

**Political Protesting, Race, and College Athletics:  
Why Diversity Among Coaches Matters**

**James Druckman**

Payson S. Wild Professor of Political Science  
IPR Fellow  
Northwestern University

**Adam Howat**

IPR Graduate Research Assistant  
Northwestern University

**Jacob Rothschild**

IPR Graduate Research Assistant  
Northwestern University

Version: July 19, 2017

**DRAFT**

*Please do not quote or distribute without permission.*

## ABSTRACT

*Objective.* Athletes have long used their platform to stage political protests on issues ranging from racial oppression to athlete compensation. For college student-athletes, protesting is complicated by their amateur status and dependence on their schools. As a result, college coaches hold particular power over student-athletes' decisions in this realm. The researchers seek to better understand the determinants of coaches' attitudes toward student-athlete protests.

*Methods.* The researchers use a novel survey to study what college coaches think when student-athletes participate in various forms of political protests.

*Results.* They find that African-American coaches exhibit greater support for protests and are more likely to believe protests reflect concern about the issues, rather than attention-seeking behavior.

*Conclusion.* The results isolate a major driver of opinions about athletic protests and reveal why the relatively low number of minority college coaches matters: greater diversity in the coaching ranks would lead to more varied opinions about the politicization of student-athletes.

Political decisions fundamentally affect sports – this is clear on such issues as gender equality in college athletics (e.g., Title IX), the use of public funds to build stadiums, labor negotiations, drug testing, and more. Sports also affect politics, such as when athletes use their public platform to make political statements. While there is a long history of political protests by athletes (e.g., Bass 2002, Kaufman and Wolff 2010, Epstein and Kisska-Schulze 2016), they have become particularly salient in recent years: “the era of the ‘apolitical’ athlete appears to be drawing to a close as a ‘new era of athlete awareness and advocacy’ has emerged” (Cooky 2017: 4).

At the college level, protests have included refusing to stand during the national anthem to draw attention to racial oppression, threatening to boycott practice and games in response to racially charged campus incidents, and writing the acronym “APU” (standing for “All Players United”) on wrist tape to demand increased benefits for student-athletes. These protests, not surprisingly given the large college sport fan base, garner attention and generate debate. They also accentuate the unique position of college student-athletes, whose success as athletes and often as students depends on their coaches (e.g., Staurowsky 2014: 23-24). As Kassing and Anderson (2014: 173) explain, “coaches hold a degree of authority over their respective players and by implication operate to some degree as supervisors... Athletes in turn end up in subordinate roles.” What coaches think undoubtedly affects what players are willing to do. Yet, we know little about what college coaches think when it comes to various types of student-athlete protests, and perhaps more importantly, what explains variation in coaches’ opinions.

We aim to fill this gap with a large survey of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) coaches. The survey probes their opinions on various types of student-athlete protests and the reasons behind those opinions. As we explain in the next section, we expect race to play

a large role in explaining variation in attitudes, with African-Americans being more supportive of protests. This is, in fact, what we find. Regardless of what one believes when it comes to student-athletes' protesting, our findings make clear that diversity among coaches generates a diversity in beliefs.

### **Race and Opinions About Athlete Protests**

Race and sports are deeply intertwined. The history of racial exclusion from sports (Widener 2017), contemporary bias in media coverage bias and perceptions of athletes (Buffington and Fraley 2008), and a disproportionately low number of minority coaches all make this clear. The latter led the National Football League to implement the Rooney Rule, in 2003, that requires teams to interview at least one minority candidate in head coaching searches. Diversity in the coaching ranks is an acute concern at the college level. Lapchick (2017: 2) states: "Opportunities for coaches of color continued to be a significant area of concern in all divisions [of college sports]." Relative to the demographics of student-athletes, white coaches are notably over-represented, particularly among head coaches.<sup>1</sup> The low proportions of minority coaches likely reflect an entrenched history of institutional racism (Martin 2014) and limit the number of minority role models for athletes (Hoch 2011).

The lack of minority coaches also may affect what players do when it comes to political protests. To see why, consider that coaches have notable power and influence over their players (Turman 2006, Jayakumar and Comeaux 2016): "[t]he relevancy then of coaches' communication to athletes' experience is sizeable" (Kassing and Anderson 2014: 174). These communications, which range from formal rules to subtle gestures, are particularly salient for college student-athletes. Staurowsky (2014: 23-24) explains:

In the netherworld that has existed for college athletes between bona fide workers and students, their ability to access their rights becomes more difficult... The lives of college

athletes are routinely regulated in ways that distinguish them from their colleagues in the general student population... coaches and athletic department personnel concerned with the brand and the product have developed over the years a detailed set of guidelines by which athletes must live... in an atmosphere where questioning the status quo is not welcome and with the expectation that players will not go public with their grievances for fear of damaging the program and their own prospects, there is considerable risk associated with player activism...”<sup>2</sup>

This latter point implies: (1) coaches (and/or other athletic administrators) oppose activism,<sup>3</sup> and (2) they work to prevent it. We are unaware of systematic data on either claim.<sup>4</sup> Our goal here is to partially address the first claim by exploring college coaches’ opinions when it comes to student-athlete behavior. Instead of bluntly focusing on whether to “allow” or “disallow” protests, we are particularly interested in *sources of variance* in coaches’ opinions. We suspect race plays a substantial role in affecting coaches’ opinions, and as a consequence, the aforementioned lack of diversity among college coaches leads to a scarcity of perspectives within both universities and the NCAA writ large.

Why would race explain variance in opposition to or support for student-athletes’ protests? Protests have played a significant role in the history of black politics in the U.S., constituting an important and effective political resource for relatively disadvantaged groups (Gillion 2012; Lipsky 1968). In addition to helping secure civil rights victories in the 1960s and 1970s, protest maintains its importance to 21<sup>st</sup> century minority politics. African-Americans who exhibit higher degrees of racial group consciousness are more likely to engage in protests and boycotts (Chong and Rogers 2005). Furthermore, alienation in the form of cynicism toward traditional avenues of political influence has been shown to lead to favorable protest orientations among African-Americans (Jackson 1973). As a result, African-Americans should be more inclined to prioritize the right to protest over other considerations such as team unity or image maintenance.

Moreover, protests in the arena of athletics are often race-based. One of the early modern protests in sports involved University of Michigan football players threatening not to play when one of their African-American teammates was asked not to participate (Epstein and Kisska-Schulze 2016: 83-84). Sports history is rife with other examples of race protests (e.g., Epstein and Kisska-Schulze 2016), with the best-known one being the 1968 Olympic Black Power salute by two African-American sprinters (Bass 2002). More recently, attention was drawn to the state of race relations in the United States when, in 2016, San Francisco 49ers quarterback Colin Kaepernick refused to stand during the national anthem prior to games, as a way to protest racial injustice and police brutality in the U.S. (Rogers 2016; Wyche 2016). Other NFL players soon adopted the practice, as did a number of college athletes (Breech 2016; Associated Press 2016; ESPN 2016).

Such protests have prompted divergent reactions among the public. Opinion data suggests that attitudes toward police are important predictors of support for the protests, but among the most significant factors is race; African-Americans prove more supportive than whites, with large differentials – 74% of blacks versus 30% of whites approve (see <https://poll.qu.edu/national/release-detail?ReleaseID=2387>). It comes as no surprise that race should explain the difference, given that many African-Americans may well have lived through or observed police brutality. Even those who have not experienced it themselves likely feel a sense of linked fate – that is, the belief that what happens to blacks as a group affects them as well (Simien 2005; Gay and Tate 1998; Herring et al. 1999).

National anthem protests were not the only ones about racial issues to occur in sports in recent years. In 2014, NBA players wore T-shirts that read “I Can’t Breathe” during pregame warm-ups – another effort to call attention to police violence against African-Americans (Strauss

2014).<sup>5</sup> This protest occurred at the college level as well; for example, the entire Georgetown men's basketball team wore "I Can't Breathe" T-shirts, as did female basketball players at Notre Dame (White 2014; Associated Press 2014). Another protest occurred in 2015 at the University of Missouri, where football players, unhappy with the university president's handling of racial issues on campus, refused to practice or play until the president resigned (Tracy and Southall 2015).<sup>6</sup>

Racial differences carry over into yet another issue that is often the subject of student-athlete protests. During games, some players have worn wristbands bearing the slogan "APU," which stands for "All Players United," to protest NCAA rules forbidding compensation of student-athletes beyond scholarships (Patterson 2013). Support for "pay for play," as well as allowing college athletes to unionize, also evinces a large racial gap: overall, only about 33% favor paying college athletes and 47% support unionization, but among non-whites these numbers increase to 51% and 66%, respectively (Prewitt 2014). Druckman, Howat, and Rodheim (2016) find that this racial gap operates through a stark difference in the way pay for play and unionization are viewed – African-Americans are more likely to see these benefits as tools to remediate racial inequalities, which makes them more supportive.

In all of the above cases, then, race proves to be a powerful, if not decisive, explanatory variable. African-Americans, and non-whites more broadly, tend to show far greater sensitivity to the inequities being protested. Such awareness may manifest in political alienation and other psychological dispositions that lend themselves to pro-protest orientations. As they have in the past, political protests continue to serve as a means for minority groups to express grievances and call for change. We therefore expect African-American coaches to express considerably more support for student-athletes' protests.

## Survey

Our population is all Division I and Division III coaches at NCAA schools. We focused on these two divisions since they offer a contrast; Division I schools can offer athletic scholarships and often invest heavily in athletics, whereas Division III schools neither offer scholarships nor invest heavily (<http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/ncaa-101/our-three-divisions>).<sup>7</sup> We obtained a full list of the 351 Division I and the 451 Division III schools from the NCAA website (<http://web1.ncaa.org/onlineDir/exec2/divisionListing>). We then randomly selected 36% (127) of Division I schools and 14% (65) of Division III schools. We over-sampled Division I because we anticipated lower response rates given the likelihood of more solicitations of these coaches and because Division I protests are more likely to be noticed given greater media coverage. We then accessed the athletic department webpage for each selected school and obtained the contact information for anyone in a coach position for *every sport*.<sup>8</sup> We included any person in a position that 1) involved direct contact with student-athletes in an advisory capacity and 2) was in the domain of athletic performance.<sup>9</sup> We defined the population as such because we are interested in any individual who may be seen as having some authority over a student-athlete when it comes to athletics. This resulted in a sample of 7,392 individuals to whom we sent e-mails, inviting them to participate in a survey of college coaches focused on issues having to do with student-athletes.<sup>10</sup> We assured them of anonymity, mentioning that we would not ask them at which school they work. The survey was mostly conducted from March 16<sup>th</sup> to March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017.<sup>11</sup> 965 individuals clicked on the survey, for a response rate of 13%, which is in-line with online surveys of this sort (Couper 2008). On the survey, we directly asked if the person would describe himself/herself as “a coach (of any type).”



Nine percent of the respondents answered no; we exclude, from our final sample, anyone who did not answer this question affirmatively, resulting in a sample of 873.<sup>12</sup>

The survey asked various questions about three distinct protests by college student-athletes. The protests included (1) student-athletes not standing during the national anthem to protest police violence against the black community, (2) student-athletes wearing wristbands with the All Players United (APU) slogan to protest NCAA rules that forbid student-athlete compensation, and (3) student-athletes wearing any apparel, aside from the APU wristbands, to protest any political issue. The first two topics obviously isolate attitudes toward specific protests that have occurred while the third topic is meant to capture more general opinions. For each of these topics, we included three types of questions, as follows.

- *Disapproval or approval* of the particular form of protest, on a 5-point scale ranging from “completely disapprove” to “completely approve.”
- Whether or not each of three *reasons* was why a student-athlete would engage in the protest: caring about the issue, being under social pressure, and seeking personal attention.<sup>13</sup> The respondent could check as few or many of the reasons as he or she wanted.
- Whether or not the respondent’s team should have a *rule* that prevents the given protest, on a 5-point scale from “definitely should not” to “definitely should.”

As explanatory variables, the survey included measures of attitudes toward police, such as police job approval, concern about brutality, treatment of minority suspects, etc. We combined 9 items in total (all of which are listed in the appendix) to create a single measure of concern about police conduct (where higher values indicate greater concern in general or about conduct toward minorities, as appropriate; alpha = .77). We gauged feelings of nationalism using four measures of American identity taken from Huddy and Khatib (2007), combined into one scale (alpha = .82). We measured attitudes about racial discrimination with an item asking respondents the extent to which they agree that “racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in

America” (thus higher scores indicate a belief in less extant discrimination) – in what follows, we refer to this variable as “discrimination skepticism.”

Respondents were asked which sports they coached (and whether it was a men’s team, women’s team, or both), in which Division (I or III) their school competed, their position (which we then used to identify head coaches), how long they had worked in the coaching field generally, and whether they played a sport in college. Finally, we included a number of standard demographic and political variables, including race/ethnicity, gender, age, income, education, political interest, and political ideology (with higher scores indicating a movement towards being more conservative). All question wordings are provided in the appendix.

## **Results**

We present an overview of our sample in Table 1. Most notably, about 9% of the coaches are African-American, more than a third are women, and the average ideology score skews slightly conservative (3.8 on a 7-point scale, moving toward conservative). Our sample also is very experienced, having spent an average of roughly 14 years in the field; we see variability in the gender of the team coached (a bit more than half are men) and Division (one-third are Division III which perfectly echoes our aforementioned sampling strategy).<sup>14</sup>

### **[Table 1 About Here]**

Recall we included, for each protest, five outcome variables: support for the protest, belief in a team rule *against* the protest, and beliefs about the protesters’ motivation as being care about the issue, social pressure, and/or attention seeking.<sup>15</sup> We present regression results for each outcome with our main independent variable being a dummy indicator of whether the respondent reported being an African-American.<sup>16</sup> We included three types of control variables: (1) demographics including gender, age, income, and education; (2) political/social attitudes including ideology, concern about police conduct, American identity, skepticism about racial

discrimination, and political interest; and (3) career characteristics including playing a sport in college, coaching men, years in the field, head coach status, Division III status, and coaching basketball or football (as these two sports stand out in terms of revenue generation). We suspect conservatives and those with greater discrimination skepticism to be less supportive of protests of any kind, as protests seek to change the status-quo and tend to be racialized (see Druckman, Howat, and Rodheim 2016; Quinnipiac University poll 2016). Police conduct concern and American identity may matter for the national anthem and political apparel protests given their connections to police behavior and, potentially, patriotism. We do not include these two variables in the APU models since that protest is orthogonal to concerns about the police or patriotism (including the variables does not change the results).

We present the results for the national anthem, APU, and political apparel protests, respectively, in Tables 2-4.<sup>17</sup> We find that race is statistically significant and has a substantively large effect in *every* model. African-American coaches, relative to non-African American coaches, display vastly more support for all three types of protest and clearly oppose team rules that would disallow such protests. To gauge the substantive effect of race, we calculate the predicted mean scores for non-African-Americans and African-Americans, holding all other variables constant at their means (using *Clarify*; see King, Tomz, Wittenberg 2000). Recall both the support and the team rule variables are 5-point scales. African-American coaches exhibit nearly a full point greater average support score (from 2.26 [SE=.05] to 3.17 [SE=.19]) for the national anthem protest, and are roughly a half point (from 3.09 [SE=.06] to 2.62 [SE=.23]) more opposed to a team rule. We find similar results for the APU and political apparel protests, albeit slightly smaller differences in support. Specifically, support for APU protests increases from 3.04 (SE=.05) among non-African-Americans to 3.69 (SE=.18) among African-Americans, and

support for a team rule against them decreases from 2.49 (SE=.05) to 1.88 (SE=.18). Support for apparel protests increases from 2.64 (SE=.04) to 3.25 (SE=.16), and support for a team rule decreases from 2.90 (SE=.06) to 2.18 (SE=.21).<sup>18</sup>

**[Tables 2-4 About Here]**

The race gap echoes the aforementioned divides in other populations (e.g., the public, student-athletes). Of equal, if not greater, importance are results on attributions for the protests.<sup>19</sup> Across all three protests, we find African-American coaches, relative to non-African-American coaches, are much more likely to believe the student-athletes who protest do so because they care about the issue. They report much *lower* scores on beliefs that the protests stem from social pressure or an effort to garner personal attention. We calculate the probability (holding all other variables at their mean scores) of believing the given cause is why the student-athletes protest. For the national anthem protest, there is a .92 (SE=.06) chance that an African-American coach believes it reflects caring about the issue, compared to a .73 (SE=.02) chance of a non-African-American coach thinking the same. This flips direction when it comes to believing the protests stem from attention seeking, with the respective probabilities being .19 (SE=.07) and .57 (SE=.02). This is remarkably high – nearly every African-American respondent believed caring about the issue is a reason why student-athletes protest when it comes to the national anthem. We see similar movements for the APU and political apparel protests.<sup>20,21</sup> In short, African-American coaches not only differ in their opinions about the protests but also in terms of what they think about the motivations of student-athletes who engage in protests. These attributions may affect how coaches treat players and the types of expectations they establish (e.g., viewing student-athletes more as attention seekers than individuals who care about issues). To be clear, we take no normative position on whether protests should or should not be encouraged/allowed – the

message of our findings is simply that the aforementioned lack of diversity in coaching ranks creates a distinctive environment around these issues.

Aside from our race result, we find that political ideology has a consistent significant effect across outcome variables (other than the social pressure motivation and, for the general apparel protest, the attention-seeking motivation). As individuals become more conservative, they are significantly more likely to oppose protests and support team rules against protests, and less likely to believe the protesting student-athletes do so because they care about the issue. For the anthem and APU protests, conservatives also believe to a greater degree that the protesting reflects attention-seeking. For the anthem and political apparel protests, we find that concern about the police leads to significantly greater support for the protest and less support for the rule (and for the anthem, affects attributions of “care” and “attention”). This appears sensible insofar as the anthem protest explicitly focused on police brutality and several political apparel protests have been aimed at the police (e.g., Strauss 2014). The final systematic pattern is that, for the APU protest, skepticism of racial discrimination significantly decreases support for the protest and increases support for a team rule. This coheres with prior work that finds a substantial racial element to opinions about student-athlete benefits (Druckman, Howat, and Rodheim 2016).<sup>22</sup> Beyond these findings, we are hesitant to make inferences about other variables given that some will be significant by chance, given the number of models run.<sup>23</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The landscape of sports seems to be rapidly changing, and this is clear when it comes to college athletics. A media transformation has made college sports, of all kinds, regularly available to fans and alumni (e.g., Nixon 2014: 41-44), and this visibility often puts student-athletes under a microscope with their behaviors being routinely monitored. It also means that

student-athletes have a platform to take stands on issues, including those of direct relevance to themselves (e.g., the APU protest) or the larger society (e.g., the national anthem protest). Whether and to what extent it is appropriate for student-athletes to use their visibility to make political statements is a thorny issue. They represent a team and a school and, at least for scholarship athletes, have agreed to abide by certain rules (e.g., training rules). Protests invariably involve taking one side on an issue, and doing so can be polarizing and/or counter to the school's interest. But student-athletes also are students, and thus otherwise free to engage in the types of protests studied here. Our goal was to not settle what is or is not appropriate. Rather, we sought to understand the opinions of coaches who play a central role in what student-athletes can and/or want to do. Our findings accentuate the central place of race in matters of sport: as with so many other issues concerning sports, race is central when it comes to attitudes about protests. Of course, the extent to which and how the opinions coaches hold on such matters affect student-athletes remains to be seen. Our main message is that when pointing to a lack of diversity among the college coaching ranks, it is not just a matter of numbers but also beliefs.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In the 2016 season, the percentage of white head coaches, for men's NCAA teams, were 86.1 % in Division I, 88.1% in Division II, and 91.7% percent in Division III. For women's teams, the respective numbers of white head coaches were 84.5%, 87.5%, and 91.6% (Lapchick 2017: 6). For assistant coaches, the respective percentages of white coaches was 72.7%, 73.1%, and 85.1% (for men), and 74.2%, 75.5%, and 87% (for women) (Lapchick 2017: 7-8). This contrasts with the percentages of white student-athletes which, respectively, for men's and women's teams, were 64.9% and 66% (across all divisions) (Lapchick 2017: 6).

<sup>2</sup> Journalist Shannon Ryan (2016) quotes Lane Demas, author of *Integrating the Gridiron*, as saying "Today, coaches and administrators still have tremendous power over these players... That's probably the thing that's changed the least in the long history of American college sport." Ryan further states, "...college basketball coaches, who are majority white, are delivering subtle and conflicting messages to their players, who are mostly black, on how to express their voices when it comes to racial injustices."

<sup>3</sup> To be clear, Staurowsky (2014) duly recognizes and discusses, at length, variations in coaches' opinions.

<sup>4</sup> At the January 2017 NCAA annual meeting, chairs of each NCAA Division's boards/councils expressed support for athlete protests and activism, especially when they revolve around social justice (New 2017). Even so, there clearly is variance in the coaching ranks (New 2017).

<sup>5</sup> Players for the Miami Heat also protested the 2012 shooting of African-American Trayvon Martin by George Zimmerman by posting a photograph of team members wearing hooded sweatshirts and by displaying messages such as "We want justice" on their shoes during a game (Boren 2012; ESPN 2012).

<sup>6</sup> A statewide poll (see

<http://bloximages.newyork1.vip.townnews.com/columbiatribune.com/content/tncms/assets/v3/editorial/b/66/b66b9a67-7be1-5ee4-a8f9-dbc67a7b8c2a/564a417b8cbb3.pdf.pdf>) showed 62% overall disapproval of the Missouri protests, but disaggregating by race revealed another sharp difference: 63% of whites, but only 38% of African-Americans, disapproved.

<sup>7</sup> Division II schools lie somewhere in between – they can offer partial athletic scholarships and typically invest at levels less than Division I but greater than Division III (<http://www.ncaa.org/about?division=d2>).

<sup>8</sup> Schools varied in terms of providing e-mail contact information directly on the athletic department webpage. For those that did not provide e-mails on the webpage, we accessed the school directories to look up contact information. A few schools in the initial sample neither listed e-mails on the athletic department webpage nor had publicly accessible directories. We dropped those schools from the samples and randomly selected replacements.

<sup>9</sup> The former requirement means we excluded office managers, facility managers, and equipment managers, marketing, etc. The latter requirement means that we excluded academic advisors, team chaplains, nutrition consultants. We did include any position coach, manager, video analyst (as they may deal directly with the analysis of play), and recruiters. The full list of titles we included/excluded is available from the authors.

<sup>10</sup> Our initial sample was 7,753, but 361 e-mails bounced back (making for a 95.3% delivery rate). In the invitation, we mentioned that the idea for the survey grew out of an undergraduate class project, which it did. We sent two reminders.

<sup>11</sup> We received a few responses (less than 5% of our sample) after March 24<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Many of the "non-coaches" listed their jobs as directors of operations, trainers, or video coordinators (we may have misclassified some of these in our initial sampling due to a lack of information on athletic department website; i.e., a lack of a clear job label for some individuals).

<sup>13</sup> A respondent also could enter "other" reasons.

<sup>14</sup> Percentages of coaches in each sport are as follows: Basketball 15.2%, Soccer 12.8%, Track and Field 11.7%, Football 11.5%, Volleyball 10.1%, Swimming 8.4%, Cross Country 6.4%, Baseball 5.7%, Softball 5.3%, Golf 5.3%, Lacrosse 4.5%, Tennis 4.0%. All other sports were represented by fewer than 4.0% of coaches in our sample.

<sup>15</sup> For the latter three variables we only included respondents who answered the general support measure since that is a pre-requisite to explaining *why* you oppose or support a protest.

<sup>16</sup> We do not include variables for other races/ethnicities since our expectations revolve specifically around African-Americans rather than minorities in general. Practically, the sample also includes very few other minorities (e.g., just 3% of the sample reported being Hispanic).

<sup>17</sup> The Ns for the regressions shrink for two reasons. First, of the 873 coaches who started the survey, a fair number rolled off with 662 answering at least one of the three overall protest support questions. Second, there was some non-response on three items: racial discrimination skepticism, American identity, and police conduct concern batteries. The central results are robust if we exclude these variables.

---

<sup>18</sup> While these race effects are quite notable, support even for African-American coaches is not extremely high, never reaching an average score of 4 on the 5-point support scale. Across the entire sample, support is fairly low: 2.33 for the national anthem protest, 3.09 for the APU protest, and 2.68 for the political apparel protest.

<sup>19</sup> Recall that respondents could agree with any number of attributions.

<sup>20</sup> African-Americans have a .94 (SE=.04) probability of believing an APU protester would care about the issue, compared to a .71 (SE=.02) probability for all other coaches. For apparel protests, these probabilities are .92 (SE=.05) and .75 (SE=.02), respectively. African-American coaches have a .15 (SE=.06) probability of believing an APU protester would be seeking attention, compared to a probability of .44 (SE=.02) for non-African-Americans. These probabilities are .39 (SE=.08) and .59 (SE=.02), respectively, for apparel protests.

<sup>21</sup> When we enter the attribution variables as independent variables in the overall support models, we find that the “care” and “attention” variables are always significant (see table A.1 in the appendix). There is some evidence of partial mediation of the race main effect, although in all cases the race variable remains highly significant. In other words, attributions affect support with “care” generating more support and “attention” leading to less support but the impact of race does not work entirely through those variables.

<sup>22</sup> The inconsistent role of discrimination skepticism for the other protests likely reflects its strong relationship with police conduct concern, which is a more proximate cause of opinions in those cases (i.e., the two correlate at -.52).

<sup>23</sup> Some of the other findings, however, are sensible such as more political interest leading to greater support for protests, and coaching high-revenue sports making one less supportive of the APU.



## References

- Associated Press. 2014. "Notre Dame Women Wear 'I Can't Breathe' T-shirts." *San Diego Union-Tribune*, December 13. <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sdut-notre-dame-women-wear-i-cant-breathe-t-shirts-2014dec13-story.html>
- Associated Press. 2016. "National Anthem protests spread to college football, WNBA." *Fox News Sports*, September 25. <http://www.foxnews.com/sports/2016/09/25/national-anthem-protests-spread-to-college-football-wnba.html>
- Bass, Amy. 2002. *Not the Triumph But the Struggle: The 1968 Olympics and the Making of the Black Athlete*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boren, Cindy. 2012. "Miami Heat, LeBron James, Dwayne Wade Don Hoodies for Trayvon Martin." *Washington Post*, March 23. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/early-lead/post/miami-heat-lebron-james-dwyane-wade-don-hoodies-for-trayvon-martin/2012/03/23/gIQAuC0EWS\\_blog.html?utm\\_term=.10b01e3e4e3f](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/early-lead/post/miami-heat-lebron-james-dwyane-wade-don-hoodies-for-trayvon-martin/2012/03/23/gIQAuC0EWS_blog.html?utm_term=.10b01e3e4e3f)
- Breech, John. 2016. "Here are the 11 players who joined Colin Kaepernick's protests in Week 1." *CBS Sports*, September 2016. <http://www.cbssports.com/nfl/news/here-are-the-11-players-who-joined-colin-kaepernicks-protest-in-week-1/>
- Buffington, Daniel, and Todd Fraley. 2008. "Skill in Black and White: Negotiating Media Images of Race in a Sporting Context." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 32(3): 292-310.
- Chong, Dennis, and Reuel Rogers. 2005. "Racial Solidarity and Political Participation." *Political Behavior* 27(4): 347-374.
- Cooky, Cheryl. 2017. "'We Cannot Stand Idly By': A Necessary Call for a Public Sociology of Sport." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 34: 1-11.
- Couper, Mick P. 2008. *Designing Effective Web Surveys*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Druckman, James N., Adam J. Howat, and Andrew Rodheim. 2016. "The Influence of Race on Attitudes about College Athletics." *Sport in Society* 19(7): 1020-1039.
- Epstein, Adam, and Kathryn Kisska-Schulze. 2016. "Northwestern University, The University of Missouri, and the 'Student-Athlete': Mobilization Efforts and the Future." *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* 26(2): 71-105.

- ESPN. 2012. "Heat Don Hoodies After Teen's Death." *ESPN.com*, March 24.  
[http://www.espn.com/nba/truehoop/miamiheat/story/\\_/id/7728618/miami-heat-don-hoodies-response-death-teen-trayvon-martin](http://www.espn.com/nba/truehoop/miamiheat/story/_/id/7728618/miami-heat-don-hoodies-response-death-teen-trayvon-martin)
- ESPN. 2016. "Michigan, Michigan State Players Raise Fists During National Anthem." *ESPN.com*, September 25. [http://www.espn.com/college-football/story/\\_/id/17626402/college-football-players-protest-anthem](http://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/17626402/college-football-players-protest-anthem)
- Gay, Claudine and Katherine Tate. 1998. "Doubly Bound: The Impact of Gender and Race on the Politics of Black Women." *Political Psychology* 19(1): 169-184.
- Gillion, Daniel Q. 2012. "Protest and Congressional Behavior: Assessing Racial and Ethnic Minority Protests in the District." *Journal of Politics* 74(4): 950-962.
- Herring, Mary, Thomas B. Jankowski, and Ronald E. Brown. 1999. "Pro-Black Doesn't Mean Anti-White: The Structure of African-American Group Identity." *Journal of Politics* 61(2): 363-386.
- Hoch, David. 2011. "Coaches as Role Models." *NFHS Coaching Today*.  
<http://old.nfhs.org/CoachingTodayContent.aspx?id=8709>
- Huddy, Leonie, and Nadia Khatib. 2007. "American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 63-77.
- Jackson, John S., III. 1973. "Alienation and Black Political Participation." *Journal of Politics* 35(4): 849-885.
- Jayakumar, Uma M., and Eddie Comeaux. 2016. "The Cultural Cover-Up of College Athletics: How Organizational Culture Perpetuates and Unrealized and Idealized Balancing Act." *Journal of Higher Education* 87(4): 488-515.
- Kassing, Jeffrey W., and Rachael L. Anderson. 2014. "Contradicting Coach or Grumbling to Teammates: Exploring Dissent Expression in the Coach-Athlete Relationship." *Communication and Sport* 2(2): 172-185.
- Kaufman, Peter, and Eli A. Wolff. 2010. "Playing and Protesting: Sport as a Vehicle for Social Change." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 34(2): 154-175.
- King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg. 2000. "Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation." *American Journal of Political Science* 44(2): 347-361.
- Lapchick, Richard. 2017. "The 2016 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport." The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES), the University of Central Florida.

- Lipsky, Michael. 1968. "Protest as a Political Resource." *American Political Science Review* 62(4): 1144-1158.
- Martin, Lori Latrice. 2014. "The Black Athlete and the Postracial Myth." In *Out of Bounds: Racism and the Black Athlete*, edited by Lori Latrice Martin. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 3-28.
- New, Jake. 2017. "Athletes and Activism." *Inside Higher Ed*, February 3. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/02/03/ncaa-meeting-college-sports-leaders-recommend-supporting-athlete-protests>
- Nixon, Howard L., II. 2014. *The Athletic Trap: How College Sports Corrupted the Academy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Patterson, Chip. 2013. "All Players United campaign launched with 'APU' on wrist tape." *CBS Sports*, September 21. <http://www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/all-players-united-campaign-launched-with-apu-on-wrist-tape/>
- Prewitt, Alex. 2014. "Large Majority Opposes Paying NCAA Athletes, Washington Post-ABC News Poll Finds." *The Washington Post*, March 24. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/colleges/large-majority-opposes-paying-ncaa-athletes-washington-post-abc-news-poll-finds/2014/03/22/c411a32e-b130-11e3-95e8-39bef8e9a48b\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/colleges/large-majority-opposes-paying-ncaa-athletes-washington-post-abc-news-poll-finds/2014/03/22/c411a32e-b130-11e3-95e8-39bef8e9a48b_story.html).
- Rogers, Martin. 2016. "49ers' Colin Kaepernick on Protest: 'I Don't Want to Kneel Forever.'" *USA Today*, September 14. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/nfl/49ers/2016/09/14/colin-kaepernick-protest-kneel-police-brutality-san-francisco/90375234/>
- Ryan, Shannon. 2016. "College Coaches Should Follow Players' Lead on Protests, Expression." *Chicago Tribune*, November 11. <http://www.chicagotribune.com/sports/columnists/ct-college-sports-activism-spt-1112-20161112-column.html>
- Simien, Evelyn M. 2005. "Race, Gender, and Linked Fate." *Journal of Black Studies* 35(5): 529-550.
- Staurowsky, Ellen. 2014. "College Athletes' Rights in the Age of the Super Conference: The Case of the All Players United Campaign." *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport* 7(1): 11-34.
- Strauss, Chris. 2014. "Nets' Jarrett Jack Explains 'I Can't Breathe' T-shirts." *USA Today*, December 9. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/nba/2014/12/09/jarrett-jack-nets-cavaliers-i-cant-breathe-t-shirts-lebron-james-kyrie-irving/20125923/>

- Tracy, Marc, and Ashley Southall. 2015. "Black Football Players Lend Heft to Protests at Missouri." *New York Times*, November 8. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/09/us/missouri-football-players-boycott-in-protest-of-university-president.html>
- Turman, Paul D. 2006. "Athletes' Perception of Coach Power and the Association between Playing Status and Sport Satisfaction." *Communication Research Reports* 23(4): 273-282.
- White, Joseph. 2014. "Georgetown Players Stage 'I Can't Breathe' Protest." *San Diego Union-Tribune*, December 10. <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sdut-georgetown-players-wear-i-cant-breathe-t-shirts-2014dec10-story.html>
- Widener, Daniel. 2017. "Race and Sport." In *Oxford Handbook of Sports History*, edited by Robert Edelman and Wayne Wilson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 462-476.
- Wyche, Steve. 2016. "Colin Kaepernick Explains Why He Sat During National Anthem." *NFL.com*, August 27. <http://www.nfl.com/news/story/0ap3000000691077/article/colin-kaepernick-explains-protest-of-national-anthem>

**Table 1: Sample Characteristics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Percent</b>
African-American	8.8%
Female	35.5%
Coach Men	56.7%
Head Coach	38.4%
Division III	33.2%
Played Sport in College	88.9%
	<b>Mean (std. dev.)</b>
Years in the Field	14.04 (11.00)
Age (1-5 scale) <sup>1</sup>	3.63 (.95)
Income (1-5 scale) <sup>2</sup>	2.77 (1.16)
Education (1-6 scale) <sup>3</sup>	4.58 (.57)
Ideology (1-7 scale)	3.80 (1.66)
Police Conduct Concern (0-1 scale)	.53 (.16)
American Identity (1-4 scale)	3.23 (.61)
Racial Discrimination Skepticism (1-4 scale)	1.53 (.68)
Political Interest (1-5 scale)	2.95 (.98)

<sup>1</sup> 1=18-24, 2=25-34, 3=35-50, 4=51-65, 5=over 65

<sup>2</sup> 1=<\$30,000, 2=\$30,000-\$69,999, 3=\$70,000-\$99,999, 4=\$100,000-\$200,000, 5= >\$200,000

<sup>3</sup> 1=less than high school, 2=high school, 3=some college, 4=4-year college degree, 5=master's degree, 6=doctorate

**Table 2: National Anthem Protest**

	(1) Support	(2) Team Rule	(3) Care	(4) Pressure	(5) Attention
African-American	0.907*** (0.195)	-0.457* (0.243)	1.647** (0.769)	-1.812*** (0.521)	-1.753*** (0.492)
Female	-0.337*** (0.128)	0.207 (0.160)	-0.358 (0.300)	0.026 (0.249)	-0.012 (0.260)
Age	0.082 (0.095)	-0.090 (0.119)	-0.174 (0.209)	-0.252 (0.185)	-0.346* (0.193)
Income	0.032 (0.045)	-0.049 (0.056)	0.178* (0.104)	0.049 (0.087)	-0.040 (0.091)
Education	0.182** (0.083)	-0.069 (0.104)	0.249 (0.187)	-0.006 (0.163)	-0.387** (0.172)
Ideology	-0.261*** (0.035)	0.244*** (0.044)	-0.291*** (0.081)	0.046 (0.069)	0.188*** (0.073)
Police Concern	2.276*** (0.418)	-2.280*** (0.523)	2.746*** (0.989)	-0.313 (0.812)	-2.656*** (0.870)
American Identity	-0.302*** (0.086)	0.103 (0.107)	-0.037 (0.204)	-0.110 (0.166)	0.186 (0.174)
Discrim. Skepticism	-0.091 (0.084)	-0.002 (0.105)	-0.264 (0.177)	-0.045 (0.163)	0.072 (0.172)
Political Interest	0.135*** (0.049)	-0.041 (0.062)	-0.095 (0.112)	0.003 (0.095)	0.075 (0.101)
Played Sport	-0.162 (0.152)	0.022 (0.192)	-0.024 (0.342)	-0.058 (0.296)	-0.146 (0.312)
Men's Coach	0.204* (0.117)	-0.141 (0.147)	-0.232 (0.271)	-0.014 (0.229)	-0.200 (0.239)
Years in Field	-0.014* (0.008)	-0.001 (0.010)	-0.022 (0.018)	-0.012 (0.016)	-0.005 (0.016)
Head Coach	-0.115 (0.112)	0.243* (0.139)	0.385 (0.252)	0.443** (0.218)	0.171 (0.226)
Division III	0.009 (0.102)	0.039 (0.127)	0.055 (0.231)	-0.048 (0.197)	0.017 (0.206)
Basketball	-0.062 (0.148)	0.136 (0.189)	-0.066 (0.357)	0.179 (0.291)	0.179 (0.305)
Football	-0.199 (0.165)	0.244 (0.206)	-0.338 (0.366)	0.412 (0.327)	0.501 (0.354)
Constant	1.485** (0.644)	3.806*** (0.806)	-0.431 (1.428)	0.725 (1.246)	3.695*** (1.320)
Observations	545	542	545	545	545
R <sup>2</sup> /Log-Likelihood	0.436	0.236	-275.5	-353.2	-328.5

*Note:* Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients (for models 1-2)/Logit coefficients (for models 3-5) with associated standard errors in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ , \* $p \leq 0.1$  for two-tailed tests.

**Table 3: All Players United Protest**

	(1) Support	(2) Team Rule	(3) Care	(4) Pressure	(5) Attention
African-American	0.660*** (0.193)	-0.597*** (0.193)	1.975*** (0.745)	-1.310*** (0.408)	-1.573*** (0.472)
Female	-0.396*** (0.134)	0.367*** (0.134)	-0.296 (0.273)	0.238 (0.243)	-0.282 (0.251)
Age	-0.126 (0.099)	0.021 (0.100)	-0.144 (0.197)	-0.194 (0.180)	-0.077 (0.184)
Income	-0.009 (0.047)	-0.040 (0.047)	-0.031 (0.094)	0.143* (0.086)	-0.092 (0.087)
Education	-0.049 (0.086)	0.042 (0.086)	-0.036 (0.172)	-0.008 (0.156)	0.086 (0.160)
Ideology	-0.168*** (0.034)	0.219*** (0.034)	-0.178*** (0.068)	0.083 (0.061)	0.234*** (0.063)
Discrim. Skepticism	-0.242*** (0.082)	0.188** (0.082)	-0.149 (0.158)	0.024 (0.148)	-0.105 (0.151)
Political Interest	0.007 (0.051)	-0.031 (0.051)	0.020 (0.103)	0.069 (0.092)	-0.031 (0.094)
Played Sport	-0.105 (0.161)	-0.019 (0.161)	0.027 (0.323)	0.143 (0.292)	0.085 (0.298)
Men's Coach	-0.045 (0.123)	0.052 (0.124)	0.005 (0.250)	0.039 (0.224)	-0.323 (0.231)
Years in Field	-0.004 (0.008)	0.005 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.017)	0.000 (0.015)	-0.002 (0.016)
Head Coach	-0.192* (0.116)	0.129 (0.117)	0.080 (0.232)	0.431** (0.211)	0.389* (0.216)
Division III	0.037 (0.107)	-0.008 (0.107)	0.064 (0.215)	0.037 (0.193)	-0.196 (0.197)
Basketball	-0.388** (0.154)	0.444*** (0.156)	-0.097 (0.318)	0.036 (0.282)	0.315 (0.287)
Football	-0.001 (0.173)	0.293* (0.174)	0.054 (0.362)	0.329 (0.319)	0.295 (0.325)
Constant	3.916*** (0.618)	1.918*** (0.620)	1.806 (1.226)	-0.485 (1.123)	-1.147 (1.143)
Observations	548	545	548	548	548
R <sup>2</sup> /Log-Likelihood	0.175	0.175	-308.4	-365.3	-352.9

*Note:* Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients (for models 1-2)/Logit coefficients (for models 3-5) with associated standard errors in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ , \* $p \leq 0.1$  for two-tailed tests.

**Table 4: Political Apparel Protest**

	(1) Support	(2) Team Rule	(3) Care	(4) Pressure	(5) Attention
African-American	0.621*** (0.170)	-0.724*** (0.227)	1.513** (0.652)	-0.854** (0.388)	-0.820** (0.382)
Female	-0.071 (0.113)	0.104 (0.152)	-0.870*** (0.299)	-0.331 (0.245)	-0.381 (0.251)
Age	-0.069 (0.084)	0.081 (0.112)	-0.070 (0.209)	-0.100 (0.180)	-0.321* (0.186)
Income	-0.005 (0.040)	-0.034 (0.053)	0.156 (0.102)	0.156* (0.086)	0.096 (0.089)
Education	-0.044 (0.073)	0.020 (0.097)	0.312* (0.182)	0.012 (0.156)	0.006 (0.161)
Ideology	-0.125*** (0.031)	0.151*** (0.042)	-0.277*** (0.081)	0.045 (0.068)	0.111 (0.070)
Police Concern	1.994*** (0.366)	-1.729*** (0.490)	0.908 (0.942)	-0.615 (0.789)	-0.912 (0.813)
American Identity	-0.102 (0.075)	0.024 (0.101)	0.033 (0.204)	-0.134 (0.163)	0.163 (0.166)
Discrim. Skepticism	-0.011 (0.074)	0.002 (0.099)	-0.215 (0.176)	-0.129 (0.160)	0.159 (0.167)
Political Interest	0.100** (0.043)	-0.012 (0.058)	0.175 (0.110)	0.077 (0.093)	0.070 (0.097)
Played Sport	0.093 (0.135)	0.233 (0.181)	0.145 (0.342)	-0.126 (0.292)	0.614** (0.298)
Men's Coach	0.029 (0.103)	-0.234* (0.138)	-0.148 (0.268)	-0.075 (0.223)	-0.316 (0.230)
Years in Field	-0.008 (0.007)	0.001 (0.010)	-0.036** (0.018)	-0.026* (0.016)	-0.007 (0.016)
Head Coach	-0.014 (0.098)	0.074 (0.132)	0.166 (0.249)	0.198 (0.212)	0.180 (0.217)
Division III	-0.161* (0.090)	0.010 (0.121)	0.039 (0.230)	-0.184 (0.194)	-0.004 (0.200)
Basketball	-0.037 (0.131)	0.108 (0.177)	-0.673** (0.330)	0.065 (0.284)	0.432 (0.297)
Football	-0.020 (0.146)	0.310 (0.195)	-0.523 (0.364)	0.245 (0.316)	-0.004 (0.325)
Constant	2.606*** (0.564)	2.723*** (0.756)	-0.547 (1.402)	0.361 (1.210)	0.847 (1.251)
Observations	545	542	545	545	545
R <sup>2</sup> /Log-Likelihood	0.302	0.174	-279.8	-366.3	-351

Note: Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients (for models 1-2)/Logit coefficients (for models 3-5) with associated standard errors in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ , \* $p \leq 0.1$  for two-tailed tests.



## Appendix

### Question Wording

Which sport(s) team do you work with (e.g., coach)? Check all that apply.

- |  |                                       |  |   |                                     |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Baseball            | <input type="checkbox"/> Fencing      | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacrosse              | <input type="checkbox"/> Softball                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Volleyball |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basketball          | <input type="checkbox"/> Field hockey | <input type="checkbox"/> Lightweight<br>Rowing | <input type="checkbox"/> Swimming                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Water polo |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Beach<br>Volleyball | <input type="checkbox"/> Football     | <input type="checkbox"/> Pistol                | <input type="checkbox"/> Synchronized<br>Swimming | <input type="checkbox"/> Wrestling  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bowling             | <input type="checkbox"/> Golf         | <input type="checkbox"/> Rifle                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Tennis                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cross country       | <input type="checkbox"/> Gymnastics   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rowing                | <input type="checkbox"/> Track and Field          |                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diving              | <input type="checkbox"/> Ice Hockey   | <input type="checkbox"/> Soccer                |   |                                     |

Do you work with a men's team, women's team, both, or neither (directly)?

*Men's*       *Women's*       *Both*       *Neither Directly*

Would you describe yourself as a coach (of any type)?

*Yes*       *No*

What is your exact job title? \_\_\_\_\_

How many years have you worked in your current field (generally speaking)? (This includes your time in your current position)?

\_\_\_\_\_

In which NCAA division does your school compete?

*Division 1*       *Division 2*       *Division 3*

What is your gender?

*Male*       *Female*       *Other*

What is your age?

*Under 18*       *18-24*       *25-34*       *35-50*       *51-65*       *Over 65*

Which of the following do you consider to be your primary racial or ethnic group (*you may check more than one*)?

*White*       *African American*     *Asian American*     *Hispanic*       *Native American*     *Other*

What is your estimate of your family's annual household income (before taxes)?

*< \$30,000*       *\$30,000 - \$69,999*       *\$70,000-\$99,999*       *\$100,000-\$200,000*       *>\$200,000*

Which point on this scale best describes your political views?

*Very liberal*       *Moderately liberal*       *Somewhat liberal*       *Moderate*       *Somewhat conservative*       *Moderately conservative*       *Very conservative*

In general, how interested are you in politics?

*Not at all interested*       *Not too interested*       *Somewhat interested*       *Very interested*       *Extremely interested*

What is your highest level of education?

*Less than high school*       *High school*       *Some college*       *4 year college degree*       *Master's degree*       *Doctorate*

If you attended any college, did you play a varsity sport (for at least one season)?

*Did not attend any college*     *No*       *Yes*

Do you disapprove or approve of the way the police **in the United States** are doing their job?

*Completely disapprove*       *Somewhat disapprove*       *Neither disapprove nor approve*       *Somewhat approve*       *Completely approve*

Do you disapprove or approve of the way the police **in your community** are doing their job?

*Completely disapprove*       *Somewhat disapprove*       *Neither disapprove nor approve*       *Somewhat approve*       *Completely approve*

Which of the following two statements comes closer to your view?

*The police should take all steps necessary to prevent crime in the United States even if it means some of your basic civil liberties could be violated.*

*The police should take steps to prevent crime but not if those steps could violate your basic civil liberties.*

Do you think the police **in the United States** are generally tougher on whites than on blacks, tougher on blacks than on whites, or do the police treat them both the same?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Tougher on whites*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Tougher on blacks*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Treat both the same*

Do you think the police **in your community** are generally tougher on whites than on blacks, tougher on blacks than on whites, or do the police treat them both the same?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Tougher on whites*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Tougher on blacks*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Treat both the same*

When faced with a possible criminal situation involving minority suspects, do you think police **in the United States** generally use excessive force, appropriate force, or insufficient force?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use excessive force*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use appropriate force*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use insufficient force*

When faced with a possible criminal situation involving minority suspects, do you think police **in your community** generally use excessive force, appropriate force, or insufficient force?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use excessive force*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use appropriate force*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Use insufficient force*

How serious a problem do you think police brutality is in the United States: not a problem at all, not very serious, somewhat serious, or very serious?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Not a problem at all*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Not very serious*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Somewhat serious*

\_\_\_\_\_ *A very serious problem*

Is being the victim of police brutality something you personally worry about, or not?

\_\_\_\_\_ *No*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Yes*

As you may know, some athletes and sports teams have begun not standing during the national anthem in order to protest police violence against the black community in the United States. To what extent do you disapprove or approve of this form of protest?

\_\_\_\_\_ *Completely disapprove*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Somewhat disapprove*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Neither disapprove nor approve*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Somewhat approve*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Completely approve*

Why do you think a student-athlete would protest by kneeling during the national anthem? (Check all that apply.)

They care about the issue.

They are under social pressure.

- They are seeking personal attention.
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Do you believe your team should not or should have a rule that athletes must stand for the national anthem?

                      
*Definitely  
should not*
                      
*Probably  
should not*
                      
*No opinion*
                      
*Probably  
should*
                      
*Definitely  
should*

As you may know, some college athletes have worn wristbands with the slogan “APU” during games or competitions. This stands for “All Players United” and is meant to protest NCAA rules forbidding compensation of student athletes beyond scholarships. To what extent do you disapprove or approve of this form of protest?

                      
*Completely  
disapprove*
                      
*Somewhat  
disapprove*
                      
*Neither disapprove  
nor approve*
                      
*Somewhat  
approve*
                      
*Completely  
approve*

Why do you think a student-athlete would protest by wearing one of these wristbands? (Check all that apply.)

- They care about the issue.
- They are under social pressure.
- They are seeking personal attention.
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Do you believe your team should not or should have a rule banning athletes from wearing APU wristbands during games?

                      
*Definitely  
should not*
                      
*Probably  
should not*
                      
*No opinion*
                      
*Probably  
should*
                      
*Definitely  
should*

This next set of questions deals with **political** protest apparel *in general, aside from* APU wristbands.

To what extent do you disapprove or approve of student-athletes wearing **any** apparel to protest **any** political issue?

                      
*Completely  
disapprove*
                      
*Somewhat  
disapprove*
                      
*Neither disapprove  
nor approve*
                      
*Somewhat  
approve*
                      
*Completely  
approve*

Why do you think a student-athlete would wear any apparel to protest a political issue? (Check all that apply.)

- They care about the issue.
- They are under social pressure.
- They are seeking personal attention.
- Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Do you believe your team should not or should have a rule banning athletes from wearing apparel that protests about any political issue during games?

Definitely should not      Probably should not      No opinion      Probably should      Definitely should

How important is being American to you?

Not important at all      Not very important      Very important      Extremely important

To what extent do you see yourself as a typical American?

Not at all      Very little      Somewhat      A great deal

How well does the term “American” describe you?

Not well at all      Not very well      Very well      Extremely well

When talking about Americans, how often do you say “we” instead of “they?”

Never      Not very well      Very well      Extremely

We would like you to tell us how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statement: “Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in America.”

Disagree strongly      Disagree somewhat      Agree somewhat      Agree strongly

**Table A.1: Mediation by Motivation Attribution**

	(1) Anthem	(2) APU	(3) Apparel
African-American	0.636*** (0.191)	0.370** (0.187)	0.502*** (0.169)
Female	-0.313** (0.122)	-0.372*** (0.128)	-0.055 (0.113)
Age	0.051 (0.091)	-0.121 (0.094)	-0.082 (0.083)
Income	0.013 (0.043)	-0.009 (0.045)	-0.005 (0.039)
Education	0.119 (0.080)	-0.039 (0.082)	-0.061 (0.071)
Ideology	-0.212*** (0.035)	-0.122*** (0.033)	-0.104*** (0.031)
Police Concern	1.765*** (0.405)	- -	1.889*** (0.360)
American Identity	-0.283*** (0.082)	- -	-0.102 (0.074)
Discrim. Skepticism	-0.056 (0.081)	-0.228*** (0.078)	0.004 (0.073)
Political Interest	0.152*** (0.047)	0.006 (0.048)	0.098** (0.043)
Played Sport	-0.177 (0.146)	-0.096 (0.152)	0.104 (0.134)
Men's Coach	0.194* (0.112)	-0.070 (0.117)	0.021 (0.102)
Years in Field	-0.013* (0.008)	-0.003 (0.008)	-0.008 (0.007)
Head Coach	-0.117 (0.107)	-0.153 (0.111)	-0.007 (0.097)
Division III	0.007 (0.097)	0.014 (0.101)	-0.170* (0.089)
Basketball	-0.033 (0.141)	-0.351** (0.146)	0.019 (0.130)
Football	-0.106 (0.158)	0.030 (0.164)	0.018 (0.144)
Care <sup>1</sup>	0.499*** (0.109)	0.659*** (0.106)	0.309*** (0.098)
Pressure <sup>1</sup>	-0.118 (0.097)	-0.156 (0.103)	-0.162* (0.088)
Attention <sup>1</sup>	-0.502*** (0.100)	-0.359*** (0.105)	-0.173* (0.091)
Constant	1.997*** (0.630)	3.489*** (0.595)	2.692*** (0.559)
Observations	545	548	545
R-squared	0.489	0.262	0.329

<sup>1</sup> Coefficients for “Care,” “Pressure,” and “Attention” represent the effects of motive attributions respective to each type of protest.

*Note:* Cell entries are OLS regression coefficients (for models 1-2)/Logit coefficients (for models 3-5) with associated standard errors in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\* $p \leq 0.01$ , \*\* $p \leq 0.05$ , \* $p \leq 0.1$  for two-tailed tests.