

Supplementary materials

Effectiveness of an educational intervention targeting homophobic language by young male athletes: a cluster randomised controlled trial

Supp. Table 1: Intervention script		
Section	Purpose	Content
Introduction	Introduce topic of diversity and how it relates to growing the sport, identify and engage with the leaders in the group	<p>- Share that you are there to ask for their help to make the game even better</p> <p>- Grow participation, make all feel welcome</p> <p>Share that you are there to <u>ask for their help to make the game even better</u>, grow participation, make all feel welcome</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does everyone want to grow the sport? • Do you want everyone to feel welcome to play the game?
Section 1	Establish the value of diversity in rugby to team performance/cohesion. Demonstrate acceptable forms of banter through traditional rugby stereotypes (back line players are fast and stylish; forwards are slow and like to eat)	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are people from? (Samoa, NZ, Aus) • Who is the fastest in the room? • Who is the joker? • Who is the best prop? • What would happen if everyone was a prop? Wing? Good team? • Why is diversity better? • How does it help? <p>Critical: Make point that <u>a good team is diverse</u>. Strong evidence that diverse teams are better.</p>
Section 2	Introduce how homophobic language use, or any discriminatory banter, is counterproductive to diversity. Educate about the harm. Role model disapproval. Highlight misperception that everyone approves of language to shift norms.	<p>- Share personal stories about how language made you feel unwelcome and how you used the language yourself; express regret</p> <p>- Highlight how racist language is not as common anymore but homophobic is (potential questions: has anyone experienced racist language? How did it feel)</p> <p>- Talk about homophobic being harmful (5x higher suicide)</p> <p>- Ask if anyone would want to harm their teammate?</p> <p>Critical: How many of you would support a mate if he was struggling and thinking of leaving team or hurting himself? How many want the language to stop? (hands)</p>
Conclusion	Teach new ways to react negatively to language used by others, build confidence to react negatively in future	<p>- The easiest thing you can do is stop language is not react</p> <p>- If you hear something, don't laugh, give a frown</p> <p>- If you feel confident you can say something</p> <p>- Demonstrate how to do this</p>

Supp. Table 2: Generalised estimating equation results Per-Protocol – effect of intervention on T2 variables when the intervention was delivered as designed (as a discussion)

	Homophobic lang. use <i>N</i> = 128 / <i>N</i> teams = 10			Acceptability of lang. <i>N</i> = 127 / <i>N</i> teams = 10			Descriptive norms <i>N</i> = 127 / <i>N</i> teams = 10		
	<i>Est</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Est</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Est</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Intervention condition</i>	0.05	-0.24 – 0.33	.749	0.17	-0.04 – 0.38	0.117	0.19	-0.19 – 0.56	0.331
<i>Time 1 score</i>	0.37	0.17 – 0.56	<0.001	0.21	-0.12 – 0.29	<0.001	0.29	0.20 – 0.37	<0.001
<i>Club size</i>	0.17	-0.10 – 0.44	0.214	0.05	-0.18 – 0.28	0.677	0.33	-0.16 – 0.82	0.183
<i>Cohens d</i>	0.04	-.20 – .27		0.13	-0.03 – 0.29		0.15	-0.15 – 0.44	
	Proscriptive injunctive norms <i>N</i> = 125 / <i>N</i> teams = 10			Prescriptive injunctive norms <i>N</i> = 107 / <i>N</i> teeams = 9 ^a			<i>Exploratory Homophobic attitudes</i> <i>N</i> = 118 / <i>N</i> teams = 10		
<i>Intervention condition</i>	-0.03	-.83 – 0.88	0.951	0.49	-0.40 – 1.38	0.279	-0.10	-2.11 – 1.92	0.925
<i>Time 1 score</i>	0.34	0.14 – 0.53	<0.001	0.20	0.03 – 0.37	0.024	0.66	-1.60 – 2.91	0.568
<i>Team size</i>	-0.27	-1.50 – 0.96	0.671	0.56	-0.12 – 1.23	0.108	-0.09	-1.96 – 1.78	0.924
<i>Cohens d</i>	0.01	-0.29 – 0.30		0.18	-0.15 – 0.51		-0.09	-1.79 – 1.62	

Note: ^asurvey misprint omitted question from one treatment club