

Sport and the Threat to Gender Boundaries¹

Helen Jefferson Lenskyj

In 1978, when I was a lecturer at the Townsville College of Advanced Education, a remarkable thing happened. A group of lesbian and gay students succeeded in having a section of the student handbook devoted to gay and lesbian issues. I confess that, given my slowly emerging feminist consciousness and my thoroughly submerged lesbian identity at the time, I paid little attention to these events. However, I clearly recall a rather predictable response on the part of the heterosexual male department head: 'I don't flaunt my sexuality, why should they flaunt theirs?'

Silencing and invisibility were certainly the lot of gays and lesbians, both in Australia and in North America, in the 1970s. Two incidents that occurred last year in Australia—one concerning allegations of sex discrimination in women's cricket and the other, the 'pin-up' style photographs of track and field athletes in the *Golden Girls of Athletics' Calendar*—suggest that, although advances have been made by feminist and gay and lesbian activists over the last decade, the situation for women, especially lesbians, in mainstream sport has remained stubbornly woman-hating and homophobic. Beneath the superficial changes in societal attitudes, women's sport remains largely an aesthetic spectacle shaped by market demand and (male) audience response. The two incidents in question, which had very little bearing on women's sporting abilities or achievements, were the focus of extensive media attention—a sure indication of the primacy of 'image' issues in women's sport.

The recent allegations of discrimination against a heterosexual woman cricketer and the charges of prudishness levelled at critics of the *Golden Girls Calendar* drew considerable public support both inside and outside sporting circles. While the similarities between these issues may not be immediately apparent, it will be argued that there are important common themes, most notably the manifestation of homophobia thinly veiled as liberal humanism, with emphasis on individual freedoms and the depoliticising of individual actions. That these controversies were

taken up in the mass media as general news items, and not simply relegated to the sports section, is indicative of the public and media preoccupation with sexualising female athletes. Moreover, the considerable staying power of these stories suggests that 'sympathetic' (that is, noncritical) media coverage resonated with the 'common sense' convictions of many Australians.²

After providing some general background on sexuality issues confronting women in sport, these issues will be further expanded. The theoretical approach in this article is, for the most part, radical feminist and neo-marxist, somewhat influenced by postmodernism. While I recognise that women's modes of self-presentation are not necessarily acts of conformity and may in fact challenge gendered power relations and subvert traditional rules about femininity, I am more interested in the bigger question concerning the effects of these styles of self-presentation on women's social power and social position within sport.³ In other words, I am taking up the challenge of theorising women as agents while keeping in view the very real social constraints on women's lives. Furthermore, I treat subject position as a central consideration in the deconstruction of women's experiences, and to that end, I identify myself as a white, middle-class, lesbian feminist.

Putting Homophobia on the Sport Agenda

In the subculture of traditional, male dominated sport, lesbians are by definition members of at least two marginalised groups: they are not male and they are not heterosexual. Their race or class status may contribute yet another layer of marginalisation. While men in sport are usually assumed to be heterosexual, because of sport's key role in shaping hegemonic masculinity in most western contexts, the sexuality of women who engage in team sports or other non-traditional physical activity has long been viewed with suspicion. Because their social behaviour is seen as crossing the line into masculinity, questions are raised about their sexual behaviour—do they want to be men? Are they lesbian?

Given the public focus on the sexuality of women who venture into non-traditional spheres of activity such as sport, politics or the military, many women in these areas experience implicit or explicit pressure to present themselves in ways that are unequivocally heterosexual. In these contexts, the word 'feminine' has become a codeword for precisely this heterosexual image.⁴

On the issue of feminine styles of self-presentation, feminist commentaries of the 1970s referred to the 'apologetic' in women's sport, a similar concept to Connell's 'emphasised femininity'.⁵ With increasing female sports participation and the changing position of women in society at large, women's sport was correctly perceived as a threat to the existing gender order. No longer weak and passive, sportswomen were displaying physical strength and endurance, competitiveness and risk-taking behaviours. Thus, for competitive athletes in the public eye, it became important to send out reassuring messages that, underneath their tough exteriors, they were just like 'the girl next door', interested in frilly clothing and jewellery, sewing, cooking and boyfriends—in other words, heterosexual. The women who were lesbian were astute enough to realise that public approval rested on their compliance with this facade of emphasised femininity. Until relatively recently, this compliance sometimes extended to 'marriages of convenience', according to a retired professional tennis player who is lesbian.⁶

With the gains of the last two decades in terms of human rights legislation and more liberal societal attitudes about sexuality, there is somewhat less pressure on female athletes to emphasise their femininity in these ways. Self-disclosure by an increasing number of lesbians and gay men in public life, whether in politics, the entertainment industry or sport has contributed to the changing climate. Within North American sports science circles, too, a number of gay and lesbian academics are disclosing, and thus politicising, their sexuality.

However, many coaches, administrators and sponsors, female as well as male, continue to express concern about the alleged 'image problem' of women's sport and put considerable energy into making superficial changes aimed at convincing the public that female athletes are 'normal' heterosexual women. Coaches and sponsors of women's teams often impose dress codes that include revealing uniforms, long hair, shaved legs and makeup. In the Ladies Professional Golf Association tour, an 'image lady' was recently hired to promote a more publicly acceptable image for the golfers, while on some American university campuses, there are mandatory 'makeover classes' for members of women's varsity sports teams.⁷

The homophobic agenda in these marketing strategies is clear: sportswomen, already seen as non-conforming in their sporting activities, should at least try to conform to prevailing standards of heterosexual

attractiveness. According to one supporter of the *Golden Girls' Calendar*, the photos were intended to counter the public image of female athletes as 'masculine with hairy armpits'; most defenders of the calendar unabashedly supported the strategy of using sex (meaning hetero-sex) to sell women's sport.⁸

Such thinking has a long history, evident, for example, in the operation of the All-American Girls' Softball League in the 1940s and 1950s. The short skirts that players were required to wear, at a time when young women were increasingly wearing shorts or pants for sport and casual wear, obviously served a marketing function. Concern about the femininity quotient of these players extended to mandatory 'Charm School', and chaperones were employed to ensure acceptable standards. League organisers were preoccupied with what they believed were the 'outward signs' of lesbian lifestyles. A Detroit player was told she would be removed from the team if she had her hair cut too short, while others with so-called 'boyish bobs' were quickly expelled. Even Oxford shoes were considered too 'masculine' for the required heterosexual image.⁹

Related to the marketability of 'feminine' athletes was the conservative ideology concerning women's destiny. Throughout the century, doctors, physical educators and other guardians of hegemonic femininity often voiced concerns that sporting participation was 'masculinising' girls and women, or that girls and women who were masculine at the outset were attracted to sport.¹⁰ Either way, female sport demanded careful scrutiny, lest male power and privilege be undermined by a new generation of women whose sporting participation had interfered with their (apparently fragile) heterosexual leanings, and hence their willingness to fulfil their destinies as wives and mothers. A lesbian tennis player, now in her seventies, recalled precisely that line of reasoning. In the 1940s, women of her mother's generation used to whisper about how sport 'deformed' some women, and how younger women were 'recruited into lives too immoral and unnatural to contemplate'. As she explained, her mother believed that 'marriage to the first remotely attractive young man' interested in her would eliminate the possibility that she would become 'one of "those women"—and mothers did not then speak the name'.¹¹

Given women's tenuous position in the male world of sport, it is perhaps not surprising that women's sport advocates as well as female

athletes have maintained a longstanding silence around lesbian issues—in the words of one commentator, ‘a silence so loud it screams’.¹² Until the 1980s, even feminist activists paid limited attention to the central problem of homophobia in women’s sport, the destructive effects of enforced lesbian invisibility and the negative impact on sportswomen of all sexual orientations. Most commentaries, including those written by lesbians, ignored sexual identity as a social variable. A few took the liberal position that lesbians are everywhere, and that sport is no different to any other area of human activity.

Some aspects of lesbian invisibility, while not freely chosen, represent survival strategies adopted by some lesbians. For example, the significant numbers of lesbians who work with children and young women as coaches, instructors and physical education teachers would no doubt find that their jobs were in jeopardy if their sexual identities were widely known. Ironically, the fact that known sexual offenders, who are male, continue to coach children and young women does not appear to provoke as much parental concern as the possibility of lesbian coaches or peers allegedly recruiting vulnerable young women.¹³ In fact, as American researcher Michael Mewshaw discovered in his investigation of the women’s professional tennis circuit, some parents tacitly approve of these exploitative relationships between young female players (some as young as sixteen) and their older male coaches, on the grounds that at least these arrangements protect their daughters from the lesbian players.¹⁴

There is considerable evidence pointing to the fact that lesbians have been, and continue to be over represented in the ranks of sportswomen.¹⁵ Most explanations put forward to date shed only partial light on this trend: some for example suggest that women who are non-conforming in terms of sexuality also choose to be non-conforming in their recreational activities; others argue that women-only sport provides a relatively safe social context for lesbians to meet other women who are strong and independent, and probably lesbian;¹⁶ and yet others content sport offers an appealing outlet for the those lesbians who consider themselves to have always been ‘tomboys’, that is, more interested in wearing utilitarian clothes, getting dirty, and having adventures in the outdoors than in spending time on fashion, makeup, sewing, cooking and other traditionally feminine, indoor pursuits.¹⁷

It is useful to consider the issue from another perspective. It could be argued, for example, that most heterosexual women, having been

socialised from a young age to value male attention and approval, are more vulnerable than their lesbian counterparts to pressure to behave and present themselves in ways that emphasise femininity and heterosexual conformity —hence, they avoid ‘unfeminine’ sports. This is not to suggest that such pressure is ‘all in their heads’; there are physical and material consequences, ranging from sexual assault to poverty, for women who resist the lessons of compulsory heterosexuality. The heterosexual women who do successfully resist the prevailing ideology and pursue competitive team sport are likely to have supportive male partners, families and friends, and those who meet with opposition at home will probably find it harder to continue in sport.

Sex, Sport and Politics: Two Australian Examples

In January 1994, in what is now a well known and much analysed incident in Australian sport history (and, no doubt, in Australian lesbian history), women cricketer Denise Annetts complained of sexual discrimination (on the basis of her heterosexuality) on the part of the Australian Women’s Cricket Council. In July of the same year, sportswomen made headlines again for reasons largely unrelated to their sporting achievements, this time when female track and field athletes posed in minimal clothing for a fundraising calendar for Athletics Australia.

The debates surrounding these issues, as reported in a sampling of Australian newspapers at the time, were illuminating in the ways in which they took up issues of female sexuality. I would argue that the simplistic ‘other side of the coin’ arguments (‘It’s reverse discrimination’, ‘If it’s okay for the Rugby League men ...’, etc.) that were commonly raised around both of these issues are responses that deliberately and conveniently avoided a more sophisticated analysis of issues of power and privilege. In the current climate of backlash against progressive social movements, pejoratively termed ‘political correctness’ movements, it is not surprising that these arguments fell on fertile ground, with some conservative white male reporters leading the way.

At the same time, in what appeared to be a rejection of a feminist position that has been inaccurately characterised as ‘victim feminism’, some women’s sport advocates portrayed women exclusively as agents of their own destinies (and hence, to be applauded for posing in gold paint, etc.). Given the Australian disdain for ‘whingeing and whining’

and the dismissal of feminists as humourless, anti-sex Puritans, this position also had its share of supporters.

Unlike their more traditional counterparts who are simply opposed to women's intrusion on male sporting turf, those who espoused the 'other side of the coin' arguments appealed to 'common sense' (in the neo-marxist meaning of the term). That is, they grounded their rhetoric in simplistic and unquestioned assumptions about rights and justice, for example, the belief that fair treatment means the same treatment, 'you get the same go, it doesn't matter',¹⁸ and the fear that the rights of 'the 98 plus [*sic*] per cent heterosexual majority in Australia' are in jeopardy.¹⁹ It comes as no surprise that gratuitous references to the Mabo decision on Aboriginal Land Rights were thrown in as further evidence of the minority takeover of Australia.²⁰

Many of these commentators presented themselves as allies of women in sport; they simply wanted to correct negative stereotypes of female athletes, to promote a 'feminine, soft and sexy' image (that is, hetero'sexy), and to raise the profile of women's sport using sex as its selling point. They were concerned about image problems (like allegations of rampant lesbianism) that might deter aspiring young athletes or their parents, and they worried that human rights policies might not protect the very athletes who will promote this positive public image, that is, white, conventionally attractive, credentialled heterosexual women.²¹ A few key facts were thus conveniently skirted: there are lesbians in sport; there are female athletes who do not conform to hegemonic standards of heterosexual attractiveness; and female athletes of all sexual orientations suffer the negative effects of sexism, heterosexism and homophobia. Only a small minority of journalists recognised the complexities of the issue.²²

Homophobia, Heterosexism and Women's Sport

It is important to define two terms that are relevant to this discussion: heterosexism and homophobia. Heterosexism has been defined as 'the promotion by institutions of the superiority of heterosexuality and the assumption that everyone is heterosexual'. Accordingly, power and privilege accrue to heterosexuals and are denied to lesbians, gays and bisexuals. Homophobia refers to 'the fear of gays and lesbians and the hatred, disgust and prejudice that fear brings. Homophobia refers to individual negative attitudes and personal prejudice.'²³ I would add

that, in everyday practice, the impact of heterosexism and homophobia goes far beyond attitudes and assumptions; individuals and institutions perpetrate actual violence upon lesbians and gay men, ranging from gay-bashing to state policies on AIDS drug plans.

These definitions make an important distinction between individual prejudice and institutionalised discrimination. In other words, like the other 'isms', heterosexism has the force of social systems—law, education, religion, etc.—behind it. For the person who is a member of a disadvantaged minority (or in the case of women, a disadvantaged majority), oppression is experienced at both the individual and the institutional level, while at the same time the two levels interact and reinforce one another in insidious ways.

Take the example of a white lesbian athlete on a predominantly heterosexual team. She is a member of a sexual minority both in the context of the team and in the broader society. On the team, she experiences explicit and implicit pressure towards 'emphasised femininity in terms of appearance and behaviour. She is required to wear a style of uniform that conveys the message of heterosexual availability. To avoid constant questions and innuendoes, she has to invent a boyfriend or change the pronouns from 'she' to 'he' when she talks about her social life. And a similar scenario plays itself out in her other social milieux. She presents herself as heterosexual to keep her job; her parents and siblings pressure her to get a boyfriend; her university lecturers make homophobic jokes; homophobic graffiti assail her as she walks down the street; and when she goes out to dinner with her partner, they are harassed by adolescent males. Thus, there is a certain seamlessness to her experiences of homophobia and heterosexism. Notwithstanding the anti-discrimination policies and statutes that attempt to ameliorate this situation, the individuals who treat her in homophobic ways can probably do so with impunity; moreover, their behaviour is reinforced by institutionalised social practices spanning law, religion, education, family and community life.²⁴

Now let us consider the possible experiences of a white heterosexual athlete on a predominantly lesbian team. Despite the odds against this happening, the lesbian majority on the team may have succeeded in transforming the microclimate so that it becomes safe for the lesbians to disclose their sexuality, to talk freely about their partners, children and chosen families, and to present themselves in ways that indicate pride in

their individual and group identities. Admittedly, the heterosexual athlete may, at times, feel like an outsider, although I would argue that this experience could raise her consciousness immeasurably, in much the same way as a white, Anglo-Saxon person will experience heightened awareness of race and racism issues if she lives in a neighbourhood of predominantly visible minority immigrants. Returning to the heterosexual athlete, let us consider what happens after she finishes the game, packs her bag and heads for home. Virtually everyone and everything that she encounters validate her heterosexual identity: she sees male-female couples walking arm-in-arm, and heterosexual images on billboards and in magazines; her friends, family members, even strangers on the street assume (correctly) that she is heterosexual and behave accordingly towards her. Her partner is welcomed to family and workplace gatherings, and male-female couples are the norm in her social circles. And if she happens to be homophobic, and chooses to complain to her family and friends about the lesbians on her team, she will almost certainly receive support for her prejudice. (Conversely, if she tells people about her wonderful lesbian team mates, she is likely to be met with stony silence, if not outright hostility).

In short, I am arguing that there is no such thing as reverse discrimination or 'heterophobia'. When a person who is a member of an advantaged majority finds that she is a minority in one of her many social settings, what she experiences is, at best, a fleeting feeling of being an outsider, and, at worst, individual prejudice at the hands of marginalised individuals whose bias carries virtually no weight in the broader society. It is precisely this analysis of the relationship between individual prejudice and systemic discrimination that forms the rationale for State and Federal anti-discrimination statutes. As has been stated in many court decisions, the purpose behind their enactment was not to protect the social position of those who are already privileged by virtue of their sex, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or ability; rather, they were an attempt to ameliorate the position of disadvantaged minorities (or, in the case of women, majority). This is not to suggest that those with power and privilege will not make cynical attempts to use the legislation for their own ends, as in the women's cricket incident and, equally important, in its coverage by journalists who portrayed heterosexuals as an endangered species. In a recent Canadian example, a Toronto man (who held a black belt in judo) lodged a human rights

complaint of sex discrimination against an organisation that teaches women's self-defence skills to women only classes. The case was eventually dismissed, but not without considerable expenditure of time and money on the part of this non-profit organisation.

A parallel argument can be developed about the sexualisation of female athletes for the purpose of raising the profile of women's sport. Just as I have argued that the individual experiences of the lesbian or heterosexual athlete in the examples above need to be contextualised, the same is true for the individual act of posing for the *Golden Girls' Calendar*. The popular liberal humanist rationales for the women's calendar—Rugby League men have a calendar, what sportswomen do off the field is their own business, the idea came from the women themselves, it's no different than models who pose for fashion magazines, the photographs are tasteful, the female athlete's body is beautiful²⁵—need to be situated in the broader context in which coercion and exploitation invariably accompany sexualised images of women. Thus, while it is unlikely that the provocative poses of male rugby players will render them, or other men, (hetero)sexually vulnerable, this is a distinct danger in the case of women. Men's and women's bodies are read very differently in a society where men as a gender group have greater power and privilege, and where violence against women is a widespread and chronic social problem. Consider, for example, that a woman would probably perceive a man who exposes his genitals as threatening, whereas a man might perceive a woman who exposes her genitals as sexually available. In another example common in North America, the practice of 'mooning' on the part of adolescent males is viewed simply as good natured humour, but a young woman engaging in this practice may not be seen in the same light.

It should be noted that the media debate on these issues was by no means one-sided. For example, the response of Federal Cabinet Minister Dr Carmen Lawrence, who called the *Golden Girls' Calendar* not 'the best way to go about drawing attention to women in sport' but indicative of sportswomen's 'desperation', was sympathetically reported by Lisa McLean in the *Australian*.²⁶ Even the predictable verbal leer from *Australian* columnist Jeff Wells confirmed feminists' concerns that, no matter how 'tasteful' the image, some male viewers will subvert the intention with the usual objectifying and commodifying of female body parts.²⁷

Keeping up Appearances

Much of the preceding discussion has focused on the alleged 'image problem' of women's sport. In fact, there seems to be great concern that sportswomen should not *look* lesbian and, hence, give certain sports a bad reputation, but there is less interest in the actual sexual practices of female athletes who conform to a heterosexual image. (When did you last read a front page story about the lesbians on the national synchronised swimming team?) In the debate about lesbians in cricket, some of the more progressive voices agreed that there are lesbians in cricket but called the whole issue 'a distraction' and 'not relevant'.²⁸ Certainly, it is to be hoped that the time will come when sportswomen's sexuality is not relevant, but avoidance and denial strategies do not serve women's interests in the current political climate.

It is worth diverging from this sporting topic a little to note some parallels to the lesbian 'image' question that come from right wing fundamentalist religious circles in North America. A number of anti-gay lay ministries have been established in the last ten years, for the stated purpose of helping lesbians and gay men relearn and reorient their sexual identities, primarily through changing their social-emotional behaviour. Falling into the traditional stereotypical thinking that equates the concepts of 'feminine' and 'masculine' with 'normal' heterosexuality, and 'unfeminine' and 'unmasculine' with homosexuality, these fundamentalists appear to believe that a mere change in homosexuals' external appearance or behaviour will inevitably prompt a more profound psychosexual change. It is not difficult to identify the misogyny inherent in this approach, which implicitly calls for a return to the days when 'girls were girls and men were men' and when the rules of traditional male and female sex-roles and self-presentation were universally understood and followed, and the sanctions for non-conformity were strong and swift. For example, Elizabeth Moberly, a psychologist associated with reorientation therapy, proposed that 'masculine sport friendships' in contexts such as softball should be promoted to reorient gay men to more 'masculine' (that is, heterosexual) behaviour.²⁹ Similarly, the Life Ministries program in New York included beauty makeovers for lesbians on their reorientation agenda; needless to say, softball is not included in lesbians reprogramming. Getting new hair styles, learning how to sit, and how to 'feel feminine inside' were presented as the route to a heterosexual identity.

The similarities to the mandatory 'charm schools' and beauty courses for female athletes are strikingly clear. As in the sports context, 'feminine' is a codeword for 'attractive to men'. As one 'ex-gay' woman explained, part of her 'reorientation' required a change in attitude towards her own capacities. She gave the example of changing the radiator hose in her car, stressing that her new heterosexual identity required that she should let a man do it for her. This is a simplistic equating of lesbian equals independent, heterosexual equals helpless, dependent on men. It is, at one level, incredibly naive to assume that changing the outer trappings of gender identity will have an effect on one's sexual preference. As someone once said, if I wear crocodile skin shoes, will that turn me into a crocodile? It is offensive, too, to imply that heterosexual men are only attracted to helpless, dependent women.

However, from another perspective, the emphasis on superficial external appearance, behaviour and self-presentation fits very well with mainstream values in western capitalist societies. I would therefore argue that it is this same conviction about the importance of a conventionally heterosexual appearance that animated the critics of lesbians in women's cricket and the supporters of the *Golden Girls' Calendar*. While not abandoning the liberal humanist position that people's sexual lives behind closed doors are their own business, they point to the 'image' problem (the obvious lesbians in the cricket eleven) and the perceived solution (the obvious heterosexuals in the *Golden Girls'* dozen). No one, it seemed, considered the possibility that one or more of the *Golden Girls* might be lesbian, or that their modes of self-presentation could be sexualised by lesbian viewers (just as many gay men undoubtedly sexualise the Rugby League men in their calendar).

To demonstrate how this thinking plays itself out in another everyday situation, I will briefly discuss a sexual harassment complaint lodged by a male electrician in ACT in December 1994.³⁰ Recent policy changes made it possible for John Daniels to lodge a complaint of discrimination on the grounds of perceived homosexuality with the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. There was evidence that Daniels' male co-workers called him 'weirdo, gay boy, gay bar freak, poofter and poof', according to the tribunal. The most salient behaviours that prompted these epithets included: having a 'trendy haircut, wearing one earring and taking aerobic dance classes. Other more conventionally heterosexual behaviours, including having a girl friend and playing competitive

Rugby League, were apparently disregarded by his co-workers. Finally, the fact that he challenged the masculine subculture of the workplace by removing a poster of a naked woman that had offended a female staff member was seen as conclusive evidence of his gay identity—apparently, he wasn't misogynist enough to be straight. This example again suggests how self-presentation is perceived as determining sexual orientation, when in fact, the reverse is more likely to be true.

Conclusions

It has been shown that, in women's sport circles, while much has changed, much has stayed the same. As in the early decades of the century, issues of appearance and propriety, defined according to white, middle class heterosexual values, were the key to public and media approval of sportswomen. Despite an apparent loosening of attitudes concerning sexuality since the 1960s, in women's sport circles lesbian sexuality remains largely 'in the closet' while heterosexuality continues to be exploited in the name of 'selling sport'. Right-wing backlash to progressive social movements has made it possible for many traditional opponents of women's sport to present themselves as reasonable critics, and to co-opt liberal humanist arguments for their own purposes. It is frightening to witness how these mean-spirited and dangerous 'slippery slope' arguments—ranging from the lesbian takeover of women's sport to the Aboriginal takeover of 'white' land—gain wide currency and popular support. For these reasons, I believe that sports science researchers, now more than ever, have a social responsibility to work towards justice and equity.

Notes:

- 1 Many thanks to Jim MacKay, University of Queensland, for providing me with the newspaper clippings referred to in this article.
- 2 See also A Burroughs, L Ashburn, and L Seebohm, 'This is a Leso Story': Homophobic Coverage of Women's Cricket in Australia', *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 12, no. 1, Nov. 1995, pp. 27-46.
- 3 S Bordo, 'The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity: a Feminist Appropriation of Foucault', in A Jaggar and S Bordo, eds. *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstruction of Being and Knowing*, Rutgers, New Brunswick, 1989; C Kitzinger, 'The Social Construction of Lesbianism', Sage, London, 1987; M C Duncan, 'Beyond Analysis of Sport Media Texts', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1993, pp. 353-72.
- 4 H Lenskyj, *Out of Bounds: Women, Sport and Sexuality*, Women's Press, Toronto, 1986; H Lenskyj, 'Combating Homophobia in Sport and Physical Education:

- Academic and Professional Responsibilities', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1991, pp. 61-9.
- 5 R W Connell, *Gender and Power*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1987.
 - 6 'Anonymous' in M Adelman, ed., *Long Time Passing: Lives of Older Lesbians*, Alyson Publications, Boston, 1986.
 - 7 R Lipsyte, 'The Key Word should be "Golfer"', *New York Times*, 28 May 1995.
 - 8 B Harris, 'Sex Sells Women's Sport: Graf', *Australian*, 28 July 1994.
 - 9 L Browne, *Girls of Summer*, Harper Collins, Toronto, 1992.
 - 10 Lenksyj, *Out of Bounds*; S Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth Century Women's Sport*, Free Press, New York, 1994.
 - 11 'Anonymous', p. 66.
 - 12 M B Nelson, *Are We Winning Yet?* Random House, New York, 1991.
 - 13 CBC, *The Fifth Estate: Sexual Harassment in Sport*, 2 Nov. 1993.
 - 14 M Mewshaw, *Ladies of the Court*, Crown Park, New York, 1993.
 - 15 Cahn, *Coming On Strong*; H Lenksyj, 'Sexuality and Femininity in Sports Contexts: Issues and Alternatives', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1994, 356-75; B Palzkill, 'Between Gymshoes and High Heels: The Development of a Lesbian Identity and Existence in Top Class Sport', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, vol. 25, 1990, pp. 221-33.
 - 16 Cahn, *Coming on Strong*; Nelson, *Are We Winning Yet?*; Y Zipter, *Diamonds are a Dyke's Best Friend*, Firebrand, Ithaca, 1988.
 - 17 H Devor, *Gender Blending*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1989.
 - 18 Matt Ridley, cited in F Harari, 'Where the Willow Weeps Unnoticed', *Australian*, 18 Jan. 1994.
 - 19 Kavanagh, 'Let's Sidestep the Politically Correct Waffle', *Courier-Mail*, 29 Jan. 1994.
 - 20 Kavanagh, 'Let's Sidestep'.
 - 21 'Games Girls' Fund-raising Knocked Back by Official', *Canberra Times*, 21 July 1994; Harari, 'Where the Willow Weeps'; Harris, 'Sex Sells'.
 - 22 For example, W Smith and T Hudson, 'Just not Cricket', *Sunday Mail*, 30 Jan. 1994; W Smith, 'Good S(p)orts', *Courier-Mail*, 28 July 1994.
 - 23 Canadian AIDS Society, *Homophobia, Heterosexism and AIDS*, Canadian AIDS Society, Ottawa, 1991, pp. 65-6.
 - 24 C Fusco, 'Lesbians and Locker Rooms: the Subjective Experiences of Lesbians in Sport', unpub. paper, NASSS, Ottawa, Nov. 1992; S Pharr, *Homophobia: A Weapon of Sexism*, Chardon Press, Little Rock, 1990.
 - 25 For example, 'Games Girls' Fund-raising'; G Green, 'Different Rules for Female Athletes?', *Morning Bulletin*, 26 July 1994; J Huxley, 'Sneers, Leers but all the Girls are Good Sports', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 July 1994; D D McNicoll, 'Politically Correct Pin-ups take the Risk out of Risque', *Weekend Australian*, 30-31 July 1994.
 - 26 L McLean, 'Lawrence Laments Calendar Coverage', *Australian*, 26 July 1994.
 - 27 J Wells, 'Three Cheers for Girls with Nothing to Hide', *Weekend Australian*, 30-31 July 1994.
 - 28 F Harari and P Smellie, 'Lesbianism in Sport Prevalent but not Relevant, says Cricketer', *Australian*, 19 Jan. 1994; Smith and Hudson, 'Just not Cricket', 1994.
 - 29 NBC, *The Human Edge: One Nation Under God*, 4 Jan. 1995.
 - 30 B Lawson, '\$12 500 Award for Gay Jibes', *Telegraph Minor*, 2 Dec. 1994.