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This study examined subjects’ perceptions of racist quotations from sports figures based on three variables (objectionability, racist-ness, offensiveness). This study wanted to examine perceptual and contextual differences in interpretations of each quotation. The sample consisted of 219 undergraduate students in two separate conditions using the same quotations. Males and females significantly differed in their perceptions of racist-ness and offensiveness. Significant difference was also found between conditions based on same-race racism. Limitations of the study and implications for future research are also discussed.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction

In his article on sports history, Murray Nelson argues that sports have been an integral part of the US culture since the creation of the republic (Nelson, 2005). Sports are a microcosm of American life, people are interested in sports. The American public takes sports so seriously that, for example, in September of 2005, Ohio State tight end Ryan Hamby received hate e-mails and voice mails from fans following a loss to Texas in which he dropped what would have been a touchdown (Kane, 2005). Sports has become so important to the American public that some feel this phenomenon offers a great way to understand cultural differences; the sports’ perspective can lead to not only a greater understanding of our different subcultures but can also lead to positive changes in society (Nelson, 2005).

The Problem

Racism in American sports is still an issue today. The majority of professional athletes downplay the effects of race in sports to the point that several indicate that race is a nonissue today; yet racial conflicts in American sports still occur.

The current state in the world of American sports shows a serious hesitation at making “icons” or sports “heroes” accountable for things that they say while a lesser-known public figure cannot make a statement that is even close to being racially insensitive because it can, and most likely will, be a career-ending mistake.

Significance of the Study
This project is aimed at exploring how public and media popularity determines the attention given to a potentially racist comment. This analysis will allow for a better appreciation for the role that contemporary sports can play in race relations in the United States. More specifically, this project posits and tests communication as the central element in understanding how individual perceptions may differ regarding race.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this project was two-fold. One was to test the importance of source credibility and content regarding potentially racially charged comments. Statements were judged depending on the source of the message. This study hypothesized that it is not the actual quotation but the individual who made the statement, and the perceived status of that person that affects perception. In addition, this study hypothesized that same-race racism is not viewed as racist even though comments in this regard may be equally offensive as cross-cultural racist statements. Therefore, eight hypotheses were developed around possible perceptions of subjects.

H1: Participants will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of how objectionable a comment is perceived to be.

H2: Males and females will significantly differ in their opinions of how objectionable the quotations are perceived to be.
H3: Participants will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of racism.

H4: Males and females will differ significantly in their interpretation of how racist the quotations are perceived to be.

H5: Subjects will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of offensiveness.

H6: Males and females will differ significantly in their interpretations of how offensive the quotations are perceived to be.

H7: Participants will rate comments where target and source are the same as less racist than when they do not know the source and target relationship.

H8: Perceptions of source credibility will be inversely related to the perceptions of racism.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Race: Not a Black and White Issue

The number of blacks in Major League Baseball has been declining in recent years and the criticism of that decline fell onto white people (Entine, 2000). In his book, Taboo: Why Black Athletes Dominate Sports and Why We Are Afraid to Talk About It, Jon Entine points out that after it was reported that the number of black people playing baseball was declining, an editorial was almost immediately published in the New York Times titled, A White Man’s Place To Be, the subject of which was that white people were trying to take over baseball and dominate the sport (Entine, 2000). In actuality, the number of white players is not increasing and has not been for some time; rather it is the number of Hispanics that are increasing (Entine, 2000). Also, there are other cultural reasons for fewer African-Americans playing baseball. For instance, a lot of young black people grow up in cities and the sport of choice is basketball and not baseball (Wendel, 2003). Over the past 20 years the number of Hispanics playing in Major League Baseball has jumped from 8% to 24%. Today, African-Americans and Hispanics make up over 40% of baseball players (Entine, 2000). Yet racism is rarely a big issue when the race is anything other than black or white. In early August of 2005, San Francisco radio personality Larry Krueger referred to the San Francisco Giants’ Latino players in a derogatory way (Dubow, 2005). Krueger called Latino players on the Giants, “…brain-dead Caribbean hitters hacking at slop nightly” (Dubow, 2005). In the same segment, Krueger referred to Giants Manager Felipe Alou, also Latino, as a manager whose mind had “turned to cream of wheat” (Dubow, 2005). When Alou cried foul over the comments and the rampant racism involved, Krueger
was suspended for one week (Dubow, 2005). Initially, the suspension was going to be the extent of the punishment but Krueger was fired on August 9, 2005, after the incident received national attention with Felipe Alou appearing on ESPN's *Outside the Lines* (Kroner, 2005). These types of situations need the same attention as black and white issues. However, on the other side of the issue, Felipe Alou did not protest when Dusty Baker made comments regarding the ability of Latinos, along with blacks, to play better in the heat (Soto, 2003).

**Negative Stereotyping**

Stereotypes are generalizations or assumptions that people make about the characteristics of all members of a group based on an image about what people in that group are like (Burgess, 2003). Often these generalizations are negative and are categorized as negative stereotyping. For example, Americans are perceived to be arrogant, impatient, and domineering but this is not true for all Americans (Burgess, 2003). The problem is that stereotypes are self-perpetuating because races are perceived in different ways and often people believe in those stereotypes and will try to counteract the other “side” (Burgess, 2003). For instance, if one group believes that another group is deceitful then they too will act in a deceitful way (Burgess, 2003).

Stereotyping does not consider a person’s character or individuality but instead labels him/her with the beliefs that are held about their race (Gates, 1991). Meier wrote that negative stereotyping is the greatest hindrance to black success in the United States (Gates, 1991). For instance, one negative stereotype against blacks is that they are incompetent (Gates, 1991). This stereotype limits the amount of opportunities for black people (Gates, 1991). Also, when a black person breaks out
of the stereotype, rather than embracing that, the white race makes excuses for why that is not normal (Gates, 1991). In his article, *Racial Trends and Differences in the United States 30 Years after the Civil Rights Decade* (1997), Farley wrote that negative stereotyping leads many whites, even if they endorse equal opportunity, to look at black employees as undesirable. Plous and Williams ran a test to compare how white people in contemporary times feel about blacks in comparison with attitudes held during slavery in America (1995). The negative stereotypes concerning the physical and mental abilities of blacks were still present as the majority of the respondents held some sort of negative stereotype against black people (Plous and Williams, 1995).

In his article, *White Americans Found to Cling to Negative Racial Stereotypes* (1991), Raymond found that a portion of white Americans held negative stereotypes and racist attitudes against blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and other minority groups. Asian-Americans make up only 3% of the population, widely on the east and west coasts (Mahdzan and Ziegler, 2001). Negative media images promote the negative stereotypes of Asians and formulate a negative opinion of Asian people and culture because television is often the only exposure to Asians that Americans come in contact with (Mahdzan and Ziegler, 2001). For instance, Asian males are often portrayed as evil, greedy gangsters like in *Lethal Weapon 4* (Mahdzan and Ziegler, 2001). Another negative stereotype of Asian people is that of the “Yellow Uncle Tom” (Mahdzan and Ziegler, 2001). This phrase was coined to refer to an Asian man who speaks broken English and is passive, like Mr. Miyagi in the *Karate Kid* (Mahdzan and Ziegler, 2001). Countless images like these go out to mainstream America and most Americans do not have interpersonal interaction with Asian people and culture to counteract these images.
Hispanics are the fastest-growing ethnic group in America. In *The Changing Image of Hispanic Americans* (2005), Weaver found that American’s opinions of Hispanics on work ethic, intelligence, and wealth have improved significantly from 1990 to 2000. However, in terms of media portrayal, negative stereotypes of Hispanics are still prevalent (Freeman, 1994). Hispanics are under-represented on television and when they are represented they are often portrayed as maids, gardeners, crooks, etc (Freeman, 1994). In *Media*, Schainberg reported that the likelihood of Hispanic characters on television to be cast negatively is high and that these images of negative stereotyping are detrimental to the self-image of Hispanic children (1994).

Negative stereotyping takes on another dimension when members of the same race criticize others for breaking the stereotypes that bind them. In 2005, J. Whyatt Mondesire, president of the Philadelphia chapter of the NAACP, criticized Donovan McNabb, quarterback of the Philadelphia Eagles, for not being a running quarterback anymore (ESPN.com, 2005). Mondesire claimed that McNabb’s unwillingness to be a running quarterback “not only amounts to a breach of faith but also belittles the real struggles of black athletes” (ESPN.com, 2005). This instance compares interestingly with the claims of Meier. Meier claimed that when a black person breaks out of a stereotype, the white race does not embrace that action. In this instance, it is a black leader who did not embrace a black person breaking those stereotypes. Negative stereotyping persists as a major problem in America.

**Mascot Controversy**
The prevalence of racism today is clear when examining the mascots being used by some college and professional teams. Most notable are the Washington Redskins and the Kansas City Chiefs of the NFL, and the Atlanta Braves of Major League Baseball. As Seth Siegel pointed out in his article, Winning Team Names, On and Off the Field (2003), these types of mascots are morally deficient choices. Siegel goes on to point out that these names “convey a lack of humanity of Native Americans,” meaning these names show animal-like fearlessness which lacks “any human attributes” (Siegel, 2003). As recently as 1997, sports teams at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, were known as the Redskins. In 1997, newly-named University president James Garland decided to change the racially insensitive name to Redhawks. However, eight years later at least a few cars on Miami’s campus have bumper stickers which say “Redskins Forever.” Siegel also points out that an anti-black or anti-Semitic name would not be tolerated but because Native Americans are a small race, the public largely ignores their pleas for equality (Siegel, 2003). In 2005, the NCAA made public its wish that any school nickname that was racially insensitive towards Native Americans be replaced (Brooks, 2005). The qualifier for the new NCAA policy was that American Indian names could not be used in a hostile or abusive way; they could not convey a lack of humanity (Brooks, 2005). However, the board of trustees at Florida State University vowed to keep their school nickname as the Seminoles (Wienberg, 2005). Florida State was just one of 18 schools deemed by the NCAA to be using hostile or abusive names, but it, along with the University of Illinois and Bradley University, publicly opposed the ruling (Wienberg, 2005). Florida Representative Tom Feeney referred to the ruling as “political correctness run amuck” (Wienberg, 2005). The point of this is that even though universities are not trying to maliciously hurt
Native Americans, those types of nicknames are offensive. These types of nicknames are also a perpetuation of the negative stereotype of Native Americans as savages. Currently, professional teams with mascots like the Redskins, Chiefs, and Braves have no plans to change the mascot name. This is just one example of the presence of racism in both college and professional sports.

**Race Bearing Positions in Football**

African-Americans have been overtaken by Hispanics as the second largest ethnicity in the United States (Jelinek, 2005). Yet, race in the United States, including race in sports, is viewed in terms of black and white. Those who think that race is becoming a non-issue need only look at recent history and the current situations in professional football and baseball. Currently in the NFL there are 32 teams. Of those 32 teams, only six (New Orleans, Atlanta, Minnesota, Tennessee, Philadelphia, and Jacksonville) have black starting quarterbacks. The quarterback position is historically looked at as a “white” position with speculation being that the quarterback is the most important person on the field and must be the smartest person on the field (Moorehead, 2001). The criticism is that teams often do not give black quarterbacks a chance because they are viewed as not being smart enough to handle the position (Moorehead, 2001). This perpetuates the negative stereotype that black quarterbacks can be athletic, but not intelligent. This stigma still surrounds the NFL even though in 2003, Tennessee Titans quarterback Steve McNair shared the leagues’ MVP with Indianapolis quarterback Peyton Manning (Barra, 2003). In addition, in 2004, Daunte Culpepper and Donovan McNabb, both African-American, were the NFL’s second and third leading
passers; both men went to the Pro-Bowl. In 2004 at the University of Tennessee there were two outstanding freshman quarterbacks: Eric Ainge and Brent Schaeffer. Eric Ainge is white and Brent Schaeffer is black. Commentators regarded Ainge as the “prototypical” quarterback meaning that he was tall, strong, and had a powerful arm. These same commentators followed the typical stereotype by referring to the African-American Schaeffer as a “good” athlete, which is the most common way to refer to a black quarterback (Barra, 2002). This type of language negatively stereotypes the ability of a black quarterback as a “runner” and does not emphasize the ability to throw the football or read defensive coverages. Eric Ainge is still the starting quarterback at Tennessee; Brent Schaeffer decided it was in his best interest to transfer schools (ESPN.com, 2005). This is interesting because a 2003 article entitled, Young College Athletes See ‘Raceless’ World posited that, in a recent study done in Tennessee, race was no longer an issue in athletics at a college campus. This is a remarkable study considering that the stigma surrounding black and white quarterbacks remains an issue.

There is another side to this spectrum which was pointed out by John Donovan in his article, Users Strike Back (Donovan, 1999). In this article, fans, whose ethnicity is not known, acknowledge the stigma surrounding the language used in regards to black quarterbacks. One of the issues this article brings up is why nobody seems to talk about the discrepancies that white wide receivers face in the NFL (Donovan, 1999). A receiver is a predominantly black position in not only the NFL but also in college. White receivers also have a special vocabulary tacked onto them just like black quarterbacks. This article points out that white receivers are called “possession” receivers and “hard-workers” (Donovan, 1999). The idea is that receiver is not
a position that a white person, for whatever reason, is inherently good at. Rather, they have to work harder to succeed at the position and at that, are not a “deep threat,” meaning they cannot outrun defensive backs on long pass patterns but rather their job is to simply run shorter routes that can get the team first downs. Users Strike Back also presents and confronts the stigma that black quarterbacks are not “fast enough thinkers,” which is another negative stereotype of black quarterbacks (Donovan, 1999). The point is that the public in this case is very aware of the double set of standards that are applied to black quarterbacks; but at the same time are aware of the double set of standards that are applied to white players playing predominately black positions. Receiver is not the only position that is considered a non-white position. White cornerbacks face similar stereotypes, not being athletic enough to cover receivers. There was not one white starting cornerback in the NFL in 2005 (ESPN.com, 2005). The perpetuation of negative stereotypes is holding back quality athletes, both black and white, because they are playing positions that are supposed to “belong” to the other race.

Hiring Practices in Professional Sports

There are currently six African-American head coaches. Marvin Lewis of the Cincinnati Bengals, Dennis Green of the Arizona Cardinals, Herman Edwards of the Kansas City Chiefs, Tony Dungy of the Indianapolis Colts, Lovie Smith of the Chicago Bears, and Romeo Crennel of the Cleveland Browns. In 2003, the NFL was 67% African-American and at that time there were only three coaches in the NFL that were African-American (Pedulla, 2003). The positive side is that in two years there was a 100% increase in African-American coaches but there are still 26
white head coaches compared to six minorities. The current policy of the NFL is that every team with a coaching vacancy must “seriously” interview at least one minority candidate (Pedulla, 2003). The wording of the policy is interesting considering that only African-Americans have been interviewed as minority candidates. Norm Chow is considered one of the brightest offensive minds in football today and he has never been interviewed for a head coaching position in the NFL. In addition, the NFL did not adopt this policy until lawsuits were threatened from prominent attorneys such as Johnny Cochran who threatened to sue if the NFL did not change its minority hiring practices (Pedulla, 2003). There is no doubt that the necessity of this policy is interesting— that the NFL must force teams to interview minority candidates. There has been only one Hispanic head coach in the NFL. Tom Flores became the head coach of the Oakland Raiders in 1979, and won two Super Bowls in 1980 and 1983 (Wikipedia, 2006).

Fritz Pollard, in the 1920s, was technically the first African-American coach in the NFL because he was a player/coach (Hoover, 2005). This groundbreaking achievement was not acknowledged until 2005, when he was inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame (Hoover, 2005). After Fritz Pollard, there would not be another minority coach in the NFL until 1979 when Tom Flores became coach of the Oakland Raiders. There was not another African-American head coach until 1989 when Art Shell became coach of the Raiders. In a span of over 50 years only one franchise in the NFL hired minorities as head coaches. The minority hiring practices of the NFL brought out one of the major issues dealing with racism that this project addressed, which is the double standard the NFL uses when enforcing the policy of seriously interviewing minority candidates for head coaching positions. Tom Pedulla points out in his article,
Lawsuits Threatened Over NFL Minority Hiring Practices (2003), that for the policy to work effectively, all teams must be held equally accountable. Pedulla points out the NFL’s double standard in this policy when dealing with the high-profile owner of the Dallas Cowboys, Jerry Jones, and the lesser-known General Manager of the Detroit Lions, Matt Millen (Pedulla, 2003). The NFL failed to fine Jerry Jones for not interviewing minority candidates before hiring Bill Parcells to become the new coach of the Cowboys (Pedulla 2003). In fact, Jones did not interview any candidate other than Parcells. However, Detroit was not so fortunate. The Lions were fined $200,000 for not interviewing minority candidates prior to hiring Steve Mariucci as head coach (NFL.com, 2003). Detroit Lions owner William Clay Ford, like Tom Pedulla, wondered how the Dallas Cowboys avoided this penalty (About.com, 2003). It is simply not acceptable to hold one team accountable while another higher profile team gets let off the hook for violating the minority interviewing stipulation because it undermines the policy.

The issue of minority hiring practices is not solely an NFL problem. There have also been problems in both Major League Baseball and the National Basketball Association. In May of 2003, the Florida Marlins fired Manager Jeff Torborg and promoted Jack McKeon to interim-manager. The Marlins wasted little time, less than a week, dropping the “interim” from McKeon’s title and making him the fulltime manager. In a (Sports Illustrated) article the following week it was reported that the Marlins were fined an undisclosed amount for not interviewing minority candidates for the job (Marlins Fined, 2003). Baseball Commissioner Bud Selig has the power to fine teams up to $2 million; the extent of the fine was never released from the league office or from Florida (Sports Illustrated, 2003). The
Marlins failed to follow the guidelines set by the league. The question beckons as to how Major League Baseball expected the Marlins to conduct a hiring search in the middle of the season. In this same article, Sports Illustrated also pointed out that in 2000 the Detroit Tigers failed to consider minority candidates when hiring Phil Garner, but escaped punishment from Major League Baseball because they created a five-member community advisory board to work on minority employment and contract issues (Marlins fined, 2003).

The issue of minority hiring is also present in the NBA. In his article, Race and the NBA Coaching Carousel (2005), David Zirin points out that the public is led to believe that race is a figment of the past; that in sports it is no longer supposed to exist. Yet, Zirin took the time to look more closely at minority coaching history in the NBA and found discrepancies when compared to white coaches. First, Zirin pointed out that when Paul Silas was fired as coach of the Cleveland Cavaliers he only had the job for a year and a half and had pushed them towards playoff contention. In addition, the fact that Silas is black was never even discussed in reference to his firing. The simple explanation that Zirin posits is there is more parity in terms of coaching in the NBA as opposed to the NFL (Zirin, 2005). Zirin points out that black coaches in the NBA have an average tenure of 1.6 seasons (Zirin, 2005). Conversely, white coaches in the league have an average tenure of 2.4 seasons, which is nearly an entire season more (Zirin, 2005). Also, this article pointed out that since 1989, of the 14 coaches in the NBA who held their jobs for at least five years only one of them, Lenny Wilkins, was black (Zirin, 2005). These views were seconded in the article Black Coaches in N.B.A. have Shorter Tenures, in which similar empirical evidence was studied and the same conclusion was drawn (Fessenden and Leonhardt, 2005). This
article also pointed out that this double standard has gone largely unnoticed; yet it is causing a serious dividing line between coaches and executives along racial lines (Fessenden and Leonhardt, 2005). Former New Jersey Nets Coach Butch Beard said, “For black coaches you have to be a Jesus miracle worker” (Zirin, 2005). Paul Silas himself in January of 2005 said, “Our white counterparts are given more the benefit of the doubt” (Zirin, 2005). It is also worth mentioning that more white coaches get a second opportunity to be a head coach than do black coaches.

The NFL, the NBA, and Major League Baseball are three huge sports entities. In all three there are problems concerning the hiring of minority coaches. Meanwhile, as Zirin pointed out, all three are claiming that race is no longer an issue. The general public also seems to want to ignore the issue of racism in sports. John Donovan, in his article for CNN Sports Illustrated, chronicles the feelings of several sports fans in America (Donovan, 1999). In this article, Donovan notes that fans are fiercely against the idea of quotas in terms of minority hiring in the NFL; something that high-powered lawyers such as Johnny Cochran threatened to sue the NFL over (Donovan, 1999). It would be a very interesting situation, for a team to fire its coach and know that the coaching pool could be limited to only minorities if quotas were instituted into the league. Greg Franks’ article, Quotas Undermine NFL’s Colorblind Tradition (2003), points out that instituting quotas in the league limits the ability of a team to hire not only the coach that they want to hire but could make the most deserving candidate left without a job. Another point of the article was to say the penalty for not interviewing minorities could get out of control. The Lions were fined $200,000 but that penalty could grow up to as much as $500,000 (Franks, 2003). In addition, quotas would stigmatize
coaching forever (Franks, 2003). Further, the scrutiny surrounding the hiring of white coaches would get out of control. There was already one instance at the college level when Alabama hired Mike Shula instead of Sylvester Croom (Russo, 2003). At the time of Shula’s hiring there had never been a black head coach in the SEC and many people felt that Croom was the more deserving candidate but was not hired because he was black (Russo, 2003). Mississippi State did hire Croom as its head coach the following year making him the first black head coach in the 87-year history of the SEC (Russo, 2003). In Alabaman’s Sweet Home: Mississippi (2004), Lynn Zinser profiles Croom and how he got over the rejection of Alabama hiring Shula. This article pushes the idea that racism was the deciding factor in Croom not being hired and Shula being hired (Zinser, 2004).

**Attribution Theory**

Attribution theory, in the widest sense of the term, deals with answering “why” questions in the behavior of people (Jaspars, Hewstone, and Fincham, 1983). Attribution theory began in social psychology with theorists such as Fritz Heider (Miller, 2002). The original theorist of attribution theory proposed that individuals looked for causal reasons that could be used to explain behavior (Miller, 2002). The basic distinction in attribution theory is between an internal attribution and an external attribution. An internal attribution locates the cause of a particular behavior within the individual person while an external attribution locates the cause of the behavior in the situation (Miller, 2002). Therefore a certain behavior from a person can be explained as either being something within that person that made him/her behave in that manner or that some sort of outside influence caused the
behavior. Nisbett and Ross (1980) identified what is known as the fundamental attribution error, which is that observers will tend to overestimate the importance of internal factors and underestimate the importance of external factors. Jones and Nisbett explained that while observers will tend to overestimate internal factors, the individual will tend to attribute his/her own actions more to external factors (1972). However, some theorists believe that aspects in a situation might lead to results which counter the fundamental attribution error (Miller, 2002). Weiner argued, “that causes of behavior are not seen simply along the dimension of internal versus external but along two additional dimensions of stability and controllability” (1986). Stability, meaning that the cause of an event is always present; unstable, meaning the cause of an event varies over time and context (Miller, 2002). Controllability means the individual can control the events that lead to the behavior; uncontrollable means that the individual could not control the events that lead to the behavior (Miller, 2002).

**Speech Act Theory**

Speech act theory was proposed by J.L. Austin in 1962 and was most fully developed by John Searle (Miller, 2002). Speech act theory states that when people say something, they are not stringing together words or representing meaning but are performing an action (Miller, 2002). The first level of examining a statement is at the *utterance level*, which is the stringing together of words (Miller, 2002). The next level is *propositional act*, meaning the individual has said something that he/she believes to be true (Miller, 2002). The propositional act deals with the connection between the utterance and word to which it refers; these concepts form the
notion of a locutionary act (Miller, 2002). The next level is the illocutionary act level. This level indicates how a statement is to be interpreted by those who hear it (Austin, 1962). The evaluation of the illocutionary force indicates what the speaker wants to do by making a particular statement (Miller, 2002). A statement can also be seen as a perlocutionary act, which means that the statement has a particular effect on the receiver (Miller, 2002). Speech act theory deals primarily with the illocutionary and perlocutionary levels, meaning how a statement is to be taken and then what effect that statement has on the receiver (Miller, 2002). One major point of speech act theory is that words do carry meaning and those words can hurt the people that are affected by them (Patterson, 2004). The scope of speech act theory is broad and the following section reviews basic foundations of how different statements can be analyzed and perceived by receivers.

**Source Credibility**

Beebe and Beebe define credibility as a person’s believability (2003). There are many different elements that may comprise a person’s credibility but there are three specific elements that Beebe and Beebe identify. The three elements are competence, trustworthiness, and dynamism (Beebe and Beebe, 2003). Competence is defined as the state or quality of being adequately or well qualified or as having a specific range of skill, knowledge, or ability (American Heritage Dictionary, 2006). Trustworthiness is characterized as the ability for people to believe a person to be honest (Beebe and Beebe, 2003). Dynamism is a form of energy; Beebe and Beebe identify charisma as a form of dynamism (2003). Yoon, Choong, and Min-Sun (1998) tested expertise (competence) and trustworthiness among
different racial dimensions and found that these elements were of nearly the same importance to different races. The manner in which a source delivers a message will affect the credibility or perceived credibility of a message. Payne and Downing took a speech from Jessie Jackson at the 1996 Democratic National Convention and translated it into Ebonics (2000). They then played the audio recording to 72 African-American students at a mid-south university (Payne and Downing, 2000). Next, they played the same excerpt but in Standard English and then asked the students to evaluate each speaker (Payne and Downing, 2000). The tape of the speech in Standard English was rated as being a more credible source (Payne and Downing, 2000). The credibility of the source was affected by the way the speech was delivered. In the article, *The Persuasiveness of Source Credibility: A Critical Review of Five Decades’ Evidence* (2004), Pornpitakpan reported that there were five categories that source credibility interacted with: source, message, channel, receiver, and destination variables. The conclusion drawn in the article was that a high credible source is almost always superior to a less credible source (Pornpitakpan, 2004). A person with high source credibility is looked more favorably upon by the public.

**Race: A Source and Contextual Situation**

While many in the sports world, including fans, pretend that racism is a thing of that past; that is not the case. There are currently a few major factors that trump racism and they have to do with context. Right now, a favorable media or public image or iconic status, may affect perceptions of racism as long as that icon is not offending someone who is a bigger icon. This was pointed out by Jonathan Long in his article, *On the Moral Economy of Racism and Racist Rationalizations in Sport* (2004).
Long posits in his article that responses to racism vary in viciousness and they vary on factors of rationalizations based on the media and the public (Long, 2004). Long challenges the instances of unacknowledged racism and when racism becomes a factor and that it is not okay to have this broad range of racism based on factors that are directly linked to a racist remark or action (Long, 2004). These factors include source credibility, attribution of the statement, and how the statement is perceived.

There was an example in the 1980s of a recognizable star making a foolish statement about another more recognizable player at the time and the situation ballooning out of control. In 1987, Isiah Thomas seconded a comment made by teammate Dennis Rodman. Rodman claimed that “Larry Bird was overrated, a regular winner of the MVP only because of his race” (Murdoc Online, 2003). Isiah Thomas backed up his teammate, “If Bird was black, he’d be just another good guy” (Murdoc Online, 2003). A huge controversy resulted from Thomas’s remarks about Larry Bird, a white star of the NBA. Thomas had a lot more credibility than Rodman and his criticism of Bird brought harsh reaction. The response was so severe that Thomas had to fly out to Los Angeles, where the NBA Finals were starting, and make a public apology to Larry Bird (ESPN Sportcentury, 2004). Thomas was undoubtedly a recognized player at this time, but he was not as recognizable as Larry Bird. The comment was not politically correct but was also not so overtly racist that he had to apologize to Bird in person. Thomas was speaking in the moment; his Pistons had just lost to Bird’s Celtics. The Celtics were going to the NBA Finals and the Pistons were going home. Instead of Thomas’ comment being attributed to external disappointment of the situation, it was attributed to internal racism. Also, a lot of people took the comment from Thomas very personally and
an apology was necessary. However, the response to Thomas’ comments about Larry Bird directly counteracts the position taken by Debbie Schlussel. In her article, *NBA’s Same Old Double-Standard*, Schlussel claims that minorities in the NBA can say and do whatever they want with apparent impunity (Schlussel, 2002). Schlussel references that black NBA players Charlie Ward and Allan Houston were not fined for making anti-Semitic remarks, essentially inferring that a white basketball player could not get away with such action (Schlussel, 2002). NBA Commissioner David Stern said that he did not fine Houston and Ward because he did not want to draw attention to the issue (Schussel, 2002).

Along those same lines is the situation that arose between Fuzzy Zoeller and Tiger Woods. In April of 1997, Tiger Woods was on the verge of winning his first Masters (Laird, 1997). Zoeller, the 1979 Masters Champion, was and still is regarded as one of golf’s most colorful personalities and he is widely popular (Daugherty, 1998). At the time even though Tiger Woods was about to win his first Masters in record fashion, Zoeller was at least as recognizable as Woods. On the last day of the tournament when asked about Woods, Zoeller gave this reply, “That little boy is driving well and he’s putting well. He’s doing everything it takes to win. So, you know what you guys do when he gets in here? You pat him on the back and say congratulations and enjoy it and tell him not to serve fried chicken next year. Got it? Or collard greens or whatever the hell they serve” (CNN, 1997). Zoeller’s comments caused some waves of discontent but he was able to apologize and say that his comments were misconstrued and all was forgotten (CNN, 1997). To this day, Woods attributes the comments to Zoeller having too much to drink and is quick to say that he forgives but does not forget (Daugherty, 1998). Zoeller’s comments were
overtly racist and offensive but he has a very favorable image, thus the media and public were quick to forgive him. In this instance, Zoeller’s comments were attributed externally, to the heat of the moment when he spoke after drinking too much alcohol. Zoeller was not labeled as a racist and he still enjoys a popular image today.

Paul Hornung was a Heisman Trophy winner at Notre Dame and an NFL star for the Green Bay Packers. He enjoyed a favorable image with both the media and public for decades. Hornung is a highly credible football source. Recently, Notre Dame, his alma mater, had fallen on hard times on the football field. In 2004, Hornung made this statement regarding Notre Dame’s possible resurrection to greatness on the football field: “We can’t stay as strict as we are as far as the academic structure is concerned because we’ve got to get the black athlete. We must get the black athlete if we are going to compete” (The Vindicator, 2004). Initially, there was controversy surrounding Hornung’s statements. However, he apologized a day later and the controversy died immediately (The Vindicator, 2004). Nothing else was ever said about this comment even though it was very racist. Columnist and co-host of ESPN’s Pardon the Interruption, Tony Kornheiser, broke down the essence of Hornung’s comments very well when he said that essentially what Hornung said was that “white athletes stink, smart black athletes stink, only dumb black athletes are any good” (Pardon the Interruption, 2004). Hornung’s comments were externally attributed to being taken out of context and Hornung himself said that he did not mean for his words to come across the way that they did.

Larry Bird has been a sports icon since his college years at Indiana State University in the late 1970s. He is one of the most respected sports figures in the United States and he is currently President of the Indiana Pacers. In fact, Bird is so
well thought of that many sports analysts refer to him simply as “Larry Legend” (Sportscentury, 2003). In June of 2004 Larry Bird along with Magic Johnson, Carmelo Anthony, and LeBron James sat with ESPN’s Jim Gray to discuss the current status of the NBA (ESPN.com, 2004). Bird and Johnson were the elder, retired statesmen, while Anthony and James were the rookies. In addition, Bird was the only white person of the four. During the discussion, Bird sounded off that the NBA needed more white stars because it’s good for the fan base because the majority of America is white (ESPN.com, 2004). In addition, Bird claimed that basketball is a black man’s game because the best athletes are African-American (ESPN.com, 2004). Finally, Bird said that the only time he became upset when playing basketball was when a white person guarded him because it was a disrespect to his game (ESPN.com, 2004). Magic Johnson backed up all of Bird’s statements with his own questionable statement when he said that Bird was “the only (white) guy mentioned in the barbershop” (ESPN.com 2004). Johnson’s statement insinuated that in the black, male environment of the barbershop the only white basketball player discussed was Bird. Also, Bird negatively stereotyped white players as insufficient, even though he is white. Following Bird’s comments, host Jim Gray asked both rookies Anthony and James if race was an issue in the NBA and both replied that it was not an issue (ESPN.com, 2004). There was actually little said about Bird’s comments and he had more supporters than detractors and since the issue has died completely. Bird is a highly credible basketball source. Interestingly, when Rick Barry, who was recognized as one of the 50 greatest basketball players of all time, took offense to Bird’s comments, he received little or no press (ESPN.com, 2004). Barry is a highly credible basketball source as well, but he is not as credible in the public’s eyes as Bird. In fact, the
only real press that Bird’s comments received were the comments regarding more white stars in the NBA; those were deemed marginally racist to the point that ESPN wrote an article asking if these comments made Bird a racist (ESPN.com, 2004). This was an example of same-race racism.

Respect is also very important as to whether or not the media and public will be forgiving to a person who makes questionable comments. Dusty Baker is one of the most respected managers in Major League Baseball today and that was beneficial for him in 2003 when he made very controversial remarks. “Personally, I like to play in the heat. Most Latin and minority people do. You don’t find too many brothers from New Hampshire or Maine, right? We were brought over here because we could work in the heat...isn’t that history? Your skin color is more conducive to heat than it is to the lighter-skinned people. I don’t see brothers running around burnt.” Dan Zanoza in his article, *Is Baker Different from Jimmy “the Greek,”* summarizes Baker’s comments to mean that whites are racially inferior to blacks and Latinos when it comes to performing in hot conditions (Zanoza, 2003). Zanoza also said that the local media dismissed Baker’s comments but his comments did receive national attention (Zanoza, 2003). In her article, *Dusty Baker’s Racist Remarks,* Virginia Soto compared Baker’s remarks to that of former television sports analyst Jimmy “the Greek” Snyder (Soto, 2003). Soto also pointed that Baker defended his comments by saying that it’s okay for him to say what he said because black managers can say things about black players that white managers cannot say about black players (Soto, 2003). In this same article, Baker said that it is also okay for a white manager to say things about a white player that a black manager cannot say about a white player (Soto, 2003). In addition, he tries to back it up as historical fact without having any kind of numbers or
documentation that can prove that minorities play better in the heat than white people. Also, Dusty Baker defended his comments by saying that it is okay for a black manager to make these types of comments about black players. However he did not limit his comments to black players. He extended his comments to Latinos as well, but the media did not really address this situation but instead let it die. In a baseball atmosphere, Baker is a high credible source. He is not only a manager but he was a former player and he has observed whites, blacks, and Latinos playing baseball. However, he is not a highly credible historic source and he offers no type of evidence for his opinions and by saying what he said, he negatively stereotyped white players as less capable of playing in the heat.

Legend status in the eyes of the media and public is something that Bill Parcells has enjoyed for the last several years. Currently, Parcells is the head coach of the Dallas Cowboys and he is recognized as one of the greatest ever football coaches. In June of 2004, Parcells made a racist remark against a largely ignored ethnicity in the world of sports racism. Parcells had this to say about the game planning of offensive coordinator Sean Payton: “Sean, he’s going to have a few...no disrespect to the Orientals, but what we call Jap plays. Ok. Surprise things” (ESPN.com, 2004). There was an Asian reporter in the room, Akira Kuboshima (ESPN.com, 2004). Kuboshima is editor of American Football Magazine in Japan. He claimed that he was not offended by the comments of Parcells (ESPN.com, 2004). The Japanese American Citizens League did not feel the same way. The JACL released a statement saying, “We are deeply disappointed and highly offended by Coach Bill Parcells’ use of the word “Jap” (JACL website, 2004). In addition, the JACL was quick to point out that the use of the word “Oriental” is outdated and inappropriate; the correct word is Asian (JACL
The term Oriental refers more to products, like rugs, and it is not considered politically correct (JACL website, 2005). John Tateishi is the executive director of the JACL and he said, “Parcells is a brilliant coach but unfortunately he’s ignorant about racial slurs” (Chu Lin, 2004). Interestingly, despite the inappropriateness of the comment, neither the NFL nor the Dallas Cowboys fined Parcells for his racial insensitivity (ESPN.com, 2004). Parcells did apologize for what he said (ESPN.com, 2004). Parcells, like Dusty Baker in baseball, is a highly credible source and his statement was largely attributed to misspeaking. In term of attribution theory, it fell under the category of unstable because this was a time and context incident where Parcells misspoke. The appropriate football term for trick plays is gadgets. It does bear mentioning that while there are not many Asian players in the NFL one of them is on Parcells’ team. Dat Nguyen is a starting linebacker for the Cowboys.

Rush Limbaugh is no stranger to political controversy. However, it was in the sports arena where Limbaugh found himself in the biggest controversy. In 2003, ESPN hired Limbaugh to be a part of NFL Sunday Countdown, a pre-game show for the NFL. In 2003, Limbaugh had this to say about Philadelphia quarterback Donovan McNabb, “The media has been very desirous that a black quarterback do well. There is a little hope invested in McNabb, and he got a lot of credit for the performance of this team that he didn’t deserve” (Bechtel and Kennedy, 2003). Initially very little was said over Limbaugh’s comments. However, on the following Tuesday Limbaugh’s statement became an issue when Democratic presidential hopefuls Wesley Clark, Howard Dean, and Al Sharpton called for ESPN to fire Limbaugh (ESPN.com, 2003). ESPN initially said it found nothing wrong with Limbaugh’s comments and it supported him; by Wednesday ESPN had changed its
mind and accepted Limbaugh’s resignation (ESPN.com, 2003). Rush Limbaugh was out of his element; Limbaugh is a political analyst. He is not considered a high credible source for sports. However, this does not mean that what he said was entirely incorrect. In 2003, Donovan McNabb finished as the league’s 16th rated passer; in a league of 32 teams that puts him in the middle, he played mediocre football (Barra, 2003). Also, in terms of offensiveness or racism, this is one of the milder things that Limbaugh has ever been quoted as saying. Rush Limbaugh was once quoted as saying in regards to the African-American voice being heard, “They are 12 percent of the population. Who the hell cares?” (Cadenhead, 2003). But comments like this make a case that what he said about McNabb can be attributed to internal racism.

Anonymity in the sports world is an indicator that a person must watch what they say. Al Campanis, for example, had been in baseball since the 1940s as a player and executive. He once threw down his glove and challenged a white player who was attempting to bully Jackie Robinson (Elder, 1998). However, Campanis was relatively unknown to the public and the media because he spent the majority of his career as an executive behind the scenes. In 1987, Al Campanis’ name became infamous and his career ruined following one interview on “Nightline” when he misspoke on why there were not more black managers (Elder, 1998). “(Blacks) may not have some of the necessities to be, let’s say, a field manager, or perhaps a general manager” (Elder, 1998). Campanis was fired shortly for racial insensitivity and a career of some 40 years was ruined. Even in death his name has not been restored to where it once stood. The people that knew Campanis the best have voiced their own opinions. Vin Scully, longtime Dodger’s announcer said, “Campanis didn’t have a racist bone in his body” (Elder, 1998).
Former Dodger player and current Chicago Cubs manager Dusty Baker said, “What he said was wrong, but he was always cool to minorities when I was there, especially the Latin players and the blacks” (Elder, 1998). Campanis was a highly credible source on the matter of which he spoke, and he offered his honest opinion. The comment was attributed as internal and controllable, and was interpreted as spreading a negative stereotype of the intelligence level of African-Americans. In terms of Speech Act theory, a lot of people were hurt by the phrasing of this statement and Campanis was labeled a racist.

Jimmy “the Greek” Snyder had been a sports commentator for 13 years. In 1988 he was in a restaurant where he was asked why he thought that blacks excelled in sports and he offered this explanation. “The black is the better athlete. And he practices to be the better athlete, and he’s bred to be the better athlete because this goes way back to the slave period. The slave owner would breed this big black with this big black woman so he could have a big black kid. That’s where it all started” (Limbacher, 2001). Snyder was under the impression that what he was saying was off the air because he did not know there was a camera on him, but CBS decided to air the footage anyway. Snyder was fired almost immediately for racial insensitivity. Recently, journalists like Dan Zanoza have compared what Snyder said to the comments of Dusty Baker about minorities excelling in hot weather (Zanoza, 2003). Snyder did not just lost his job but he also lost his career and never escaped those comments. However, Dusty Baker felt no ill effects from his statement and he did not have to apologize for them (Soto, 2003). Snyder was a not a highly credible historical source and he phrased this quotation in an insensitive way and was labeled a racist.

The final instance of racism is perhaps the most compelling. John Rocker was a relief pitcher for the Atlanta
Braves in the 1990s. In an interview with *Sports Illustrated* in 1999, Rocker voiced his opinion on New York City. “The biggest thing I don’t like about New York are the foreigners. I’m not a very big fan of foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?” (Pearlman, 1999). Essentially, with the closing remark he was including every race except for white, English-speaking people. At this time, he was one of the best relief pitchers in Major League Baseball. Baseball Commissioner Bud Selig fined Rocker $20,000 and suspended him for a month (Cook, 2000). An arbitrator was able to get that fine reduced to $500 and two weeks taken off of his suspension (Cook, 2000). It is possible that there has never been such a wide-reaching offensive comment ever made publicly; that comment received almost no punishment. Rocker was criticized harshly and vilified by fans but he was able to continue pitching for Major League Baseball. However, his career was never the same.

Contemporary American sports offer a vast arena to make cultural advances in the United States, but currently falls short of being used to its potential. These last several quotations from sports personalities were used by this project to test the proposition that the source of a comment matters more than what is actually said. Once the content of what is said matters more than the person who said it, then actual progress can be made in this field.

**Male and Female Interpretation Differences**

Differences of interpretations of racism do not exist solely between different ethnicities but also between males and
females. Males and females process information and analyze communication in different ways (DeVito, 2006). Males tend to focus on the content of the communication while females tend to focus more on the relationship dimensions of the communication (cf. Pearson, West, & Turner, 1995; Wood, 1994; Ivy and Backlund, 2000). This difference is a potential barrier to communication interpretation between the sexes (DeVito, 2006).

In their article, *Gender and Values* (1995), Beutel and Marini found that females are more likely to feel compassion for other people. They also found that females were more likely to express concern and responsibility for the well-being of others (Beutel and Marini, 1995). In their article, *Does Gender Matter? Male and Female Participation in Social Work Classrooms* (2003), Hyde and Deal found that females tended to exhibit more caretaking and sensitive communication styles than males. This article also found that females were more caring of the feelings of other people than males (Beutel and Marini, 1995). Men were typically more concerned with their own issues and less about others when communicating and interacting with other people (Beutel and Marini, 1995). Women also tend to communicate more in a nonverbal reaffirming way than men. In the article, *To Nod or not to Nod: An Observational Study of Nonverbal Communication and Status in Female and Male College Students* (2004), women were much more nonverbally reinforcing to the people they were communicating with than men were, especially when dealing with someone in a position of power.

The differences between male and female communication are also present in sports. In his article, *Gender and Communication: Communication Strategies for Athletes* (2005), Chand analyzed the different communication strategies between female athletic teams and male athletic teams. He found that females had more interpersonal support in terms of their
communication strategies and stronger camaraderie (Chand, 2005). There is a clear difference present between the ways that males and females communicate and interpret communication. This raises an important question; how do males and females perceive comments when the source of the message is different? Unknown? Known?

**Summary**

There are many different racial factors in American sports but many of those factors are not considered. A consistent path with dealing with racism does not appear to exist and the process of determining what is or is not racist is flawed. Content is not the central factor in deciding what is or is not racist. The following study was conducted to see how context affected perceptions of racism.
Chapter 3: Methods

Introduction

This project explores the possibility that the source of a potentially racist comment will directly impact the extent to which individuals view that comment as racist. This study hypothesized that same-race racist comments will be perceived as less offensive, less racist, and less objectionable than comments that are made across ethnicities. In addition, this study also hypothesizes that males and females will differ in their perceptions of the comments. Finally, this study examines whether or not a person who is perceived as highly credible is perceived as less racist than a person who is perceived to have low credibility. This project compares several different quotations to see if there is a significant difference between how subjects perceive the various comments when the source is present or absent and if a person’s credibility affects these perceptions. This chapter discusses the methods and procedures used to examine these hypotheses.

Sample

Following a review of literature, 219 students were randomly selected from a mid-sized, Midwestern university with an undergraduate population of approximately 16,000. There were two different conditions employed. In condition one, there were 110 subjects, while 109 subjects took part in condition two. Of the total number of subjects, 79 were male and 140 were female. In condition one, the subject pool was comprised of 44 males and 66 females. In condition two, 35 subjects were male and 74 were female. The vast majority of participants identified themselves
as sports fans with 197 (90%) saying they were sports fans, while 22 (10%) did not identify themselves as sports fans.

In all, 14 (6.4%) first-years took part in the research, 162 (74%) sophomores took part, 29 (13.2%) juniors took part, 13 (5.9%) seniors took part, and there was one (.5%) subject who was considered a non-traditional student. Twelve (5.5%) of the subjects were 18 years old, 125 (57.1%) of the subjects were 19 years old, 59 (26.9%) subjects were 20 years old, 14 (6.4%) subjects were 21 years old, seven (3.2%) subjects were 22 years old, one (.5%) subject was 23 years old, and one (.5%) subject was 49 years old. The average age of the sample was 19.6 years old.

The majority of the participants were Caucasian; 197 (90%) identified themselves as Caucasian, while four (1.8%) identified themselves as African-American, seven (3.2%) identified themselves as Asian, five (2.3%) identified themselves as Latino, and six (2.7%) identified themselves as a different race other than the previous ones listed.

**Measurement Instrument**

This project tested to see if subjects’ perceptions of various quotations from sports personalities were potentially offensive, racist, or objectionable. Eleven different quotations from sports personalities were selected for this project. The quotations were selected because each had brought negative media attention for perceived racism. These quotations were also selected because the consequences for the person varied from person-to-person. Table 1 on page 39 has a complete list of all the quotations used on both surveys.

**Condition and Survey 1**
In condition one, subjects filled out his/her demographic information that was listed earlier. Following the demographic information, subjects were asked to rate each of the 11 comments said by sports personalities in terms of how offensive, racist, or objectionable they found the quotation to be. Each comment caused the public some degree of discomfort but reaction was not the same for any two comments.

Since no scale for measuring racist quotations was found during the review of literature, a scale was developed for the purposes of this project. The researcher selected three different, but related, adjectives to describe each quotation. The three adjectives were objectionable, racist, and offensive. The researcher felt these were appropriate adjectives for subjects to rate. Each subject rated how objectionable he/she thought each quotation was, how racist he/she thought the quotation was, and how offensive he/she believed the quotation to be. This rating took place on a 7-point Likert scale. A one rating indicated that the subject did not believe the comment to be objectionable, racist, or offensive. A seven rating indicated that a subject believed a comment to be very objectionable, very racist, or very offensive. On this scale, an ascending score indicated subject’s feelings that a comment was inappropriate.

In condition one, before each quotation; subjects were given the name of the source of each quotation. In addition, subjects were also given qualifiers about each quotation, such as race, gender, and occupation. For instance, Fuzzy Zoeller was one source of a quotation and next to his name, his qualifiers were that he was Caucasian, male, and a professional golfer. (See Appendix A to view the rest of the qualifiers.) The first set of surveys contained not just a quotation but the full identity of the speaker.
In addition to providing these ratings, participants were also asked to rate the source credibility of the speaker. The McCroskey scale on source credibility was utilized in condition one. The McCroskey scale is a 15 item semantic differential scale that is an accepted measuring tool for evaluating source credibility. The McCroskey scale also uses a seven-point Likert measuring scale for each category but switches the adjective order randomly so it was evident when subjects were circling the same number. This project utilized five categories of the McCroskey scale: sociability, extroversion, competence, composure, and character. However, before starting the source credibility portion for each individual, subjects needed to answer whether or not they knew the person they were about to evaluate. If a subject circled “no” they were advised to skip that individual so as not to skew results by evaluating a person he/she did not know.

The source credibility was the final step in the process of completing this condition. There were 110 copies of survey one completed (Appendix A).

**Condition and Survey 2**

Condition two was nearly identical to condition one with a few minor differences. Subjects once again started by filling out demographic information and then moving on to the quotation portion of the condition. The purpose of condition two was to get subjects to evaluate each comment without knowing the source. Therefore, the set-up of condition two was slightly different than survey one.

In the quotation section, the same 11 quotations were used but this time the source of the quotation was not identified. Also, there were no qualifiers given about the source of the
speaker. Subjects’ evaluations were based only on the content of the comment and not who said the comment. The evaluation process was the same as condition one. Each subject rated each quotation based on how objectionable, racist, and offensive he/she believed each comment to be using 7-point Likert scales.

In condition one, after subjects evaluated each quotation, since the identity of the speaker was already known, the source credibility for each speaker directly followed the evaluation of each quotation. This was not possible in condition two since the identity of the speaker was not revealed. Therefore, the source credibility portion of condition two came after all the quotations had been evaluated. At that point, each subject in condition two followed the same process as those in condition one. They were first asked if he/she knew the person they were about to evaluate. If the answer was “yes” he/she went on to evaluate that person. If the answer was “no” he/she skipped to the next person.

In all, 109 subjects participated in the second condition. (See Appendix B for a copy of Survey 2.)

**Statistical Analysis**

Two x two Univariate ANOVAs were run to test for differences between conditions (source presence, source absence) and gender (male, female) across the three dependent variables (offensiveness, racist-ness, and objectionable-ness) and to test for any interaction effects. In addition, Pearson’s Product Moment correlations were run to test for the relationship between source credibility and perceived racism.

Frequencies were drawn to more carefully compare each data set, quotation, and source credibility. For each quotation, the frequency allowed the researcher to view the percentages for
each number on each scale (objectionable, racist, offensive). Descriptive statistics were also drawn to view the differences between each quotation in each survey and to compare those means between the two surveys.

Correlations were run to test the eighth hypothesis: that the more credible the source is perceived to be, the less racist, offensive and objectionable the comment will be perceived to be.

Summary

Through an analysis of academic and popular literature, 11 separate sports-related quotations were selected to be analyzed based on three major categories: objectionable-ness, racism, and offensiveness. After collecting descriptives, frequencies, and means between each survey; the researcher analyzed the data using univariate ANOVAs, which was an appropriate test for this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy Zoeller</td>
<td>“That little boy (Tiger Woods) is driving well and he’s putting well. He’s doing everything it takes to win. So, you know what you guys do when he gets in here? You put him on the back and say congratulations and enjoy it and tell him not to serve fried chicken next year. Got it? Or collard greens or whatever the hell they serve.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Campanis</td>
<td>“(Blacks) may not have some of the necessities to be, let’s say, a field manager, or perhaps a general manager.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiah Thomas</td>
<td>“If (Larry) Bird was black he’d be just another good guy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy “The Greek” Snyder</td>
<td>“The black is the better athlete and he practices to be the better athlete, and he’s bred to be the better athlete because this goes way back to the slave period. The slave owner would breed this big black with this big black woman so she could have a big black kid. That’s where it all started.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusty Baker</td>
<td>“Personally, I like to play in the heat. Most Latin people and minority people do. You don’t find too many brothers from New Hampshire or Main, right? We were brought over here because we could work in the heat—isn’t that history? Your skin is more conducive to heat than it is to the lighter-skinned people. I don’t see brothers running around burnt. That’s a fact. I’m not making this up. I’m not seeing some brothers walking around with some white stuff on their ears and noses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hornung</td>
<td>“We can’t stay as strict as we are as far as the academic structure is concerned because we’ve got to get the black athlete. We must get the black athlete if we are going to compete.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Parcells</td>
<td>“Mike wants the defense to do well, and Sean, he’s going to have a few...no disrespect for the Orientals, but what we call Jap plays. Ok, surprise things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Limbaugh</td>
<td>“I think what we’ve had here is a little social concern in the NFL. The media has been very desirous that a black quarterback do well. There is a little hope invested in McNabb, and he got a lot of credit for the performance of this team that he didn’t deserve. The defense carried this team.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Bird</td>
<td>“The one thing that always bothered me when I played in the NBA was I got irritated when they put a white guy on me. I still don’t understand why. As far as playing I didn’t care who guarded me—red, yellow, black. I just didn’t want a white guy guarding me. Because it’s a disrespect to my game.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rocker</td>
<td>“The biggest thing I don’t like about New York are the foreigners. I’m not a very big fan of foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher DeBerry</td>
<td>“Afro-American kids can run very, very well. That doesn’t mean Caucasian kids and other descents can’t run but it’s obvious to me they run extremely well.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter provides the results of the study conducted and is organized around the eight hypotheses proposed in Chapter 1. Means and frequency statistics were collected for each quotation for comparison between the two conditions and between males and females.

Descriptive Statistics

Means allowed the researcher to compare quotations that were separated by the different conditions (source present, source absent) and also to compare quotations inside of each condition. The following are the means for each quotation based on the seven point Likert Scale described in Chapter 3. In addition, the percentage of subjects that found each quotation to be objectionable, offensive, or racist is also listed.

Professional golfer Fuzzy Zoeller was the source of the first quotation, although that was not known in the second condition. The overall mean for this first quotation was 5.75. In the condition where the source was present, 80.9% of subjects found the quotation to be objectionable. When the source was not present, 83.5% of subjects found the quotation to be objectionable. In terms of racist-ness when the source was present, 91% of subjects found the quotation to be racist; when the source was not present, 91.8% of subjects found the quotation to be racist. When subjects knew the source, 84.5% found the quotation to be offensive. When the source was unknown, 89% of the subjects found the quotation to be offensive.

Former baseball executive Al Campanis was the source of the second quotation and the overall mean for this quotation (x =
6.18) was the highest for any quotation. When the source was present, 86.3% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable. When the source was absent, 88.1% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable. In terms of racist-ness when the source was present, 92.7% of subjects rated the quotation as racist, which was the exact same percentage as when the subject was absent. For offensiveness, 91.8% of subjects in which the source was present, rated the quotation as offensive. When the source was absent, 90.8% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive.

Former professional basketball player and current president of the New York Knicks, Isiah Thomas, was the source of the third quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 4.98. When the source was present, 65.5% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable; that percentage dropped to 63.3% when the source was absent. For racist-ness, 72.7% of subjects rated the quotation to be racist when the source was present. When the source was not present, 68.8% of subjects believed the quotation to be racist. For offensiveness, when the source was present, 57.3% of subjects believed the quotation was racist, whereas 59.7% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive when the source was not present.

Former CBS Analyst Jimmy “the Greek” Snyder was the source of the fourth quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 5.70. In terms of objectionable, when the quotation source was present, 86.3% of subjects found the quotation to be objectionable, that percentage dropped to 75.2% when the source was not present. When the source was present, 82.7% of subjects rated the quotation as racist; 79% of source absent subjects rated the quotation as racist. For offensiveness, 81.8% of subjects where the source was present found the quotation to be
offensive; 80.7% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive when the source was absent.

Former professional baseball player and current manager of the Chicago Cubs, Dusty Baker, was the source of the fifth quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 4.61. In terms of how objectionable subjects found the quotation to be, 50.1% of subjects where the source was present found the quotation to be objectionable, when the source was absent 59.6% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable. When the quotation source was present, 48.2% of subjects rated the quotation as racist, but when the source was absent, 58.7% rated the quotation as racist. For offensiveness, 35.5% of subjects, where the source was present, found the quotation to be offensive. When the source was absent, the percentage of subjects who rated the quotation as offensive was higher (55.1).

Former Heisman Trophy winner and professional football player, Paul Hornung, was the source for the sixth quotation. The overall mean for the sixth quotation was 5.24. When the source was present, 72.8% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable; when the source was absent, 66.9% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable. For how racist the quotation was perceived to be, when the source was present, 79.1% of subjects rated the quotation as racist. When the source was absent, 66% of subjects found the quotation to be racist. When the quotation source was present, 71.8% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive, but when the source was absent, 64.2% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive.

Dallas Cowboys Head Coach Bill Parcells was the source of the seventh quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 5.44. For how objectionable subjects found the quotation to be, subjects where the source was present (78.2%) had a higher percentage than subjects where the source was absent (75.2%).
When the source was present, 80.9% of subjects rated the quotation as racist, but when the source was absent, 83.5% rated the quotation as racist. When the source was present, 80% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive, when the source was absent, 78.9% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive.

Political analyst and former ESPN football analyst Rush Limbaugh was the source of the eighth quotation. The overall mean for the eighth quotation was 4.33. When the source was present, 60% of subjects found the quotation to be objectionable; however, when source was absent, only 44.9% of subjects found the quotation to be objectionable. In terms of racist-ness, when the source was present, 43.7% of subjects found the quotation to be racist. When the source was absent, 45.9% of subjects found the quotation to be racist. For offensiveness, when the source was present, 46.3% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive; when the source was absent, 46.8% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive.

Former professional basketball player and current president of the Indiana Pacers, Larry Bird, was the source of the ninth quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 5.17. When the source was present, 50.9% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable, but when source was absent, 84.4% of subjects rated the quotation as objectionable. In terms of racist-ness, when the source was present, 59.1% of subjects found the quotation to be racist, but when the source was absent, 91.8% of subjects found the quotation to be racist. When the source was present, 47.3% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive, but when source was absent, 92.7% of subjects found the quotation to be offensive.

Former Major League Baseball player, John Rocker, was the source of the tenth quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 6.10. When the source was present, 90% of subjects rated
found the quotation to be objectionable; when the source was absent, 80.7% of subjects found the quotation objectionable. For racist-ness, when the source was present, 94.6% of subjects rated the quotation as racist but that percentage dropped among subjects where the source was not present (86.3%). When the quotation source was present, 91.9% of subjects rated the quotation as offensive, but when the source was absent the percentage was lower (87.1%).

Air Force Head Football Coach, Fisher DeBerry, was the source of the 11th and final quotation. The overall mean for this quotation was 3.41. Subjects where the source was present had a slightly lower percentage (32.8%) than subjects where the source was absent (33.9%) in terms of how objectionable subjects found the quotation to be. Subjects where the source was present had a higher percentage (32.7%) than subjects where the source was absent (26.6%) in terms of racist subjects found the quotation to be. For offensiveness, where the source was present, 18.1% found the quotation to be offensive; when the source was absent, 23.9% found the quotation to be offensive.

These quotations, on the whole, offered a relatively substantial range in means. The highest overall mean was quotation two, which was said by Al Campanis, at 6.18. The lowest range was for quotation 11, said by Fisher DeBerry, at 3.41. Gender means also offered a wide range, as did the overall range of frequency percentages. Table 2 on the following page has the means for each gender for each quotation, depending on the condition and on the whole. Tables 3, 4, and 5 report frequencies for each quotation, separated by condition and dependent variable (objectionable, racist, offensive).
Table 2 – Gender Results
*The entire quotations can be found in Table 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Survey 1 Mean</th>
<th>Survey 2 Mean</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That little boy...&quot;</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(Blacks) may not...&quot;</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If (Larry) Bird...&quot;</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The black is...&quot;</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Personally I like to...&quot;</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We can’t stay as...&quot;</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mike wants...&quot;</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think what...&quot;</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The one thing...&quot;</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The biggest thing...&quot;</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Afro-American kids can...&quot;</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 - Objection Frequencies
*Numbers Represent Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Unobjectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUO</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Moderately Unobjectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUO</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Slightly Unobjectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Slightly Objectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Moderately Objectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Objectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>MUO</th>
<th>SUO</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>MUO</th>
<th>SUO</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>OB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That little boy is...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(Blacks) may not...&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If (Larry) Bird...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The black is...&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Personally I like to...&quot;</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We can’t stay as...&quot;</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mike wants...&quot;</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think what&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The one thing...&quot;</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The biggest thing&quot;</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Afro-American kids can...&quot;</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4- Racism Frequencies
*Numbers Represent Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>MNR</th>
<th>SNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>MNR</th>
<th>SNR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That little boy is...&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(Blacks) may not...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If (Larry) Bird...&quot;</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The black is...&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Personally I like to...&quot;</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We can’t stay as...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mike wants...&quot;</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think what...&quot;</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The one thing...&quot;</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The biggest thing...&quot;</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Afro-American kids can...&quot;</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5- Offensive Frequencies  
*Numbers Represent Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>MNF</th>
<th>SNF</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>MNF</th>
<th>SNF</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That little boy is...&quot;</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(Blacks) may not...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If (Larry) Bird...&quot;</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The black is...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Personally I like to...&quot;</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We can’t stay as...&quot;</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mike wants...&quot;</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think what...&quot;</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The one thing...&quot;</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The biggest thing...&quot;</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Afro-American kids can...&quot;</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rest of this chapter focuses on the results of the tests for each of the eight hypotheses. The first six hypotheses focused on how objectionable, racist, and offensive the quotations were perceived to be in each condition and by gender. The seventh hypothesis focuses on same-race and racism and hypothesis eight focuses on the relationship of source credibility and ratings of racism. Two-by-two ANOVAs were run to test the first seven hypotheses to check for significant differences. Correlations were going to be run to test the eighth hypothesis. However, subjects were advised not to rate the source credibility of individuals they were not familiar with, thus not enough data was able to be gathered on source credibility to accurately run the correlations. Finally, the researcher gathered a racism compilation of the three dependent variables and a reliability coefficient was run.

Objectionable-ness

The first two hypotheses focused on the dependent variable of objection.

H1: Subjects will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of how objectionable a comment is perceived to be.

H2: Males and females will significantly differ in their opinions of how objectionable the quotations are perceived to be.

A 2(source present, source absent) x 2 (male, female) ANOVA was run to test the first two hypotheses. Results indicated that there was no significant difference (F (1, 215) = .650, p <
between condition one (x=5.14) and condition two (X=5.11) regarding objectionable-ness. Results also indicated that there was no significant difference (F (1, 215) = 1.698, p < .194) between males (x = 5.04) and females (x = 5.18). No interaction effects were found.

Racism

The third and the fourth hypotheses centered on the perceptions of racism.

H3: Subjects will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of racism.

H4: Males and females will differ significantly in their interpretation of how racist the quotations are perceived to be.

A 2(source present, source absent) x 2 (male, female) ANOVA was run to test hypotheses three and four. Results indicated that there was not a significant difference between the two conditions (source present, source absent) in terms of racism (F (1, 215) = .456, p < .500). The means between the two conditions, concerning racism, were also similar. Condition one (x = 5.18), was slightly lower than condition two (x = 5.35).

A significant difference was found, however, between males’ and females’ perceptions of racism (F (1, 215) = 11.927, p < .001). Females (x = 5.40) rated the quotations as more racist than males (x = 5.02) when the source was present. In addition, females (x = 5.54) rated the quotations much more racist than the males (x = 4.94) when the source was absent.
Offensiveness

The fifth and sixth hypotheses centered on the dependent variable of offensiveness.

H5: Subjects will rate source-attached comments significantly different than source-absent comments in terms of offensiveness.

H6: Males and females will differ significantly in their interpretations of how offensive the quotations are perceived to be.

A 2(source present, source absent) x 2 (male, female) ANOVA was run to test hypotheses five and six. Results once again indicated that there was not a significant difference in terms of offensiveness between the conditions (F (1, 215) = 2.368, p < .125). The means between the two conditions were similar. Subjects where the source was present (x = 4.95) rated the quotations slightly lower than subjects when the source was not present (x = 5.2).

However, a significant difference was once again found in terms of gender (F (1, 215) = 14.753, p < .000). Females (x = 5.23) rated quotations higher than males (x = 4.79) when the source was present. When the source was absent, females (x = 5.38) also rated quotations much higher than males (x = 4.80).

Racism Compilation

A racism compilation was gathered of the three dependent variables (objectionable, racist-ness, offensive) and a
reliability coefficient was run. The results indicated a high reliability coefficient (alpha = .864).

**Same-Race Quotations**

The seventh hypothesis dealt with subjects’ reactions to comments that could be perceived as same-race racism.

H7: Comments where the sports figure and source of the comment are racially congruent will be perceived as less racist than comments where the sports figure and source of the comment are racially different.

Because the three dependant variables were of high reliability, they were combined and the composite was used to test hypothesis 7. A 2(source present, source absent) x 2 (male, female) ANOVA was run to test hypothesis seven. Results indicated that there was a significant difference between when the subject knew the target and source were racially congruent (conditional and construct when they did not know condition 2) when they were different (F (1, 215) = 42.184, p < .000). There was a significant difference between the means of condition one and condition two when the source was absent (x = 5.34) had a higher mean than when the source was present (x = 4.24).

**Summary**

Results indicated that males and females differed significantly in their perceptions of offensiveness and racism but not in objectionable-ness. Also, results indicated that among the three dependent variables (offensiveness, racist-ness, offensiveness) that significant difference did not exist among the two conditions (source present, source absent). However,
results did indicate that same-race racist comments were perceived as less racist than comments where source and target were of different races.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This study investigated audience responses to quotations from sports personalities that were deemed to hold some degree of racist-ness. The hypotheses in this project were designed to test whether source presence with qualifiers (such as ethnicity and sport affiliation) affected subjects’ impressions of racist-ness, offensiveness, and objectionable-ness. Additionally, this research tested to see whether males and females differed in their impressions. Same-race racism was taken into account as was source credibility.

This chapter is divided into four sections: research goals and findings, limitations of the study, future research, and summary/conclusions.

Research Goals and Findings

The first two hypotheses explored how source played a role in terms of objectionable-ness and how males and females rated each quotation based on this variable. In terms of the dependent variables, objectionable-ness was the only dependent variable that showed no significant difference between males and females or between the two conditions (source present, source absent). There is a possible explanation for this. As discussed in Chapter 3, these dependent variables do not mean the same thing; there is a difference in meaning between objectionable, offensiveness, and racist-ness, although they are highly related. The definition of objectionable is to cause disapproval and/or protest (Random House, 1997). This could provide the rational as to why no significant difference was found. The other two dependent variables (racist-ness, offensiveness) can
simply be feelings of discontent or discomfort. However, objectionable carries the connotation of discomfort to the point of action that something must be done. It is completely possible that subjects, although disagreeing with a quotation, did not feel that it actually hit the status of action. It is also possible that for the quotations that had high objection levels that the content was actually so bad that regardless of the source or qualifiers, there was need for some sort of action to be taken.

The third and the fourth hypotheses explored how source played a role in terms of racist-ness and how males and females differed in their rating of each quotation based on racist-ness. There was no significant difference found in terms of source was presence or absence. However, significant differences were found between males and females, especially when the source of the quotation was not present. As discussed in Chapter 2, males and females interpret information differently. Generally, females are much more likely to express concern and compassion for the well-being of others (Beutel and Marini, 1995). Females are more likely to perceive something as racist because they are more concerned with the well-being of other people. The difference between males and females was more significant when the source of the quotation was not present, indicating that the findings of Beutel and Marini hold true. In the second condition, subjects had only the content of the quotation to work with and males were much less likely to find a quotation overtly racist than females. Males tend to focus more on the content of a comment while females focus on the relationship dimensions of the communication (cf. Pearson, West, & Turner, 1995; Wood, 1994; Ivy and Backlund, 2000). This finding would explain why the differences were greater when the source was absent because
males are still focusing on content and females are relating the communication to a person or group of people.

The fifth and sixth hypotheses explored how source played a role in terms of offensiveness and how males and females differed in their rating of each quotation based on offensiveness. Once again, there was not a significant difference found between source present and source absent. There was, however, a significant difference found between males and females. This difference was once again more significant when the source of the quotation was absent. The offensiveness variable is more similar to the racist variable than the objectionable variable. Due to the similarity between offensiveness and racist-ness, it was expected that if significant difference was present for one that it would be present for the other. The objectionable variable could be perceived as bad to the point of action but the other two variables can be perceptions of feeling. Females are more likely to perceive a quotation as offensive because they are more compassionate and will be more likely to perceive a comment as offensive whereas males will focus more on the content of the quotation.

The seventh hypothesis explored how subjects would perceive same-race racism. Significant differences were found between the source present condition and the source absent condition indicating that subjects perceive same-race racism to be significantly less racist. This study aimed to investigate the content of comments and to investigate whether contextual factors weigh in to subjects’ perceptions of racism. This study had two quotations that could be perceived as same-race racism and these were the best avenue to test how contextual factors affect the perceptions of all three dependent variables. Larry Bird was the source of one of the quotations and Dusty Baker was
the source of the other quotation. These quotation ratings were combined and significant differences were found. Subjects found the comments much less racist when they knew the race of the individual. It is common for people to believe that it is okay to criticize one’s own race. Studies have also shown a propensity for individuals inside one’s own race to use offensive/racist language. In the article, Deniggerification? N-Word Debate Rages Eternal (2006), Arinde wrote how the word “nigger” has become a form of hip-hop lingo. In this article, a man on trial for injuring a black man with a baseball bat had first called the man a nigger. The accused claimed that he was not a racist, just using a new form of hip-hop lingo (Arinde, 2006). Al Sharpton took it upon himself to try to end the use of the word nigger in everyday language but admitted that he used it in private situations and that it must stop even in black-only situations (Arinde, 2006). Writer and director Keith Beauchamp admitted that he also used the word the same way that many “black folks” do (Arinde, 2006). Other evidence from this article indicated that young blacks think of the word nigger as a term of endearment while the majority of older blacks think of it as offensive (Arinde, 2006). The point was that black leaders believe the use of the word has gotten out of control to where a hate crime, like the man mentioned was on trial for, can bring a defense of using hip-hop lingo (Arinde, 2006). Sharpton claimed that if the jury bought the defense’s stance that the word “nigger” has become lingo, then it would legitimize racism (Arinde, 2006). Either way, the relative acceptability of using racial terms inside one’s own race (in this case using the word nigger) has spilled into everyday society with the possibility that it could be known as lingo. Accepting racist terms inside one’s own race can affect society if the use of that term gets
out of control. However, it does explain, in part, why same race comments would be judged as less offensive.

**Limitations of the Study**

There were limitations to this study; most predominant was the use of college students as subjects for this study. Several of these quotations were said a number of years ago and the overall young age of the population (X = 19.6) meant that the majority of subjects often were too young to have experienced the quotations at the time of occurrence. Also, the use of college students as subjects meant that on the whole the subjects’ responses were similar to one another. Therefore, the sample was not representative of the general population. A broader sample of individuals would aid in a clearer exploration of perceptions of the three dependent variables when source was present to when it was absent. Also, a broader sample would offer a better exploration of how males and females interpreted the quotations among different age ranges.

Another limitation of this study was gender. There was a great disparity between the number of males and number of females that participated. Of the total number of subjects, 79 were male and 140 were female. If the number of males and females were more equal it could offer a better analysis. Significant differences were found among two of the three dependent variables. This difference could have been greater or lesser if there were a more equal ratio of males to females. An equal number of males and females could have offered different results and perhaps a better overall analysis of how males and females interpreted each quotation.

The ethnicities of the subjects were another limitation of the study. In order to properly analyze subjects’ perceptions of
racism, a more racially representative sample would be better. In this study, 90% of subjects were Caucasian, while Asians were the next highest represented ethnicity at 3.2%. It would be better for purpose of analysis to have a subject population that better mirrors the general population. Results would be more representative if the racial breakdown was more consistent.

A lack of in-depth sports knowledge was another limitation to the study. Overall, 90% of subjects identified themselves as sports fans. However, there was a clear lack of in-depth sports knowledge. The eighth hypothesis required that subjects rate each quotation source on his credibility to see if source credibility was inversely related to racism. This hypothesis could not be tested because subjects, on the whole, did not know enough of the people in the study to rate them on credibility. Therefore, on the whole a subject population with more knowledge of sports could offer clearer results in perceptions of racism when the source was present in comparison to the source credibility of each individual in the study to see if these are inversely related.

A final limitation to the study was the sample size. There were 219 subjects in this study. A larger sample would offer more solid results and could also give the researcher more leeway. If a larger sample was gathered, it would have been possible for the researcher to test the eighth hypothesis because then enough subjects could have rated the source credibility of the individuals in the study to check for the relationship between source credibility and racism.

**Direction for Future Research**

This research tested the relationship between source presence and racism amongst several different sports quotations.
Also, it looked at how males and females differed on their perceptions of these quotations and how subjects perceive same-race racism. This research can be expanded in different ways.

As discussed in Chapter 2, reactions to these quotations varied as did the consequences of the source of each quotation. However, subjects rated the majority of the quotations similarly. One area this research can be expanded is through the framework of apologia. Ware and Linkugel (1973) define apologia as a genre of discourse characterized by the theme of accusation followed by apology, which serves as verbal self-defense. Benoit (1995) renamed apologia to image restoration because in cases of apologia the individual is not simply apologizing but is rather trying to restore a favorable image to the public. Benoit also argued that there are five techniques that individuals employ in apologia. The five strategies are denial, avoidance of responsibility, offensiveness reduction, corrective action, and mortification. Different situations call for different strategies and at times for multiple strategies depending on public backlash. This research branches well into apologia because a possible explanation for the different consequences for the individuals who said each quotation can be linked to apologia. As discussed in Chapter 2, some of the individuals used in this study lost their careers over what they said, while others had very little happen to them. Individuals in this study who did not lose their careers may have engaged in some type of apologia. The people in this study who lost their careers, like Al Campanis, did not appear to engage in any type of apologia. Future research could focus on what types of apologia are more effective than others and when events call for more than one type of apologia. Additionally, there could be a focus on the necessity for apologia and the different outcomes.
of those people who fail to engage in apologia when viewed negatively by the public.

Another way this research can be expanded is through the joint theoretical frameworks of Elaboration Likelihood Model and Agenda Setting. The central tenets of ELM are the different ways that people process information. ELM posits that people process information either centrally or peripherally. When people process information centrally they are actually evaluating information to make a decision on how they feel about what was done or said. When people process information peripherally they do not cognitively evaluate information but rather make a decision based on some other factor. One of these factors can be that they saw it on television or read it in a newspaper or some other form of media. People tend to process information peripherally, but when that is the case, in a media sense, they are accepting what they hear in the media as truth without consciously evaluating a quotation or event. This moves into agenda setting which is defined as the media’s attempt to shape public opinion by putting emphasis on some issues while giving other issues little or no attention. In addition, the vehemence with which a story, event, or quotation is emphasized can work to shape the public’s opinion, especially when people are peripherally processing information.

Although hypothesis 8 could not be tested, because subjects on the whole were not familiar enough with the individuals used in the study, the quotations were rated similarly, for the most part, by subjects. The majority of the quotations subjects felt they were equally objectionable, offensive, and racist. The consequences in reality were much different for some of the individuals involved but subjects were not aware of that.

Future research could focus on a couple of different elements. First of all, perceptions of subjects’ knowledge on
Agenda Setting could be tested. It is possible that people are influenced by the media without actually knowing it. That notion could be expanded through research in people’s complicit-ness in allowing the media to set their agenda; do people actually care that the media sets their agenda? Finally, this research could lead to testing how important or serious a situation must be before people will centrally process the information. The subjects in this study for the most part felt similarly about the quotations they were reading but had little knowledge about the people or situation surrounding the quotation. Future work could focus on at what point people actually take the time to evaluate a situation without taking it at the media-imposed face-value.

Finally, this research could lead to a similar study that is analyzed from a qualitative standpoint. This research presented quotations in two conditions (source-present, source-absent) and asked subjects to evaluate these quotations based on three dependent variables (objection, racist-ness, offensiveness). Differences were found but this research did not focus on specifically where those differences were and how that differed between males and females. Future research could analyze the elements that make subjects believe that something is more or less racist.

Conclusion

Racism is ever-present in American life including sports. As of yet, there exist no consistent measures for evaluating racism and responses to racist quotations from sports personalities vary case-by-case. This research showed a consistent rating among the majority of the quotations, but in actuality, the 20 different sources used in this study faced
varying degrees of consequences for what they said. At a minimum, this research indicates that elements other than the content of a quotation affect the response it will receive from the media and the public. The most significant difference was found between males and females for two of the dependent variables (racist-ness, offensiveness) and perceptions of same-race racism among the two conditions (source-present, source-absent). This study brought attention to inconsistencies in American interpretation of sports racism; contextual factors weigh into the equation. Extending this research to include a more diverse audience in terms of both ethnicity and age could improve our understanding of how people perceive racist statements in American sports. This research offers a launching pad for a deeper analysis of perceptions of racism in American sports.
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Appendix A:

Survey 1

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as accurately as possible.

Gender (Please circle one): Male   Female

Year in School (Please circle one): Freshman   Sophomore   Junior   Senior

Age (List): __________

What is your Ethnicity? (Please circle one):
Caucasian   African-American   Asian   Latino   Indian   Other

Are you a sports fan? (Please circle one): Yes   No

If yes, what is your favorite sport? (Please list): __________

Likert Scale Measuring Racism

Instructions: Rate each of the following quotations on a scale from “1-7” based on how racist you believe each statement is. A “1” rating indicates a quotation that is non-racist or unobjectionable. A “7” rating indicates a quotation that is objectionable or very racist. After rating the comment, please evaluate the source credibility of the person if you can.

1. Fuzzy Zoeller (Caucasian, Male, Professional Golfer) - “That little boy (Tiger Woods) is driving well and he’s putting well. He’s doing everything it takes to win. So, you know what you guys do when he gets in here? You pat him on the back and say congratulations and enjoy it and tell him not to serve fried chicken next year. Got it? Or collard greens or whatever the hell they serve.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unobjectionable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Objectionable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Racist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-Offensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you know who Fuzzy Zoeller is? Yes   No

If no, then skip to the second person.

Sociability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good-natured</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Irritable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gloomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extroversion
- Timid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold
- Verbal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet
- Talkative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent

Competence
- Expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert
- Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent
- Intellectual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow

Composure
- Poised 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous
- Tense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed
- Calm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious

Character
- Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
- Unsympathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic
- Pleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant
- Awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice
- Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

2. Al Campanis (Caucasian, Male, Former Professional Baseball Player and Executive)- "(Blacks) may not have some of the necessities to be, let’s say, a field manager, or perhaps a general manager."

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

Do you know who Al Campanis is? Yes No

If no, then skip to the third person.

Sociability
- Good-natured 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable
- Cheerful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy
- Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly

Extroversion
- Timid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold
- Verbal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet
- Talkative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent

Competence
- Expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert
- Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent
- Intellectual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow
### Composure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poised  | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nervous
Tense   | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Relaxed
Calm    | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Anxious

### Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dishonest | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Honest
Unsympathetic | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Sympathetic
Pleasant | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unpleasant
Awful | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nice
Good | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bad

3. **Isiah Thomas (African-American, Former Professional Basketball Player and Current President of the New York Knicks)**—“If (Larry) Bird was black he’d be just another good guy.”

Unobjectionable | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Objectionable
Non-Racist | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Racist
Not-Offensive | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Offensive

Do you know who Isiah Thomas is?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the fourth person.

### Sociability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good-natured | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Irritable
Cheerful | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Gloomy
Unfriendly | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Friendly

### Extroversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timid | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bold
Verbal | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Quiet
Talkative | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Silent

### Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expert | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Inexpert
Unintelligent | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Intelligent
Intellectual | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Narrow

### Composure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poised | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nervous
Tense | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Relaxed
Calm | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Anxious

### Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dishonest | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Honest
Unsympathetic | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Sympathetic
Pleasant | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unpleasant
Awful | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nice
Good | 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bad
4. Jimmy the Greek Snyder (Former CBS Sports Commentator) - “The black is the better athlete and he practices to be the better athlete, and he’s bred to be the better athlete because this goes way back to the slave period. The slave owner would breed this big black with this big black woman so she could have a big black kid. That’s where it all started.”

Do you know who Jimmy the Greek Snyder is? Yes No

If no, then skip to the fifth person.

Sociability
- Good-natured
- Cheerful
- Unfriendly

Extroversion
- Timid
- Verbal
- Talkative

Competence
- Expert
- Unintelligent
- Intellectual

Composure
- Poised
- Tense
- Calm

Character
- Dishonest
- Unsympathetic
- Pleasant
- Awful
- Good
5. **Dusty Baker (African-American, Male, Former Professional Baseball Player, Current Manager of the Chicago Cubs)** - “Personally, I like to play in the heat. Most Latin people and minority people do. You don’t find too many brothers from New Hampshire or Maine, right? We were brought over here because we could work in the heat — isn’t that history? Your skin is more conducive to heat than it is to the lighter-skinned people. I don’t see brothers running around burnt. That’s a fact. I’m not making this up. I’m not seeing some brothers walking around with some white stuff on their ears and noses.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unobjectionable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Objectionable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Racist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-Offensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you know who Dusty Baker is? **Yes**  **No**

If no, then skip to the sixth person.

**Sociability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good-natured</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Irritable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gloomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extroversion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timid</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Bold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Silent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Inexpert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poised</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Paul Hornung (Caucasian, Male, Former Heisman Trophy Winner at Notre Dame, Former Professional Football Player)- “We can’t stay as strict as we are as far as the academic structure is concerned because we’ve got to get the black athlete. We must get the black athlete if we are going to compete.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

Do you know who Paul Hornung is? Yes No

If no, then skip to the seventh person.

Sociability
Good-natured 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable
Cheerful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy
Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly

Extroversion
Timid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold
Verbal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet
Talkative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent

Competence
Expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert
Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent
Intellectual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow

Composure
Poised 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous
Tense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed
Calm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious

Character
Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
Unsympathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic
Pleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant
Awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice
Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

7. Bill Parcells (Caucasian, Male, Head Coach of the Dallas Cowboys)- “Mike wants the defense to do well, and Sean, he’s going to have a few...no disrespect for the Orientals, but what we call Jap plays. Ok, surprise things.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive
Do you know who Bill Parcells is?  Yes  No

If no then skip to the eighth person.

Sociability
Good-natured  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Irritable
Cheerful     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Gloomy
Unfriendly   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Friendly

Extroversion
Timid        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bold
Verbal       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Quiet
Talkative    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Silent

Competence
Expert       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Inexpert
Unintelligent 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Intelligent
Intellectual 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Narrow

Composure
Poised       1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nervous
Tense        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Relaxed
Calm         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Anxious

Character
Dishonest    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Honest
Unsympathetic 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unsympathetic
Pleasant     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unpleasant
Awful        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nice
Good         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bad

8. Rush Limbaugh (Caucasian, Male, Political Radio Personality, Former Talent on NFL Sunday Countdown on ESPN)- “I think what we’ve had here is a little social concern in the NFL. The media has been very desirous that a black quarterback do well. There is a little hope invested in McNabb, and he got a lot of credit for the performance of this team that he didn’t deserve. The defense carried this team.”

Unobjectionable 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Objectionable
Non-Racist      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Racist
Not-Offensive   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Offensive

Do you know who Rush Limbaugh is?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the ninth person.
### Sociability
- Good-natured: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Irritable)
- Cheerful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Gloomy)
- Unfriendly: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Friendly)

### Extroversion
- Timid: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Bold)
- Verbal: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Quiet)
- Talkative: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Silent)

### Competence
- Expert: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Inexpert)
- Unintelligent: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Intelligent)
- Intellectual: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Narrow)

### Composure
- Poised: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Nervous)
- Tense: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Relaxed)
- Calm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Anxious)

### Character
- Dishonest: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Honest)
- Unsympathetic: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Sympathetic)
- Pleasant: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Unpleasant)
- Awful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Nice)
- Good: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Bad)

9. **Larry Bird** (Caucasian, Male, Former Professional Basketball Player, Current President of the Indiana Pacers) - "The one thing that always bothered me when I played in the NBA was I got irritated when they put a white guy on me. I still don’t understand why. As far as playing I didn’t care who guarded me—red, yellow, black. I just didn’t want a white guy guarding me. Because it’s a disrespect to my game."

Unobjectionable: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Offensive)
Non-Racist: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Racist)
Not-Offensive: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Offensive)

Do you know who Larry Bird is?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the tenth person.

### Sociability
- Good-natured: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Irritable)
- Cheerful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Gloomy)
- Unfriendly: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Friendly)
10. **John Rocker (Caucasian, Male, Former Professional Baseball Player)**

"The biggest thing I don’t like about New York are the foreigners. I’m not a very big fan of foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?"

Do you know who John Rocker is?

If no, then do not fill out this scale.

---

**Extroversion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tied</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poised</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sociability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good-natured</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Extroversion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tied</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Fisher DeBerry (Caucasian, Male, Head Football Coach at Air Force) - “Afro-American kids can run very, very well. That doesn’t mean Caucasian kids and other descents can’t run but it’s obvious to me they run extremely well.”

Do you know who Fisher DeBerry is? Yes No

If no, then skip this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:

Survey 2

Instructions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

Gender (Please circle one): Male Female

Year in School (Please circle one): Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

Age (List): ___________

What is your Ethnicity? (Please circle one): Caucasian African-American Asian Latino Indian Other

Are you a sports fan? (Please circle one): Yes No

If yes, what is your favorite sport? (Please list): ___________

Likert Scale Measuring Racism

Instructions: Rate each of the following quotations on a scale from “1-7” based on how racist you believe each statement is. A “1” rating indicates a quotation that is non-racist or unobjectionable. A “7” rating indicates a quotation that is objectionable or very racist.

1. “That little boy (Tiger Woods) is driving well and he’s putting well. He’s doing everything it takes to win. So, you know what you guys do when he gets in here? You pat him on the back and say congratulations and enjoy it and tell him not to serve fried chicken next year. Got it? Or collard greens or whatever the hell they serve.”

   Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
   Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
   Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

2. “(Blacks) may not have some of the necessities to be, let’s say, a field manager, or perhaps a general manager.”

   Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
   Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
   Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive
3. “If (Larry) Bird was black he’d be just another good guy.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

4. “The black is the better athlete and he practices to be the better athlete, and he’s bred to be the better athlete because this goes way back to the slave period. The slave owner would breed this big black with this big black woman so she could have a big black kid. That’s where it all started.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

5. “Personally, I like to play in the heat. Most Latin people and minority people do. You don’t find too many brothers from New Hampshire or Main, right? We were brought over here because we could work in the heat—isn’t that history? Your skin is more conducive to heat than it is to the lighter-skinned people. I don’t see brothers running around burnt. That’s a fact. I’m not making this up. I’m not seeing some brothers walking around with some white stuff on their ears and noses.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

6. “We can’t stay as strict as we are as far as the academic structure is concerned because we’ve got to get the black athlete. We must get the black athlete if we are going to compete.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive

7. “Mike wants the defense to do well, and Sean, he’s going to have a few…no disrespect for the Orientals, but what we call Jap plays. Ok, surprise things.”

Unobjectionable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Objectionable
Non-Racist 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Racist
Not-Offensive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Offensive
8. “I think what we’ve had here is a little social concern in the NFL. The media has been very desirous that a black quarterback do well. There is a little hope invested in McNabb, and he got a lot of credit for the performance of this team that he didn’t deserve. The defense carried this team.”

| Unobjectionable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Objectionable |
| Non-Racist      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Racist         |
| Not-Offensive   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Offensive      |

9. “The one thing that always bothered me when I played in the NBA was I got irritated when they put a white guy on me. I still don’t understand why. As far as playing I didn’t care who guarded me—red, yellow, black. I just didn’t want a white guy guarding me. Because it’s a disrespect to my game.”

| Unobjectionable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Objectionable |
| Non-Racist      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Racist         |
| Not-Offensive   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Offensive      |

10. “The biggest thing I don’t like about New York are the foreigners. I’m not a very big fan of foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?”

| Unobjectionable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Objectionable |
| Non-Racist      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Racist         |
| Not-Offensive   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Offensive      |

11. “Afro-American kids can run very, very well. That doesn’t mean Caucasian kids and other descents can’t run but it’s obvious to me they run extremely well.”

| Unobjectionable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Objectionable |
| Non-Racist      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Racist         |
| Not-Offensive   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Offensive      |
Source Credibility

Instructions: On the scales below, please indicate your feelings about the following ten public figures. Circle the number between the adjectives which best represents your feelings about each person. Numbers “1” and “7” indicate a very strong feeling. Numbers “2” and “6” indicate a strong feeling. Numbers “3” and “5” indicate a fairly weak feeling. Number “4” indicates you are undecided or do not understand the adjectives themselves. Please work quickly. There are no right or wrong answers.

Person #1: Bill Parcells

Do you know Bill Parcells? Yes No

If no, then skip to the second person.

Sociability
- Good-natured: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable
- Cheerful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy
- Unfriendly: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly

Extroversion
- Timid: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold
- Verbal: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet
- Talkative: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent

Competence
- Expert: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert
- Unintelligent: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent
- Intellectual: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow

Composure
- Poised: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous
- Tense: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed
- Calm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious

Character
- Dishonest: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
- Unsympathetic: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic
- Pleasant: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant
- Awful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice
- Good: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

Person #2: Al Campanis

Do you know Al Campanis? Yes No

If no, then skip to the third person.
Sociability
Good-natured  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Irritable
Cheerful      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Gloomy
Unfriendly    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Friendly

Extroversion
Timid         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bold
Verbal        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Quiet
Talkative     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Silent

Competence
Expert        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Inexpert
Unintelligent 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Intelligent
Intellectual  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Narrow

Composure
Poised        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nervous
Tense         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Relaxed
Calm          1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Anxious

Character
Dishonest     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Honest
Unsympathetic 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Sympathetic
Pleasant      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unpleasant
Awful         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Nice
Good          1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bad

Person #3: Rush Limbaugh
Do you know Rush Limbaugh? Yes No
If no, then skip to the fourth person.

Sociability
Good-natured  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Irritable
Cheerful      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Gloomy
Unfriendly    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Friendly

Extroversion
Timid         1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Bold
Verbal        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Quiet
Talkative     1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Silent

Competence
Expert        1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Inexpert
Unintelligent 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Intelligent
Intellectual  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Narrow
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composure</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person #4: Fuzzy Zoeller

Do you know Fuzzy Zoeller? Yes No

If no, then skip to the fifth person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extroversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timid</td>
<td>Bold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Inexpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composure</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person #5: Isiah Thomas

Do you know Isiah Thomas? Yes No

If no, then skip to the sixth person.
| Sociability       | Good-natured | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Irritable   | Cheerful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Gloomy  | Unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Friendly |
| Extroversion      | Timid        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bold        | Verbal   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Quiet    | Talkative | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Silent   |
|                   |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| Competence        | Expert       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Inexpert    | Unintelligent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Intelligent | Intellectual | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Narrow |
|                   |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| Composure         | Poised       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Nervous     | Tense    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Relaxed  | Calm       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Anxious  |
|                   |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| Character         | Dishonest    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Honest      | Unsympathetic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Sympathetic | Pleasant   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unpleasant |
|                   | Unpleasant   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Nice        | Awful    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Nice      | Good       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bad      |

**Person #6: Jimmy the Greek Snyder**

Do you know Jimmy the Greek Snyder?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the seventh person.

| Sociability       | Good-natured | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Irritable   | Cheerful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Gloomy  | Unfriendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Friendly |
| Extroversion      | Timid        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bold        | Verbal   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Quiet    | Talkative | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Silent   |
|                   |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| Competence        | Expert       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Inexpert    | Unintelligent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Intelligent | Intellectual | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Narrow |
|                   |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
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### Composure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poised</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Calm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Unsympathetic</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
<th>Awful</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Person #7: Paul Hornung**

Do you know Paul Hornung?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the eighth person.

### Sociability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good-natured</th>
<th>Cheerful</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extroversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timid</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Talkative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Unintelligent</th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelegent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Composure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poised</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Calm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Unsympathetic</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
<th>Awful</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Person 8: Dusty Baker**

Do you know this person?  Yes  No

If no, then skip to the ninth person.
### Sociability
- Good-natured: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Irritable)
- Cheerful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Gloomy)
- Unfriendly: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Friendly)

### Extroversion
- Timid: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Bold)
- Verbal: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Quiet)
- Talkative: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Silent)

### Competence
- Expert: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Inexpert)
- Unintelligent: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Intelligent)
- Intellectual: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Narrow)

### Composure
- Poised: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Nervous)
- Tense: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Relaxed)
- Calm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Anxious)

### Character
- Dishonest: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Honest)
- Unsympathetic: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Sympathetic)
- Pleasant: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Unpleasant)
- Awful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Nice)
- Good: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Bad)

**Person #9: Larry Bird**

Do you know Larry Bird? Yes No

If no, then skip to the tenth person.

### Sociability
- Good-natured: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Irritable)
- Cheerful: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Gloomy)
- Unfriendly: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Friendly)

### Extroversion
- Timid: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Bold)
- Verbal: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Quiet)
- Talkative: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Silent)

### Competence
- Expert: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Inexpert)
- Unintelligent: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Intelligent)
- Intellectual: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (Narrow)
Composure
Poised 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous
Tense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed
Calm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious

Character
Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
Unsympathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic
Pleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant
Awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice
Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

Person #10: John Rocker
Do you know John Rocker? Yes No
If no, then skip to the 11th person.

Sociability
Good-natured 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Irritable
Cheerful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gloomy
Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Friendly

Extroversion
Timid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bold
Verbal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Quiet
Talkative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Silent

Competence
Expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inexpert
Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intelligent
Intellectual 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Narrow

Composure
Poised 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nervous
Tense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relaxed
Calm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxious

Character
Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Honest
Unsympathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sympathetic
Pleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unpleasant
Awful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Nice
Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad

Person #11: Fisher DeBerry
Do you know Fisher DeBerry? Yes No
If no, then do not fill out this portion of the survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sociability</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good-natured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Extroversion</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Competence</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Composure</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Character</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>