1989

Positive distinctiveness and intergroup discrimination between intercollegiate athletes and nonathletes

Jean H. Pace
University of Richmond

Positive Distinctiveness and Intergroup Discrimination Between Intercollegiate Athletes and Nonathletes

Jean H. Pace and Scott T. Allison

University of Richmond

Running head: POSITIVE DISTINCTIVENESS

Abstract

Past research has shown that individuals seek to establish a positively valued distinctiveness between their own group (ingroup) and other groups (outgroups) to maintain and enhance their self-esteem (Turner, 1981). The purpose of this study was to explore this issue further using intercollegiate student athletes and nonathletes as subjects. Ten athletes and ten nonathletes each generated lists of personality traits that they believed athletes and nonathletes possess. A different group of athletes and nonathletes (N=68) then rated the social desirability of these traits. The results revealed that each group attempted to differentiate itself positively from the other. Athletes and nonathletes tended to describe their own group as more positive than the outgroup, but neither group interpreted as positive those ingroup attributes designated as negative by the outgroup. A factor analysis of the trait ratings provided further support for Turner's model. We discuss the theoretical implications and practical applications of these findings.

Positive Distinctiveness and Intergroup Discrimination Between Intercollegiate Athletes and Nonathletes

A recurring theme in social psychological research is that people seek to understand or make sense of their social environment (Asch, 1951; Carroll & Payne, 1976; Heider, 1958; Ross, 1977). To achieve this goal of social understanding, individuals are compelled to sift through and make sense of a vast array of social information. Because we cannot possibly attend to and process all of this information, we actively categorize individuals into social groups. Social categorizations are one way we reduce the complex social world to a more simple and manageable structure (Wilder, 1984).

But social categorizations do not merely systematize the social world; they also provide a system of orientation that helps to create and define the individual's place in society (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Schutz, 1932, 1967). According to Berger (1966), "society not only defines but creates psychological reality. The individual realizes his identity in socially defined terms and these definitions become reality as he lives in society" (p.107). Social groups, understood in this sense,

provide their members with an identification of themselves in social terms.

There is much evidence that individuals not only define but also evaluate themselves in terms of their group memberships (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1981). They seek to establish positively valued differences between their own group (ingroup) and other groups (outgroup) to maintain and enhance their self-esteem. In other words, when group membership contributes to defining the self, the need for positive self-esteem should motivate a desire to evaluate one's group positively.

Any categorization rule that provides a basis for classifying an individual as belonging to one social group as distinct from another can be sufficient to produce perceptual and attitudinal biases favoring the ingroup over the outgroup (Brewer, 1979). Tajfel (1972) and Turner (1975) hypothesize that the group behavior produced by social categorization is discriminatory precisely because of the need to enhance self-esteem. This discrimination or ingroup favoritism represents an attempt to achieve <u>positive distinctiveness</u> for one's own group. Two experiments support this idea directly. Oakes and Turner (1980)

found that ingroup favoritism increased subjects' self esteem compared to a control group who were categorized but who were not given the opportunity to display ingroup favoritism. In another study, Turner and Spriggs (1981) had their subjects cooperating or competing with each other on an interpersonal (self vs. individual other) or intergroup basis (ingroup vs. outgroup). They found that both interpersonal and intergroup competition increased self-esteem; that the latter was as effective as the former suggests that categorized individuals do evaluate themselves in terms of their group memberships. Both studies also provide evidence that social categorization effects are associated with changes in self-esteem.

Following Tajfel (1972), we assume that social categories through which individuals identify themselves contribute positively or negatively to their self-identities. This contribution to an individual's self-identity is dependent on, and assessed by means of, social comparisons between ingroups and other groups in terms of valued attributes of the groups. Therefore, an ingroup will be able to preserve its contribution to its members' positive social identity only if it manages to

maintain a positively valued distinctiveness from other groups (Tajfel, 1972; Turner, 1975).

On the basis of these assumptions, it can be hypothesized that in any situation in which a group is able to compare itself with another group on some valued dimension, the group will attempt to differentiate itself from the other toward the positively valued pole of that dimension in order to preserve its members' self-esteem. Further, where any two groups can compare themselves with each other on a dimension that they value similarly, each must attempt to differentiate itself from the other toward the same positively valued pole. Even differences on a single dimension can be represented in alternative ways that favor one group or the other (Campbell, 1967). This process underscores Peabody's (1968) finding that even when various groups agree about their respective characteristics, the trait is evaluated more positively by the group that possesses it.

Two distinct social categories, intercollegiate athletes and nonathletes, lend themselves to an investigation of the above hypotheses. These two groups were studied for two reasons. First, athletes and nonathletes are salient reference groups for their

members, and this implies that membership in these groups contributes to the individual's social identity. If the need for positive social identity motivates a search for and the creation of positive distinctiveness for one's own group, then a clear demonstration of the positive distinctiveness principle should be obtained using athletes and nonathletes.

Second, a number of studies have investigated personality differences between athletes and nonathletes, and these studies suggest that differences do exist (Schendel, 1965; Hunt, 1969; Schurr, Ashley, & Joy, 1977; Morgan, 1980). While there is evidence to indicate that these two groups differ, the trend or direction of these differences in terms of positive or negative values is not clear. Thus, when athletes and nonathletes are asked to evaluate personality traits associated with their ingroup or outgroup, there should be a tendency for them (a) to rate ingroup attributes as more positive; and (b) to interpret as positive those attributes designated as negative by the outgroup.

Method

Overview

The experiment consisted of two separate phases. In phase 1, subjects generated ingroup and outgroup personality characteristics. In phase 2, a different group of subjects rated the social desirability of those characteristics. We describe the subjects and procedure associated with each phase below.

Phase 1 Subjects

The subjects were ten intercollegiate student athletes (representing the sports of basketball, field hockey, cross-country, swimming, baseball, soccer, football, and tennis) and 10 student nonathletes. Subjects were designated as nonathletes if they had not participated in any organized sports program since the beginning of high school. Both males and females were included in the sample. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

Phase 1 Procedure

Subjects were asked to respond to two open-ended questions. One question asked subjects to list what they perceived the personality attributes of an intercollegiate student athlete to be. The other question asked subjects to list what they perceived

the personality attributes of a student nonathlete to be. Each question appeared on a separate page, and the order of the questions was counterbalanced. Subjects listed as many attributes as they wished. After both questions had been answered, subjects were fully debriefed.

The above procedure produced four different lists of personality traits: 1) athletes' perceived attributes of athletes, 2) athletes' perceived attributes of nonathletes, 3) nonathletes' perceived attributes of athletes, and 4) nonathletes' perceived attributes of nonathletes.

Phase II Subjects

The subjects were 34 intercollegiate student athletes (representing the same range of sports as the athlete sample in phase I) and 34 student nonathletes.

Phase II Procedure

Eliminating the redundant personality traits generated in Phase I produced a master list of 125 traits of athletes and nonathletes that we used in Phase II. A semantic differential rating scale was constructed to measure the subjective (or connotative) evaluation of these 125 personality traits. Subjects were asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 7 (1 being

very negative and 7 being very positive) how positive or negative they would rate a person possessing the personality trait. The personality traits were listed in random order. Subjects were not aware of the fact that the traits were descriptors of athletes and nonathletes.

Upon completion, subjects were briefly interviewed about their past and present participation in sports. This interview was conducted after subjects completed the rating scale so as not to reveal any attempt on the part of the researchers to classify the subject as either an athlete or nonathlete. The personality trait rating scales completed by subjects who met the requirements for membership in the athlete or nonathlete groups were retained and those completed by the 27 subjects who did not qualify were discarded.

Results

Analysis of Desirability Ratings

A 2 (Rater: Athletes, Nonathletes) x 2 (Source: Athletes, Nonathletes) x 2 (Target: Athletes, Nonathletes) analysis of variance (ANOVA), with repeated measures on the last two factors, revealed several significant effects. First, there was a main

effect for Source, $F(1, 65) = 7.33$, $p < .05$, indicating that, overall, traits generated by athletes were rated as more positive than traits generated by nonathletes ($M = 4.60$ vs. $M = 4.54$, respectively). In addition, the analysis uncovered a main effect for Target, $F(1, 65) = 45.59$, $p < .05$. Overall, traits generated to describe athletes were rated as more positive than traits generated to describe nonathletes ($M = 4.88$ vs. $M = 4.27$, respectively).

The ANOVA also revealed two significant two-way interactions, qualifying the above main effects. First, there was a Source x Target interaction, $F(1, 65) = 580.03$, $p < .05$. The means associated with this interaction are provided in Table 1. A simple effects

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

test indicated that the mean rating of traits that athletes generated to describe themselves ($M = 5.40$) was significantly greater (i.e. more positive) than the mean rating of traits that athletes generated to describe nonathletes ($M = 3.80$), $F(1, 65) = 220.86$, $p < .05$. Also, the mean rating of traits that nonathletes generated to describe themselves ($M =$

4.73) was significantly greater than the mean rating of traits that nonathletes generated to describe athletes (M = 4.36), $F(1, 65) = 16.68$, $p < .05$. Another way to interpret this interaction is to recognize that the mean rating of traits that athletes generated to describe themselves (M = 5.40) was significantly greater than the mean rating of traits that nonathletes generated to describe athletes (M = 4.36), $F(1, 65) = 466.44$, $p < .05$. Moreover, the mean rating of traits that athletes generated to describe nonathletes (M = 3.80) was significantly lower than the mean rating of traits that nonathletes generated to describe themselves (M = 4.73), $F(1, 65) = 437.38$, $p < .05$.

The ANOVA also revealed a Rater x Target interaction, $F(1, 65) = 8.25$, $p < .05$. The means associated with this interaction are provided in Table 2. A simple effects test indicated that athletes

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

rated traits generated to describe themselves (M = 5.03) as significantly more positive than traits generated to describe nonathletes (M = 4.16), $F(1, 65)$

= 22.81, $p < .05$. Also, athletes' ratings of traits generated to describe themselves (M = 5.03) were significantly more positive than nonathletes' ratings of those same traits (M = 4.73), $F(1, 130) = 5.84$, $p < .05$.

Factor Analysis

For each of the 4 lists of traits, we performed a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The attributes that athletes generated to describe themselves yielded 9 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Table 3 presents the eigenvalue and proportion of original variance for each of the 9 factors. Factor labels and the traits comprising each factor are also presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

As this table shows, we present only those traits with loadings greater than .33 or less than -.33. Factor 1 was labeled "diligent." Factor 2 was bipolar with "distorted" and "realistic" representing opposite endpoints of the factor. Factors 3 and 4 were labeled "relaxed" and "zealous," respectively. Factor 5 was bipolar with "singleness of purpose" and "active" as

endpoints of the factor. Factor 6 was bipolar with "adaptable" and "firm" as endpoints. Factor 7 was bipolar with "attentive" and "strained" as endpoints. Factors 8 and 9 were labeled "clearheaded" and "take-charger," respectively.

The attributes that athletes generated to describe nonathletes yielded 10 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Table 4 presents the eigenvalues, proportion of original variance, factor labels and traits for List 2.

Insert Table 4 about here

Factors 1, 2, and 3 were labeled "nerd," "unorganized," and "indolent," respectively. Factor 4 was bipolar with "relaxed" and "academically motivated only" representing opposite endpoints of the factor. Factors 5 and 6 were labeled "unbending" and "doubtful," respectively. Factor 7 was bipolar with "conforming" and "nonconforming" as endpoints. Factors 8 and 9 were labeled "uncertain" and "particular," respectively. Factor 10 was bipolar with "agreeable" and "precise" as endpoints.

The analysis of nonathletes' perceived attributes of athletes yielded 9 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The eigenvalue and proportion of original variance for each of the 9 factors as well as the factor labels and traits for List 3 are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Factor 1 was bipolar with "strong character" and "superficial" as opposite endpoints of the factor. Factors 2 and 3 were labeled "self-centered" and "confident," respectively. Factor 4 was labeled "relaxed." Factor 5 was bipolar with "rigid" and "imperfect" as endpoints. Factors 6 and 7 were labeled "counterproductive" and "athletic," respectively. Factors 8 and 9 were labeled "dynamic" and "competent," respectively.

Finally, the analysis of nonathletes' perceived attributes of nonathletes yielded 8 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Table 6 displays the eigenvalues, proportion of original variance, factor labels and traits for List 4.

Insert Table 6 about here

Factor 1 was bipolar with "compassionate" and "self-centered" as endpoints of the factor. Factor 2 was labeled "competent." Factor 3 was bipolar with "unenterprising" and "venturesome" as endpoints. Factor 4 was bipolar with "introverted" and "extroverted" as endpoints. Factor 5 was bipolar with "structured" and "relaxed" as endpoints. Factor 6 was bipolar with "scholarly" and "materialistic" as endpoints. Factor 7 was bipolar with "independent" and "works well with people" as endpoints. Factor 8 was bipolar with "sociable" and "reserved" as endpoints.

Discussion

These results provide a clear demonstration of the positive distinctiveness principle as outlined by Tajfel and Turner (1979). In order to maintain and enhance their social identities, both athletes and nonathletes attempted to establish a positively valued distinctiveness between their own group and the other group. The personality traits that athletes generated to describe themselves (ingroup attributes) were seen

as more positive than the personality traits that athletes generated to describe nonathletes (outgroup attributes). Moreover, the traits that athletes generated to describe themselves were also seen as more positive than the traits that nonathletes generated to describe athletes.

Likewise, the traits that nonathletes generated to describe themselves (ingroup attributes) were seen as more positive than the traits that nonathletes generated to describe athletes (outgroup attributes). Furthermore, the traits that nonathletes generated to describe themselves were also seen as more positive than the traits that athletes generated to describe nonathletes. Thus, motivated by the need for positive self-esteem, members of each group tended to describe their own group as more positive than the outgroup. This discrimination or ingroup favoritism represents an attempt to achieve positive distinctiveness for one's own group.

Although positive distinctiveness was displayed by both groups, Peabody's (1968) finding was not replicated. According to Peabody (1968), even when two groups agree about their respective characteristics, a trait is evaluated more positively

by the group that possesses it. This suggests that a process of reinterpretation takes place whereby members of a group change the values of the attributes assigned to their group by the outgroup such that traits which were intended to be negative are reinterpreted as positive.

In the present study, positive distinctiveness was displayed by both groups, yet this effect occurred independent of the rater. In other words, athletes and nonathletes tended to describe their own group as more positive than the outgroup, but neither group reinterpreted as positive those attributes designated as negative by the outgroup. This was probably due to the inherent negative value connotation attached to some of the personality traits (e.g. conceited, obnoxious, jealous). With such traits, a positive reinterpretation was virtually impossible, and thus both groups attempted to differentiate themselves from each other towards the same positively valued pole of the dimension. These reciprocal attempts at intergroup differentiation are inherently competitive since each group is competing for the same positively valued difference relative to the other. This suggests a process of competition for positive social

identity.

The results of the factor analyses performed on each of the 4 lists of traits support the results of the analysis of variance. Accounting for the largest proportion of variance in List 1 (athletes' perceived attributes of athletes) was Factor 1 labeled "diligent." Comprising this factor were the following positive traits: "assertive," "strong character," "competitive," "focused," "confident," "determined," and "good communicator." Accounting for the largest proportion of variance in List 4 (nonathletes' perceived attributes of nonathletes) was Factor 1 labeled "compassionate." Comprising this factor were the following positive traits: "self-reliant," "sensitive," "trustworthy," "diverse interests," "helpful to others," "free thinking," "doesn't strive for attention," "calm," and "relaxed."

The fact that both athletes and nonathletes described their respective ingroups in such positive terms lends support to the positive distinctiveness principle. Both groups attempted to discriminate or compete against the outgroup in order to differentiate themselves and maintain a positive social identity. It is of interest to note that many of the traits

generated to describe athletes are traditionally "masculine" in nature whereas many of the nonathlete traits are traditionally "feminine." This might help explain why both athletes and nonathletes rated the traits generated to describe athletes as more positive than the traits generated to describe nonathletes. Masculine traits are typically seen as more socially desirable than traditionally feminine traits (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974).

The results of the factor analyses performed on the trait ratings are consistent with the results of the analysis of variance. From the list of athletes' perceived attributes of nonathletes, the three factors accounting for the most variance were negative ("nerd," "unorganized," and "indolent"). The remainder of the factors from this list were also for the most part negative (e.g. "unbending," "doubtful," and "uncertain").

From the list of nonathletes' perceived attributes of athletes, two out of the first three factors accounting for the most variance were positive ("strong character/superficial" and "confident"). Several other factors from this list were also positive (e.g. "relaxed," "dynamic," "competent").

These results explain why the difference between athletes' ratings of the two groups was larger than the difference between nonathletes' ratings. Both athletes and nonathletes rated the traits generated to describe athletes as more positive than the traits generated to describe nonathletes. Yet, the nonathletes managed to maintain a positive self-identity without necessarily depreciating the outgroup. This suggests that athletes differentiate themselves from their outgroup more so than nonathletes do. Moreover, the fact that all of the means are roughly four (the midpoint of the scale) or greater offers some support for Brewer's (1979) contention that ingroup bias may result from ingroup favoritism and not from outgroup derogation.

The behavior demonstrated here by the nonathletes is suggestive of a process of social cooperation in which groups co-exist with mutual appreciation of each others' qualities. This implies that in a multi-group society, there can be a distribution of identities which is not necessarily conflictual. Probably the groups will differ in the allocation of value to characteristics, but the evaluation of outgroup characteristics need not be negative or derogatory.

Perhaps nonathletes feel less need to improve their position, either because their group already provides them with a satisfactory social identity or certain traits are not valued because they are of little relevance to their social identity. When, however, a group is able to compare itself with another group on some valued trait, the ingroup's superiority is threatened, and measures have to be taken to secure its position. Specifically, the group will attempt to re-establish a positive intergroup difference in order to reduce the threat. This is achieved by accentuating positive intergroup differences and allocating more value to ingroup attributes (i.e. positive distinctiveness).

This argument implies that for every group, there are two sets of traits. One set includes traits that are of little evaluative significance because these traits are not a salient, internalized aspect of members' self-identity. The other set includes valued attributes of the group that contribute positively or negatively to its members' self-identity. In a situation where a group is able to compare itself with another group on these valued dimensions, the group will discriminate as a means of making valued

comparisons in favor of the ingroup. This suggests that ingroup favoritism must presuppose some process of active identification by individuals with certain attributes of their ingroups. Intuitively, it does not make sense for group members to evaluate themselves in terms of a group attribute unless they have, to some extent, internalized that ingroup attribute as an aspect of their self-concept.

The idea that groups have two sets of traits is reminiscent of Gordon Allport's (1961) idea that each individual has a set of "central traits" and a set of "secondary traits." The "central traits" of a group may be those valued attributes that are highly characteristic of the group and thus are central to its members' self-identity. A group's "secondary traits" may be those group characteristics that are not as frequently evidenced and thus are of secondary importance to members' self-identity.

The present research, by identifying stereotypes of athletes and nonathletes that might exist on college campuses, may have possible implications for the improvement of interpersonal relationships between these two groups. Efforts to eliminate negative stereotypic conceptions of athletes, for example, can

be facilitated once these conceptions are made known. Perhaps a reduction in intergroup discrimination could be achieved by emphasizing the differences between a person and his or her fellow ingroup members. Accentuating intra-group differences might decrease discrimination by reducing the salience of the ingroup as a referent for behavior. Without a powerful reference group to contribute positively or negatively to an individual's self-identity, an individual might feel less motivated to favor the ingroup in situations where the ingroup would benefit from discrimination.

References

Allport, G.W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Asch, S.E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgment. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), Groups, leadership and men. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

Berger, P.L. (1966). Identity as a problem in the sociology of knowledge. European Journal of Sociology, 7, 105-115.

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. Allen Lane, London.

Brewer, M.B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 307-324.

Campbell, D.T. (1967). Stereotypes and the perception of group differences. American Psychologist, 22, 817-829.

Carroll, J.S., & Payne, J.W. (Eds.). (1976). Cognition and social behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 80-85.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.

Hunt, D.H. (1969). A cross racial comparison of personality traits between athletes and non-athletes. Research Quarterly, 40(4), 704-707.

Morgan, W.P. (1980). The trait psychology controversy. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 51, 50-76.

Oakes, P.J., & Turner, J.C. (1980). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour: Does minimal intergroup discrimination make social identity more positive? European Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 295-301.

Peabody, D. (1968). Group judgments in the Philippines: evaluative and descriptive aspects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 290-300.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press.

Schendel, J. (1965). Psychological differences between athletes and non-participants in athletics at three educational levels. Research Quarterly, 36(1), 52-67.

Schurr, K.T., Ashley, M.A., & Joy, K.L. (1977). A multivariate analysis of male athlete characteristics: Sport type and success. Multivariate Experimental

Clinical Research, 3, 53-68.

Schutz, A. (1932). Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt. Springer, Vienna. In translation: The phenomenology of the social world (1967). Heinemann, London.

Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorization. English MS. of La categorisation sociale. In S. Moscovici (Ed.)., Introduction a la psychologie sociale, Vol I Paris: Larousse.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations. European Monographs in Social Psychology, No.14, London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.). The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole.

Turner, J.C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: some prospects for intergroup behaviour. European Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 5-34.

Turner, J.C. (1981). The experimental social psychology of intergroup behaviour. In J.C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.). Intergroup Behaviour. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner, J.C., & Spriggs, D. (1981). Social categorization, intergroup behaviour and self-esteem: a replication.

Unpublished manuscript. University of Bristol.

Wilder, D.A. (1984). Intergroup contact: The typical member and the exception to the rule. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 20, 177-194.

Table 1

Mean Rating of Traits for Source x Target Interaction

	Target	
Source	Athlete	Nonathlete
Athlete	5.40	3.80
Nonathlete	4.36	4.73

Note. The higher the mean, the more positive the ratings.

Table 2

Mean Rating of Traits for Rater x Target Interaction

	Target	
Rater	Athlete	Nonathlete
Athlete	5.03	4.16
Nonathlete	4.73	4.38

Note. The higher the mean, the more positive the ratings.

Table 3

Results of Factor Analysis of List 1 (Athletes' Perceived Attributes of Athletes)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance	Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance
1. Diligent	13.96	34.1%	5. Singleness Of Purpose	1.61	3.9%
Traits	Loadings		Traits	Loadings	
Assertive	.53		Involved	.47	
Strong Character	.50		Disciplined	.40	
Competitive	.50		Perservering	.39	
Focused	.49		Hardworking	.36	
Confident	.45				
Determined	.41		Active	-2.94	
Good Communicator	.40				
2. Distorted	3.90	9.5%	6. Adaptable	1.39	3.4%
Insensitive	.84		Lively	.59	
Arrogant	.79		Outgoing	.55	
Macho	.69		Extroverted	.52	
Pressured	.59		Active	.44	
			Flexible	.41	
Realistic	-.52				
			Firm		
			Responsible	-.36	
			Perservering	-.35	
3. Relaxed	2.36	5.8%	7. Attentive	1.22	3.0%
Laid Back	.81		Intuitive	.74	
Easy Going	.54		Takes Orders	.47	
			Strained		
			Pressured	-.46	
4. Zealous	1.84	4.5%	8. Clearheaded	1.15	2.8%
Dedicated	.64		Intelligent	.51	
Motivated	.51		Responsible	.48	
Goal-oriented	.51		Natural	.47	
Works Well w/Peo.	.41		Good Listener	.46	
			Strong Character	.45	
			9. Take-charger	1.04	2.5%
			Responsible	1.06	
			Aggressive	.45	

Table 4

Results of Factor Analysis of List 2 (Athletes' Perceived Attributes of Nonathletes)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance	Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance
1. Nerd	7.45	21.3%	6. Doubtful	1.52	4.4%
Traits		Loadings	Traits		Loadings
Bookish		.73	Tense		.65
Intellectual		.63	Predictable		.64
Studious		.54	Analytical		.59
Mentally Compet.		.47	Impressionable		.42
Stressed		.47			
Self-conscious		.43			
Serious		.41			
Uncoordinated		.40			
2. Unorganized	3.49	10.0%	7. Conforming	1.49	4.3%
Unorganized		.80	Uncoordinated		.53
No Sense of Time		.72	Overprotected		.45
Minimal Effort		.65			
Not Outgoing		.46	Nonconforming		-.64
Uncoordinated		.45			
3. Indolent	3.00	8.6%	8. Uncertain	1.18	3.3%
Undedicated		.65	Dependent		.67
Detached		.62	Impressionable		.62
Lazy		.47			
4. Relaxed	2.08	5.9%	9. Particular	1.10	3.2%
Easy Going		.80	Careful		.63
Laid Back		.58	Unbalanced		.61
Academically Motivated Only		-.42			
5. Unbending	1.92	5.5%	10. Agreeable	1.08	3.1%
Ambitious		.81	Greek		.73
Precise		.72	Nice		.61
			Sensitive		.60
			Precise		-.35

Table 5

Results of Factor Analysis of List 3 (Nonathletes' Perceived Attributes of Athletes)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance	Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance
1. Strong Character	8.80	24.5%	5. Rigid	1.59	4.4%
Traits	Loadings		Traits	Loadings	
Hardworker	.73		Perfectionist	.71	
Organized	.71		Intense	.37	
Cooperative	.64				
Outgoing	.62		Imperfect		
Determined	.54		Immature	-.62	
Superficial			6. Counter-Productive	1.53	4.3%
Shallow	-.56		Nonscholarly	.77	
Careless	-.55		Restricted	.67	
Conceited	-.39				
2. Self-Centered	5.78	16.1%	7. Athletic	1.23	3.4%
Self-centered	.77		Athletic	.84	
Pompous	.76		8. Dynamic	1.11	3.1%
Appearances Only	.76		Motivated	.65	
Jealous	.68		Enjoys Compet.	.60	
Conceited	.62		Aggressive	.47	
Recognition	.61		Forceful	.40	
Obnoxious	.58		Sociable	.39	
Loud	.56		Teamworker	.37	
Shallow	.46		Determined	.37	
Intense	.43				
Careless	.40				
3. Confident	2.48	6.9%	9. Competent	1.04	2.9%
Healthy	.60		Well Rounded	.77	
Talented	.54		Efficient	.41	
Extroverted	.54		Cooperative	.37	
Sociable	.47				
4. Relaxed	1.77	4.9%			
Easy Going	.77				
Relaxed	.75				

Table 6

Results of Factor Analysis of List 4 (Nonathletes' Perceived Attributes of Nonathletes)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance	Factor	Eigenvalue	Variance
1. Compassionate	8.45	22.8%	5. Structured	1.63	4.9%
Traits	Loadings		Traits	Loadings	
Self-reliant	.69		Prepared	.67	
Sensitive	.68		Develop. Oriented	.52	
Trustworthy	.62		Studious	.46	
Diverse Interests	.59		Controlled	.36	
Helpful to Others	.59		Conscientious	.35	
Free Thinking	.57				
No Strive Attent.	.49		Relaxed	-.58	
Calm	.46				
Relaxed	.40				
Self-centered	-.58				
2. Competent	5.22	14.1%	6. Scholarly	1.62	4.4%
Ambitious	.79		Dependable	.66	
Assertive	.61		Hardworker	.59	
Independent	.56		Studious	.45	
Extroverted	.51		Calm	.34	
Venturesome	.48				
Relaxed	.46		Materialistic	-.59	
Materialistic	.44				
Works Well w/Peo.	.40				
Intelligent	.35				
Hardworker	.35				
3. Unenterprising	2.46	6.6%	7. Independent	1.24	3.3%
Fears Failure	.64		Nonteamworker	.56	
Sedentary	.62		Intelligent	.40	
Lacks Strength	.58		Self-reliant	.39	
			Free Thinking	.33	
Venturesome	-.36		Works Well w/Peo.	-.33	
4. Introverted	2.12	5.7%	8. Sociable	1.13	3.0%
Loner	.73		Responsible	.70	
Introverted	.68		Works Well w/Peo.	.36	
Quiet	.65				
Unathletic	.50		Reserved		
Timid	.43		No Strive Attent.	-.34	
Controlled	.36		Wastes Time	-.64	
Extroverted	-.47				