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Abstract

This study expands upon the study of racial stereotyping through looking at the realm of professional sports. An athlete’s race, the sport an athlete plays, and the crime the athlete commits were all investigated to determine whether racial stereotyping plays a role in verdict and sentencing decisions. Participants were exposed to one of eight vignettes in a 2 (Race: White or Black) X 2 (Sport played: professional football or professional soccer) X 2 (Crime: sexual assault or performance enhancing drug use) design. The dependent variables measured are classified as “seriousness, guilt, and responsibility” and “sentencing.” Results from this study show that racial stereotyping does still play a role in terms of sentencing. While most of the hypotheses are partially supported, there is no full support of any one hypothesis. Data was expected to support the hypotheses that black athletes will be more harshly punished than white athletes. Results showed that there was a significant 3-way interaction on the variable “seriousness of crime” \( p < .05; F(1, 151) = 5.20 \). The independent variable of crime type had a significant main effect on all of the variables excluding monetary fine and the sport violence variables \( p < .05 \) for all. However, the direction of this effect differed per dependent variable. Race of the athlete only had a main effect on the variable of monetary fine \( p < .05 \) in the direction of white athletes. No pattern was found in the results suggesting that perhaps participants may have responded opposite to racial biases.

*Keywords*: stereotyping, crime, punishment

Whether people acknowledge prejudices or not, negative stereotypes exist. Unfortunately, the same prejudices that are manifested in everyday life, are also active in the judicial realm. Stereotypes change the way police officers and probation officers look at defendants in juvenile cases (Graham & Lowery, 2004). Can it be assumed that older defendants will be shown the same prejudice based upon race? Graham and Lowery (2004) state that there is, in fact, racial prejudice against the adolescents who have committed an offense. These results give insight into what officers and (potentially) the general public think about racial (Black in Graham and Lowerys’ 2004 study) minorities who have been arrested for committing a crime. It is logical to think that an officer who discriminates (knowingly or unknowingly) against an adolescent will discriminate against an adult as well. However, there seems to be a protective “shield” for athletes in the legal realm, since certain crimes they commit are thought to be within the nature of the sport itself (Gee & Potwarka, 2007). Thus, while there are clear racial biases against minorities; Gee and Potwarka (2007) argue that some sports which are violent in nature allow for aggressive behavior. Ideally, this behavior should be punished, but usually do not apply vigorous enough punishments.

Examples of current legal cases involving athletes are Aaron Hernandez (football), Lance Armstrong (cycling), and Tiger Woods (golf). The offenses committed vary from Hernandez’s murder charge (Armstrong, 2013), Armstrong’s performance enhancing drug (PED) use (Wilson, 2013), and Woods’ sexual infidelity scandal (“Cocktail Waitress,” 2009). In the Hernandez case, he was convicted and put into
custody fairly quickly, disregarding his stature as a professional athlete and public figure (Armstrong, 2013). Did his race – Latino – have any significant importance in terms of sentencing and sympathy in the media portrayal and judicial hearings? Armstrong, who survived testicular cancer (Livestrong Foundation) and won seven Tour de France gold medals was also caught for using PEDs (Wilson, 2013). However, public backlash toward Armstrong’s PED use did not seem to be as great as it was for other athletes (such as baseball players) who have been guilty of the same crime (Fainaru-Wada & Williams, 2006). These baseball players vary in race and nationality; some names include, but are not limited to: Jason Giambi and allegedly, Barry Bonds (Fainaru-Wada & Williams, 2006). Public response to athlete scandals do seem to align with negative stereotyping, which points toward an athlete’s race, position in the sport, and potentially the sport itself as factors which ultimately effect public perception. Finally, in the case of Woods, is his race a factor in the media portrayal and legal sentencing? While Woods was involved in a horrendous sex scandal with numerous women, he clearly is not the only athlete or public figure who has allegedly committed a similar offense (Creed, 2011). The following research will confirm the existence of stereotypes and their effects on sentencing – suggesting that minorities face harsher punishments. Such stereotyping would suggest that white athletes are thought of as less threatening (in terms of crime) than are black athletes. Furthermore, the sport an athlete plays should not necessarily have any bearing on punishment. But, does the sport an athlete plays matter in terms of strength of punishment? Prejudices, which are real and apparent in this day and age, play a large role in the way a jury potentially punishes an individual. This study will aim to investigate
these questions about race, type of crime or offense, as well as how these factors effect a judicial sentence.

In the judicial realm, stereotyping occurs at a surprisingly high rate by those who are in authority roles in the correctional branch of the judicial system (Graham & Lowery, 2004). As previously stated, Graham and Lowery’s (2004) study is strictly focused on adolescents who either committed a robbery of $40 or an assault of a similarly aged peer. In this same study, the participants (police officers and juvenile probation officers) were primed to either racially black or neutral words. Concluding this study were the findings that the officers generally suggested stronger punishments when they were primed to the Black condition rather than the neutral condition (Graham & Lowery, 2004). Schram, Soss, Fording, and Houser (2009) performed an experiment in which they looked at racist actions of caseworkers in the American welfare system. Two vignettes were written varying the welfare recipients race (Vignette 1: White and Hispanic; Vignette 2: Black and White) and the client markers of those in the welfare system (deserving recipient or undeserving recipient). Results from this experiment revealed that both the Hispanic and Black experimental conditions were more likely to be sanctioned from welfare than were the white conditions. These results indicate prejudicial attitudes as well as stereotyping amongst caseworkers.

Johnson and Kaiser (2012) focused on the perception of black individuals in a higher socioeconomic status in the eyes of other black individuals. Stereotyping and racism are not explicit to intergroup biases, intragroup racism does exist as well. Johnson and Kaiser (2012) decided to look at the perception of racial identity in terms of socioeconomic status. In other words, does an individual’s socioeconomic bracket have
any effect in terms of intragroup racism and stereotyping (Johnson & Kaiser, 2012)? Due to racial stereotypes that Blacks are not often found at the higher levels of socioeconomic stature, a wealthy individual who is Black has a weaker racial identification than a stereotypically poor, Black individual (Johnson & Kaiser, 2012). Johnson and Kaisers’ (2012) claim that this perception of weak racial identification is a product of history in the United States. Therefore, stereotyping and racism are functions of culture. Opinions about public figures are also generally cultural. Berinsky, Hutchings, Mendelberg, Shaker, and Valentino (2011) performed an experiment regarding whether or not political candidates (White or Black) suffered more from an exposed sex scandal. This study may have been skewed due to the use of actual candidates’ names; the authors chose to use Barack Obama’s and John Edwards’ names and faces as some of their independent variables (Berinsky et al., 2011). However, Berinsky, Hutchings, Mendelberg, Shaker, and Valentino (2011) discovered that participants in the study found that a story of a sexual scandal was more negative for Obama than Edwards. Therefore, Black candidates do in fact face a more negative perception in the public eye than do White candidates (Berinsky et al., 2011). These results suggest that there is an unfair racial stereotype that Black individuals are less faithful in terms of relationships (Berinsky et al., 2011). Unnever and Cullen (2012) found similar results in their study which looked at racist attitudes toward minority groups. This experiment specifically looked at the perceptions of White individuals when they were asked if they thought Black and Hispanic individuals were more likely to be violent and how this affects support of the death penalty. Data was gathered through analyzing two years (1990 and 2000) of the General Social Survey (GSS). Data yielded results which suggest that those who thought that
Black and Hispanic individuals were more predisposed to violence also generally support the death penalty. Findings from this experiment suggest that those who have generally more “prejudicial” responses are also likely to punish people more severely (Unnever & Cullen, 2012). These findings pose that the public may suggest harsher sentencing and punishment for people belonging to minority groups.

Intragroup crimes have also been studied by Saucier, Hockett, Zanotti, and Heffel (2010). Their study focused on sentencing as related to the race of both the victim as well as the perpetrator. What is interesting is the realm in which Saucier, Hockett, Zanotti, and Heffel (2010) looked at these crimes, specifically hate crimes. The researchers wrote eight vignettes, varying the assault (simple assault and aggravated assault), the race of the perpetrator (Black or White), and the race of the target/victim (Black or White). After reading the vignettes the participants answered questions regarding how the perpetrator should be sentenced. This study seems to be loaded on one side due to the implication of hate crimes (Saucier et al., 2010). Results from this experiment show that aggravated assaults were considered to fit the moniker of “hate crime” – thus, more harshly punished; interracial crimes were more severely punished and were thought of as hate crimes. Further analysis showed that participants who ranked higher on a scale of racism also gave harsher punishments to Black perpetrators. Similar findings were found in both of these studies. But what is the reasoning? In Saucier, Hockett, and Wallenbergs’ (2008) study regarding strictly hate crimes between different racial groups (Black or White) it was found that aggravated assaults and crimes in which the White individual attacked a Black victim were given higher sentences than the opposing conditions of simple assaults or a Black perpetrator and White victim. Also, it was found that participants were more
likely to think of a crime as a “hate crime” if there was the use of a racial slur rather than profanity (Saucier et al., 2008). Maybe this is not surprising, but it does confirm that there are racial attitudes against Black perpetrators (Saucier et al., 2008). This can be extrapolated by the fact that participants in the study were more willing to order a longer sentence for a White perpetrator and Black victim; suggesting that the participants in the study assume that a serious crime committed by a White perpetrator against a Black victim is more racially charged (Saucier et al., 2008). In Saucier, Hockett, Zanotti, and Heffels’ (2010) study it was found an individual’s level of racism did, in fact, change the perception of interracial crimes. Similarly, it was found that an interracial crime was thought to be much worse than an interracial crime (Saucier et al., 2010). This same study, like the Saucier, Hockett, and Wallenberg (2008) study, found that hate crimes were more likely to have a White or Black assailant with the victim being Black or White, respectively (Saucier et al., 2010). While these studies have all looked at the racial aspects of crimes, they did not look strictly at length of punishments or sentencing nor at the effect of sports on sentencing.

Lin, Dahl, & Argos’ (2013) created three separate situations in which an individual would either be confronted and punished for a transgression, or nothing would happen (Lin et al., 2013). They found that when an individual is punished by what the authors describe as a third party, the participants were not as willing to punish the transgressor further. In terms of sports, do athletic league punishments work in the same manner as the third party reprimanding of an individual as in Lin, Dahl, & Argos’ (2013) experiment? As noted in Pepitone and DiNubiles’ (1976) study, the law is not always equal – there is always an area that is free for interpretation (Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976).
Unlike Lin, Dahl, & Argos’ (2013) study, which concluded that people will administer a punishment if they feel it is warranted; Pepitone and DiNubile (1976) compared two crimes – assault or homicide – in a variety of orders. As expected by the researchers, there was an effect in terms of seriousness of the crime and the order in which crimes were read by the participants (Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976). In general the homicide was thought to be a more serious crime than assault, however, ordering did affect the participants’ perception of severity (Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976). In the experimental conditions in which the assault vignette was read before the homicide vignette, homicide was given harsher punishments. But, in the condition which there were two homicide vignettes, the second assault was not as highly ranked in terms of severity. However, the conditions in which assault followed homicide or assault followed assault, the crime was not ranked as high in seriousness.

In terms of punishment, further studies have been conducted in which the amount of punishment has been investigated. Calseyde, Keren, and Zeelenberg (2013) looked at the effects of insurance on the amount of punishment given to an offender. In other words, does insurance on an item make a crime of theft any more or less forgivable (Calseyde et al., 2013). The authors of this experiment set up hypothetical situations, through vignettes, in which a photographer’s camera, which was either insured or uninsured, was stolen (Calseyde et al., 2013). What was found in this set of seven different experiments is that, in general, participants were harsher in terms of punishment when the uninsured camera was stolen (Calseyde et al., 2013). Interestingly, the participants also thought that the punishment should not differ strictly based upon the ownership of insurance; regardless of insurance, theft should still receive the same
punishment. Naturally, it would follow that regardless of the circumstances of a crime it should be punished equally. Individuals should not be given preferential treatment or negative treatment based upon stature or occupation.

In the realm of sports, are crimes punished equally? As discovered through many experiments, participants generally think that punishment should be equal for similar crimes (Calseyde et al., 2013); however, it has been found that there are significant discrepancies in terms of severity of sentencing or punishment (Lin et al., 2013; Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976). In Gee and Potwarkas’ (2007) study, the authors found that only very malicious acts in the realm of sports are prosecuted outside of an athlete’s league. Specifically, Gee and Potwarka analyzed the prevalence of aggressive penalties after an actual governing body prosecuted an athlete for a crime. In general, this study did provide insight into decreasing amounts of violent penalties committed by hockey players, after an incredibly violent incident was prosecuted by the attorney general of Vancouver (Gee & Potwarka, 2007). However, at the time this study was completed, the player charged with assault causing bodily harm was still playing professional hockey (Gee & Potwarka, 2007). Therefore, this crime in specific may have not been prosecuted equally since there was no immediate criminal charge, the assailant was allowed to complete the hockey season (Gee & Potwarka, 2007). It may be postulated that the assailant was treated differently due to his stature as an athlete. Further, he may have been treated differently because he participated in what is generally considered to be an incredibly violent sport (Rowe, 1998).

Many athletes who have been charged with crimes such as spousal abuse and rape participate in sports which are more violent in nature such as football, boxing, hockey,
and basketball (Rowe, 1998). Brickman (1977) suggests that the sporting world is thought of differently than the rest of society. This may suggest the idea that an athlete may be able to assault another athlete when on the athletic stage, while non-athletes cannot commit the same offenses without punishment. Since O.J. Simpson’s trial there has been a general increase in the amount of violent crimes committed by athletes (Rowe, 1998). While this fact does not indicate a correlation between the trial and crime, it does seem to introduce a trend of athletes (competing in violent sports) committing violent crimes. Rowe’s (1998) meta-analysis provides evidence that in some specific cases, athletes have not been charged for a crime they have committed. However, legal punishments, as well as sport penalties, are meant to keep an equality within society and a game (Brickman, 1977). Vokey and Russells’ (1992) study investigated penalties as a function of aggression in sports. Factors which need to be studied to measure aggression in sports – penalties – do not need to be created through experimental conditions. Thus, the authors suggested that there are definite ways to investigate aggression when looking at penalties in sports which encourage aggressive behavior. (Vokey & Russell, 1992).

This study will focus on two offenses, sexual assault and PED use. When looking at sexual assault Benavides-Espinosa and Cunnighams’ (2010) study investigates how a bystander perceives the event. Specifically, the experimenters looked at sexual harassment in a workplace scenario (Benavides-Espinosa & Cunningham, 2010). They found that in general women participants prefer far more stringent punishments (Benavides-Espinosa & Cunningham, 2010). The study did not include the concept of offenders receiving special treatment due to stature. While not typically thought of as a legal matter, PED use is against the rules of most if not all major sports leagues –
including Major League Baseball, the Olympics, the National Football League, and more (CNN Library, 2013). Furthermore, the use of PEDs has certainly increased in the sporting world in the past two decades, in terms of media coverage (CNN Library, 2013). Bloodworth, Petróczi, Bailey, Pearce, and McNamee (2012) investigated how younger athletes felt about using illegal substances in sports. Results showed that athletes do not advocate the use of PEDs (Bloodworth et al., 2012). This study gives insight into the minds of the adolescent participants (Bloodworth et al., 2012), which would suggest an overall trend that most people would find the use of PEDs unacceptable and punishable.

Also, this study will focus on the interactions between race, sports, and crime in terms of length and form of punishment. Piquero, Piquero, Gertz, Baker, Batton, and Barnes (2011) conducted an experiment in which they polled adults on their opinions of the Michael Vick dog fighting scandal. The study was conducted through phone polling. Questions from the experiment were on the topic of the severity of the punishment Vick endured and the how participants felt about the governing sports body (National Football League) responded. Results from the experiment showed that White participants were more likely to think that Vick should have been more harshly punished by the judicial system. White participants were also less likely to agree with the NFL commissioner’s decision to reinstate Vick to the league. Nonwhite participants felt that Vick’s punishment was suitable and agreed that he should have been reinstated (Piquero et al., 2011). Results from this study further suggest that racial biases exists when discussing crimes and punishments for professional athletes. Sports which are considered to be violent will be another focus of the study. Alkemeyer and Bröskamp (1996) performed a meta-analysis on the concept of racism in sports. In this analysis the authors concluded
with stating that the field of sports and racism is worth a much more in depth look and warrants future study (Alkemeyer & Bröskamp, 1996). Wagner-Egger, Gygax, and Ribordy (2012) investigated racism in soccer – in terms of the likelihood a foul would be called. Due to the findings that foul calls in soccer may not be due to race (Wagner-Egger et al., 2012), this study will use soccer as an experimental condition. Therefore, this study will also focus on the construct of race in sports.

For this study a 2 X 2 X 2 design will be used to test the hypotheses. The three independent variables are race (2 levels: Black athlete, White athlete), sport the athlete plays (2 levels: professional football, professional soccer), and the final variable is crime the athlete allegedly commits (2 levels: sexual assault, performance enhancing drug use). Thus, there will be eight total conditions in this study. Based upon the prior reviews of literature the following hypotheses are postulated: First, athletes who are Black will receive more stringent punishments than White athletes due to a construct of racism within the United States. Second, athletes who participate in more violent sports will receive more stringent punishments. Third, the crime that will be considered the worst and therefore, punished the most, will be sexual assault. Fourth, Black football players committing sexual assault will be punished more than any other athlete due to the violent nature of the sport and racial stereotyping. Fifth and finally, the least punished athlete will be a white soccer player caught using steroids due to racial biases and the concept of soccer as a more “civilized” sport.
Method

Participants

The participants for this study will be recruited in three different ways. First, participants will be solicited through the use of Sona Systems. This is an online database which Claremont McKenna College uses to allow lower-level psychology students to sign up for experiments in exchange for course credit. Participants who sign up with Sona Systems will be compensated with course credit. The second way participants will be selected is through the use of social media. A Facebook invitation will be sent out to the experimenter’s “friend list.” The invitation will contain directions regarding how to participate in the study. Individuals who complete the study via the Facebook invitation will have the option to send their email address to the experimenter in exchange for being placed a raffle. Finally, participants will also be chosen through personal solicitations. The experimenter will walk up to individuals, at random, and ask them to participate in the study. These participants will also have the option to enter into a raffle. The winner of the raffle will be compensated with a gift card of a specified amount. There was a total of 207 participants - however, 25 participants failed to complete the survey and have been omitted from data analysis. Of the remaining 182 participants (72 males, 109 females, and 1 omitted response), only those who answered the manipulation check questions correctly could be used for data analysis. The mean age of participants is 22.8 years old; with 71.4% of all participants being Caucasian, 2.2% Middle Eastern/ Indian, 15.4% Asian, 5.5% Hispanic, 2.7% Black, and 2.7% identified as “Other.” Due, to the ambiguity in the sexual assault condition, participants who answered that the alleged crime was “assault” rather than “sexual assault” are kept in data analysis. Otherwise, participants
must have correctly identified the athlete’s race and sport they played. After eliminating these participants from data analysis a total of 165 participants were available for full analysis. For personally solicited participants, individuals will be randomly assigned to one condition. Each participant receives a number which will correspond to a specific range of numbers, which in turn indicated a specific vignette and picture combination. For participants who took the online version of the study every block of 25 participants was exposed to a random condition. There were a total of 102 participants from Facebook, 71 from Sona Systems, and 9 personally solicited participants. The total distribution of participants within the conditions after data cleaning is as follows: 19 participants (condition 1), 21 participants (condition 2), 24 participants (condition 3), 19 participants (condition 4), 21 participants (condition 5), 21 participants (condition 6), 19 participants (condition 7), and 21 participants (condition 8).

Materials

This study uses vignettes, pictures, and a response form. There are two basic types of vignettes – sexual assault or performance enhancing drug use. These vignettes have been adapted from Pepitone and DiNubiles’ (1976) study which looked at both assault and homicide. Unlike the referenced study, this study will utilize vignettes describing sexual assault or performance enhancing drug use. It is important to note that the vignettes are intentionally written to be as ambiguous as possible. Another important detail is that words that are considered to be “charged” such as rape or steroids, are not used in the vignettes.

The vignette describing the sexual assault condition revolves around a famous athlete (football wide receiver, or soccer forward) at a night club in New York City (see
Appendix A, B, C, and D). In this situation the athlete is seen talking to one woman the entire night. Then, when the woman leaves the club, the athlete leaves shortly after. The vignette ends with the woman returning to the club beaten and bloody, then she is taken to the hospital and the athlete is picked up by police. The performance enhancing drugs condition, depicts the athlete as having a career filled with injury. Then the athlete is described as failing a drug test, but the athlete claims the use of the performance enhancing drugs was strictly to stay healthy (see Appendix E, F, G, and H).

Each vignette will be paired with a picture. The picture will be either a White or Black football player or a White or Black soccer player (see Appendix I, J, K, and L). These pictures are used to further suggest the race of the athlete, along with stereotypical names used in the vignettes. The pictures do not show the athlete’s face on purpose. By not using the athlete’s face, attractiveness is avoided as a potential confounding variable in participant responses. If the faces were included, they could potentially cause bias against “less attractive” athletes. Also, some of the pictures have been modified so as to remove any team names or last names from the jerseys. Once again, the removal of these details is done to eliminate any potential confounding variables – such as a participant’s favorite or least favorite team or player. Football pictures were found by looking up the Canadian Football League (CFL) so as to make the athlete the least known to a predominately American sample. Soccer players were found by searching “soccer players” on an internet image database. With picture editing, the soccer players are hopefully not recognizable.

The final piece of materials used in this study is the response form (see Appendix M). This response form is completely original. It utilizes 10 point Likert scales ranging
from the points of “Not at All” to “Extremely.” Other questions on the response form will use categorical formats. Some questions from the response form include: How serious is the offense you read about? Who do you think should punish this athlete? And, what would you recommend in terms of punishment from the criminal justice system? In total there are eight questions regarding the severity of the crime as well as the form and length of sentence, four about the violence of sports, as well as administrative and biographical questions. Administrative questions refer to questions which will be used as a check to ensure the participants are responding to the independent variables. Biographical questions pertain to the identity of the participant.

It is important to note that for participants who opt to be part of the study via the Sona Systems or Facebook method will complete the entire study online. An online survey tool named “Survey Monkey” will be used to show instructions, pictures, the vignettes, and the response form to these participants. For the participants whom are personally solicited, a paper copy of the instructions, pictures, vignettes, and response forms will be used to complete the experiment.

**Procedure**

This study employs a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial design, varying the independent variables of race (White or Black), the sport an athlete plays (football or soccer), and the crime committed by the athlete (sexual assault or performance enhancing drug use) to investigate the effect on sentencing. The study uses a between-subjects design as each participant will only be exposed to one of the eight possible conditions.

First, the participants will be directed to the study on an online database named “Survey Monkey” (if they are part of the Sona System or Facebook solicited group of
participants). If the participants are selected via personal interaction, they will complete the study with a pen and paper. Before receiving instructions all participants will be given a consent form to fill out and acknowledge their participation in the study. Upon completion of the consent form, participants will be given a set of instructions telling them to read the vignette and then look at the picture. The picture will be described as an action shot of the athlete during a game. At this point the participants will read the vignette and look at the picture which they were randomly assigned.

The second and final step is completing the response form. After the participant has read the vignette and seen the picture, they will be prompted to a screen describing instructions to filling out the response sheet. Then the participants will complete the response form. Once the response form has been submitted, the participants will be debriefed and instructed to not discuss the experiment with anyone else. Upon debriefing all participants will be given the experimenter’s contact information if they have questions regarding the nature and contents of the study.

**Results**

Data was first cleaned to allow for valid analysis. Any participant who omitted an answer within the dependent variable group was filtered out of the corresponding Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). Also, participants were filtered out of analysis if they were unable to correctly identify the alleged crime, the athlete’s race, and the sport the athlete participated in – exceptions were made if the participant did not accurately identify the athlete’s name and in the sexual assault condition, if participants answered assault their responses were not filtered. All outliers of data, which were any answers (per dependent variable) that were either very low or high in comparison to the
mean, were kept in the analysis due to the fact that there would have been too large a
difference between total participants per condition if they had been removed. To assess
the main effects and interactions MANOVAs were conducted. Correlations were ran
prior to conducting the MANOVAs – statistics yielded that there were significant
correlations between athlete’s responsibility and perceived guilt (r = 0.66); time
suspended and participants’ agreement to fine the athlete (r = 0.57); prison time and
participants’ agreement to fine the athlete (r = 0.54); and between prison time and time of
suspension (r = 0.64). To maximize the number of participants, separate MANOVAs
were conducted for the three groupings of dependent variables: “Seriousness,
responsibility, and guilt,” “Punishment,” and “Violence of sports” (side analysis). The
results are listed below, organized by the dependent variables.

**Seriousness of the Crime**

Seriousness of the crime is a scale variable (1-10) which measures the
participant’s judgments of how serious the alleged crime is (sexual assault or
performance enhancing drug use) as a function of the athlete’s race and sport played.
Results indicated that the crime had a significant effect $p < .05; F(1, 151) = 175.69$ on
perceptions of the seriousness of the crime. Sexual assault ($M = 8.56$) was thought to be
more serious than use of performance enhancing drug use ($M = 5.07$). The MANOVA
also yielded significant results of a 3-way interaction between the athlete’s race, sport
played, and alleged crime; $p < .05; F(1, 151) = 5.20$. There were no significant two-way
interactions. Due to the nature of the two crimes, an Analysis of Varience (ANOVA) was
conducted to investigate whether participant gender and the crime type interacted with
regard to the seriousness of the crime rating. The 2 X 2 ANOVA was not significant providing that the participant’s gender did not change the perception of crime severity.

**Responsibility**

Responsibility refers to how responsible the athlete is perceived for committing the crime. This is a scale variable of 10% increments (from 0%-100%). The type of crime also yielded significant results $p < .05$, $F(1, 151) = 25.96$. Athletes using performance enhancing drugs ($M = 9.06$) were perceived as more responsible for the crime than were athletes who allegedly committed sexual assault ($M = 7.09$). There were no other significant results for this variable.

**Guilt**

The variable of “guilt” measured how guilty participants perceived the athlete to be as a function of the alleged crime, athlete’s race, and sport played. This too is a scale variable from 1-10. Statistics show that there was a significant effect of the crime on the perceived guilt of the athlete: $p < .05$; $F(1, 151) = 22.33$. Athletes using performance enhancing drugs ($M = 8.45$) were perceived as more guilty than athletes committing sexual assault ($M = 6.68$). The MANOVA also showed that the two-way interaction between the sport played and the crime approached significance $p = 0.08; F(1, 151) = 3.08$.

**Prison Time**

Prison time is a scale variable (6 month increments) giving the participants the options of “no time” to a maximum sentence of 54 months. This is meant to measure how long a participant believes the athlete should be sent to jail for given an alleged accusation. Statistics show that the independent variable of crime type had a significant
effect on prison time $p < .05; F(1, 153)=107.05$. Sexual assault ($M = 4.24$) led to longer prison terms than performance enhancing drugs ($M = .23$) (see Table 1). While there were other significant main effects, the variables grouped as “punishment” are all highly correlated. Thus, prison time is graphed because it is the most indicative in terms of overall punishment an athlete receives, and allows for the easiest interpretation of the hypotheses (see Figure 2). The interaction between sport played and the crime also approached significance $p = 0.09$.

**Monetary Fine**

The monetary fine variable is a scale variable ranging from 1-10 which measures how much a participant agrees with the statement: “the athlete should pay a $100,000 fine.” Race of the athlete had a significant effect on participants’ thoughts of fining the athlete $p < .05; F(1, 153) = 4.81$. White athletes ($M = 5.99$) were fined more than Black athletes ($M = 5.05$). The main effect of sport the athlete played also approached significance $p = .071; F (1,153) = 3.31$.

**Time of Suspension**

Time of suspension is a scale variable (no time – lifetime ban) which allows for participants to choose how much time the athlete should be suspended from their sport at 1/2 season increments. Crime type had a significant effect on suspension time $p < .05$; $F(1, 153) = 107.05$. Sexual assault ($M = 3.94$) was suspended for longer than performance enhancing drugs ($M =2.66$).

**Violence of Sports**

These variables measured the participants’ thoughts of how violent baseball, basketball, football, and soccer were on a scale from 1-10. Soccer and basketball did not
show significant results. However, the interaction between race of an athlete and sport played had a significant effect on perceived violence of baseball \( p < .05; F(1, 157) = 4.29 \). Participants rated baseball more violent when reading about White football players (M = 3.10, SD = 1.58) than White soccer players (M = 2.76, SD = 1.46). However, when participants read about Black athletes – baseball was rated as more violent in the soccer player conditions (M = 3.30, SD = 1.80) than the football player conditions (M = 2.60, SD = 1.56). The interaction between the athlete’s race and the crime type approached a significant effect on perceived violence of football \( p = 0.08 \).

**Discussion**

This study examined how participants respond to an athlete’s race, the sport an athlete plays, and the crime an athlete allegedly commits. Results from this study help to explain the public’s thoughts about athletes, with the hopes of understanding the effects of race on a potential jury verdict. Participant responses are meant to be thought of as a potential indication of how jurors or other decision makers would respond if the vignette was an actual court case. The hypotheses investigated were: Black athletes will be punished more heavily than White athletes (main effect); sexual assault will be more severely punished than performance enhancing drug use (main effect); football players will be more heavily punished than soccer players (main effect); a Black football player committing sexual assault will receive the highest punishment ratings (interaction); and a White soccer player using performance enhancing drugs will be the least punished of the eight potential conditions (interaction).

The first MANOVA looked at the effect of the three independent variables (athlete’s race, sport played, alleged crime) on the “seriousness, responsibility, and guilt”
grouping of variables. Once again, separate MANOVA’s were conducted in the interest of maximizing the number of participants per condition. From this statistical test, the dependent variable of seriousness of crime yielded a significant main effect of the alleged crime in the direction of sexual assault (see Figure 1). Effectively, participants ranked that the crime of sexual assault was far more serious than was performance enhancing drug use. As predicted, sexual assault should be generally more punished than performance enhancing drug use. Since there were six dependent variables which were used to test each hypothesis, all of the dependent variables must yield main effects of crime type to fully support the hypothesis. Also, these main effects must all go in the same direction to support or fail to support the hypothesis. Seriousness of crime yielded a significant three-way interaction between all of the independent variables. This suggests that when race is held constant, that the effect of the athlete’s sport and the alleged crime was significant. However, results from this test provide that the interaction may not align with the hypothesis that a Black football player committing sexual assault is thought to be the most serious crime. In fact, results show that for a Black athlete there is an interaction between crime type and sport played. The cross over interaction shows that a soccer player committing sexual assault is rated as more serious than a football player charged with the same crime (see Figure 3). In the performance enhancing drug condition, soccer players received lower seriousness ratings than football players. As for the White athletes, the cross over effect is the opposite of the previously described effect with Black athletes. Participants in the White athlete conditions rated football players committing sexual assault as more serious than soccer players committing sexual assault. Also,
participants in the White condition rated soccer players using performance enhancing drugs as a more serious crime than football players using performance enhancing drugs.

Results for the dependent variable of responsibility indicate that the crime of performance enhancing drug use was rated as having higher athlete responsibility than sexual assault (see Table 1). Since responsibility is not specifically within the realm of punishment, this result was expected. The vignette was framed so the motive of the athlete’s drug use was in question, not whether he was “doping.” Thus, the results are reasonable given the wording of the vignettes.

For the dependent variable of athlete guilt, once again, crime type produced a significant main effect on the variable. Like the athlete responsibility variable, the main effect was in the direction of performance enhancing drugs (see Table 1 and Figure 1). Participants rated both White and Black athletes using performance enhancing drugs as guiltier than athletes accused of alleged sexual assault. Like the previously discussed variable, the way the vignettes were written suggests that participants would think that the doping athlete would be ranked as more guilty because he was caught for using the drugs. The sexual assault condition was written to be ambiguous as to whether the athlete actually committed the crime; the performance enhancing drug vignette was meant to be ambiguous in respect to the athlete’s motivation. The two-way interaction between crime type and sport played was also significant for this variable. Based on the results, this suggests that when an athlete played soccer or football they were rated as more guilty for doping than they were for alleged sexual assault. However, while a football player committing sexual assault was considered guiltier than a soccer player transgressing in the same way; a soccer player who was caught doping was considered to be guiltier than
a football player committing the same offense. Once again, there was no hypothesis about this specific dependent variable, but it does align with the general way the vignettes were constructed.

The second MANOVA ran looked at the group of dependent variables classified as the “punishment” variables, which is comprised of the variables: prison time, monetary fine, and suspension time. Results from the statistical testing for prison time shows that the type of crime had a significant main effect in the direction of sexual assault. This provides partial confirmation of the hypothesis that sexual assault will be more heavily punished than performance enhancing drug use. Statistics also show that a two-way interaction between the sport played and alleged crime approached significance. The interaction suggests that sexual assault is punished more heavily in football than in soccer. However, performance enhancing drugs received stronger punishment in the soccer condition. Overall, sexual assault receives more prison time than performance enhancing drug use. This interaction does provide that there is partial support for the predictions made, but, for full confirmation of the predictions, a soccer player doping should receive less prison time than a football player.

The variable of monetary fine was framed as whether the participant agreed with fining the athlete $100,000. There was a significant main effect of an athlete’s race as to whether participants thought the athlete should be fined. Interestingly, the main effect was in the direction of higher fines for White athletes. This finding rejects the hypothesis made. White athletes were not expected to be more heavily punished due to racial bias against Black athletes. Thus, this provides a very interesting finding in regards to either the vignettes or the population of participants. The sport played also approached a
significant main effect for this variable. The direction of this effect (which was not
significant at the .05 level) was toward football.

The final punishment related variable was suspension time. There was a
significant main effect on the time participants recommended an athlete be suspended
only for type of crime. The main effect was in the direction of sexual assault being more
heavily suspended than performance enhancing drug use. While this is in line with the
hypothesis that sexual assault be more heavily punished than performance enhancing
drug use, the result is still surprising. Since sexual assault is not necessarily punished (in
terms of suspension) by the governing sports league, it was somewhat expected that this
variable would have had the main effect go in the direction of performance enhancing
drugs; since, doping is defined as an offense in player unions.

The third and final MANOVA conducted, tested the independent variables against
the violence of sports variables. There was only one significant result of violence ratings
which suggests that perhaps this was a strange population. Violence ratings are very
subjective to the person, so the independent variables do not necessarily have an effect on
these ratings. Also, these four variables were meant to be a “side study.” Thus, the lack of
significant results provides that the ratings of a sport’s violence is far more related to the
participants subjective thought rather than the independent variables. However, means
from this analysis suggest that participants think that football is more violent than
baseball, soccer, and basketball (see Table 2). This does support the hypothesis that
football players will be more heavily punished than soccer players due to the violent
nature of the sport itself.
The three-way interaction of the independent variables on the seriousness of the crime variable was the only significant three level interaction. This interaction supports the hypothesis in this sense – the highest rating in terms of seriousness of crime was for a Black soccer player committing sexual assault. Since a Black athlete received the highest seriousness score, this provides that racial bias does exist. In terms of juries, the findings from this study do suggest that race does play a role in terms of public perception of a crime. Findings from this study would be able to suggest that a prosecutor may receive higher probability of a guilty verdict when the defendant is Black, due to the exhibited racism (in terms of crime seriousness).

In past studies, researchers have investigated the perceptions of correctional officers in terms of potential racial biases against Black juveniles (Graham & Lowery, 2004). Researchers have also looked at the ratings of crime seriousness when participants were exposed to vignettes of either homicide or assault (Pepitone & DiNubile, 1976). This study does what other studies have not – combined the race of an individual with the crime they allegedly commit. By combining these two studies, more information in terms of public perception can be made. Since race and crime are combined, this allows for further inference into the realm of courtroom verdicts. The very similar study done by Saucier, Hockett, Zanotti, and Heffel (2010) was very specific to hate crimes. The current study furthers the investigation by using race and what may be considered to be “general crime.” “General crime” being defined in the terms that they do not specifically deal with racial or ethnic matters, rather just human interactions. However, the current study investigates a third variable as well – sports. Gee and Potwarkas’ (2007) study looked at the amount of penalties in an aggressive sport after disciplinary action was taken by the
league. Also, Wagner-Egger, Gygax, and Ribordy (2012) researched the likelihood of a foul being called in response to an athlete’s race. However, it does not appear that any study has investigated the effect of an athlete’s race, the sport played, and the crime committed on overall punishment.

While this study does seem to cover new ground, it does have limitations. First, the crimes compared were not comparable in severity. While the vignettes were written with maximum ambiguity, the overall difference between sexual assault and performance enhancing drug use is too great. Also, the sample of this study were predominantly White, young adults whom attend elite colleges/universities. This sample is not indicative of the population and may not have provided accurate results. Participants who are highly educated may answer in ways that are not “racist” because they are aware of the construct being tested. Ultimately, this may have changed the data. Finally, the sample was not quite large enough – with more time, more participants could have been tested which would hopefully yield better results. In order to improve this study, the vignettes would have to be longer and with more ambiguity so there are not dependent variables which will be skewed in one direction or another. Another way to improve the study would be to eliminate one of the independent variables so as to reduce the confusion with regards to data collection. In response to participants potentially answering in the opposite way (to combat personal thoughts of racism) to appear more “moral,” an implicit attitudes test (IAT) would provide information about whether or not participants are actually responding in a “racist” manner. Finally, to improve a similar future study, reducing the number of dependent variables would allow for more specific questions relating to the same topic – such as strictly focusing on punishment. This study
may have over extended itself; however, results ultimately partially supported the hypotheses, providing that racism still is prevalent and influencing public perceptions. These results suggest that public perception is still heavily influenced; thus, group (jury or society) decisions cannot be completely trusted. The reason that these results appeared in such a manner may be due to the media. In the current age, television and social media instantly let the public know of celebrity scandals. Athletes are celebrities – their actions change the public opinion on specific sports, athletes in general, and the athlete’s racial group. In light of current athlete tabloids and media coverage, participants of this study may have been influenced through these external sources. However, the partial support of the hypotheses also suggests that perhaps society (while not yet perfect) is moving toward egalitarian ideology which ultimately will decrease racial bias. This shift in public perception, along with the participant self-awareness may be reasons for the partial rejection of the race hypothesis. Also, the globalization of soccer as a sport and the relative localization of football may actually dilute the theory that football players will be punished more than soccer players. Soccer players may be thought of as global ambassadors, so their actions could be under heavy scrutiny in comparison to football players. Ultimately, this concept may be an indicator as to the partial rejection of football players being the most strictly punished athletes. While the study can be improved, results display results which provide strong insight into the public’s perception of race in terms of crime and punishment in the realm of professional sports.
References


Table 1
*Means and standard deviations of all dependent variables per condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seriousness of Crime</th>
<th>Athlete Responsibility</th>
<th>Athlete Guilt</th>
<th>Agree to Fine</th>
<th>Time Suspended</th>
<th>Time in Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Football Sexual Assault</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Football PED Use</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Soccer Sexual Assault</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Soccer PED Use</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Football Sexual Assault</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Football PED Use</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Soccer Sexual Assault</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Soccer PED Use</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
*Ratings of Sport Violence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Football</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Main effects of the conditions on seriousness, responsibility, and guilt.
Figure 2. Main effects seen through the prison time variable.
Figure 3. Three-way interaction of the independent variables on the dependent variable, seriousness of guilt.
Appendix A

*Condition 1: Black, Football, Sexual Assault*

Around midnight on November 15th, Tyrone Davis, a popular wide receiver in the National Football League was seen at a famous New York nightclub. Others in the club noted that Davis was at the club and was talking to one girl the entire night. These same individuals confirmed that at about 2:00 AM the woman left the club. At about 2:03 AM Davis was caught on surveillance video leaving the club. Friends of Davis confirmed that he had left the club to meet up with someone. At about 3:00 AM Davis called one of his friends for a ride home. At about 3:10 AM the woman seen with Davis returned to the club, her face was beaten and bloody, her clothing was torn, and she was crying. The police were called and the woman was taken to the hospital. While in the hospital, samples of clothing as well as bodily injuries showed that the woman had been in a struggle. The clothing samples suggested she had been a victim of sexual assault. No DNA matches were found, but witnesses identified Tyrone Davis as the only man talking to her in the club. Phone triangulation technology placed Davis in the same neighborhood in which the victim was sexually assaulted. The victim also stated that Davis was upset because she left the club without him. While it was dark, the woman claimed to be attacked by Davis. Tyrone Davis was picked up by police immediately after the victim gave her statement of the night’s events. Davis denies that he was with the woman after he left the club.
Appendix B

Condition 2: Black, Soccer, Sexual Assault

Around midnight on November 15th, Tyrone Davis, a popular forward in Major League Soccer was seen at a famous New York nightclub. Others in the club noted that Davis was at the club and was talking to one girl the entire night. These same individuals confirmed that at about 2:00 AM the woman left the club. At about 2:03 AM Davis was caught on surveillance video leaving the club. Friends of Davis confirmed that he had left the club to meet up with someone. At about 3:00 AM Davis called one of his friends for a ride home. At about 3:10 AM the woman seen with Davis returned to the club, her face was beaten and bloody, her clothing was torn, and she was crying. The police were called and the woman was taken to the hospital. While in the hospital, samples of clothing as well as bodily injuries showed that the woman had been in a struggle. The clothing samples suggested she had been a victim of sexual assault. No DNA matches were found, but witnesses identified Tyrone Davis as the only man talking to her in the club. Phone triangulation technology placed Davis in the same neighborhood in which the victim was sexually assaulted. The victim also stated that Davis was upset because she left the club without him. While it was dark, the woman claimed to be attacked by Davis. Tyrone Davis was picked up by police immediately after the victim gave her statement of the night’s events. Davis denies that he was with the woman after he left the club.
Appendix C

*Condition 5: White, Football, Sexual Assault*

Around midnight on November 15th, Ryan Smith, a popular wide receiver in the National Football League was seen at a famous New York nightclub. Others in the club noted that Smith was at the club and was talking to one girl the entire night. These same individuals confirmed that at about 2:00 AM the woman left the club. At about 2:03 AM Smith was caught on surveillance video leaving the club. Friends of Smith confirmed that he had left the club to meet up with someone. At about 3:00 AM Smith called one of his friends for a ride home. At about 3:10 AM the woman seen with Smith returned to the club, her face was beaten and bloody, her clothing was torn, and she was crying. The police were called and the woman was taken to the hospital. While in the hospital, samples of clothing as well as bodily injuries showed that the woman had been in a struggle. The clothing samples suggested she had been a victim of sexual assault. No DNA matches were found, but witnesses identified Ryan Smith as the only man talking to her in the club. Phone triangulation technology placed Smith in the same neighborhood in which the victim was sexually assaulted. The victim also stated that Smith was upset because she left the club without him. While it was dark, the woman claimed to be attacked by Smith. Ryan Smith was picked up by police immediately after the victim gave her statement of the night’s events. Smith denies that he was with the woman after he left the club.
Appendix D

*Condition 6: White, Soccer, Sexual Assault*

Around midnight on November 15\textsuperscript{th}, Ryan Smith, a popular forward Major League Soccer was seen at a famous New York nightclub. Others in the club noted that Smith was at the club and was talking to one girl the entire night. These same individuals confirmed that at about 2:00 AM the woman left the club. At about 2:03 AM Smith was caught on surveillance video leaving the club. Friends of Smith confirmed that he had left the club to meet up with someone. At about 3:00 AM Smith called one of his friends for a ride home. At about 3:10 AM the woman seen with Smith returned to the club, her face was beaten and bloody, her clothing was torn, and she was crying. The police were called and the woman was taken to the hospital. While in the hospital, samples of clothing as well as bodily injuries showed that the woman had been in a struggle. The clothing samples suggested she had been a victim of sexual assault. No DNA matches were found, but witnesses identified Ryan Smith as the only man talking to her in the club. Phone triangulation technology placed Smith in the same neighborhood in which the victim was sexually assaulted. The victim also stated that Smith was upset because she left the club without him. While it was dark, the woman claimed to be attacked by Smith. Ryan Smith was picked up by police immediately after the victim gave her statement of the night’s events. Smith denies that he was with the woman after he left the club.
Appendix E

Condition 3: Black, Football, Performance Enhancing Drugs

On October 15\textsuperscript{th}, the commissioner of the National Football League ordered a league-wide drug screening. All of the players in the league received the same test. The test required athletes to submit their urine to a private lab known for their accuracy. Popular wide receiver Tyrone Davis, is well known for the number of injuries he sustains. This season Davis has been completely healthy, very strong, and putting up great numbers. None of his teammates has been able to explain his significant increase in playing time and power. Davis failed the drug test administered by the league and was found to be using Human Growth Hormone. Davis has come forth and made public statements apologizing for using illegal substances, his admission affected his team, family, and friends. In this same public speech, Davis made a point to say he did not intend to use the substance to cheat, but to prevent injuries. Since these public statements Davis has stopped communicating with the press, disconnecting all of his social media accounts.
Appendix F

Condition 4: Black, Soccer, Performance Enhancing Drugs

On October 15th, the commissioner of Major League Soccer ordered a league-wide drug screening. All of the players in the league received the same test. The test required athletes to submit their urine to a private lab known for their accuracy. Popular forward Tyrone Davis, is well known for the number of injuries he sustains. This season Davis has been completely healthy, very strong, and putting up great numbers. None of his teammates has been able to explain his significant increase in playing time and power. Davis failed the drug test administered by the league and was found to be using Human Growth Hormone. Davis has come forth and made public statements apologizing for using illegal substances, his admission affected his team, family, and friends. In this same public speech, Davis made a point to say he did not intend to use the substance to cheat, but to prevent injuries. Since these public statements Davis has stopped communicating with the press, disconnecting all of his social media accounts.
Appendix G

*Condition 7: White, Football, Performance Enhancing Drugs*

On October 15th, the commissioner of the National Football League ordered a league-wide drug screening. All of the players in the league received the same test. The test required athletes to submit their urine to a private lab known for their accuracy. Popular wide receiver Ryan Smith, is well known for the number of injuries he sustains. This season Smith has been completely healthy, very strong, and putting up great numbers. None of his teammates has been able to explain his significant increase in playing time and power. Smith failed the drug test administered by the league and was found to be using Human Growth Hormone. Smith has come forth and made public statements apologizing for using illegal substances, his admission affected his team, family, and friends. In this same public speech, Smith made a point to say he did not intend to use the substance to cheat, but to prevent injuries. Since these public statements Smith has stopped communicating with the press, disconnecting all of his social media accounts.
Appendix H

*Condition 8: White, Soccer, Performance Enhancing Drugs*

On October 15th, the commissioner of Major League Soccer ordered a league-wide drug screening. All of the players in the league received the same test. The test required athletes to submit their urine to a private lab known for their accuracy. Popular forward Ryan Smith, is well known for the number of injuries he sustains. This season Smith has been completely healthy, very strong, and putting up great numbers. None of his teammates has been able to explain his significant increase in playing time and power. Smith failed the drug test administered by the league and was found to be using Human Growth Hormone. Smith has come forth and made public statements apologizing for using illegal substances, his admission affected his team, family, and friends. In this same public speech, Smith made a point to say he did not intend to use the substance to cheat, but to prevent injuries. Since these public statements Smith has stopped communicating with the press, disconnecting all of his social media accounts.
Appendix I

*Athlete Picture*

Black football player.
Appendix J

Athlete Picture

White football player.
Appendix K

Athlete Picture

Black soccer player.
Appendix L

*Athlete picture*

White soccer player.
Appendix M

Response Form

1. What was the name of the athlete?

_________________________________

2. What sport did this athlete play?

   Baseball  |  Basketball  |  Soccer  |  Football  |  Boxing  

3. Who do you think should punish this athlete?

   Their governing sports league  |  The criminal justice system  |  Both 

4. How serious is the alleged crime you read about?

   1 (Not at all)  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6  |  7  |  8  |  9  |  10 (Extremely Serious) 

5. The athlete should pay a $100,000 fine:

   1 (Strongly Disagree)  |  2  |  3  |  4  |  5  |  6  |  7  |  8  |  9  |  10 (Strongly Agree) 

6. How responsible is the athlete for the alleged crime?

   0%  |  10%  |  20%  |  30%  |  40%  |  50%  |  60%  |  70%  |  80%  |  90%  |  100% 

7. How many seasons should he be suspended?

   0  |  ½  |  1  |  1 ½  |  2  |  2 ½  |  3  |  3 ½  |  4  | Lifetime ban from his sport
8. The athlete is guilty of the crime he was accused of committing:

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Extremely Guilty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not at all)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How long should the athlete be sent to prison for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No time</th>
<th>6 months</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>18 months</th>
<th>24 months</th>
<th>30 months</th>
<th>36 months</th>
<th>42 months</th>
<th>48 months</th>
<th>54 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not at all)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (Extremely Violent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How violent is Baseball?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (Extremely Violent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How violent is Soccer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (Extremely Violent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How violent is Basketball?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (Extremely Violent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How violent is Football?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Not at all)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (Extremely Violent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you believe this athlete should be punished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. What crime did the athlete you read about allegedly commit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homicide</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Performance Enhancing Drug use</th>
<th>Drug Trafficking</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. What race is the athlete you read about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Middle Eastern/Indian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Questions about the participant:

17. What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. What race best describes you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Middle Eastern/Indian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. How old are you?

______________

20. Are you currently an athlete (professional or NCAA)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. What sport do you play (please select your primary sport)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Softball</th>
<th>Track &amp; Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td>Swimming &amp;Diving</td>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>Wrestling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Do you know anyone who has or does use performance enhancing drugs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I decline to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. Do you know anyone who has been a victim of, or a perpetrator of Sexual Assault?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I decline to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Consent Form

Appendix N

Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects

You are being invited to participate in a research study, which the Claremont McKenna College Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved for conduct by the investigators named here. This form is designed to provide you - as a human subject - with information about this study. The Investigator or his/her representative will describe this study to you and answer any of your questions. You are entitled to a copy of this form. If you have any questions or complaints about the informed consent process of this research study or your rights as a subject, please contact the IRB at the Claremont McKenna College Office of Institutional Research at (909) 607-8395 or IRB@cmc.edu. Also see www.cmc.edu/IRB for more information on research involving human subjects.

Project Title: Crime and Punishment through the Lens of Professional Sports
Principal Investigator: Jonathan Hendel

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project – YOU MUST BE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER TO PARTICIPATE. This study involves research into the perceptions of athletes in response to the crime they commit. You will be reading about an athlete who has been accused of an alleged crime. After reading through the vignette you will be asked to fill out a survey of your opinions about the athlete. The vignettes are not graphic nor are they anticipated to cause discomfort. Participation in this study will take approximately 20 minutes of your time. We do not anticipate you experiencing any discomfort or other negative feelings when responding to items in this study.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Should you decide to discontinue participation or decline to answer any specific part of the study, you may do so without penalty. You will still receive any course credit that Sona Systems has offered in exchange for your participation. If you were recruited in any means other than through Sona Systems, you will have the option to be placed into a raffle to win a gift card of a predetermined amount. By participating in this study, you may help to further the understanding of public perceptions of athletes committing crimes. You are not required to give your name in any part of the study itself. However, for those of you how are eligible to be in the raffle, your email address and completion code is required. For this reason, and the nature of selection of some participants your participation will be confidential, none of the information you provide will be directly traced back to you by anyone other than the principle investigator.

Should you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the study’s principle investigator, Jonathan Hendel a student in the Psychology Department. His phone number is (408) 431-3041, and his e-mail address is JHendel14@cmc.edu.

CONSENT STATEMENT:
I, _____________________________, hereby give my consent to participate in the research study entitled “Crime and Punishment through the Lens of Professional Sports.” I have read the above information and am aware of the potential risks and complications. I fully understand that I may withdraw from this research project at any time without prejudice or effect on my standing with Claremont McKenna College. I also understand that I am free to ask questions about techniques or procedures that will be undertaken. I will sign and return this consent form and receive a copy of the form in case I need to refer back to it.

Finally, I understand that information obtained about me during the course of the study will be kept confidential and cannot be traced back to me.

Participant’s signature (18+ years of age) ___________________________ Date __________

I hereby certify that I have given an explanation to the above individual of the contemplated study and its risks and potential complications.

Principle Investigator’s signature ___________________________ Date __________