b>

In Table 2.3, indicator/factor (**training routine**) resulted to a mean value of 3.47 (SD = 0.61) which has a **very high** level of perception among coaches on their athletes in terms of training routines. This result further implied that training activities and drills are expected from all athletes regardless of their sexual preference since the main purpose of performing, and finishing the routines is to meet their target strength and stamina in preparation for a scheduled or future game. Physical preparation is any type of training that addresses the physical elements (physical fitness) of sports such as mobility, flexibility, strength, speed, power,

acceleration, deceleration, dynamic vision, reaction time, and sports nutrition. All of these elements need to be addressed to help best prepare an athlete or team for successful sports competitions (<http://www.finishfirstsports.com>). In Zamboanga City, particularly the schools involved in this research, the training routines prescribed by coaches for their athletes usually have varied physical drills to enhance and develop the agility, speed, cardio resistance among other physical components. The respondents in this study made sure that these routines or drills were strictly followed by all. There were varied training routines which were

based on the training programs of the coaches and these would depend on the skills and fitness that the coaches would intend to develop from among the athletes.

The very high result in this study implies that LGBT athletes in the team were not exempted

from performing these activities because there are physical and health benefits that can be derived from these which in turn are useful in the actual conduct of games.

**Table 2.4 Factor 4 Treatment during Pre, Actual, and Post Games**

<b>Treatment during Pre-, Actual, and Post- games</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
16. During crucial games, I tend to shout at athletes with different sexual orientation to emphasize focus.	2.76	1.25	<b>High</b>
17. I give instructions and explain game plans before the start of the game and would see to it athletes especially those with different sexual orientation will follow strictly.	3.41	0.87	<b>Very High</b>
18. I give a tap to athletes regardless of their sexual orientation who have shown very good performance during games.	3.35	0.79	<b>Very High</b>
19. After games, I scold and manifest disgust to athletes with different sexual orientation who have shown poor performance.	2.82	0.95	<b>High</b>
20. I see to it that all athletes regardless of sexual preference are treated fairly and are given equal opportunity and playing time.	2.94	1.03	<b>High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>High</b>

Shown in Table 2.4, indicator/factor (**treatment during pre, actual, and post games**) resulted to a mean value of 2.95 (SD = 0.44) which implied a **high** level of perception among coaches on their athletes. This means that coaches treat their athletes well and in contrast, experiences such as humiliation, public scolding, and defamatory remarks were not practiced by coaches.

There has to be working relationship or chemistry between the coaches and their athletes on and off the court; thus, to spend time together other than in practice is encouraged. Coaches need to talk to their athletes like they are equal and that they are not treated like they are lesser individuals. They need to respect the coach, but at the same time these athletes need to know they have the respect and are cared about by the coaches. The results were alarming as these implied a negative

manifestation and should not be practiced by coaches, because such approach will create fear among the athletes. In an article, Play Positive of Mutual Insurance, it is stated that the old model of motivation for athletes which states “tear them down so you can build them up” is no longer applicable, because it is now more important to build and establish good relationship between coaches and athletes following the principle of “respect getting respect back”; this partnership emphasized order, discipline, and fairness. The over-all all high perception in this indicator as perceived by coaches revealed that coaches practiced fair and equal treatment among their athletes and made sure that team rules and policies were observed, with the consequences for violating and exemptions for LGBT athletes not practiced.

**Table 2.5 Factor 5 Quartering**

<b>Quartering</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
21. I segregate the sleeping and dressing quarters for my athletes with different sexual orientation.	2.82	1.07	<b>High</b>
22. Should there only be only one dressing room, I ask my athletes with different sexual orientation to dress up the first or last in the team.	2.53	0.94	<b>High</b>
23. The same instruction is given to them during wash-up or bath time when there is only one cubicle for bathing.	3.00	1.00	<b>High</b>
24. When there is no scheduled game, all athletes and those with different sexual orientation are not allowed to entertain visitors in their quarters because they are advise to rest.	2.76	1.15	<b>Low</b>
25. Activities such as meal time, I allow my athletes with different sexual orientation to dine with other players.	3.29	0.77	<b>Very High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>High</b>

In Table 2.5, indicator factor (**quartering**) which yielded a **high** mean value of 2.84 (SD = 0.51) implied that in this indicator, quartering of athletes generally was not an issue or concern as perceived by coaches.

Although there were some statements or views that manifested some forms of discrimination among coaches like in the sleeping arrangements and even in the batting order or shower time of athletes in the quarters, considering the presence of LGBT athletes in the team. The point being

emphasized here is the discipline of athletes. In every game fought, an athlete must have had a tight sleep and good rest making him physically and mentally alert and ready. After all the competitions, the athletes have all the free time and socialization they want. There are even great athletes, like enlists and boxers, who are not even allowed to mingle with family members few hours before their fight. All of these are part of discipline.

**Table 3.6 General Mean on the Level of Perception among Coaches on Athletes having Different Sexual Orientation**

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Entry in the Team (Gender vs. Skills)	3.07	0.43	High
First Game Line-up	2.93	0.40	High
Training Routine	3.47	0.61	Very High
Treatment during Pre-, Actual, and Post- games	2.95	0.44	High
Quartering	2.84	0.51	High
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>High</b>

In Summary, Table 1.6 showed a grand mean of 3.08 (SD = 0.27) which signified a **high** level of perception among coaches towards their athletes

in teams with LGBT members. This gives an over-all impression that all indicators such as entry in the team, first game line-up, training



routines, treatment during pre, actual, and post games , and quartering when correlated with the coaches’ perceptions on athletes with different sexual preference was not viewed as a concern, a predicament, or barrier in the team.

The result has manifested a general perception of acceptability among team coaches, hence, the playing partnership among coaches and members in the team was not affected. Coaches’ perception about LGBT athletes in this study revealed a welcome environment among the LGBT athletes. Coaching is a special skill and has to consider numerous factors, considerations, and challenges in order for one to be successful in this career. One big challenge is the rising number of LGBT joining team sports. In this research, team

coaches had shown acceptance of LGBT athletes; however, when the researcher conducted informal or casual interview although, some coaches in the following teams still preferred the “straight” athletes. This included the teams in basketball men, soccer football men, baseball, and sepak takraw. On the other hand, LGBT athletes were found in teams like basketball women, soccer football women, and softball women.

The level of perception of the athletes having different sexual orientation about their coaches in terms of the following: Level of Perception of the Athletes having Different Sexual Orientation about their Coaches

**Table 3.1 Factor 1 (Entry in the Team)**

ATHLETE’S VIEWS ON THEIR COACHES	Mean	SD	Interpretation
<b>Entry in the Team</b>			
1. Sexual orientation was not an issue for my coach to select players in the team.	3.03	0.86	<b>High</b>
2. Skills and my experience were more important than athletes with different sexual orientation to be part of the team.	2.98	0.86	<b>High</b>
3. My coach chose me because I can be at par with “straight athletes” in terms of performance in the game.	2.89	0.92	<b>High</b>
4. My inclusion in the team has created inconvenience with other players.	2.56	0.89	<b>High</b>
5. I felt that having me in the team have made it difficult for my coach to deal with us.	2.85	0.95	<b>High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	2.78	0.56	<b>High</b>

In Table 3.1, indicator/factor (**entry in the team**) has yielded a mean value of 2.78 (SD = 0.56) which is described to be **high**. This means that athletes did not have problems or any bad experience in terms of their entry in the team. Team try-out intends to assess potential players in action and require them to show their skills. In doing so, athletes who were sensed to be of

different sexual orientation manifested by their moves, gestures, and even in how they talk or dress-up are still being considered to be taken in the team. The result in this study revealed that athletes with gender issues did not feel an unwelcome gesture during the try out and having them picked to be part of the team.

**Table 3.2 Factor 3 (First Game Line-Up)**

First Game line-up	Mean	SD	Interpretation
6. My coach choose me as second or third pick to compose the first line -up, because he feels that I cannot handle pressures during critical games.	2.92	0.93	High
7. I create crowd noise and that eventually lose focus for my team.	3.09	0.86	High
8. My ways and behaviors during games will just distract our team focus and game plan.	2.51	0.93	High
9. My coach emphasized that my sexual orientation is not his/her criteria for including me in the first game line up.	2.58	1.05	High
10. My good performance record will always make me include in the first game line-up.	2.91	0.92	High

In Table 3.2, indicator/factor 3 (**first game line-up**) has yielded a mean value of 2.80 (SD = 0.59) and interpreted as **high** in the statistical parameter limits. This means that athletes felt that the chance and opportunity to be included in the first line-up was rare. This result further gave the impression that their presence and uncalled behaviors and ways had caused inconvenience

among the team members and coaches. The possibility that they could not manage and handle pressures during critical situations is high which might result to losing focus during games. However, the over-all result implied that most coaches would still prefer hetero or straight athletes in the first game-line up and those with gender issues were usually considered the least.

**Table 3.3 Factor 3 (Training Routine)**

Training Routine	Mean	SD	Interpretation
11. During practice-training, I don't feel being given special treatment by my coach.	2.64	1.03	High
12. My coach gives us equal opportunities to lead in the warm-up, cool down, and other training routines.	3.18	0.92	High
13. My coach does not exempt me from all the work-outs and routine to be done.	2.70	0.98	High
14. I do not choose which training routines to perform at my convenience.	2.87	0.92	High
15. I perform and finish all routines expected from us.	3.00	0.88	High
<b>Mean</b>	2.88	0.59	<b>High</b>

Shown in Table 3.3, indicator/factor 3 (**training routine**) has resulted a **high** statistical parameter limit with a mean value of 2.88 (SD = 0.59). The result in this indicator implied that athletes had high perceptions on their coaches when it comes to training and practice drills. Athletes in the team who were deemed to be of different sexual orientation were expected to perform diligently and religiously accomplish or finish all the

training routines or drills required from them. Training programs prepared by coaches have series and variety of drills, and may come in progression from light to intense. Athletes had to do these with no exemptions to include the LGBT who were also expected to lead warm-up and cool down activities. In general, the result is in positive agreement to the perceptions of athletes.

**Table 3.4 Treatment during Pre, Actual, and Post Games**

<b>Treatment during Pre-, Actual, and Post- games</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
16. My coach would shout because it is his/her way to keep me focused during very crucial games.	2.98	0.93	<b>High</b>
17. My coach would give instructions and explain to us the game plans before the game and would see to it that I will follow these strictly.	3.26	0.87	<b>Very high</b>
18. I am happy to be given a tap on my shoulder especially when I show good performance during games.	3.23	0.89	<b>High</b>
19. He/She would manifest disgust after I have shown poor performance by scolding me even in public.	2.35	0.91	<b>Low</b>
20. I can feel that my coach treat us fairly and give us equal opportunity and playing time.	2.95	1.00	<b>High</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>High</b>

In Table 3.4, the indicator/factor **treatment during pre, actual, and post games** has resulted to a **high** level of perception among athletes and has a mean value of 2.95 (SD = 0.60). Athletes were treated well by their coaches similar to how “straight” athletes were being treated.

During crucial games, athletes had experienced being shouted at even in front of crowd to emphasize focus and concentration in the games, but when they showed good performance or had brought the team to winning a championship game, they too got good recognition from their

coaches for displaying a good playing performance. There were views that resulted to a high level of perception which post some concerns and the need to be gender sensitive be encouraged. These are found in item no.16 with a mean value of 2.98, which states, “My coach would shout because it is his/her way to keep me focused during very crucial games”, and also in item no. 19 with a mean value of 2.35, which states, “He/ She would manifest disgust after I have shown poor performance by scolding me even in public.

**Table 3.5 Factor 5 Quartering**

<b>Quartering</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
21. I am provided a separate area in our sleeping quarters.	2.95	0.98	<b>High</b>
22. If there is only one dressing room, I am usually asked to dress up the first or the last in the team	2.71	0.91	<b>High</b>
23. During wash-up or bath time, I am either the first or last if there are limited comfort rooms.	2.63	0.93	<b>High</b>
24. I am not allowed to entertain visitors when there is “no game schedule”.	2.97	0.91	<b>High</b>
25. Despite my sexual orientation, my coach allowed me to dine with all players during meal time and other similar activities.	2.90	0.99	<b>High</b>

<b>Mean</b>	2.83	0.61	<b>High</b>
-------------	------	------	-------------

In Table 3.5, the indicator/factor (**quartering**) yielded a statistical result of 2.83 mean value (SD 0.61). This equates to a parameter limit described as **high**. The result implied that in this particular indicator, athletes did not experience discrimination as an over-all perception. That despite their gender preference, athletes felt that as an over-all impression their experiences in the quarters were still positive and warm from among team mates and coaches.

However, there were views that resulted to high level of perceptions from among the athletes that need not be disregarded. The high results were evident in instances where athletes felt gender discrimination like separate areas or corners for sleeping, in dressing up and in bathing or washing-up, and entertaining visitors even if there was no scheduled game was prohibited.

**Table 3.6 General Mean on the Level of Perception of Athletes having Different Sexual Orientation about their Coaches**

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Entry in the Team (Gender vs. Skills)	2.78	0.56	High
First Game line-up	2.80	0.59	High
Training routine	2.88	0.59	High
Treatment during Pre-, Actual, and Post- games	2.95	0.60	High
Quartering	2.83	0.61	High
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>High</b>

Parameter Limits:

1.00-1.75(Very Low) 1.76- 2.50(Low) 2.51-3.25(High) 3.26- 4.00(Very High)

In summary, Table 2.6 showed a grand mean value of 2.85 (SD = 0.42) which signifies a **high** level of perception among the athletes toward their coaches. This gives an over-all impression that athletes did not have gender issues with regard to how they were treated by their coaches and team mates in their everyday dealing with them. Athletes in this research showed a positive relationship with their coaches as well as with other team members.

This finding agrees to a study made by Eric Anderson in 2010, that noted an increasing acceptance of gay athletes by their team mates. His study revealed that athletes in the 2010 cohort have had better experience after coming out than those in the earlier cohort, experiencing less heterosexism and maintaining better support

among team mates. The positive result showed how Filipinos deal with LGBT and in terms of acceptance, a news article was featured by Philip C. Tubeza in inquirer.net (2013) that the Philippines earned its ranking as one of few gay-friendly countries in the world.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made. Although gender bias and discrimination of LGBT athletes were evident, there was a positive indication towards their acceptance in team sports, and this acceptance equates to respect, understanding among coaches and team mates.

### **Recommendations**

(1) The proposed action plan dubbed as “Genero Igualdad” or Gender Equality be implemented for LGBT athletes in schools and universities. To

realize this, a proper coordination with the Gender and Development Office of the schools be done as this action plan will serve not only as a pet program but this will also be used also to intensely create campus awareness on the presence of LGBT athletes.

(2) Create a more comfortable environment for LGBT athletes through a quick response to end the use of derogatory language such as “bakla”, ”bantut”, or “tomboy” and some other uncalled for remarks that are common sources of embarrassment for the LGBT athletes. This can be done through the support of Gender and Development Office and the Guidance Department by setting up billboards about gender issues and how LGBT are to be treated.

(3) Allow LGBT athletes to represent their sector during consultations on school or campus issues and concerns such as increase of tuition fees, student elections, and other related school activities that also affect the LGBT community.

(4) Acknowledge the contributions of former LGBT athletes and coaches in any sports discipline so that this act shall help in their attempt to be recognized and accepted. This gesture can be best assisted through the inclusions of their achievements in the school paper.

(5) Develop and enforce policies on discrimination and bullying through consultation with GAD and Guidance Office and to be incorporated in the schools’ student handbook.

(6) During try-out for team and individual sports, LGBT members who intend to join and participate should feel a welcome atmosphere from coaches and teammates by providing them a registration area along with the hetero athletes and putting-up of posters and standees that will not only capture but also emphasize that gender bias is not practiced in sports.

(6) In the conduct of Solidarity meeting before competition in schools and in other local, regional and even national games, the host school or organizing committee should include as part of the meeting a revisit or an orientation on gender

sensitivity and awareness to all coaches, trainers, and other sports officials to observe and exercise fair play, equality, and respect for this group at all times.

## References

1. Abernethy, M. (2012). The Stigma of the LGBT Athlete. [www.popmatters.com](http://www.popmatters.com)
2. Adi, A. & Anderson, E. (2011). Exploring the relationship between homosexuality and sport among the teammates of a small, Midwestern Catholic College Soccer Team: Sport, Education and Society.
3. Aitchison, C. (2007). Sport and Gender Identities, Masculinities, Femininities, and Sexualities: Routledge, 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon.
4. American Psychological Association, (2011). Definition of Terms: Sex, Gender, Gender Identities. [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org)
5. Baks, B. et al (2004). Synopsis on Homophobia and Discrimination on Sexual Orientation in Sports. European Gay and Lesbian Sport Federation (EGLSF), Meeuwenlan, Amsterdam.
6. Balague, G. (1999). Understanding Identity Value and Meaning when Working with Elite Athletes. The Sport Psychologists. [journals.humankinetics.com](http://journals.humankinetics.com)
7. Barret, et al. (2016) LGBT Athletes still Experience Harassment and Discrimination. Barret and Farhany Justice at Work, Atlanta.
8. Braithwaite, W. (2015). Compassionate Coach makes Difference in High School Athletes. [www.nfhs.org](http://www.nfhs.org).
9. Buzuvis, E. (2012). Including Transgender Athletes in Sex-Segregated Sport. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

- in Sport: Essays from Activists, Coaches, and Scholars. College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education. A and M University, Texas.
10. Cotton, A.(2016). Gay Athlete's Dilemma.[www.denverpost.com](http://www.denverpost.com)
  11. CPSU,(2015)LGBT Young People in Sports.[thecpsu.org.uk](http://thecpsu.org.uk)
  12. D'Arcangelo,S.(2016).When Civil Rights and Sports Collide.[espn.org](http://espn.org)
  13. Enanor, M.(1996).Factors Affecting Sports Involvement among Varsity Athletes of Tertiary Schools in Zamboanga City: WMSU,Zamboanga City
  14. Foe,J. (2014). The 1960's Gay Life in the Philippines: Discretion with Tolerance.UST Graduate School,Espana,Manila.
  15. Grasgreen,A. (2012).For Gay Athletes. It's Getting Better.[www.insidehighered.com](http://www.insidehighered.com)
  16. Goldberg, A. (2015). What Makes A Good Coach. Strong Head St.,Amherst MA
  17. Griffin, P. (2012). LGBT Equality in Sports: Celebrating our Successes and Facing our Challenges. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Sport: Essays from Activists, Coaches, and Scholars. College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.A and M University, Texas.
  18. Griffin, P. Chalk Talk: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Athletes Coming Out to Coaches.[www.caaws-homophobiaainsport.ca](http://www.caaws-homophobiaainsport.ca)
  19. Guckert,J. (2014).How the Four Major Leagues Influence LGBT Rights.[www.jurist.org](http://www.jurist.org)
  20. Hoets,H. (2009). Focus Group Articles, Information, and Tips.[www.focusgrouptips.com](http://www.focusgrouptips.com)
  21. Johnson,S.et al.(2011). A Coach's Responsibility: Learning How to Prepare Athletes for Peak Performance.[www.thesportjournal.org](http://www.thesportjournal.org)
  22. Jowett,S. (2005).The Coach-Athlete Relationship. The Psychologist.[bps.org.uk](http://bps.org.uk)
  23. Jowett, S. & Cockerill, I.M. (2002). Incompatibility in the coach-athlete relationship. In I.M. Cockerill (Ed.) Solutions in sport Psychology. London: Thomson Learning.
  24. Kajtna,T.(2009). Psychological Characteristics of Younger and Older Coaches.[www.researchgate.net](http://www.researchgate.net)
  25. Kenow,L. &Williams, J. (1999).Coach-Athlete Capability and Athlete's Perception of Coaching Behaviors.[www.edul.edu](http://www.edul.edu)
  26. King, B.J.,et al. (2002) It takes A Team! For Lesbian, Gay,Bisexual,and Transgender Athletes and Coaches. Krane, V. et al (2012). Broken Binaries and Transgender Athletes: Challenging Sex and Gender in Sports. In G. B. Cunningham (Ed.), Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Sport: Essays from Activists, Coaches, and Scholars. College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education. A and M University,Texas
  27. Leichenger, A. (2014).What's Next in the Fight for LGBT Equality.[thinkprogress.org](http://thinkprogress.org).
  28. LGBT Youth North West (2013).Including LGBT Young People in Sports.[www.lgbtyouthnorthwest.org.uk](http://www.lgbtyouthnorthwest.org.uk)
  29. Mackenzie, B.(2005) Coaching Roles and

- Skills.<http://www.brianmac.co.uk/coachsr.htm>
30. Mackinven, J. (2014). 10 Reasons Why I Would Never Coach Minor Hockey.[glassandout.com](http://glassandout.com)
  31. Martin, A.C. (2013). What it's like to be Gay in the Philippines.[thoughtcatalog.com](http://thoughtcatalog.com)
  32. Methven (2014).What are the Effects of having Roles and Responsibilities in Team Sports. [believeperform.com](http://believeperform.com)
  33. Moffitt, K.(2013).Social conflict in sociology: Definition and Contributors.[study.com](http://study.com).
  34. Moore,E.(2013).Positive Experience Team Sports can be for LGBT Youth.[www.glaad.org](http://www.glaad.org)
  35. Pastor,R.(2013).”Will a gay athlete ever”come-out” in the Philippines.[www.rappler.com](http://www.rappler.com)
  36. Pickhardt,C.(2012) Adolescents and Bullying Coaches.[www.psychologytoday.com](http://www.psychologytoday.com)
  37. Quinn, E. (2016) What Makes a Good Coach.[www.verywell.com](http://www.verywell.com)
  38. Quirante, M. (2014).Perceptions of Athletes towards their Coaches in terms of Skills, Attitudes and Leadership in Selected Private Schools: WMSU, Zamboanga City
  39. Rankin S. & Weber (2009).Mind and Sport: Harassment and Discrimination-LGBT Student Athletes.[www.nca.org](http://www.nca.org)
  40. Simons, C. (2010). The Sports experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people in Victoria: Institue of Sport, Exercise and Active Living (ISEAL) and the School of Sport and Exercise at Victoria University, Australia
  41. Symons,C. 2007): Challenging Homophobia and hetrosexism in Sports: The Promise of the Gay Games. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon.
  42. Sportswale & Stonewall C. (2012).Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) People in Sport: Understanding LGB Sports Participation in Wales.Australia
  43. Sraub,W.E. (1980). Sports Psychology An Analysis of Athlete Behavior. Ithaca,New York
  44. Taylor,H. (2015). LGBT Equality in Sports.[www.washingtonblade.com](http://www.washingtonblade.com).
  45. Tubeza,P.(2013,June 8) PH ranks among most Gay-Friendly in the World.[globalnation.inquirer.net](http://globalnation.inquirer.net)
  46. Ukessays(2015).The Level of Acceptance of Society between Homosexuals.[www.ukessays.com](http://www.ukessays.com)
  47. Watson, Emma (2015).New Partnership Seeks to Promote LGBT Acceptance in US Rugby.[thinkprogress.org](http://thinkprogress.org)
  48. Werthner,P.(2009). Building an Effective Coach-Athlete Relationship: Perspective from Great Female Coaches and Athletes.[www.coach.ca](http://www.coach.ca)
  49. Wood,W. (2015). The Power of Questioning in Sports.[www.psychologytoday.com](http://www.psychologytoday.com)
  50. Zeigler,C. (2011).Increasing Acceptance of Gay Athletes by Teammates.[www.outsports.com](http://www.outsports.com)