

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2006

An Analysis of Goal Achievement Orientation and Sport Morality Levels of Division I-A Non-Revenue Collegiate Athletes

John Lata



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

AN ANALYSIS OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION AND SPORT
MORALITY LEVELS OF DIVISION I-A NON-REVENUE
COLLEGIATE ATHLETES

By

JOHN LATA

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management & Physical Education
In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Spring Semester, 2006

The members of the Committee approve the Dissertation of John Lata defended on November 14, 2005.

Michael Mondello
Professor Directing Dissertation

Joseph Beckham
Outside Committee Member

Charles Imwold
Committee Member

Aubrey Kent
Committee Member

Approved:

Charles Imwold, Chair, Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management & Physical Education

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

This work is dedicated to my family who supported me over the many years it has taken me to complete this leg of my journey, to my mother Winston, my father Alfred, my sister Jamie and my three boys, Brenden, Jeff and JT. And to you Betsy, always thinking of you. Thank you for your love and patience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who helped me through this extensive process. First and foremost to my committee members, Dr. Imwold, Dr. Kent and Dr. Beckham, thank you for your involvement, your wisdom and particularly for your patience. Special thanks goes to my major professor Dr. Mondello, I especially appreciate your patience in reading and re-reading chapter after chapter in detail to help me in my attempt to get it perfect, and for demanding my best and not settling for less.

I would also like to thank my mother Winston, father Alfred and sister Jamie for their support in this lengthy endeavor and their support from afar. Also to my three boys Brenden, Jeff, JT for their willingness to uproot and follow my dream to the far off land of Florida, I appreciate the sacrifices you made to your lives to help me on this journey and I apologize for the times we were apart, I think (I hope) we all grew from this experience.

To my friends who kept pushing me, Jeff Pritsker and Brian Battle, you guys can appreciate the trials and tribulations involved in this process and were incredibly supportive. And to Mike Kehoe, you beat me (but not by too much). Thanks for keeping the competitive spirit burning. To Pam Overton, my mentor, my boss and my friend, though not in that order, not a day went by that you didn't give me that little push to get it done, and you have no idea how much I appreciate you for it. You seem to see something in me that I'm still trying to see myself.

Thank you to the myriad of people who to assisted in many different ways, Cynthia Bailey, Adam Goldstein, Betty Brown, Seann Taylor, Megan McHugo, Fritz Polite, Paul Pedersen, and Ray Schneider. To Cecile Reynaud, a special thanks for helping me through the process and always being there when I had questions.

Thanks to the coaches at Florida State University for their willingness to work with me. And finally, thanks to the student-athletes at FSU, my subjects, you all are the best and I appreciate every day the opportunity I have to work with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Rationale	4
Operational Definitions	4
Research Questions and Hypotheses	5
Significance of the Study	8
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Relationship between Sport and Moral Behavior	9
Definitions of Sportsmanship	15
College Athletes' Views	17
Sequential Development	19
Social-Psychological Approach	20
Situational Appropriate	21
Moral Level	22
Lower Levels of Reasoning	24
Bracketing	25
Professional Level	27
Achievement Motivation Theories	30
Task Orientation	31
Ego Orientation	32

Age	34
Participation Length/Decline in Values	35
Specific Findings	36
Athlete/Non-Athlete	39
Gender	40
Race	44
Team vs. Individual	445
Contact vs. Noncontact	46
Defensive vs. Offensive	47
Summary	48
3. INTRODUCTION	49
Methodology	49
Research Questions and Hypotheses	49
Subjects	52
Variables	53
Independent Variables	53
Dependent Variables	53
Instrumentation	54
Procedure	56
Data Analysis	56
Limitations	58
Delimitations	59
4. RESULTS	60
Demographics	60

Results of Survey Items	63
Research Questions	80
5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	94
Discussion of Findings	95
Conclusions	96
Limitations	102
Contributions	103
Future Research	104
APPENDICES	107
Informed Consent	107
Inventory (Parts 1 and 2)	108
REFERENCES	115
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1 Gender Breakdown of Respondents	61
Table 4-2 Class Breakdown of Respondents	61
Table 4-3 Race Breakdown of Respondents	62
Table 4-4 Sport Breakdown of Respondents	62
Table 4-5 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #1	63
Table 4-6 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #2	63
Table 4-7 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #3	64
Table 4-8 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #4	64
Table 4-9 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #5	65
Table 4-10 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #6	65
Table 4-11 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #7	65
Table 4-12 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #8	66
Table 4-13 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #9	66
Table 4-14 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #10	67
Table 4-15 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #11	67
Table 4-16 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #12	68
Table 4-17 Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #13	68
Table 4-18 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #1	69
Table 4-19 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #2	69
Table 4-20 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #3	70
Table 4-21 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #4	70
Table 4-22 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #5	71

Table 4-23 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #6	72
Table 4-24 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #7	72
Table 4-25 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #8	73
Table 4-26 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #9	73
Table 4-27 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #10	74
Table 4-28 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #11	75
Table 4-29 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #12	75
Table 4-30 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #13	76
Table 4-31 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #14	76
Table 4-32 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #15	77
Table 4-33 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #16	77
Table 4-34 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #17	78
Table 4-35 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #18	78
Table 4-36 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #19	79
Table 4-37 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #20	79
Table 4-38 Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #21	80
Table 4-39 Means and Standard Deviations by Sport type for Task and Ego Orientation	81
Table 4-40 Differences between Sport type on Task and Ego Orientation	82
Table 4-41 Differences in Ego Orientation by Sport Type	83
Table 4-42 Pearson Correlations for Task Orientation and Sport Morality Level	83
Table 4-43 Pearson Correlations for Ego Orientation and Sport Morality Level	84

Table 4-44	Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels by Gender	85
Table 4-45	ANOVA showing the difference in Sport Morality Levels between Genders	86
Table 4-46	Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels by Race	87
Table 4-47	ANOVA showing the difference in Sport Morality Levels between Race	88
Table 4-48	Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels by Class	89
Table 4-49	ANOVA showing the difference in Sport Morality Levels between Class	90
Table 4-50	Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels between Team and Individual Sport SA's	92
Table 4-51	ANOVA showing the difference in Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Morality Levels between Team and Individual Sport SA's	93

ABSTRACT

The intent of this study was to investigate the goal orientations of non-revenue producing team student-athletes and the potential correlation to sport morality levels. Student-athletes (SA's) (male n=114, female n=118) from a southeastern university, from non-revenue teams, in both semi-contact and non-contact areas, were compared and contrasted by the use of the Task and Ego Orientation Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ) and the Hahm-Beller Values Choices Inventory (HBVCI).

The data were analyzed through the use of parametric statistics, specifically utilizing MANOVA and Pearson Correlation analyses. This study was an attempt to determine whether there were any sports in which sportsmanship levels or goal orientations were significantly different than in other sports. It was determined that soccer SA's exhibited significantly lower ego orientation than either golf or baseball SA's ($p < .01$).

Another finding was that SA's in this study showed a negative correlation between ego orientation and sport morality levels as had been found in previous studies. As predicted, females exhibited a significantly higher sport morality level ($p < .001$), though there were no differences found between either race or year in school. Male SA's did show a higher ego orientation at a statistically significant level ($p < .01$), and again there were no differences identified with regards to race or year in school. In studying potential differences between team and individual sport SA's, it was determined that individual sport SA's reported higher sport morality levels ($p < .01$).

This study was intended to assist athletic administrators and coaches in determining the current state of sport morality and goal orientation levels in collegiate SA's and to inspire thoughts on whether this is a teachable area. It is hoped this research will add to the body of knowledge in this field and lay a groundwork for future study.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of sportsmanship today is as elusive as ever. While many believe that sportsmanship is non-existent today (Tutko & Bruns, 1976), the idea that sport builds character is a strong belief in many societies (Sage, 1990). Many contend as much, while others declare that sport builds “characters” (Tutko & Bruns, 1976). There is no doubt sports have an effect on sportsmanship development, however to assume it is a positive effect, may be unrealistic. Sport reflects the prevailing ethic of society (Michener, 1976). “Sport is not the least bit autonomous from society. It is totally tied, as a form of social labor, to the social framework of which it is a part” (Beamish, 1982, p. 181). It is not surprising then, that our sports figures of today assume a “win at all costs” mentality. A famous quote in sport sums it up, “Winning isn’t the most important thing, it’s the only thing” Vince Lombardi (O’Brien, 1987). Sir Roger Banister was quoted in the foreword to McIntosh’s (1975) Fair Play: “Sport, which occupies the professional time of a few and the spare time of many, is a fit study for ethics”. However, “...there is all too much evidence that young people learn lessons from sports that most of us would rather they not learn” (Thompson, 1995, p. 109). The term sportsmanship is not synonymous with morals or ethics, but it can viewed as a sub-classification.

Sport has been purported to serve as an educational process, to help teach our youth how to cooperate with teammates and coaches, to negotiate and learn solutions to moral conflicts. Sport has helped participants learn to display courage and virtues we wish for every person in society to have, such as fairness, responsibility, team loyalty, teamwork, conformity, and doing what is needed for the greater good (Kleiber & Roberts, 1981). Many believe the dynamic situations which exist in sport activities should teach lessons about behavior, moral education, and character. Ernest Hemingway stated “Sport shows us how to win with honesty and sport shows us how to lose with dignity. That

means that sport shows us how to live” (Gill, 1982). Most people assume that positive values support the public behavior of athletes while engaged in their sport (Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999). But, it is difficult to quantify these “positives”. And there is no assurance that everybody feels the same way.

One does not have to look too deeply into the history books to find “ugly” incidents in sports that would fit anyone’s personal definition of poor sportsmanship, many involving serious injury, and in some cases, death (McCutcheon, 1999). These behaviors are becoming an all-too-common part of sport at every level of competition (Massaro, 1994; Stephens, Bredemeier, & Shields, 1997). Events in sport show a considerable shortfall in ethical behavior at the behavioral level (Johnson & Frey, 1985; Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). Having these events distributed on the news and television go a long way towards affecting how we view these situations as well.

“We can talk about the value of sportsmanship on one hand, and on the other hand, the leading shots, the highlights... you see every night are the outrageous and unsportsmanlike, so I think there is a double standard here. On the one hand, we complain about it, on the other hand it’s the first thing you see every night.” Joe Dumars (Institute for International Sport, 2003)

Every field has its own fundamental ethic, however, within sport and leisure, such standards have been slow to emerge (Kjeldsen, 1992). Interestingly enough, it was discovered that from 1974 to 1995, over 2,400 references were found regarding athletes in the psychological literature, and over 1,700 to moral development. However, there were only 3 references regarding athletes’ moral development - Bredemeier (1985) and Bredemeier & Shields (1986a, 1986b) (Priest et al., 1999).

The need for improved ethical behavior in sport is a given (Kjeldsen, 1992). The thought that sport builds character and that the athlete represents an ethical ideal of what man is or can become is still a pervasive one. “It is about supporting and promoting the philosophical values inherent in college sports. The character student-athletes develop from teamwork, persistence and respect matters far more than the outcome of the contest” (Brand, 2003, p. 23). While many talk a good game about emphasizing the task

orientation view of athletics, playing strictly for play sake, quite a few take a different view, that winning is the only thing, ie. an ego orientation. Ego orientation is associated with the belief that the purpose of sport is to enhance social status (Treasure & Roberts, 1994) and just as importantly, to gain financial reward (Carpenter & Yates, 1997). Which raises the question, how does ego orientation manifest itself in non-revenue sport participants, who gain little in financial reward?

The idea of fair and honest contests originated in Greece laying the foundations for the development of world sport. Games in ancient Greece acquired a symbolic significance, where competition, trial and outcome, were fully integrated in the spirit of peace, friendship, cooperation, mutual respect and celebration. There was nobility and idealism in regards to sport and the games. Greek competitive sport developed from moral concepts based on values such as “modesty,” and an awareness of the law. Any violation of either would induce a swift response, a resistance against any form of infringement, any unfair decision, any impudence, any violence. Within this moral context, athletes were rewarded with an olive branch, the “kotinos,” and public recognition for their modesty and spirit of fair play (Panagiotopoulos, 1998).

This is the moral content currently attributed to the concept of “amateur sport,” as stated in the Olympic Charter. It is a standard by which respect of the rules is measured. Any deviation from these ideals is greeted with condemnation. These concepts, which constitute sports ethics, are expressed by terms such as, “amateurism, amateur sport, love of the game, and fair play.” In the Olympic Charter, these notions are portrayed by such expressions as, “respect for one another,” “mutual understanding,” “friendship,” “friendly effort and fair competition” and “equal treatment” (Panagiotopoulos, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

It needs to be determined if there are certain sports that have different levels of task and ego orientations than other sports. What can be taken away from these sports and incorporated into others to increase the level of sportsmanship across the board? By determining task and ego levels and general sportsmanship levels between sports, and how they vary by year in school and ethnicity, we should be able to begin theorizing why certain sports have certain kinds of student-athletes in regards to sportsmanship. It can

also be compared to previous research to determine if there are trends in one direction or another.

Rationale

Sport can be seen as a reflection of society. Can sport be a positive influence on society? Does sport build or deter from moral development? Identifying certain sports might help determine what should be included in every sport, or every sport training to help us make certain that sport is a morals builder. Studies to date have tended to ignore non-revenue sports for the most part. Instead, many (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Mintah, Huddleston, & Doody, 1999; Silva, 1983) have focused on aggression and the differences between contact and non-contact sports. This area has not been studied in over a decade with regards to collegiate student-athletes. Though the study done by Priest, Krause, and Beach in 1999 was extensive, it was based on research done over ten years ago, and it was done at a military academy, meaning none of the student-athletes studied were on an athletic scholarship and they included revenue sports. How might that fact mitigate the results? This study will be mentioned in detail in later pages. Given these limitations, now is the time to study what may have changed in ten years.

What can be learned from our non-revenue sports? Are there certain sports where the SA's tend to have higher sport morality levels? Are there certain sports where the SA's tend to have a higher task or ego orientation? How do individual-sport SA's differ from team-sport SA's in these areas? These questions can be answered (and perhaps more raised) through the current study. This study will contribute to the body of theoretical research in the areas of goal achievement orientation and morality levels, and their interaction pertaining to student-athletes of non-revenue producing sports, an untapped area of research.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following terms will be utilized:

Contact sport – any sport where contact is a major factor, historically football, rugby, and hockey.

Ego orientation – a self-perception that sport is played to win, as an end to it's means (Nicholls, 1989).

Goal Achievement Orientation – a concept primarily derived from Nicholl's Theory of Achievement Motivation (1989) which assumes one's goal orientation in game situations is congruent with what they consider acceptable in that setting, and incorporates subsets of Ego and Task orientations.

Non-contact sport – all sports other than football, rugby and hockey (even though some contact may occur, it is not integral to the game).

Non-revenue sports – a sport that is not considered a revenue producer, historically, any sport other than Men's Football and Men's Basketball.

Revenue producing sports – sports producing revenue, for the purposes of this study, this will include both Men's Football and Men's Basketball.

Student-athletes (SA's) – collegiate division I-A students playing an intercollegiate sport.

Task orientation – a self-perception that sport is an opportunity to get better, that winning is not necessarily as important as becoming technically more proficient ability-wise (Nicholls, 1989).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Q1: Are SA's from one non-revenue sport different than SA's in any other non-revenue sport in task and ego orientation?

H1: There will be no significant differences between non-revenue teams in task and ego orientation among their SA's.

Rationale: There has been no research completed comparing and contrasting non-revenue team SA's on ego and task orientation. However Nicholls (1989) found task orientation was consistent with fair play.

Q2: Does the level of task orientation correlate to sport morality levels?

H2: SA's high on task orientation will have higher sport morality levels than SA's low on task orientation.

Rationale: A task oriented SA should be more likely to believe in the prosocial consequences of sport involvement (Duda, Olson & Templin, 1991). An emphasis on fair play is consistent with a task orientation (Nicholls, 1989).

Q3: Does the level of ego orientation correlate to sport morality levels?

H3: SA's high on ego orientation will have lower sport morality levels than SA's low on ego orientation.

Rationale: Higher ego orientation has been related to lower levels of judgement and intention indices of moral functioning and greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). Athletes with high ego orientation tend to demonstrate less concern for "the process of competitive sport" (Duda et al., 1991, p. 85). Higher ego orientation tends to have a detrimental effect upon athletes moral reasoning in sport when the players need to exhibit dominance over their opponents (Nicholls, 1992).

Q4: Is there any difference in sport morality levels based on gender/race/year in school?

H4: There will be no difference in sport moral levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Rationale: A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of sportsmanship values (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). Literature reviews completed in this area

show a negative correlation between the length of one's involvement in sport and the development of sportsmanlike values (Coakley, 1982; Kroll, 1975; Stevenson, 1975). The negative trend of sportsmanship values is even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982). This study will attempt to determine if there are any differences in as small a length of involvement as the four year college experience. Priest et al. (1999) found that SA's sportsmanship levels declined over their four years in college.

Q5: How do gender/race/year in school correlate to task or ego orientation?

H5: There will be no difference in ego or task orientation levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Rationale: Males and females have been socialized over the years to adopt different goal orientations (Nicholls, 1989). Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis of the literature regarding moral judgement found that women tend to score higher on tests of moral judgement. This was corroborated by Beller and Stoll in 1995 on college age students. Rest (1979) however, did not report significant gender differences on general moral development.

Little research has been done in regards to race on this issue. Greendorfer and Ewing (1981) found that African-American children placed a higher value on sport than did Caucasian children, seemingly implying an ego orientation.

A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of higher moral levels, e.g. Rainey (1986). White and Duda (1994) showed that extensive sport involvement was linked to higher levels of ego orientation. However, Smith (1977) was unable to show any effect on morals development dependent upon athletic experience. Beller and Stoll (1999), were unable to find a difference when comparing 9th through 12th graders (assuming more experience for the 12th graders). While four years is a relatively short "length of participation", it is still worthy of being researched, to ascertain if the differences are occurring on a smaller scale.

Q6: Is there a difference in sport moral levels between team-sport SA's and individual-sport SA's?

H6: There will be no difference in sport moral levels between team-sport SA's and individual-sport SA's.

Rationale: Priest et al. (1999) found that individual-sport SA's had higher sportmanship levels than team-sport athletes, but showed greater decline over their four years in college.

Significance of the Study

The importance of maintaining morals in society today cannot be overstated. Moreover, if sport can be a tool in this cause, it should be fully utilized. Previous studies have focused almost exclusively on revenue producing sports, or on issues such as contact versus non-contact, and their affects on aggression. While reducing tendencies to resort to aggression are important, they do not fully encompass all that is involved in having a good moral background. Studies such as the current one may provide sport administrators and coaches with information on the levels of sportmanship today, and perhaps with the importance of expanding morals education components of the whole sport experience.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Over three decades ago, Ogilvie and Tutko (1971) published an article titled, “Sport: If you want to build character, try something else.” Subsequently, a number of studies (e.g., Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984, 1986b; Hall, 1981) have been published suggesting that sport participation, especially at the college level, is associated with lower levels of moral functioning. Some findings offered preliminary evidence suggesting it was not necessarily sport, but rather the overwhelming emphasis on ego orientation commonly found at high levels of competitive sport that could be at least, partly, responsible for the link between sport involvement and moral immaturity (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a). Their contention was that by downplaying ego orientation there was hope for assisting athletes in their moral growth (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a).

Relationship between Sport and Moral Behavior

A historical view is required for a comprehensive understanding of sport. Sport is preeminently a social practice, and thus there must be a strong linkage between sport and social reality. Sports today reflect the prevailing ethic of society (Michener, 1976). In sport, the prevalence of the dominant class, so the argument goes, is perpetrated through the establishment of technical (constitutive) and moral (regulative) rules which privilege the bourgeoisie (Morgan, 1985).

As Gruneau argued, “while one of the purposes of the rules is to separate sport from reality, the very act of rule construction has the effect of embedding sport deeply in the prevailing logic of social relations and thereby of diminishing its autonomy. For this reason, the study of sport is haunted by a fundamental paradox” (1983, p.21). Therefore, the range of social meanings expressed in sport is surrounded for the most part by the dominant social mores, all of which suggests that sport does not so much provide a

critical commentary on our life but a dramatic portrayal of the norms and values of the dominant culture (Morgan, 1985).

It is this formal separation of sport from the realm of necessity, it is argued, that aids in sport's ability to critically dramatize social life and to offer a metasocial commentary on how we live. "Sport is not the least bit autonomous from society. It is totally tied, as a form of social labor, to the social framework of which it is a part" (Beamish, 1982, p. 181). Sport cannot stand alone outside social life.

As such, sport is subject to considerable social influence (Morgan, 1985). It is at this level then that sport can be taken over by specific social forces in the interest of social control. There is an obvious connection between the sports in which we take part and find attractive, and the social conditions in which we live. It may be appropriate to claim then that the medieval sport of jousting implies a certain military posture toward life and that the sport of football implies a certain violent posture toward life. Or alternatively that football is connected to capitalism and its acquisitional properties (Morgan, 1985).

Some (Miller, 1980) believe that we need an ethical mobilization in sport (with the hope that this will slow the moral atrophy which seems to be affecting society at large). However, when you look forward, such action patterns as (a) continuing to propagate noble rhetoric about sport's promotion of ethical behavior, ignoring the contrary indications; (b) accepting situational ethics (ie. severing claimed connections between ethics and sport); and, (c) renewing efforts to remedy the ethical ills in sport, show that we still are not where we aspire to be (Miller, 1980).

Many, particularly those involved with collegiate athletics (Brand, 2003) contend that sport builds character while many others declare that sport builds "characters" (Tutko & Bruns, 1976). The moral incompatibility of competing and cheating is demonstrated by some, others point to the power of victory over the code of honor (Keating, 1973). There is no doubt sports have an effect on sportsmanship development; however, to suggest that it is a positive effect has not been verified.

It was stated many years ago, that morality rarely, if ever, receives reinforcement from physical exercise (de Coubertin, 1986). To that point, some state that only in occupying leisure time of our youth, has it served any social use whatsoever (keeping

them off the streets and out of trouble). “Qualities of character are not a result of morality; they do not belong to the domain of consciousness. These qualities are courage, energy, will, perseverance, endurance. Great criminals and complete scoundrels have possessed them. They can be equally well employed to do bad as to do good” (de Coubertin, 1986, p. 317).

Vince Lombardi is quoted as saying “Winning isn’t the most important thing, it’s the only thing” (O’Brien, 1987). This statement is an example of the dichotomy of morals development versus winning. “When winning is everything the destination supersedes the journey, thus diminishing or negating the intrinsic rewards of sport participation” (Simon, 1983, p. 25). Not only has winning become the “all-consuming goal” of athletes and coaches, but it has also become the standard by which they are consistently judged (Eitzen, 1988).

The sport structure is characterized by a strategic competitive orientation which may be dysfunctional for the development of high-level moral responses. Within the clearly demarcated boundaries of competitive sport, participants are offered incentives to seek their own gain, or the gain of their team, to the relative neglect of the interests and needs of opponents (Bredemeier, 1984). That makes it difficult to educate people morally through sport activities because of the competitive and winning-oriented demands of these activities (Vallerand, Briere, Blanchard, & Provencher, 1997). It would be imprudent to assume that through a regular physical education program, character development would occur spontaneously. This is probably the basic instructional mistake of many educators. They would like to develop character through game activities; however, they do not create a suitable learning atmosphere for this to occur. Some colleges have created programs specifically to aid in developing sound values acquisition (Whitely, 1982).

Recently, attention has been given to the sportsmanship development aspect of physical education and other athletic programs. Development of good sportsmanship attitudes has been at least briefly mentioned as a primary goal. However, in view of the behavior that is still occurring, it quickly becomes apparent that in most areas, acceptance of the sportsmanship development objective has been given only lip-service. This must be considered unfortunate in regard to the long-range effects upon the lives of the people

we say we teach (Johnson, 1969). Ideally, these orientations would start in the home, but experience has indicated this is not always the case (Kjeldsen, 1992).

Sport has been described as a “world within a world” (Huizinga, 1955) in which the normal restraints of everyday life can be temporarily set aside in favor of a conventional structure which allows typical moral norms to be transgressed. Actions that a person could be arrested for on the streets become allowable during competition. In a game setting it may be permissible (or even necessary) to strike another person or to deliberately deceive someone (Bredemeier, 1984). The “do whatever you can get away with” attitude prevails. Furthermore, players chance incurring penalties in important contests if it appears that a violation of the rules would be to their team’s advantage, e.g., committing a violation in order to prevent an opposing player from scoring (Harris, Blankenship, Cowley, Crouse, & Smith, 1982).

Contemporary sport can no longer be considered a separate world, an opportunity to get away from the pressures of the “real” world. Except for the occasional low stakes games among friends, sport at every level has become integrated with some other field of endeavor. “Sport has become instrumental to the extrinsic and material goals of these fields and, thus, has become utilitarian rather than expressive” (Kjeldsen, 1992, p. 104). The fundamental ethics of these fields become integrated with sporting codes and in many cases taken over their codes of “sportsmanship” (Kjeldsen, 1992), leading most to feel that the concepts of sportsmanship as we know them today are diminishing.

Many aspects of the sport setting currently constrain moral dialogue. Power is concentrated in the hands of a few. The competitive, highly conventionalized structure discourages discussion among team members and their opponents. Many times information is withheld (athletes are often encouraged to sacrifice their personal health for the good of the team) (Bredemeier, 1984).

The theory of Deontology (Osterhoudt, 1973) states that principles of honesty, responsibility, and justice provide obvious moral guidance in ethical dilemmas, including those during athletic competition. The goal of moral development therefore, is to learn to recognize these principles, and how to apply them in situations, i.e. choosing the right course of action. Morally mature individuals recognize these principles in a greater variety of situations and stick to them. Thus, according to this approach, any tendency by

an athlete to use lower levels of moral reasoning in a sport situation could be considered an example of egoistic motives overriding moral logic.

There is evidence that suggesting an overemphasis on winning generates moral problems (Orlick, 1978), and competition reduces prosocial behavior (Kleiber & Roberts, 1981) and promotes antisocial behavior (Kohn, 1986). According to sport sociologist Stanley Eitzen (1988), "Sport is not a pristine activity in a utopia but rather one that occurs in a society where only the fittest survive" (p. 19). This would tend to suggest that the broader social context in which sports are played influences orientation toward sport. The incidence of immoral behavior arises through the interpretation of competition as conflict. This particular interpretation is then fueled by an achievement-oriented society, which misunderstands the notion of competition as related above (Marantos, 1985).

When sport enters the for-profit, entertainment industry, a whole new set of standards applies. Athletes view themselves (whether they realize it or not) as employees, trading their performances for payment or recognition. The ethic of the trader becomes dominant as team owner/employer/coach and athlete/worker seek to get the best of the marketplace value (Kjeldsen, 1992). The nature of professional sport is in direct opposition to the spirit of amateurism and its rules (Panagiotopoulos, 1998). Once again, we must reiterate that there is a difference between sport and professional sport. Professional sport is considered a competitive activity, which has at its penultimate, a victory in a contest and is characterized by dedication, intensity and sacrifice (Osterhoudt, 1973). Sport, by itself, while potentially containing dedication and/or intensity, can for the most part, be enjoyed without a scorekeeper.

Perhaps the most prevalent and complicated area seeing the growth of this phenomenon is Division I collegiate athletics, especially the high-expense and high profile sports of football and men's basketball. In Division I, these two sports in particular are presumed to produce a surplus of income in order to support themselves and (hopefully) other sports in the athletic program (and sometimes even other programs in the university). They are the most visible ambassadors of the university many times, and enhance the public image of the university, producing a number of positive outcomes (increased applications, enhanced contributions, etc.). These missions are often times in conflict with the goal of providing an educational environment for the athlete.

Frequently, those benefits that were historically incidental by-products, become the principal goals (ie., winning, professional contracts, etc.), and the educational benefit to the athletes becomes lost in the process.

Whereas some persons hope to find integrity and honor within intercollegiate athletics more than in any other aspect of society, many others contend that athletics has been prostituted by materialistic values and has a merchandising character wherein the struggle is solely for a prize (Miller, 1980).

“In part sport has lost its way. Traditionally when we talked about amateur sport versus professional sport, the idea behind amateur sport spoke to the philosophy that we engaged in sport for the fun of it, for the sake of the sport, for the sake of being a part of sport, for the joy, the pleasure, for the intrinsic values inherent in sport. Unfortunately, today we have moved to a corporate model, a business model, where the bottom line is ‘Your job is to get the job done’, and getting the job done speaks to the idea of winning. Get the job done, I don’t care how you get the job done, get it done, win. Therefore I don’t care whether you cheat, don’t get caught cheating, the concern is, and the problem is, whether you got caught, not whether you cheated.” Doris Corbett (American Sport Sociologist) (Smith, 1999).

Sport should, however, be considered as different from everyday life. There is an inconsequentiality in its play spirit, and yet an idealized structure. Contextually, these properties create a moral “playground” in which participants (as well as spectators) consensually legitimate the temporary “bracketing” of moral concerns. Sport represents an embodiment of release in which the suspension of everyday life moral duties may be an enjoyable, and even approved, moral deviation. Some social scientists have noted a curious fact that athletes and fans take for granted: Sport is set apart both cognitively and emotionally from the everyday world (Bredemeier, 1985).

Definitions of Sportsmanship

An adequate definition of sportsmanship has yet to be achieved. As far back as mentioned by Haskins in 1960, not having an acceptable definition of sportsmanship made the development of a standardized inventory difficult. He stated that unless the psychological dimensions of sportsmanship could be satisfactorily identified, the formal study of sportsmanship ideals and practices would be very difficult. This constraint on the study and development of sportsmanship would be very disturbing as it was universally proclaimed as one of the major benefits associated with the entire athletic experience. Some have stated that a set of statements, followed by assessment of the scalability of such statements would be a crude but necessarily acceptable strategy.

Despite the fact the importance of sportsmanship is universally proclaimed, efforts thus far to define the psychological dimensions of sportsmanship have been ineffective and few. The ethical concept of sportsmanship is obvious to both participants and non-participant observers alike. Sportsmanlike behavior, however, seems directed mainly by implicit beliefs (or by individual conscience) which are seldom explicitly stated. While the concept of sportsmanship is universally accepted, agreement upon what constitutes acceptable behavior is not. Many studies have noted disparate thought over acceptable and unacceptable behavior in sport situations (Corbin, 1971; Kistler, 1957; Kroll, 1975). It would appear the value structure inherent in the ethical concept of sportsmanship is as poorly defined as its psychological dimensions (Kroll, 1977). As recently as the mid to late 90's, researchers (Vallerand, Deshaies, Cuerrier, Briere, & Pelletier, 1996; Vallerand & Losier, 1994) stressed the need for a more standardized theory-driven definition of sportsmanship than has been used in previous research (Duda et al.,1991).

Some have attempted to come up with their own definitions of sportsmanship. Loy, Birrell, and Rose (1975) discussed the idea of a social system in sport which embodied values, norms and sanctions. Values being defined as "goals or guiding principles of behavior". Norms, on the other hand, specified "expected standards of conduct". Loy, et al. listed norms specifically requiring behavior, and norms specifically forbidding other behaviors, to which sanctions would apply. Miscisco's (1976) very subjective definition was that sportsmanship could be defined as conduct in sports whose

characteristics included honesty, integrity, fairness, generosity, courtesy and graceful acceptance of the results of competition. In 1978, Keating tried to shorten this concept by simply stating that sportsmanship was defined as the attitude and conduct which competitors display through their actions or words. Allison felt that “good” sportsmanship was typically when a person played by the rules and treated his or her opponents with dignity and respect (Allison, 1982). Feezell in 1986 made the first reference to intentional harm, both physical and mental, stating that “...a good sport doesn’t cheat, attempt to hurt the opponent, or taunt another player” (Feezell, 1986, p. 11). Feezell also discussed the importance of post-competition behavior. His feeling was that sportsmanship was realized when players achieved balance, a mean between excessive seriousness and excessive playfulness (frivolity) in sport participation. He felt that sportsmanship was manifested when players tried to play well and strove for victory, and avoided taking unfair advantage over their opponents, and reacted graciously following victory and defeat. But lastly, and most importantly, Feezell felt there was much more to sportsmanship than just abiding by only the written rules of the game.

Consequently, in order for sportsmanship to exist, both competition and cooperation must be present. The struggle to reach a similar goal that can not be shared is called competition and is necessary in order for sports to survive (Nelson & Cody, 1979). However, when reaching that goal becomes too important, competition goes beyond the rules of fairness and is termed conflict. Cooperation is the result of individual or group members agreeing to work together to achieve the common goals of the sport. However, total cooperation in sports has generally been acknowledged to result in less than satisfactory performance due to the lack of challenge or opposition from opponents. Thusly, both competition and cooperation are necessary to keep both conflict and complacency in check. This balance between the two is what may also be referred to as sportsmanship (Ulrich, 1968). This dichotomous definition is given a range of meaning through athletes’ interaction with one another and the interrelated contexts in which these interactions occur.

Many sportsmanship codes might be better termed unsportsmanship codes as they are comprised primarily of proscriptive statements. Subjects in the Kroll (1976) study perceived positive action statements of a value type as more important than prescriptive

or proscriptive norm statements. In essence, subjects perceived the value laden “do’s” higher than the “don’ts,” and might be said to have viewed ethical conduct or sportsmanship as something more than the absence of unethical conduct or lack of sportsmanship.

College Athletes’ Views

Athletes, as would be imagined, have their own thoughts on the concept of sportsmanship. When asked to define sportsmanship, 20 Division I football players felt the most important factors were helping teammates defeat their opponents, and being vocal in support of their team. All of these athletes neglected to mention being courteous and questioned why they should be courteous to the enemy (Stoll, 1992). When faced with the question about being fair to their opponents, the players commented that being fair was not their priority. They responded, “you do what you gotta do to win”; “You do to them before they do to you; fair has nothing to do with it”; “you ain’t trying if you ain’t cheating” (Stoll, 1992, p. 75). That same year Stoll, in conjunction with Beller, asked the same questions of more than 150 college athletes in a variety of sports (Stoll & Beller, 1992). They found that while most athletes felt that they should be fair and courteous to their own teammates, only about 10% felt they should give their opponents the same courtesy. On the question of gracefully accepting the results of a competition, the players agreed, but, only if they won. They felt if they lost it was because the opponent or referees had cheated. These two studies should be interpreted with caution due to their very qualitative nature, ie. through the use of open-ended questions leading to a lack of generalizability. Additionally, the first study at least, had a very small sample size, and only one sport.

In 1996, Vallerand et al. conducted a study attempting to identify athlete’s definition of sportsmanship. In this study, 1,056 French-Canadian athletes ranging in age from 10 to 18 were asked to rate 21 sport-specific items with Likert style responses describing various sport situations (previously identified by athletes as pertinent to the concept of sportsmanship), in terms of the extent to which they felt each item depicted the concept of sportsmanship. The results from the factor analysis revealed the presence of five factors. These corresponded to the respect and concern for: a) one’s full

commitment toward participation, b) rules and officials, c) social conventions, d) the opponent, as well as, e) a negative (win at all costs) approach toward sport participation. Interestingly, socio-demographic variables had virtually no impact on how sportsmanship items were assessed. There are a number of limitations identified in regards to this study. Foremost, only French-Canadian athletes were studied. Secondly, the subjects were very young, being between 10 and 18 years in age. Lastly, the subjects were not of an elite nature. This study also included only seven sports, one of them being basketball.

Previous to this, but in the same vein, Beller and Stoll in 1993 questioned students, athletes, and coaches and determined that they had different perceptions of what athletics contributed to athletes. Students felt that sports contributed to monetary gains not values. They felt athletes were expected to win, not necessarily to be moral. Athletes concurred with the latter statement in that winning was more important than morals. Many of the coaches were of the opinion that they had not been hired to teach morals; therefore, they did not consider it part of their job. These statements continue to challenge the assumption that sportsmanship is an integral part of what athletes are absorbing on the playing fields (Walker, 1993).

Sportsmanship should be considered essentially multidimensional in nature. Sportsmanship can be perceived as a core concept, encompassing a number of related and more specific dimensions. Using this conceptualization, sportsmanship reflects a general tendency toward the respect of, and the concern for the sport environment, the rules, and its participants (including opponents), and an avoidance of the negative win-at-all costs attitude.

However, the justice dimension postulated by theorists such as Kohlberg (1981, 1984) is only one part of the concept of sportsmanship. The main characteristic of sportsmanship should be the concern and respect for others, social conventions, as well as oneself. This does not preclude justice as being a part of the understanding of sportsmanship. It is important as it pertains to respect for the rules of the game. However, as researchers in the moral area (Gilligan, 1977) have suggested, to base the concept of sportsmanship solely on the dimension of justice could potentially lead to a very limited view of sportsmanship.

It should be noted at this juncture that the arousal-cost-reward model (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981) should probably be discounted before we move forward. This model would lead to the prediction that the slowest, worst athletes would be most likely to exhibit good sportsmanship. Why would this be the case? According to the arousal-cost-reward model, those who have the most to lose if they stopped to help are least likely to stop, and this has not necessarily shown itself to be the case.

Given the recent developments in sportsmanship-definitional research, it would appear the way to proceed would be to examine the relationship between goal orientations and the five-dimensional non-aggression-based sportsmanship construct developed by Vallerand et al. (1996). Using the theoretical framework provided by Nicholl's (1989) achievement goal theory and following Duda et al.'s (1991) results, one would expect to find that a high ego orientation would be associated with lower levels of sportsmanship. Additionally, one would expect that higher task orientation levels would be associated with higher levels of sportsmanship.

Nevertheless, the present results seem to indicate that Vallerand and colleagues' (Vallerand et al., 1996; Vallerand & Losier, 1994) social-psychological conceptualization of sportsmanship goes beyond previous "justice-oriented" definitions.

Sequential Development

In ascertaining the research completed, it becomes apparent that it has been largely influenced by two broad theoretical concepts of moral development: Bandura's social-learning approach (1977), and Kohlberg (1969) and Haan's (1983) structural-developmental perspectives.

The social learning theory (e.g., Bandura, 1977) places an emphasis on models and reinforcement as determinants of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. Consequently, an individual learns how to make a "moral" decision by: (a) watching what others do and don't do, (b) perceiving positive reinforcements and penalties dependent upon one's behaviors, and (c) demonstrating these same behaviors in an attempt to fit in with one's peers (Weinberg & Gould, 1995). For example, a 13 year old soccer player who watches his or her teammate knock an opponent down aggressively

while scoring and is then congratulated by his or her coach, has had their moral development greatly affected.

The structural developmental theory (e.g., Kohlberg, 1969) however, states that moral reasoning is the major determinant of behavior and that it goes through several varying levels of development. It emphasizes the internal thought process more than the observed actions of an individual. Structural developmental theorists feel that individuals bring innate tendencies to situations that help them to organize or structure their experience into coherent patterns of meaning. This is in direct contrast to the Kantian assumption of inborn organizing categories. Structural developmentalists contend that fully differentiated structures of thought are products of an individual's development.

In the classic Piagetian (1932, 1954) approach to structural developmental theory, development involves a progression through a defined and set series of stages, each stage reflecting qualitatively different organizing properties. These stages are considered to be relatively stable across a variety of contexts or content areas. However, some theorists (Haan, 1983; Turiel, 1983), have examined how qualitatively different forms of person-context interaction promote the development of situationally appropriate reasoning patterns, and thereby raising the possibility that sport contexts could be considered sufficiently distinct from everyday life contexts to provoke a situational adaptation of moral reasoning patterns. Even though Piaget (1965) and Gilligan (1977) provided early structured-developmental explanations to moral reasoning, Kohlberg's and Haan's models are more accepted by researchers and educators in this field.

Haan's (1977, 1978, 1983) interactional model of moral development, emphasized the processes utilized in determining appropriate behaviors for specific action contexts. Haan's model consisted of a 5-level characterization of a person's ability to engage in differentiated dialogical processes to achieve intersubjective "moral balance" concerning respective rights and obligations. He felt an individual progresses in three main perspectives: Moral balance, moral dialogue and moral level.

Social-Psychological Approach

Recently researchers (Vallerand, 1991; Vallerand, Briere et al., 1997; Vallerand & Losier, 1994) proposed a social-psychological approach to sportsmanship in which the

role of the social context is prominent. The researcher's primary theory was that in contrast to the social learning and structural-developmental approaches, which placed an emphasis on reward/punishment and individual differences respectively, the social-psychological approach stated that all of the above should be taken into account in predicting sportsmanship behavior. The two main forces of interest are situational and structural influences. Situational forces refer to determinants that are closely associated with the behavior to be expressed. These are viewed as the proximal causes of behavior. One situational variable virtually always considered as critical by theorists, is the analysis of the predicted utilities, e.g. the potential costs and benefits associated with performing a particular moral behavior (Vallerand, Deshaies et al., 1997).

One needs to consider the broad range of social factors that could play an important role in sportsmanship behavior. In previous research on morality, concepts such as costs/benefits analysis (Latane & Darley, 1970), instrumental value (Hogan, 1973), subjective expected utilities (Kurtines, 1986; Lynch & Cohen, 1978), anticipated social consequences (Backman, 1985), and hedonic relevance (Graziano, 1987), have proven useful in predicting behavior.

Structural forces refer to influences emanating from the structure of the sport setting, such as whether it is considered a team or an individual sport. Research has shown when a group is split in half, individuals tend to become immediately prejudiced towards the other group and feel pressure to conform (Asch, 1956).

Vallerand et al. (1996) mentioned briefly above, viewed sportsmanship as a five-dimensional construct. In the report mentioned above, through their use of multiple regression analyses, it was revealed that high ego oriented athletes were more inclined to approve of aggressive behaviors than those with low ego orientation.

Situational Appropriate

Haan (1983) and a few others (Kohlberg, Kauffman, Scharf, & Hickey, 1975; Turiel, 1983) have explored how qualitatively different forms of person-context interactions promote the development of situationally appropriate reasoning patterns. The action context of sport is obviously "framed" differently than everyday life (Bateson, 1955; Goffman, 1974). Bredemeier and Shields in 1983 and Hall in 1981 determined that

athletes use lower stage reasoning in sports settings compared to reasoning utilized in real-life situations. It seems that athletes utilize separate systems for making general and sports-related decisions. They found that a difference between athletes and non-athletes, started at roughly the sixth grade level. Hall (1986) found collegiate basketball player's moral reasoning maturity was lower than that of their college peers. Sport participants and non-participants moral reasoning about hypothetical dilemmas set in sport-specific situations became significantly more egocentric than daily life issues (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984). When 120 high school and collegiate basketball players, swimmers, and non-athletes were studied, it was discovered that the levels of moral reasoning used to discuss sport dilemmas were lower than the levels characterizing reasoning about everyday issues (Bredemeier, 1984). The issue of athletes versus non-athletes morality levels will be explored later in this paper.

Horrocks (1977, 1980) applied the concepts of Kohlberg's moral reasoning to physical activity. Through the use of intervention and super-ordinate goals, Horrocks was able to determine that a positive correlation existed between socially accepted play patterns and moral reasoning.

An interesting side study was done utilizing James Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT). It was administered to 46 female and male intercollegiate basketball players and coaches were asked to rate these same athletes aggressiveness from extremely low to extremely high. It was found that the athletes demonstrating the most morally mature reasoning were described by their coaches as low in aggression, and those with the least mature level of reasoning were viewed by their coaches as high aggressors (Bredemeier, 1985).

Moral Level

Weiss and Bredemeier (1990), in their review of literature on moral development in sport, provided three possible explanations for the lack of empirical investigations on moral development. First, perhaps a belief existed that morality was not appropriate for scientific investigation, being more of a personal or philosophical concern. Secondly, that some individuals questioned whether research on morality could be of any use. Finally, many individuals felt the job of nurturing moral growth should be left to parents,

teachers, and religious entities, and not to coaches in the sport arena. The differences inherent between sport and other social situations made the ability to generalize from one particular case to a large population somewhat limited.

How do we determine if a moral wrong has taken place? According to Blanchard and Peale (1988), morally mature persons have standards or criteria by which they assess behaviors, both others, as well as their own. Such standards are, of course, variable and somewhat arbitrary across different people; however, some guidelines may be helpful. Blanchard and Peale offered an “ethical checklist” by which a self-determined morally aware person could identify potential moral dilemmas and the correct way to proceed. Their argument was that if there was a violation of rule or law, or if there was an unfairness in the reward being received from a particular exchange, or lastly, if one would not want their behavior known by their closest referent individuals, then there was at least the potential for a moral wrong having taken place.

Social learning theorists such as Bandura (1977), focused primarily on overt behavior and environmental contingencies, thereby reducing examples of athletic aggression to nothing more than what would be considered a behavioral response in the sport context. It is far easier to study aggression as a behavioral issue. The conceptualization of aggression as a moral issue deviates from scientists more traditional interpretations. Zillmann (1979), for example, argued that moral perceptions are “distorting factors which constitute unstable reference points” (p. 38). Those who view aggression as a social interaction rather than a behavioral response, however, theorize that the term aggression represents an evaluation rather than a description (da Gloria, 1984; Felson, 1981; Mummendey, Linneweber, & Loschper, 1984; Tedeschi, 1983; Zumkley, 1984).

Intentions are very important in the understanding of moral behavior. Moral behavior has been defined as behavior that is intentional and a response to a sense of obligation, this obligation being a response to an ideal (Blasi, 1987). Kohlberg (1984) and Rest (1984), also agreed that moral behavior was intentional, motivated behavior. Rest (1984) in particular felt that motivation was an integral component of moral action.

According to Rest (1984), moral development is a complex phenomenon, and in each moral action at least four major processes occurred, and all four were necessary for

producing moral behavior. The four processes are: (a) interpreting the situation and understanding all options available and how each would affect all parties involved; (b) forming a personal judgment about what ought to be done in that particular situation; (c) deciding what one actually intends to do by selecting among competing values; and (d) implementing the behavior. Motivation enters the moral behavior equation at the third stage of Rest's model by influencing the decision-making process. Therefore, it is important that the individual interpret the situation correctly, be able to form a moral judgment as to what would be the correct thing to do in that situation, and yet decide not to act morally, because other motives have been activated during the decision-making process. The actual process of making a moral decision is influenced by motivational factors. However, actual behavior can be affected by fatigue or distraction as well as factors that could physically prevent someone from carrying out a plan of action.

Applying Rest's (1984) model to the sport domain, Shields and Bredemeier (1995) went further, proposing that each of the four processes was influenced by three sets of variables. Examples of the variables they contended influenced each process in the sport context are; situational goal structure; prevailing group norms regarding moral behavior; perceived coaching style; the ability to take responsibility for action, and lastly, the individual's level of moral reasoning. This last area we will discuss more in depth in the following section.

Lower Levels of Reasoning

As defined by Bredemeier (1985, p.120), morality "is a process of balancing one's own needs and interests with those of others". The competitive, zero-sum structure of organized sport (especially at the higher levels) is conducive to the formation of lower level moral responses. Even though maturity lies more in the process than in the outcome, even morally mature individuals occasionally cannot resist temptation or perhaps fudge on the process in the interest of attaining the desired outcome. Nobody is perfect. These lower levels of reasoning mean that moral balances are egocentrically constructed and are marked by a focus on self-interest and making compromises "to get what the self wants" (Bredemeier & Shields, 1984, p. 350).

Variations in the endorsement of athletic aggression have been conceptualized and investigated with respect to athlete's level of moral reasoning (Duda et al., 1991). Interestingly, athletes who exhibit a lower level of moral reasoning have been found to perceive more injurious acts as legitimate than athletes with higher levels of moral reasoning (Bredemeier, 1985). Across the board, the higher their level of moral reasoning, the less aggression athletes practice and condone. Athletic aggression may be conceptualized and investigated as a moral issue (Bredemeier, 1983). Theoretical (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b) and empirical (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984) support has been offered to support the notion that the most morally mature individuals accept less aggression in sport than do their less mature counterparts.

Athletes moral reasoning levels were inversely related to the number of Continuum of Injurious Acts (CIA) acts they perceived as legitimate; this reasoning-judgment relationship was particularly strong for sport reasoning and judgments made in the hypothetical context. There were differences noticed across school level and sex (Bredemeier, 1985). Because the transition from the reality of daily life to sport involves a moral transformation (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984; Shields & Bredemeier, 1984), it was not surprising that sport moral reasoning was a better predictor of legitimacy judgments about sport acts. Reasoning about sport was significantly lower than reasoning about life in their study, but only statistically significant for basketball players and high school female non-athletes (Bredemeier, 1984).

Generally, results confirmed the hypothesis that hypothetical sport dilemmas would elicit lower levels of moral reasoning than dilemmas presented within an everyday context (Bredemeier, 1984). Despite this, decreases in ethical choices observed in at least one study did not reflect a loss of ability to reason at a higher moral level outside the sport setting (Priest & Bridges, 1983). The term coined for this difference between sport morality and life morality by Bredemeier and Shields (1986b), was "bracketed morality".

Bracketing

An interesting angle on this thought process was developed by Bredemeier and Shields (1986b) suggesting athletes had different definitions of justice and responsibility, depending on the situation, which they referred to as "bracketed morality". When an

individual enters the sports arena, there occurs a temporary suspension of the moral contract to equally consider the needs of everybody involved. This flew in the face of theory to date based on the idea of a universal deontic code that applied in all situations regardless. The relatively lower level of sport moral reasoning identified might reflect consensually legitimated and contextually limited moral regression, a temporary deviation from normal patterns of how to process moral information.

Haan's (1983) model of moral development presupposes the influence of person-context interactions. Ergo, variations from the normative form of moral balancing could be seen as consistent within her model. In particular, Haan (1983) noted that power differentials between participants in a moral exchange could create special forms of moral balance. For example, when a moral dialogue is dominated by one entity, using force to achieve a resolution, the result is an illegitimate imbalance. Contrastingly, legitimate imbalances occur everyday, for example, between parent and child. Could it be there are also forms of bracketed morality in which the usual moral obligations of everyday life are temporarily set aside?

Bredemeier (1985) theorized that game reasoning might reflect a special form of bracketed morality in which the competitive strategic sport setting encouraged the temporary adoption of egocentric morality, stating that "...sport experiences are cognitively distinguished from daily life and that sport participants bracket their moral considerations of competitive sport interactions, employing 'game reasoning' which transforms limited egocentricity into an appropriate structure for moral thought and action" (Bredemeier, 1985, p. 121). A detailed understanding of the psychological dynamics of game reasoning may provide insight into the socio-moral reasoning patterns operative in other contexts (e.g., war) which are framed as distinct from everyday life (Bredemeier, 1984).

The unique characteristics of sport morality and "game reasoning" appear to influence the perceived legitimacy of aggression (Bredemeier, 1985). This lack of "real world" meaning to sport actions makes egocentric reasoning seem legitimate.

In some interesting tangential research conducted in prisons (Kohlberg et al., 1975), it was demonstrated that inmates used lower levels of reasoning in response to prison dilemmas than when attempting to resolve standard hypothetical dilemmas. It was

theorized the highly structured and authoritarian nature of prison environments discouraged the adoption of moral principles based on autonomy and equality. Many researchers have noted that in many ways, sport settings share a number of properties of social organization with other cultural institutions, in this case prisons. For example, Coakley (1981) observed that prisons and sport training camps shared many common features, including reductions in liberty, autonomy, and security. Sport is very highly regulated, hierarchically structured, and not very autonomous in its rules orientation. While these features are not unique to sport, they may combine to discourage high level moral reasoning in competitive sport settings (Bredemeier, 1984).

Professional Level

Game orientation was first examined by Webb in 1969. His feeling was that any individual who placed a higher value on winning as opposed to playing fair, was thought to have assumed a “professional orientation”. The flip side of the coin would be the person who is more concerned with fair play, they would be said to have a “play orientation”. Webb assumed the latter to prevail in youngster’s play. He theorized that as children mature in American society, their fundamental attitude in regards to play changes, that they develop a “professional attitude” placing greater emphasis on victory over skill development and fairness. Blair (1985) confirmed this observation. This is a necessary consequence of the value placed on “winning at all costs” in American culture and contemporary sport today. There appears to be an over-commercialization and rationalization of sport currently, as well as a decline in the importance of fun and fair play. When sport reaches this stage of development, play is replaced by work and human values are lost (Lumpkin, 1983).

The unsavory and unending quest for victory has corrupted the ideals of sportsmanship and fair play (Miller, 1980). The need to win often times then becomes the primary motivational goal, unfortunately, regardless of the cost (Kidd & Woodman, 1975). “When you’re playing it as a business... your livelihood depends on winning and losing and so sometimes sportsmanship is lost, as in the process of billion dollar companies.” Danny Ainge (Institute for International Sport, 2003)

“Simply trying to define sportsmanship, I think most folks would agree, responsibility and self respect, qualities that today seem in short supply at times. If character is what you do when no one is watching, then perhaps sportsmanship is that conduct with everybody watching. Frankly, the sports industry would probably survive without sportsmanship. It’s so large and so well financed, but it would be refreshing if more parents and coaches, more administrators and more journalists, and especially more players realized there is room to win with flare and style and even get rich and still keep the values that first brought us here to the games.” Bob Ley (Institute for International Sport, 2003)

Since publication of Webb’s (1969) seminal work, several investigations have been done, with a majority of the research centering on the relationship between professional orientation and age, sport involvement and gender. In particular, professional orientation has been shown to vary positively with age and level of competitive sport involvement and also to vary by gender. It has been shown in research again and again, older children, particularly high school age males, and athletes exhibit a greater degree of professional orientation than younger children, females, and nonathletes (Blair, 1985; Kidd & Woodman, 1975; Loy, Birrell, & Rose, 1976; Maloney & Petrie, 1972; Mantel & VanderVelden, 1974; McElroy & Kirkendall, 1980; Nicholson, 1979; Nixon, 1980; Petrie, 1971a, 1971b; Sage, 1980; Snyder & Sprietzer, 1979; Theberge, Curtis, & Brown, 1982). However, most research found these differences did not become significant until adolescence (Card, 1981; Maloney & Petrie, 1972; Webb, 1969).

Professional orientation towards play has shown a correlation to sex and athletic involvement. Webb (1969) discovered that females emphasize the importance of fairness higher than males at all levels from grades 3 to 12. Males more frequently emphasized the importance of the success factor. The most significant discrepancy between the sexes appeared after the sixth grade (Webb, 1969).

Studies conducted by Mantel and VanderVelden (1974) and Maloney and Petrie (1972) showed that professional orientation toward play was directly related to participation in organized athletics. Petrie (1971b) also demonstrated this professional

orientation toward play was stronger for males over females at the college level for both American and Canadian undergraduates.

Loy (1972) found that professional orientation toward play was highest in male varsity athletes (41.0%), followed by male physical education majors (39.3%), male adult citizens (27.8%), and fathers of students (27.8%). Males consistently emphasized the importance of achievement, skill and success characterizing the professional orientation. Females conversely, emphasized a play orientation with emphasis upon fairness in addition to factors such as social, aesthetic, and fun aspects. The immediate question becomes, how, potentially, has this orientation changed for females in the last thirty years?

There is often a mercenary orientation that the college athlete is required to assume towards the game. In essence, he or she is forced to trade his or her skills for the maximum return, first and foremost, for a college education through scholarships, and subsequently for an increased chance of making it to the pros. This is done by carrying out what in previous ages was considered an approved apprenticeship under the right mentor. Consequently, a trade ethic enters the relationship (Kjeldsen, 1992). People who consider themselves professionals will then operate in a capitalistic setting, directly exchanging service for reward. Technically, they become traders, seeking out the greatest return as well as becoming professionals. The responsibility to do no harm exists along with, but can become secondary to, the ethic of getting the best return on the knowledge and time investment. It has been theorized that these ideals and standards have been shaped, by the code of “sportsmanship” we learned as youngsters as well as by our early sport experiences. The reality is starting to become that these standards are no longer valid for much of today’s sport, which now is more and more, conducted for profit and/or organizational gain (Kjeldsen, 1992).

“The coming celebrity culture – in which fame would be delivered instantly – was prefigured in our idolatry of athletes and was helped along by the proliferation of media that fed our 24/7 interest. Ideas of professionalism and amateurism got blurred, as the need to commercialize even our play took precedence over innocence. Sports, as it evolved from

a local flavor to a national appetite, became a way to look at race, gender, business – you name it” Hoffer (2003, p. 74).

Achievement Motivation Theories

Recent cognitive theories of achievement motivation (Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Nicholls, 1984a, 1984b, 1989) suggest two major goal perspectives operate in achievement contexts (such as sport), a task orientation and an ego orientation. These goal orientations reflect differences in how individuals view and act upon their level of competence and, therefore, define success in a specific setting. A task orientation implies the importance that task mastery and/or personal improvement are viewed, and how they reflect high competence and subjective success to the individual. A person’s perception of competence is self-referenced if the individual is task oriented.

In Dweck and Elliott’s 1988 study, 101 5th grade children were studied (57 boys and 44 girls). The children were asked to perform an experimental task and then randomly half were told they had a high aptitude, half were told they had a low aptitude. These groups were again split randomly into groups that were given task instructions that either highlighted a performance (ego) goal or a learning (task) goal. When presented with a choice of choosing their next task, they were given the option of a performance box where there would be either an easy, medium or hard task, or a learning box where the task would be hard, but they would learn a lot. A chi-square showed a statistically significant relationship ($p < .001$) in the choice of box as related to the instructions presented regardless of the ability level they felt they had (Dweck & Elliott, 1988). While this finding could lead some to believe that it is possible to teach individuals to be either ego or task oriented, the ages of the subjects in this small study have to be taken into account.

Those who are ego oriented tend to base their self-view of competence in reference to others (Duda et al., 1991). Goal orientation research indicates that ego orientation is associated with the belief that the purpose of sport is to enhance social status (Treasure & Roberts, 1994) and gain financial reward (Carpenter & Yates, 1997). While deception (Roberts, Treasure, & Kavussanu, 1996) and taking an illegal advantage

(White & Zellner, 1996) are seen by some as the causes of success in sport. It should be recognized that task and ego orientations are considered independent constructs (Duda & Nicholls, 1992). Nicholls's theory of achievement motivation (1989) states that one's goal orientation in an achievement activity would be consistent with one's views concerning what is considered acceptable in a particular setting. Goal perspective theory would suggest that moral values and attitudes (e.g., sportsmanship) could be influenced by the type of goals adopted by the individual or promoted in the climate (Duda et al., 1991; Nicholls, 1989).

Task Orientation

Task orientation is positively related to the view that sport is strictly for personal development (Treasure & Roberts, 1994) and success is contingent upon motivation and effort (Roberts et al., 1996). When task orientation prevails, the athlete is primarily concerned with the task, not with the self. The motivational goal in this case is fulfilling one's potential, the satisfaction in doing one's best (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). Athletes high in task orientation view sport as teaching people the importance of trying one's best, cooperation, obeying the rules, and being good citizens. A task oriented student should be more likely to believe in the prosocial consequences of sport involvement (Duda et al., 1991). A task orientation is assumed to correspond to attributes of persistence following failure, optimal performance, exertion of effort and the intrinsic feeling of competence, and the choosing of moderately difficult tasks (Duda et al., 1991). A task oriented person usually has a preoccupation with skill improvement and the intrinsic pieces of the experience. Rules compliance, emphasis on fair play, and cooperation with, as opposed to needing to outperform others is consistent with a task orientation (Nicholls, 1989).

It was determined however that there was not a relationship between task orientation and legitimacy judgments (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). It would therefore appear that task orientation can not be considered as having either a positive, or a negative influence on moral functioning. The exertion of effort, focusing on the task at hand, and being concerned with fulfilling one's potential athletically, does not automatically imply more mature moral functioning.

Ego Orientation

Higher ego orientation has been related to lower levels of judgment and intention indices of moral functioning and greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). When ego orientation is the prevalent force, the athlete will be motivated to demonstrate superiority, almost always in the form of winning. When winning is at stake, the ego oriented athlete will be tempted to choose a behavior that helps attain this goal, regardless of whether the behavior is congruent with his or her moral ideals. Athletes with high ego orientation tend to demonstrate less concern for “the process of competitive sport” (Duda et al., 1991, p. 85) than their lower ego oriented counterparts. Higher ego orientation tends to have a detrimental effect upon athletes moral reasoning in sport when the players need to “maximize their superiority or dominance” (Nicholls, 1992, p. 48) over opponents. Winning becomes more important than the manner in which success is achieved.

Many high ego oriented athletes view sport as a means to an end, whereas high task oriented athletes tend to view sport achievement as the end in itself (Duda et al., 1991). Some highly ego oriented athletes may become so focused upon the end result possible (e.g., social approval, status, financial reward) that their moral concerns regarding the means to achieving those ends may deteriorate. Because winning is a key indicator of success in sport, Nicholl’s (1989) achievement goal theory theorized that highly ego oriented athletes might be tempted to endorse the use of illegal or unsportsmanlike behaviors in their efforts to achieve victory (Stephens & Bredemeier, 1996).

In Duda et al.’s research (1991), 56 male and 67 female high school basketball players completed a three part questionnaire, consisting of the Task and Ego orientation Sport Questionnaire (Duda & Nicholls, 1992), the Competitive Attitude Scale (Lakie, 1964) and Bredemeier’s (1985) Continuum of Injurious Sport Acts, all utilizing five point Likert style answers. This research found gender differences in goal orientation, task orientation at the $p < .001$ level, and ego orientation at the $p < .05$ level, as well as sportsmanship attitudes (with Cheating at the $p < .001$ level)

Injuring an opponent so that he or she missed a game, injuring an opponent so that he or she was out for the season, and nonphysical intimidation were deemed to be more

legitimate by subjects higher in ego orientation (Duda et al., 1991). A strong, negative emphasis on task orientation and a moderate, positive emphasis on ego orientation correlated to support of unsportsmanlike play/cheating and moderate disapproval of behaviors reflecting “good” sportsmanship.

It was determined that a low task orientation and high ego orientation corresponded to an endorsement of unsportsmanlike activity among interscholastic athletes. Further, a strong ego orientation positively related to the rating of intentional aggressive acts as more legitimate. Students who were rated high in ego orientation leaned towards the belief that sport should increase one’s social status and show people “how to survive and get ahead in a ‘dog-eat-dog world’”(Duda et al., 1991, p. 17).

Unfortunately, an ego oriented person’s emphasis on the demonstration of high ability often takes place at the expense of others. An ego orientation is mainly characterized by self-interest and self-concern. They are primarily concerned with the adequacy of their level of competence. Through the adoption of a lower level of moral reasoning, a person high in ego orientation would not be concerned about the psychological and physical costs of his demonstrating superiority to others (Duda et al. 1991). While these findings are thorough in nature, they are limited in scope. Duda et al (1991) studied only high school aged basketball athletes, and the study was completed over 13 years ago.

Duda et al.’s (1991) findings were corroborated by Kavussanu and Roberts (2001) in their determination that ego orientation was associated with the view that intentionally injurious sports acts would be legitimate. Kavussanu and Roberts (2001) studied 56 male and 143 female college basketball players (ranging in age from 17 to 25), primarily due the risk of injury prevalent in that sport. All were from the Midwest region in Division I, II and III levels. They were given five different survey instruments to study perception of success, moral functioning, attitudes toward sportsmanship, judgments about injurious acts and social desirability. A MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect. Subsequent univariate analyses showed specific gender differences, specifically that females scored higher in task orientation and lower in ego orientation than males at the $p < .001$ level. Pearson Product Moment Correlations were calculated and it was discovered that high levels of ego orientation were also associated with a greater

tendency to judge questionable behaviors as appropriate, an increased likelihood to engage in questionable behaviors, and a greater tendency to view acts of physical intimidation, such as knocking the wind out of opponents, as legitimate (all at the $p < .01$ level). No relationship was evident between task orientation and the moral variables listed. Among ego oriented people, the achievement activity is typically considered to be a means to some end (i.e., beating or surpassing one's peers). A limitation to this study would be the far greater number of females compared to males that were studied.

According to Nicholls (1989, p. 133), this focus on demonstrating superiority might correspond to "...a lack of concern about justice,...fairness" and the welfare of opponents. An ego orientation implies the preoccupation with being better than others and securing successful competitive outcomes.

Therefore, as theorized by Nicholl's in 1989, an ego oriented person should be expected to do anything necessary to win and display superiority. The two goals are considered orthogonal (Nicholls, 1989; Roberts et al., 1996). Meaning, a person can be high or low in both goal orientations or high in one and low in the other.

Age

As mentioned above, the concept of ability as capacity, which is a prerequisite for the development of ego orientation, does not appear in most children until the age of 12. Chaumeton and Duda (1988), for example, demonstrated that the focus on ego oriented goals increased from the elementary level to the high school level in boy's interscholastic sport. Additionally, Fox, Goudas, Biddle, Duda, and Armstrong (1994) found that school children (m age = 11) who were highly ego- and task oriented tended to report high levels of perceived competence and enjoyment in sport – attributes that would tend to be desirable for premier athletes who engage in competition over extended periods. A study done involving young female soccer players (m age = 11.5) found that goal orientations were actually not correlated with players responses to a question about the likelihood of deliberately tripping an opponent that would probably result in injury to the player (Stephens & Bredemeier, 1996). An important finding is that this divergence between life and sport moral reasoning is greater for male than for female athletes, and greater for college than high school athletes.

The divergence seems to begin appearing among 6th and 7th graders (Bredemeier, 1995), which is the age that ego orientation appears. In a much older study, even McAfee (1955) found that sportsmanship attitude scores became progressively lower from the sixth through the eighth grades.

Participation Length/Decline in Values

Several studies have supported the notion of an inverse relationship between the length of participation and the development of sportsmanship values (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). Literature reviews completed in this area show a negative correlation between the length of one's involvement in sport and the development of sportsmanlike values (Coakley, 1982; Kroll, 1975; Stevenson, 1975). Studies have found sport participants become less concerned with playing fair and more concerned about winning with increasing years of involvement in competitive athletics (Blair, 1985; McIntosh, 1979; Penny & Priest, 1990; Sage, 1980; Webb, 1969). The negative trend of sportsmanship attitudes is even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982). Silva (1983) also discovered that athletes who had participated in organized sport for a greater period of time, were more accepting with the idea of potentially injurious acts.

In studying elementary and junior high school athletes, Potter and Wandzilak (1981) found a negative relationship between the length of participation and sportsmanship behavior. More specifically, some found this negative relationship developed even as a single season progressed (Potter & Wandzilak, 1981, Vallerand & Losier 1994). Vallerand and Losier (1994) discovered a longitudinal decrease in “sportsmanship orientation” was found among adolescent male hockey players in just a 5-month interval.

A study of particular note to this researcher was done by Priest et al. (1999) with college students. Their concern was whether athlete's values actually developed over four years in college. Specifically, 631 athletes were studied and 21 sports value dilemmas were evaluated. Upon entrance, as well as near graduation, intercollegiate athletes value scores were lower than intramural athlete's scores for both sexes at a level of $p < .005$.

There was a decline seen in both groups' scores while they were in college. The decrease of 3.7 points on the HBVCI must be taken in context when compared to the standard deviation of the difference. This size difference is considered "small" when using Cohen's 1988 measure of effect size. Also of note is the fact that while the majority of student's HBVCI scores decreased (62.7%), 32% of student's scores increased. Individual-sport athletes had higher scores than team-sport athletes (again at a p level of <.005), but showed greater decline over four years. While the findings above are notable, the limitations to this author would be that the students and SA's studied were from a military institution, meaning none of the SA's studied were on athletic scholarships, in addition to the many other sociological differences that might be of concern.

The findings are consistent with other studies noted above. College athletes were used because: (a) compared to non-athletes, basketball players participating at this level demonstrated lower levels of moral development (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, Hall, 1981), (even though Bredemeier and Shields (1986a) found that college athletes scored higher in moral development than high school athletes.) The decrease in ethical value choice in sports during college is also consistent with a general trend toward decreased student admiration for other values (Astin, 1977; Priest & Beach, 1993) and of an increase in relativistic thinking as students progress through college (Perry, 1970).

Specific Findings

The findings regarding the prediction of sportsmanship attitudes are conceptually intact when viewed within Nicholls theoretical framework (1989). Since a task oriented person would judge his or her level of competence with respect to a self-referenced criteria (e.g., "am I improving?") and focus his or herself on the activity as an end in itself, it makes sense that such an individual would want to "play by the rules" and experience a "fair competition." Further, it has been discovered that task oriented people stress cooperation more than ego oriented individuals (Duda et al., 1991).

Dunn and Dunn (1999) performed multiple regression analyses which revealed that high ego oriented athletes were more inclined to show approval for aggressive behaviors than those with low ego orientation. Players with higher levels of task orientation had higher sportsmanship levels on three dimensions. Further analysis

showed that goal orientation patterns revealed that regardless of ego orientation, low (compared to high) task orientation was more motivationally deleterious to several sportsmanship dimensions.

Duda et al.'s (1991) results found a connection between athletes' ego orientation and their endorsement of unsportsmanlike play. They investigated the relationship between goal orientations and sportsmanship with male and female high school level basketball athletes and found that their goal orientations corresponded to beliefs about what was considered acceptable behavior in competition. Specifically, athletes with moderate to high ego orientation and low task orientation endorsed unsportsmanlike behaviors and deemed certain aggressive injurious behaviors that were intentionally directed at the opposition, as permissible. Additionally, high ego orientation was correlated with athlete's endorsements of verbal intimidation and injury-causing behaviors that might cause an opponent to miss some to all of a season of play (Dunn & Dunn, 1999). High task orientation groups (irrespective of ego orientation levels) had significantly higher sportsmanship orientation levels than low task orientation groups (all $p's < .008$). Higher levels of ego orientation associated with greater approval ratings for the use of aggressive behaviors.

These findings were similar to those discovered by Duda et al. (1991), who discovered that ego orientation was positively related to the endorsement of unsportsmanlike play/cheating and disapproval of behaviors reflecting sportsmanship among high school level basketball players. They discovered that competitors high in ego orientation also viewed some intentionally injurious acts as legitimate, including non-physically intimidating an opponent, or injuring an opponent so that he or she missed a game or more.

Stephens (1993) reported a link between ego orientation and the temptation to play unfairly in girl's soccer. Among male athletes, some researchers found that a task orientation positively predicted sportsmanship (Dunn & Dunn, 1999) (somewhat similar to the findings of Duda et al., (1991)), who found a negative relationship between task orientation and unsportsmanlike attitudes) while a low ego orientation combined with an ego-involving climate negatively predicted sportsmanship (Treasure & Roberts, 1998). Also, as expected, extensive sport involvement has been linked to less concern with fair

play (Blair, 1985; Sage, 1980) and higher levels of ego orientation (Chaumeton & Duda, 1988, White & Duda, 1994).

An interesting study examining the relationship between ice hockey athletes goal orientations and their perceptions about the intentional use of aggressive behaviors was done by Wann (1997). For each of the five CIA (Continuum of Injurious Acts)-Hockey scenarios, ego orientation was positively related to the dependent variable (all p 's < .05), while the relationship between each dependent variable and task orientation were not significant. Thus, results showed that, athletes with higher levels of ego orientation indicated higher approval ratings for the use of intentionally injurious behaviors than players with lower levels of ego orientation. Task orientation was shown to be positively related to athletes respect and concern for social conventions in hockey ($p < .0001$). Task orientation was also positively related to athletes ROPC (Respect of personal commitment) scores ($p < .0001$); on average. Athletes with higher levels of task orientation had greater respect and concern for their personal commitment to participation in hockey, than athletes with lower levels of task orientation. Specifically, athletes with higher levels of task orientation had higher levels of respect for rules and officials (Dunn & Dunn, 1999). In every instance where a significant univariate test statistic was seen, high task orientation groups had significantly higher sportsmanship orientation levels regardless of the level of ego orientation. In other words, irrespective of ego orientation levels, low task orientation was more "motivationally detrimental" (Fox et al., 1994). The High Task/Low Ego group had the highest sportsmanship scores on three of the four MSOS (Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientations Scale)-Hockey dimensions, while the Low Task/High Ego group had the lowest scores on all four dimensions.

These results suggest a low task orientation combined with a high ego orientation is the least desirable motivational pattern for sportsmanship. While a high task orientation combined with a low ego orientation seems to be the most beneficial for sportsmanship (Dunn & Dunn, 1999).

Athlete/Non-Athlete

Many researchers have been able to determine that non-athletes are more sportsmanlike than their athletic counterparts (Allison, 1982; Boyver, 1968; Kistler, 1957; Lakie, 1964; Richardson, 1982). Other investigators utilizing Kohlberg's theory of moral development, established there were differences between moral thought and sport action among children (Bredemeier, 1984) and among athletes vs. non-athletes. Hall (1981) discovered that collegiate basketball player's moral reasoning level was lower than that of their college peers. Furthermore, it has been noted that collegiate basketball players use a lower level of moral reasoning in sports situations than in other life situations (Priest et al., 1999). Investigators focusing on professional orientation have determined that athletes scored higher than non-athletes and males higher than females (Card, 1981; Maloney & Petrie, 1972; Webb, 1969).

Compared to non-athletes, collegiate basketball players demonstrated less mature moral reasoning in response to both life and sport moral dilemmas. At the high school level, there was no difference discovered between athletes and non-athletes (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a). Not coincidentally, it was found that collegiate basketball players judged a significantly greater number of intentionally injurious acts as legitimate as opposed to their high school peers (Bredemeier, 1985). College athletes are quite often studied because: (a) compared to non-athletes, basketball players participating at this level have demonstrated markedly lower levels of moral development (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, Hall, 1981); and (b) extensive sport involvement has been linked to higher levels of ego orientation (White & Duda, 1994).

Beginning at approximately the sixth grade, athletes and non-athletes moral reasoning about hypothetical issues set in sport-specific situations becomes significantly more egocentric when compared to the response to daily life issues (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984). Beller and Stoll discovered that both individual sport athletes and team sport athletes reach a moral plateau by the time they graduate from college (Beller & Stoll, 1995).

It has been shown that athletes display lower levels of moral reasoning in sport than in non-sport settings and that moral reasoning represents an important determinant of aggressive tendencies (Bredemeier & Shields, 1983; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

Both athletes and non-athletes used lower level egocentric moral reasoning when thinking about dilemmas in sport than when addressing moral issues in other contexts (Bredemeier, 1985).

Athletes are more likely than non-athletes to be familiar with the nature of competitive sport, a context unlike many others, in which complex and strategic patterns of thought often require an adaptive style of moral reasoning. Competitive sports often familiarize participants with consensually legitimated forms of sport reasoning, ie. “bending” of the rules, but it may also encourage adaptive reasoning patterns (Bredemeier, 1984).

These researchers found a significant difference between collegiate basketball players and non-athletes and a non-significant athletic standing effect for high school students on their responses to life versus sport dilemmas. Their discovery that collegiate swimmers did not differ significantly from either collegiate basketball players or non-athletes highlights the diversity of socio-moral dynamics involved in various sports (Bredemeier, 1984).

In 1982, Promoli conducted a study to determine whether or not collegiate athletes differed from recreation basketball players in their perceptions of cheating in sports. He found that 70 percent of the recreation players were against cheating, while 72 percent of the athletes were in favor of cheating. This study is consistent with previous research noted above in which athletes were found to reason at a significantly lower moral level than their non-athlete counterparts (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986). However, his research found no differences between high school athletes and non-athletes (Promoli, 1982).

Gender

Gender differences in aggression tendencies are well established in literature (Hyde, 1984). Males and females, have been socialized over the years to adopt different goal orientations (Nicholls, 1989). Sex differences in attitudes expressed toward ethical codes for sportsmanship may well be linked to traditional sex stereotypes which foster an achievement and success motive for males and an expressive and more social motive for females. An adequate understanding of the psychological dimensions of sportsmanship

would thus seem to require consideration of additional psychosocial factors other than those traditionally associated with sportsmanship (Kroll, 1976).

Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis of the literature regarding moral judgement found that women tend to score higher on tests of moral judgement. His analysis suggested that women's advantage in such tests might be due to their greater verbal ability. With greater verbal ability, women might be able to detect subtleties in sport situations that men cannot. In studies of college students, Beller and Stoll (1995) found that women recorded higher moral reasoning scores than did all college men. Among high school students, a similar pattern was discovered.

Gilligan's (1982) theory of moral development suggested that males learned to emphasize achievement and success and therefore viewed winning primarily in context of self rather than the situation. Females, conversely were seen as stressing caring and feelings of responsibility for others, on establishing cooperative relationships. They, also, place a high value on success, but do so realizing that such achievement is almost always at the cost of another person's loss (Gilligan, 1982). A great deal of research has concurred with this finding of gender differences in goal perspectives (Duda, 1988, 1989; Gill, 1986), and overall gender differences in aggressiveness and competitiveness (Eagly, 1987).

Rest (1979) in his research, does not report significant gender differences on general moral development. However, gender differences on moral variables continues to be a persistent finding in literature, not only of sport-specific measures, but also in general moral maturity measures (Bredemeier, 1984; Hall, 1981).

Women are more likely to see athletic competition as involving moral considerations (Crown & Heatherington, 1989) and less likely to have a "professional" orientation that emphasizes winning over fair play (Blair, 1985). Females are characterized as having a play orientation, thereby placing greater emphasis upon fairness and the social values of sport. Males, conversely, tend to place more emphasis upon skill, indicating a professionalized attitude toward play due to an emphasis upon success.

Gender differences have been reported on motivational (Duda et al., 1991; Kavussanu & Roberts, 1996; Walling & Duda, 1995; Williams, 1994) and moral (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Duda et al., 1991) variables. Strong

gender differences are apparent in most moral variables. Females display significantly higher levels of moral functioning than males. This finding is consistent with research on sportsmanship attitudes (Allison, 1982; Duda et al., 1991), legitimacy judgments (Bredemeier, 1985; Duda et al., 1991; Silva, 1983), and moral reasoning in both sport and daily life contexts (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986b; Hall, 1981). At the high school level, female players demonstrated more mature moral reasoning than male players in response to both sport and life dilemmas. But at the college level, they exhibited more mature reasoning in response to sport dilemmas only (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a).

Silva (1983) determined that socialization in sport appeared to legitimize aggressive behavior for males, but not for females. His belief was that the sport socialization process would cause females to become less accepting of such behavior. While other research confirmed Silva's findings that males are more accepting of aggression in sport $t(63)=6.05, p<.01$ (Rainey, 1986). Several female athletes argued strongly they would not succumb to what they perceived as inappropriate male attitudes. Originally everyone was intrigued not only by the ever increasing opportunity for women to participate, due to such programs as Title IX, but also by the possibility that women would strengthen the ethical dimensions of overall athletic programs (Miller, 1980). Unfortunately that would appear to not be the case, according to an article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Fields, 1978) which reported that rules violations were growing in women's sports.

Bredemeier & Shields (1986b) suggested the detrimental dimensions of sport participation may be less pronounced in women's sport programs, partly due to the different goals adopted by male and female athletes. Because sport traditionally has been a male domain (Oglesby, 1978), the egocentric aspects of competitive interaction might be embraced more by males than females.

Many discovered sex differences in the acceptance of aggressive behavior during sport competition. Acceptance of physical aggression was viewed as more consistent with the male gender role (Weiss & Bredemeier, 1990). Male athletes tended to accept a higher number of injurious acts as legitimate (Bredemeier, 1985; Duda et al., 1991) and, as expected, were more approving of unsportsmanlike play/cheating (Duda et al., 1991). Females saw injurious acts as significantly less legitimate than males (Bredemeier, 1985).

It was also noticed that the acceptability ratings for male athletes increased as a function of the amount of contact in their sports, the number of years of participation in organized sports, and the level of sport attained. Female non-athletes, however, were slightly more accepting of aggression in sport than female athletes who had participated in either contact or non-contact sport (Rainey, 1986).

In the study done by Duda et al. (1991) on high school age basketball athletes, results showed that a low task orientation and high ego orientation corresponded to an endorsement of unsportsmanlike play/cheating. This study examined achievement goals and their correlation to moral functioning (i.e., moral judgment, intention and behavior), unsportsmanlike attitudes, and judgments about the legitimacy of intentionally injurious acts in college basketball players. Ego orientation was positively related to the viewing of aggressive acts as more legitimate. Gender differences in goal orientation and sportsmanship attitudes could be detected.

Univariate F tests revealed a significant gender difference in task and ego orientation and sportsmanship attitudes. Female athletes were more task oriented and less ego oriented than male athletes. Females also saw unsportsmanlike play/cheating as less acceptable and viewed the intentional injuring of an opponent at all levels of intensity (with the exception of the permanently disabling scenario) as less legitimate (Duda et al., 1991).

Male athletes, conversely, tended to have a higher ego orientation, lower task orientation, lower levels of moral functioning, and approve a greater number of unsportsmanlike behaviors. They were far more likely to judge injurious acts as legitimate than females. For the female sample, analysis indicated the presence of a significant correlation between goal orientations and the set of moral variables. Even for the females, a higher ego orientation was related to lower levels of moral judgement and a greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts (Duda et al., 1991). No relationship emerged between task orientation and the moral variables. Results also showed a significant negative relationship between social desirability and ego orientation as well as some moral variables among female athletes (Duda, 1991).

Once again, on a related study, female basketball players showed higher levels of moral reasoning as measured by Rests (1979) Defining Issues Test (Bredemeier &

Shields, 1984). Male basketball players reported significantly higher ego and lower task orientation than females (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001).

Other studies also found the moral evaluations of the legitimacy of injurious acts were also influenced by gender (Bredemeier, 1983; Gilligan, 1982), as well as school level (Hyde, 1984). Silva (1983) found that potentially injurious acts were seen as significantly less legitimate by females than males and by those who participated at lower rather than higher levels of organized sport.

However, these findings were contradicted by Smith, (1977) who presented the Haskin's Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sport Situation to a sample of 7th to 12th graders, male and female, athlete and non-athlete. Smith found that female subjects across the board, indicated a higher level of sportsmanship, as expected, but that there was no difference between athletes and non-athletes sportsmanship attitudes, and that years of athletic experience had no effect on the development of sportsmanship attitudes, for either sex.

Race

Few studies related to ethnicity and sportsmanship have been conducted. It has been theorized that it would be expected the game orientation of athletes, as well as non-athletes, would be a function of ethnicity. Greendorfer and Ewing (1981) discovered that African-American children placed a higher value on sport than did Caucasian children. And in 1977, Hernandez found that non-Hispanic boys showed a much stronger preference to participate in sport than Hispanic boys. Knight and Kagan (1982) also discovered that, in contrast to Caucasian children, Hispanic youngsters demonstrated more cooperative than competitive behaviors. Hernandez (1977) found the sport experience played a part in socializing Hispanic athletes into dominant American values. In 1990, Penny and Priest discovered (using data from Hahm (1989)), that South Korean students gave a higher ratio of deontologically correct responses to the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) than did American students.

These studies seem to indicate that game orientation is a complex phenomenon and is probably very situation specific. The significance of the ethnic effect for both

orientations and setting in their studies prompted these researchers to recommend that any future studies in this area should include race or ethnicity as an independent variable.

Team vs. Individual

Social psychological research would suggest that, generally, group conflict is resolved in line with the position of the majority (Asch, 1956). It has been hypothesized that individual-sport athletes are highly influenced by the utilities variables while displaying higher levels of concern for the opponent than team-sport athletes.

Researchers have felt this interaction was due to the fact that team-sport athletes are subjected to two types of expected utilities: the desire to win as well as social pressure from teammates and coaches to act accordingly (Vallerand, Briere, et al., 1997).

Past work in regards to team sports (McMurtry, 1974; Smith, 1974, 1978; Vaz, 1974) tend to show that social pressure from the majority is directed at leading team members to do whatever is necessary to enable the team to win. Although individual-sport participants also experience pressure to win (especially from parents and coaches), it would appear it is nowhere as powerful as that found in team sports. When given the behavioral alternatives of showing concern and fairness toward the opponent (and losing the contest) and that of helping the team win, the mental imagery of the reactions of teammates and coaches, may lead athletes to regulate their behaviors in line with the opinions of significant others (Baldwin & Holmes, 1987). Team-sports athletes ($m=2.10$) reported lower levels of concern for the opponent than athletes from individual sports ($m=2.77$), $p<.0001$ (Vallerand, Deshaies, & Cuerrier, 1997).

Individual-sport athletes showed a greater decline in their moral reasoning scores during college than did team-sport athletes (Priest et al., 1999). This might simply indicate that individual-sport athletes are following the earlier example of the team-sport athletes, i.e. that both groups reach a moral plateau by the time they graduate from college. In a cross-sectional sample of 9th through 12th graders, no significant age difference in moral reasoning was found among team-sport athletes and individual-sport athletes (or non-athletes for that matter) (Beller & Stoll, 1995). Results have revealed that team-sport athletes show low levels of concern for the opponent irrespective of the situation (Priest et al., 1999). On the other hand, individual-sport athletes showed

significantly more concern for the opponent in the moderate than in the low utilities situation (i.e., a situation where a little more is at stake). The present findings underscore the fundamental importance of the social context in sportsmanship behavior. These results can be understood in light of the effects of the social context on behavior. Individual-sport athletes spend a lot of time on their own, and therefore must rely on their own norms. Team-sport athletes are constantly being reminded by coaches of the importance of winning.

Priest's findings corroborated the findings of Bredemeier and Shields (1986a) who discovered that basketball players had lower moral reasoning scores than swimmers, and that players involved in a team contact sport are more involved in moral negotiations with opponents. Miller and Jarman (1988) also suggested that team sports (e.g., basketball) and individual sports (e.g., swimming) have different ethical climates. They, however, theorized another, and very interesting reason for this difference: they felt that in team sports, moral responsibility was abrogated onto the officials by team members.

Contact vs. Noncontact

Extensive sport participation in high contact sports for boys and medium contact sports for girls has also shown to be associated with lower levels of moral reasoning (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a). It could be that sports involving any degree of contact may alter moral reasoning to the extent that the athletes involved do not feel the need to justify or defend aggressive behavior (Bredemeier, 1985).

In one study done, when the Bredemeier Athletic Aggression Inventory – Short form (BAAGI-S) hostile findings were studied, though not significant, the means seemed to indicate that contact-sport athletes may agree with the use of hostile aggression more than semi-contact-sport athletes. This followed along with findings of Bredemeier and Shields (1986b) who theorized that contact-sport athletes considered intentional aggression to be nothing more than intense competitive play. It could be that athletes in full-contact sports view instrumental aggression as part of the game, and an aid to the desired outcome of winning. Other researchers have found somewhat similar results. Silva's research in 1983 showed that athletes involved in high-contact collision sports (e.g., football, ice hockey, and rugby) legitimized use of rule-violating behaviors in sport

more than individuals involved in sports with less physical contact (e.g., soccer, basketball, and baseball). It should be noted that Mintah et al (1999) research showed the contrary, that contact-sport participants disagreed more with the use of instrumental aggression than semi-contact-sport participants.

Defensive vs. Offensive

One interesting study was done to determine the differences between the sportsmanship attitudes of defensive and offensive high school soccer players (Hopkins & Lantz, 1999). The researchers also attempted to investigate the effects of the time of season and team membership.

Offensive soccer players began the season with poorer sportsmanship attitudes than defensive players, but, interestingly, by the end of the season their attitudes had reversed (Hopkins & Lantz, 1999). These results seemed to suggest that the sportsmanship attitudes of the defensive soccer players worsened during the competitive season, while the sportsmanship attitudes of the offensive players actually improved over the same time period. They found no differences in sportsmanship attitudes between athletes and non-athletes at either the pre or post season utilizing the Competitive Attitude Scale (CAS). Researchers theorized that due to the protective nature of their positions, defensive players may have adopted unsportsmanlike attitudes and were willing to do whatever needed to prevent the opposition from scoring. The offense on the other hand, may have felt compelled to play within the rules to avoid incurring penalties. The researchers were particularly intrigued as these findings were observed in only a 12 game season lasting just 10 weeks. They were curious as to what effects might be seen over a longer season or seasons with more competitive opportunities. Could this serve to exacerbate negative attitudes being formed by the defensive players?

An interesting proposition opined by Hopkins and Lantz (1999), was that perhaps persons who possess certain attitudes or personality traits, such as aggression, might naturally gravitate to particular playing positions. Society projects certain images associated with particular sports as positions, and, as a result, this cultural emphasis may attract certain personalities to these locales. Therefore, it may not always be the positions

that people play that helps to develop these attitudes, but rather the attitude that they bring to the sport.

Summary

The measure of moral levels in sport, in life, and as affected by sport, have been studied through the ages. Our society propagates the “win at all costs” philosophy. Sport is entering the for-profit, entertainment industry, creating a new set of standards, causing athletes to see themselves as employees, trading their performances for payment or recognition. The most prevalent area seeing the growth of this phenomenon is Division I collegiate athletics. Only 10% of college athletes in all sports felt they should be fair and courteous to their opponents (Stoll & Beller, 1992). Using a theoretical framework provided by Nicholl’s (1989) achievement goal theory, coupled with Duda et al.’s (1991) findings, research would be expected to find that high ego orientation would be expected to have an inverse relationship to measured levels of sportsmanship. Vallerand et al. (1996) discovered a similar relationship between high ego orientation and inclination to perform aggressively. Higher ego orientation has been related to lower levels of judgment and intention indices of moral functioning (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). Orientation has also been shown to vary positively with age, gender and length of sport involvement. There has also been a noticeable decline in value scores over the four-year period of college, in both athletes and non-athletes (Astin, 1977; Priest & Beach, 1993); and this trend has been even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982). Team sport athletes reported lower levels of concern for opponents than individual sport athletes (Vallerand, Deshaies, & Cuerrier, 1997).

CHAPTER 3

INTRODUCTION

The proposed study was designed to investigate the goal orientations of non-revenue producing student-athletes and the potential correlation to sport morality levels. By determining goal orientations, task and ego levels and general sportsmanship levels between sports, and how they vary by grade level and ethnicity, it was determined to be possible to begin theorizing which sports possess certain kinds of student-athletes in regards to sportsmanship, as well as comparing data generated to previous research to determine if there are trends in one direction or another. The dependent variables for the current study were task and ego orientation levels and sportsmanship levels. The independent variables were task and ego orientation levels, sports, sport types (team or individual), grade level and ethnicity.

METHODOLOGY

The following sections describe the subjects, instrumentation, procedures for data collection, and methods of data analysis for the current study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Q1: Are SA's from one non-revenue sport different than SA's in any other non-revenue sport in task or ego orientation?

H1: There will be no significant differences among non-revenue teams in task or ego orientation among their SA's.

Rationale: There has been no research completed comparing and contrasting non-revenue team SA's on ego and task orientation.

Q2: Does the level of task orientation correlate to sport morality levels?

H2: SA's high on task orientation will have higher sport morality levels than SA's low on task orientation.

Rationale: A task oriented SA should be more likely to believe in the prosocial consequences of sport involvement (Duda, 1991). An emphasis on fair play is consistent with a task orientation (Nicholls, 1989).

Q3: Does the level of ego orientation correlate to sport morality levels?

H3: SA's high on ego orientation will have lower sport morality levels than SA's low on ego orientation.

Rationale: Higher ego orientation has been related to lower levels of judgment and intention indices of moral functioning and greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). When ego orientation is the prevalent force, the athlete will be motivated to demonstrate superiority, almost always in the form of winning. When winning is at stake, the ego oriented athlete will be tempted to choose a behavior that helps attain this goal, regardless of whether the behavior is congruent with his or her moral ideals. Athletes with high ego orientation tend to demonstrate less concern for "the process of competitive sport" (Duda et al., 1991, p. 85) than their lower ego oriented counterparts. Higher ego orientation tends to have a detrimental effect upon athletes moral reasoning in sport when the players need to "maximize their superiority or dominance" (Nicholls, 1992, p. 48) over opponents.

Q4: Is there any difference in sport morality levels based on gender/race/year in school?

H4: There will be no difference in sport moral levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Rationale: A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of sportsmanship values (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). Literature reviews completed in this area show a negative correlation between the length of one's involvement in sport and the development of sportsmanlike values (Coakley, 1982; Kroll, 1975; Stevenson, 1975). The negative trend of sportsmanship values is even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982). This study will attempt to determine if there are any differences in as small a length of involvement as the four year college experience. Priest et al. (1999) found that SA's sportsmanship levels declined over their four years in college.

Q5: How do gender/race/year in school correlate to task or ego orientation?

H5: There will be no difference in ego or task orientation levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Rationale: Males and females have been socialized over the years to adopt different goal orientations (Nicholls, 1989). Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis of the literature regarding moral judgment found that women tend to score higher on tests of moral judgment. This was corroborated by Beller and Stoll in 1995 on college age students. Rest (1979) however, did not report significant gender differences on general moral development.

Little research has been done in regards to race on this issue. Greendorfer and Ewing (1981) found that African-American children placed a higher value on sport than did Caucasian children, seemingly implying an ego orientation.

A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of higher moral levels, e.g. Rainey (1986). White and Duda (1994) showed that extensive sport involvement was linked to higher levels of ego orientation. However, Smith (1977) was unable to show any effect on morals development dependent upon athletic experience. Beller and Stoll (1999), were unable to find a difference when comparing 9th through 12th graders (assuming more experience for the 12th graders). While four years is a relatively short “length of participation”, it is still worthy of being researched, to ascertain if the differences are occurring on a smaller scale.

Q6: Is there a difference in sport moral levels between team-sport SA’s and individual-sport SA’s?

H6: There will be no difference in sport moral levels between team-sport SA’s and individual-sport SA’s.

Rationale: Priest et al. (1999) found that individual-sport SA’s had higher sportsmanship levels than team-sport athletes, but showed greater decline over their four years in college.

Subjects

The majority of student-athletes participating in non-revenue sports at a major southeastern Division I-A university's athletic program were surveyed. Attempts were made to survey all non-revenue SA’s, however due to a variety of issues, not everybody was available. There is some precedent for using students in a Division I-A university’s athletic program. Many researchers have utilized this subset in this area of research, e.g. Priest et al., 1999; Stoll & Beller, 1992; Vallerand, Deshaies, & Cuerrier, 1997. For the purposes of this study, the revenue sports of Men’s Football and Men’s Basketball were not utilized. Any student-athlete identified as a “multi-sport” athlete (as defined by the NCAA) was excluded as well. Based on history, this number was not expected to exceed 10 student-athletes in any given year. For data collection purposes, the members of the

Men's and Women's Cross Country team were combined with the Men's and Women's Track and Field team, as the majority (if not all) of these SA's participate on the Track team as well. This left a total of approximately 350 student-athletes from 13 Men's and Women's sports as the participants in this study.

Variables

Independent Variables

- Task orientation. Task orientation served as an independent variable for the current study. The variable was measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale questionnaire to determine the respondent's task orientation level.
- Ego orientation. Ego orientation also served as an independent variable. This was measured by the use of the same 5-point Likert-type scale questionnaire mentioned above. Due to the orthogonal nature of the orientations, it should be mentioned again that being measured high in one orientation, did not necessarily require a subject to measure low in the other.
- Non-revenue team. Team differential (by sport) served as a dependent variable in the first hypothesis. There are 13 different non-revenue sports.
- Demographics. In hypotheses #4 and #5, gender, race and year in school were all utilized as dependent variables. Gender is self-explanatory, in terms of race, only six different races were studied; African American, Asian American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native American and Other, and only five different years in school were considered; Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior and Fifth Year.

Dependent Variables

- Sport Morality Level. One dependent variable in this study is the measured level of sport morality. The instrument used for this variable is also a 5-point Likert-type scale. Many of the questions had a sport frame of reference, but had life morals level components as well. As with real life, many of the issues discussed here, are larger than sport. Many researchers have found a connection between life and sport morals levels (Vallerand, 1991; Vallerand, Briere et al., 1997; Vallerand & Losier, 1994).

- Task orientation. Task orientation also served as a dependent variable in hypothesis #5. The variable was measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale questionnaire to determine the respondent's task orientation level.
- Ego orientation. Ego orientation also served as a dependent variable in hypothesis #5. This was measured by the use of the same 5-point Likert-type scale questionnaire mentioned above. Due to the orthogonal nature of the orientations, it should be mentioned again that being measured high in one orientation did not necessarily require a subject to measure low in the other.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument that was utilized in the proposed study was composed of two elements (See Appendix B).

The Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire

The first portion of the survey was the Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ) (Appendix B, Part 1) utilized by Duda and Nicholls (1992) to examine goal orientation. After analysis of the items, it was determined that any individual could be high or low in either orientation, which could be considered an orthogonal design.

No modifications were needed to any of the above components. The TEOSQ is a 13-item questionnaire eliciting scores on task (7 items) and ego (6 items) orientation. Each item is answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree").

Many sources have established evidence for the factorial stability of the TEOSQ items (Chi & Duda, 1995; Duda, 1989; Duda & White, 1992) and have provided evidence of acceptably high levels of subscale internal consistency using Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha (Lochbaum & Roberts, 1993; Williams, 1994). In the 1989 Duda study, the Cronbach coefficient alphas were .82 for the task subscale, and a .89 for the ego subscale.

White, Duda, and Keller (1998) determined an internal consistency of the task and ego subscales also utilizing Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Both the

seven item task orientation, and the six item ego orientation subscales exhibited acceptable internal reliability with the task $\alpha = .83$ and the ego $\alpha = .76$.

White and Duda (1994) reported coefficient alphas ranging from .77-.87 for the task orientation subscales to .77-.91 for the ego orientation subscale ranging across the four different subsets they were investigating.

The Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory

The next portion of the instrument was the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) (Appendix B, Part 2) developed in 1989. This portion determined sport moral levels. The HBVCI is a 21-item questionnaire prompting scores on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree on a variety of questions dealing with life and sport moral questions. The HBVCI was developed in 1989 to assess moral reasoning in the area of sport. Currently, it has been used to study over 10,000 athletes and coaches from a variety of venues. It has proven itself to be reliable (with Cronbach (1951) with values ranging between .74 and .88 for all studies (Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Hahm, 1989; Penny & Priest, 1990)) and valid for groups from ninth grade into adulthood.

The HBVCI is based upon three of the universal deontic codes of conduct: honesty, responsibility, and justice. The theory involved is that by utilizing the defined principles of the above mentioned three codes, any situation arising should be solved deontologically, implying that an established right action must be followed to avoid violating another competitor.

Each of the three codes is represented by seven questions (for a total of 21 questions). Honesty is represented by questions 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20. Responsibility is represented by questions 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, and 18. And lastly, justice is represented by questions 1, 4, 10, 13, 16, 19, and 21.

When evaluating results, the higher the mean score, the more a deontological approach was used when making their decisions. HBVCI scores did not necessarily reflect a moral action, but rather moral knowledge. The inventory was not designed to assess how an individual will act in a given situation, but rather how they morally reason

about issues in sport. It is important to note that cognitive knowledge is just one of many factors affecting moral action.

Procedure

Upon receiving permission from the Human Subjects Committee, surveys were administered by the investigator prior to the beginning of each team's practice, or team meeting towards the beginning of the semester. The surveys were given in a group situation, however, for larger groups, they had the option of being broken up into smaller groups to eliminate discussions. The surveys were of pencil and paper format. The opportunity to make changes to answers was permissible if desired prior to submission. Brief instructions were given by the investigator prior to the survey's distribution to ensure accurate completion of the instruments and assure anonymity. The SA's were reminded that participation was voluntary, responses were anonymous, and they were thanked for their time. The survey took no longer than 20-30 minutes to complete. If SA's were unsure of terminology, definitions were offered, however no interpretations were discussed. If they were still unsure, the investigator told them to do the best they could with the information given, and if they were still unsure, to leave the answer blank. As the surveys were turned in, the investigator checked them to make sure all questions and demographics were answered. Any unanswered questions were not coded. SA's who were unavailable during the initial testing date were contacted to complete the survey within a two week window. Any SA's not contacted within that time frame were considered not available. Inventories were scored by hand.

Data Analysis

Once collected, the data were coded according to the question format. For the TEOSQ, the questions were broken into two sections, task and ego. The task section had seven questions (all the odd questions). Answers coded Strongly Agree were scored as 5 points, Agree = 4 points, Neutral =3 points, Disagree =2 points, down to Strongly Disagree equaling 1 point. The sum of answers was divided by seven to determine the task orientation score for each individual. The same was done for ego. All even numbered question's answers were coded similarly as above, but divided by six (as there

were only six ego questions), to determine the ego orientation score. For both orientations they could run from a low score of 1 to a high of 5, with 3 being the midpoint.

The HBVCI survey was coded similarly. Questions were scored 5 points for Strongly Disagree (the opposite of above), 4 points for Disagree, 3 points for Neutral, 2 points for Agree and 1 point for Strongly Agree. The only exceptions to this were questions 8, 11, and 18 which were scored in reverse. For this section, the sum for statistical analysis was used, as opposed to the mean as above with the TEOSQ (as per the Moral Reasoning and Moral Development in Sport Review and HBVCI Manual, 1992b). Scores on the HBVCI could range from a high of 105 (which indicates a strong disagreement with unethical behavior) to a low of 21. The midpoint would be a 63, indicating moderate deontological considerations.

Statistical treatment and procedures varied according to the stated hypothesis. Descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation, were performed and scatterplots were generated to assure the data fit correctly. A Tukey post hoc was also performed on the results.

H1: There will be no significant differences among non-revenue teams in task and ego orientation among their SA's.

Hypothesis 1 was analyzed by determining if any of the 13 non-revenue teams were different from one another on their level of task and ego orientation through the use of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

H2: SA's high on task orientation will have higher sport moral levels than SA's low on task orientation.

Hypothesis 2 treated the data utilizing a multiple regression analysis to determine if SA's exhibited a significant correlation between their levels of task orientation and sport morality.

H3: SA's high on ego orientation will have lower sport morality levels than SA's low on ego orientation.

Hypothesis 3 treated the data utilizing a regression analysis to determine if SA's exhibited a significant relationship between their levels of ego orientation and sport morality.

H4: There will be no difference in sport moral levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Hypothesis 4 was to determine if there was a significant difference in sport moral levels among all SA's as differentiated by gender, race or year in school through the use of the MANOVA. (For the purposes of this study, only six different races were to be studied; African American, Asian American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native American and Other, and only five different years were possible; Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior and Fifth Year.)

H5: There will be no difference in ego or task orientation levels according to gender, race or year in school.

Hypothesis 5 was to determine if there was a significant difference in ego or task orientation levels among all SA's as differentiated by gender through the use of the MANOVA.

H6: There will be no difference in sport moral levels between team-sport SA's and individual-sport SA's.

Hypothesis 6 was to determine if there was a significant difference in sport moral levels among all SA's as differentiated by whether they are considered a team-sport SA, or an individual-sport SA through the use of the ANOVA. (For the purposes of this study, SA's were considered team-sport if they participated on the baseball, women's basketball, soccer, softball and volleyball teams. They were considered individual-sport if they participated on the men's and women's golf, men's and women's swimming and diving, men's and women's tennis, men's and women's track and field and cross country teams.)

Limitations

The following limitations were possible within the proposed study: the survey method assumed the respondent would make an honest effort to understand and answer the questions truthfully. The HBVCI has been shown to be reliable and valid with ages 14 and above, therefore any person with a reading level below that could have potentially answered incorrectly, this could have included persons with language barriers, such as English as a second language. For the purposes of comparing non-revenue teams to one

another, some teams were inherently small, ie, a men's or women's golf team could have only had eight or nine members. In comparing such a team to a track team with 50 members, cell size could have potentially disqualified a certain group. In comparing race, small cell size could have affected the Native American and/or Other group data. This study surveyed a convenient sample which limits the generalizability of the results.

Delimitations

A number of delimitations were placed on the current study. First, the student-athletes participating in the athletic program at the time of the study comprised the sample. The same survey conducted during a different year or at a different university or different divisions (i.e. II or III) may not realize the same results. Secondly, it is assumed that the non-revenue sports sample provided a broad representation of all collegiate non-revenue SA's in other areas. It was determined that race would be an acceptable study demographic, but that ethnicity would be impossible to measure as the definitions for such would be immeasurably vague and fragmented.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of the research was to investigate the goal orientations of non-revenue producing student-athletes and the potential correlation to sport morality levels. From the total number of questionnaires distributed (n=270), 233 were returned, not all of which were determined to be usable for every question. One respondent failed to list gender and one failed to list year in school for a total of 231. Questionnaires were totally excluded if pertinent classification questions were incomplete. Of the questionnaires returned, only one was determined to be in this category. If the classification areas were completed, but a question from one of the two survey instruments was not answered, the questionnaire was utilized where possible. One person failed to answer all the required questions on the TEOSQ and two people did the same on the HBVCI, and thusly were disqualified. Upon completion of the data entry, printouts of the data tables, frequencies, and scatter plots were examined for visible discrepancies. Upon visual inspection of the scatter plots, no outliers or other indicators warranted further inspection. Data tables and frequencies all appeared to be within acceptable parameters.

Prior to conducting data analysis on the research questions, a Cronbach's (1951) alpha internal consistency reliability measure was calculated for each of the two survey instruments. For the TEOSQ when broken down into Task and Ego sections, the respective alpha coefficients were 0.782 and 0.866 which demonstrated the instrument's reliability.

An alpha level was set at .05 for all research questions to determine statistical significance.

Demographics

The questionnaire was administered to SA's participating in non-revenue sports at a major southeastern university. Collectively, 233 questionnaires were returned, with the gender breakdown consisting of 48.9% male (n=114) and 50.6% female (n=118) with

one respondent failing to opt for either choice. A breakdown of the applicable statistics is provided in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1
Gender Breakdown of the Respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Male	114	48.9	49.1	49.1
Female	118	50.6	50.9	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

In terms of class, respondents had the choice to respond either Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, or Fifth Year. The breakdown was as follows, 32.2% Freshman (n=75), 27.5% Sophomore (n=64), 21.5% Junior (n=50), 13.7% Senior (n=32) and 4.7% Fifth Year (n=11) with again one respondent failing to answer. An overview of class demographics is provided in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2
Class Breakdown of the Respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Freshman	75	32.2	32.3	32.3
Sophomore	64	27.5	27.6	59.9
Junior	50	21.5	21.6	81.5
Senior	32	13.7	13.8	95.3
Fifth Year	11	4.7	4.7	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

With regards to race, 69.5% of respondents were Caucasian (n=162), 13.7% were African American (n=32), 8.6% deemed themselves Other (n=20), 5.6% were Hispanic (n=13), 2.1% were Asian American, no respondent selected Native American and one

respondent failed to make a choice. Statistics for this demographic can be found in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3
Race Breakdown of the Respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
African American	32	13.7	13.8	13.8
Asian American	5	2.1	2.2	15.9
Caucasian	162	69.5	69.8	85.8
Hispanic	13	5.6	5.6	91.4
Other	20	8.6	8.6	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

The sport breakdown is as follows, 33.0% of respondents were Track & Field athletes (n=77), 17.2% were on the Swimming & Diving team (n=40), Baseball players were 13.7% of respondents (n=32), 9.9% were Golfers (n=23), 7.7% were Soccer athletes (n=18), 7.3% were Softball players (n=17), 6.9% were Tennis participants (n=16) and Volleyball players consisted of 4.3% of the respondents (n=10). This is represented in Table 4-4. It should be noted that all respondents completed this portion of the questionnaire, and that no respondent circled more than one sport, i.e. could be considered multi-sport.

Table 4-4
Sport Breakdown of the Respondents

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
baseball	32	13.7	13.7
golf	23	9.9	23.6
soccer	18	7.7	31.3
softball	17	7.3	38.6
swimming & diving	40	17.2	55.8
tennis	16	6.9	62.7
track & field	77	33.0	95.7
volleyball	10	4.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	

Results of Survey Items

The following is the breakdown of the total responses to each survey item. The Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ) will be examined first. For survey item TEOSQ #1 – “I feel most successful in sport when I learn a new skill and it makes me want to practice more.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #1

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	97	41.6	41.6	41.6
Agree	116	49.8	49.8	91.4
Neutral	18	7.7	7.7	99.1
Disagree	2	.9	.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #2 – “I feel most successful in sport when I’m the only one who can do the play or skill.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #2

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	57	24.5	24.6	24.6
Agree	66	28.3	28.4	53.0
Neutral	57	24.5	24.6	77.6
Disagree	33	14.2	14.2	91.8
Strongly Disagree	19	8.2	8.2	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

For survey item TEOSQ #3 – “I feel most successful in sport when I learn something that is fun to do.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-7.

Table 4-7
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #3

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	104	44.6	44.8	44.8
Agree	98	42.1	42.2	87.1
Neutral	29	12.4	12.5	99.6
Disagree	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

For survey item TEOSQ #4 – “I feel most successful in sport when I can do better than my friends.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #4

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	44	18.9	19.0	19.0
Agree	84	36.1	36.2	55.2
Neutral	75	32.2	32.3	87.5
Disagree	20	8.6	8.6	96.1
Strongly Disagree	9	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

For survey item TEOSQ #5 – “I feel most successful in sport when I learn a new skill by trying hard.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #5

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	131	56.2	56.2	56.2
Agree	92	39.5	39.5	95.7
Neutral	8	3.4	3.4	99.1
Disagree	2	.9	.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #6 – “I feel most successful in sport when the others can’t do as well as me.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-10.

Table 4-10
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #6

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	41	17.6	17.6	17.6
Agree	62	26.6	26.6	44.2
Neutral	66	28.3	28.3	72.5
Disagree	49	21.0	21.0	93.6
Strongly Disagree	15	6.4	6.4	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #7 – “I feel most successful in sport when I work really hard.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-11.

Table 4-11
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #7

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	143	61.4	61.4	61.4
Agree	77	33.0	33.0	94.4
Neutral	10	4.3	4.3	98.7
Disagree	3	1.3	1.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #8 – “I feel most successful in sport when others mess-up and I don’t.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-12.

Table 4-12
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #8

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	24	10.3	10.3	10.3
Agree	45	19.3	19.3	29.6
Neutral	70	30.0	30.0	59.7
Disagree	68	29.2	29.2	88.8
Strongly Disagree	26	11.2	11.2	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #9 – “I feel most successful in sport when something I learn makes me want to go and practice more.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-13.

Table 4-13
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #9

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	104	44.6	44.6	44.6
Agree	109	46.8	46.8	91.4
Neutral	18	7.7	7.7	99.1
Disagree	2	.9	.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #10 – “I feel most successful in sport when I score the most points/goals/hits, etc.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #10

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	84	36.1	36.1	36.1
Agree	69	29.6	29.6	65.7
Neutral	47	20.2	20.2	85.8
Disagree	22	9.4	9.4	95.3
Strongly Disagree	11	4.7	4.7	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #11 – “I feel most successful in sport when a skill I learn really feels right.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-15.

Table 4-15
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #11

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	104	44.6	44.6	44.6
Agree	105	45.1	45.1	89.7
Neutral	23	9.9	9.9	99.6
Disagree	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #12 – “I feel most successful in sport when I’m the best.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-16.

Table 4-16
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #12

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	79	33.9	33.9	33.9
Agree	73	31.3	31.3	65.2
Neutral	49	21.0	21.0	86.3
Disagree	20	8.6	8.6	94.8
Strongly Disagree	12	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item TEOSQ #13 – “I feel most successful in sport when I do my very best.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-17.

Table 4-17
Breakdown of Responses to TEOSQ #13

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	161	69.1	69.1	69.1
Agree	62	26.6	26.6	95.7
Neutral	10	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

The responses to the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) will now be examined.

For survey item HBVCI #1 – “Two rival basketball teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on team A’s court. During the game, team B’s star player was consistently heckled whenever she missed a basket, pass or rebound. In the return game on team B’s court, the home crowd took revenge by heckling team A’s players. Such action is fair because both crowds have equal opportunity to heckle players.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-18.

Table 4-18
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #1

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	40	17.2	17.2	17.2
Agree	77	33.0	33.0	50.2
Neutral	46	19.7	19.7	70.0
Disagree	48	20.6	20.6	90.6
Strongly Disagree	22	9.4	9.4	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #2 – “During the double play in baseball, players must tag second base before throwing to first. However, some players deliberately fake the tag, thus delivering a quicker throw to first base. Pretending to tag second base is justified because it is a good strategy. Besides, the umpire’s job is to call an illegal play.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-19.

Table 4-19
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #2

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	31	13.3	13.3	13.3
Agree	81	34.8	34.8	48.1
Neutral	47	20.2	20.2	68.2
Disagree	46	19.7	19.7	88.0
Strongly Disagree	28	12.0	12.0	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #3 – “Blood doping is not potentially dangerous to an athlete even though it violates rules in all major competitions. Just before a race, athletes use the technique to freeze their blood and return the red blood cells to the body. The elevated red cell content enables the body to send more oxygen to the muscles, resulting in an enhanced performance. Because there is no physical harm in blood doping, an

athlete should be given the choice “to dope or not to dope”.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-20.

Table 4-20
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #3

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	10	4.3	4.3	4.3
Agree	16	6.9	6.9	11.3
Neutral	33	14.2	14.3	25.5
Disagree	69	29.6	29.9	55.4
Strongly Disagree	103	44.2	44.6	100.0
Total	231	99.1	100.0	
Missing	2	.9		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 2

For survey item HBVCI #4 – “Swimmers are taught to stand completely still just before the gun shot that starts the race. Some coaches teach their swimmers to move their head and upper body slightly which possibly forces an opponent to false start. If swimmer B false starts he will probably stay in the blocks a fraction longer when the race starts. Consequently, swimmer A may have an advantage during the race. Because all competitors have equal opportunity for this strategy, this is an acceptable means for swimmers to increase their advantage.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-21.

Table 4-21
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #4

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	28	12.0	12.0	12.0
Agree	85	36.5	36.5	48.5
Neutral	53	22.7	22.7	71.2
Disagree	44	18.9	18.9	90.1
Strongly Disagree	23	9.9	9.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #5 – “Soccer players are allowed to play the ball with any part of their body except the hands or outstretched arms. A soccer player receives a chest high pass and taps the ball to the ground with his hand. The referee does not see this action and the play continues. Because it is the referee’s job to see these actions, the player is not obligated to report the foul.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-22.

Table 4-22
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #5

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	63	27.0	27.0	27.0
Agree	107	45.9	45.9	73.0
Neutral	28	12.0	12.0	85.0
Disagree	29	12.4	12.4	97.4
Strongly Disagree	6	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total	63	27.0	27.0	27.0

For survey item HBVCI #6 – “In golf, there is an unwritten rule that players generally observe silence while other golfers are preparing for and executing shots. Player A is preparing to “tee off”. Player B notices that he can break player A’s concentration by rattling his clubs and making other noises. Player B believes this is a good strategy. Player B does not believe he is violating a rule because “observed silence” is an unwritten rule.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-23.

Table 4-23
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #6

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	10	4.3	4.3	4.3
Agree	17	7.3	7.4	11.7
Neutral	28	12.0	12.1	23.8
Disagree	97	41.6	42.0	65.8
Strongly Disagree	79	33.9	34.2	100.0
Total	231	99.1	100.0	
Missing	2	.9		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 2

For survey item HBVCI #7 – “Basketball player A skillfully dribbled the ball around her opponents to the basket. Just as she moved toward the basket, she was tripped by player B, causing the basket to be missed. If player A had not been tripped, two points probably would have been made. Player B is charged with a foul and player A must shoot two free throws. Player A missed the two shots from the free throw line. Player B is demonstrating good strategy by forcing player A to shoot two foul shots instead of an easy lay-up.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-24.

Table 4-24
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #7

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	45	19.3	19.3	19.3
Agree	87	37.3	37.3	56.7
Neutral	60	25.8	25.8	82.4
Disagree	27	11.6	11.6	94.0
Strongly Disagree	14	6.0	6.0	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #8 – “A gold medal track athlete was told to undergo drug testing during recent international competition. Because she played by the rules, competed on her merits, and did not use performance enhancing drugs, she opposed the

drug testing. She believed that athletic organizations had no moral authority to force her to be tested. Because she and other athletes are truthful and drug testing assumes they are untruthful, drug testing should not be mandatory.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-25.

Table 4-25
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #8

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	8	3.4	3.4	3.4
Agree	11	4.7	4.7	8.2
Neutral	31	13.3	13.3	21.5
Disagree	96	41.2	41.2	62.7
Strongly Disagree	87	37.3	37.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #9 – “Certain basketball teams are coached to run plays that cause the opponents to foul. Players and coaches believe this is clever strategy because the opponents may foul out of the game, giving their team an advantage. Because the coach orders this type of play, the players should follow his directions.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-26.

Table 4-26
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #9

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	45	19.3	19.3	19.3
Agree	112	48.1	48.1	67.4
Neutral	60	25.8	25.8	93.1
Disagree	13	5.6	5.6	98.7
Strongly Disagree	3	1.3	1.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #10 – “A star football player had a history test on Friday, the day of the cross-town rival football game. He knew about the test for several weeks,

however he waited until Thursday to study. Other teammates prepared for the test. On Friday he said he was having difficulty concentrating on his studies. If the instructor permits the athlete to take the test at a later date, the instructor would be acting fairly.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-27.

Table 4-27
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #10

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	7	3.0	3.0	3.0
Agree	8	3.4	3.4	6.4
Neutral	41	17.6	17.6	24.0
Disagree	108	46.4	46.4	70.4
Strongly Disagree	69	29.6	29.6	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #11 – “Coaches display confidence and trust in the officials by remaining on the bench and calming their players when questionable calls are made. During a basketball game the center blocked a shot, however she was called for a foul. The players, fans, and coaches clearly believe she blocked the shot by only touching the ball. The team and fans were outraged but the coach calmed her players and encouraged them to forget the call and continue playing. Because the coaches must place mutual confidence in the officials, the coach acted properly.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-28.

Table 4-28
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #11

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	64	27.5	27.6	27.6
Agree	117	50.2	50.4	78.0
Neutral	39	16.7	16.8	94.8
Disagree	11	4.7	4.7	99.6
Strongly Disagree	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

For survey item HBVCI #12 – “A tennis star is preparing to play a match. She complains of not feeling well during the warmup. This star player finally lost a match. When discussing the game, she continually remarked that “I just did not play my best game”. Because the player believed her best game was not played, her statement was acceptable.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-29.

Table 4-29
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #12

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	52	22.3	22.3	22.3
Agree	118	50.6	50.6	73.0
Neutral	50	21.5	21.5	94.4
Disagree	9	3.9	3.9	98.3
Strongly Disagree	4	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #13 – “Player A who is the center on an ice hockey team skated the puck down the ice, around several opponents. He had a clear shot at the net as he passed player B. Player B, while pretending to go for the puck, decided to turn at the last second to trip player A with his stick. Consequently, player A missed the goal.

Because player A must now attempt a penalty shot instead of an easy goal, this is demonstrating good strategy.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-30.

Table 4-30
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #13

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	21	9.0	9.0	9.0
Agree	65	27.9	27.9	36.9
Neutral	74	31.8	31.8	68.7
Disagree	61	26.2	26.2	94.8
Strongly Disagree	12	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #14 – “During a volleyball game player A hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazed off player B’s fingers and landed out of bounds. However the referee did not see player B touch the ball. Because the referee is responsible for calling rule violations, player B is not obligated to report the violation.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-31.

Table 4-31
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #14

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	45	19.3	19.3	19.3
Agree	123	52.8	52.8	72.1
Neutral	34	14.6	14.6	86.7
Disagree	29	12.4	12.4	99.1
Strongly Disagree	2	.9	.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #15 – “A field hockey player is permitted to hit the ball hard, providing the ball is not hit purposely at an opponent. Player A (intently concentrating on the net) hit the ball towards the goal, but hit player B instead. Player B complains that player A purposely hit the ball into her, however the foul was not called.

Down the field, player B gained possession of the ball, retaliated, and hit the ball at player A. Player B’s action was acceptable.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-32.

Table 4-32
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #15

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	6	2.6	2.6	2.6
Agree	12	5.2	5.2	7.7
Neutral	40	17.2	17.2	24.9
Disagree	108	46.4	46.4	71.2
Strongly Disagree	67	28.8	28.8	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #16 – “Football players are not allowed to move beyond the line of scrimmage until the ball is snapped. Some coaches encourage their players to charge across the line of scrimmage a fraction of a second before the ball is snapped. The officials have difficulty seeing the early movement, therefore, the team has an advantage compared to their opponents. Because the strategy is beneficial and the officials must call the infraction, the team’s actions are fair.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-33.

Table 4-33
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #16

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	23	9.9	9.9	9.9
Agree	83	35.6	35.8	45.7
Neutral	69	29.6	29.7	75.4
Disagree	49	21.0	21.1	96.6
Strongly Disagree	8	3.4	3.4	100.0
Total	232	99.6	100.0	
Missing	1	.4		
Total	233	100.0		

N = 233

Missing/invalid responses = 1

For survey item HBVCI #17 – “During an intramural basketball game, a student official awarded one free throw shot instead of two to team A. Team B knew the call was wrong, however chose to remain silent, knowing the call was to their advantage. Because the official’s job is to make the proper calls, and it is not a formal game, team B’s action was acceptable.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-34.

Table 4-34
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #17

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	22	9.4	9.4	9.4
Agree	84	36.1	36.1	45.5
Neutral	61	26.2	26.2	71.7
Disagree	62	26.6	26.6	98.3
Strongly Disagree	4	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #18 – “One of our rights as human beings is the freedom of choice. Because we have freedom of choice, we should be able to take any performance enhancing drug we choose. Also, because drug ingestion only affects our bodies, we are not hurting anybody else. Hence when a governing body bans a drug, our freedom of choice is violated.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-35.

Table 4-35
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #18

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	6	2.6	2.6	2.6
Agree	12	5.2	5.2	7.7
Neutral	28	12.0	12.0	19.7
Disagree	80	34.3	34.3	54.1
Strongly Disagree	107	45.9	45.9	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #19 – “Many athletes use drugs such as steroids to gain maximum strength, while others do not. Some athletes feel that unless they take such drugs, they are at a disadvantage compared with those who do. Athletes, who do not use drugs, state that competition against their drug using opponents results in not having an equal opportunity to win the game. For an equal opportunity, these athletes decide to take drugs. This decision is acceptable.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-36.

Table 4-36
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #19

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	6	2.6	2.6	2.6
Agree	9	3.9	3.9	6.4
Neutral	21	9.0	9.0	15.5
Disagree	102	43.8	43.8	59.2
Strongly Disagree	95	40.8	40.8	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #20 – “During a youth sport football game, an ineligible pass receiver catches a long touchdown pass and scores. The officials fail to determine that the player was ineligible. Because it is the referee’s job to detect the ineligible receiver, the player or the coach does not have to declare an ineligible receiver. Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-37.

Table 4-37
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #20

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	27	11.6	11.6	11.6
Agree	85	36.5	36.5	48.1
Neutral	57	24.5	24.5	72.5
Disagree	51	21.9	21.9	94.4
Strongly Disagree	13	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

For survey item HBVCI #21 – “Ice hockey is often a violent game. Even though players are often hurt, hitting hard and smashing players into the boards is normal. Player A and B are opponents playing in a championship game. While trying to control the puck, player A smashed player B into the boards. Even though the puck is on the opposite side of the arena, player B a few minutes later, retaliated by smashing player A into the boards. Because “hitting hard” and “smashing players into the boards” are an inherent part of the game, player B’s action was acceptable.” Responses for this question can be found in Table 4-38.

Table 4-38
Breakdown of Responses to HBVCI #21

Respondents	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Strongly Agree	19	8.2	8.2	8.2
Agree	78	33.5	33.5	41.6
Neutral	60	25.8	25.8	67.4
Disagree	59	25.3	25.3	92.7
Strongly Disagree	17	7.3	7.3	100.0
Total	233	100.0	100.0	

Research Questions

Each of the six research questions are followed by a summary of the analyses, including overall multivariate effects and univariate effects. Analyses are presented for all univariate effects of interest, regardless of whether the multivariate effect was statistically significant. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were calculated for each of the dependent variables across all hypotheses.

Research Question One

Question one inquired whether SA’s from one non-revenue sport were different than SA’s in any other non-revenue sport in task or ego orientation? Means and Standard Deviations were calculated for each of the teams according to task and ego orientation and are included in Table 4-39.

Table 4-39
Means and Standard Deviations by Sport type for Task and Ego Orientation

Sport	<i>Task</i>			<i>Ego</i>		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
baseball	3.9688	.65388	32	3.4479	.76486	32
golf	3.9130	.69285	23	3.4783	.71298	23
soccer	4.0000	.61396	18	2.6481	.60198	18
softball	3.9748	.61494	17	2.9118	.99673	17
swimming & diving	3.9393	.68465	40	2.9083	.83883	40
tennis	3.9464	.63861	16	3.2708	.57373	16
track & field	4.1101	.65343	77	3.3247	.93459	77
volleyball	4.4857	.53537	10	3.0333	.90540	10
Total	4.0284	.65395	233	3.1867	.86372	233

In order to reduce Type I error, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with both task and ego orientations and sport as the dependent variable. Using the Pillai's Trace criterion, this analysis revealed a significant effect, $F(7, 225) = 2.200, p = .007$. This finding indicates significant differences between sports on either task or ego orientation. There were no other statistically significant multivariate main effects, nor were there any statistically significant multivariate interactions. The overall effects of the MANOVA for sport type are presented in Table 4-40.

Table 4-40
Differences between Sport Type on Ego and Task Orientation

Effect		Value	F	Hypo. df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.971	3731.580(b)	2.000	224.000	.000	.971	7463.160	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.029	3731.580(b)	2.000	224.000	.000	.971	7463.160	1.000
	Hotelling's Trace	33.318	3731.580(b)	2.000	224.000	.000	.971	7463.160	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	33.318	3731.580(b)	2.000	224.000	.000	.971	7463.160	1.000
sport	Pillai's Trace	.128	2.200	14.000	450.000	.007	.064	30.804	.970
	Wilks' Lambda	.875	2.207(b)	14.000	448.000	.007	.065	30.896	.970
	Hotelling's Trace	.139	2.213	14.000	446.000	.007	.065	30.985	.971
	Roy's Largest Root	.102	3.294(c)	7.000	225.000	.002	.093	23.059	.955

a Computed using alpha = .05

b Exact statistic

c The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

d Design: Intercept+sport

After performing tests of between-subjects effects it was determined there was no significant difference between non-revenue sports on task orientation. However, there was a significant difference regarding ego orientation between non-revenue sports, $F(7, 225) = 3.175, p = .003$. A Tukey Highly Significant Differences (HSD) post hoc test revealed the differences were between the sports of baseball and soccer, and golf and soccer, with soccer ($M=2.65, SD=.60$) showing a significantly lower level of ego orientation than either golf ($M=3.48, SD=.71$) or baseball ($M=3.45, SD=.76$). The Tukey HSD results are found in Table 4-41. Therefore, hypothesis one – “There will be no significant differences among non-revenue teams in task or ego orientation among their SA’s” was not supported.

Table 4-41
Differences in Ego Orientation by Sport Type
Tukey HSD

Sport	N	Subset	
		1	2
soccer	18	2.6481	-
swimming diving	40	2.9083	2.9083
softball	17	2.9118	2.9118
volleyball	10	3.0333	3.0333
tennis	16	3.2708	3.2708
track & field	77	3.3247	3.3247
baseball	32	-	3.4479
golf	23	-	3.4783
Sig.		.165	.366

Note. Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Based on Type III Sum of Squares

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = .700.

Research Question Two

Question two inquired whether the level of task orientation correlated to sport morality levels. Previous research theorized that task oriented SA's should be more likely to believe in the prosocial consequences of sport involvement (Duda, 1991). An emphasis on fair play is consistent with a task orientation (Nicholls, 1989). However, a Pearson Correlation test revealed no significant correlation between task orientation and sport morality level. Results may be seen in Table 4-42. Therefore, hypothesis two – "SA's high on task orientation will have higher sport morality levels than SA's low on task orientation" was not supported.

Table 4-42
Pearson Correlations for Task Orientation and Sport Morality Level

Test	hbvci
Pearson Correlation	-.003
Sig. (2-tailed)	.965
N	233

Research Question Three

Question three asked if there was a negative correlation between the level of ego orientation and sport morality levels of respondents. Previous research indicated that higher ego orientation was related to lower levels of judgment and intention indices of moral functioning and greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). When ego orientation is the prevalent force, the athlete will be motivated to demonstrate superiority, almost always in the form of winning. When winning is at stake, the ego oriented athlete will be tempted to choose a behavior that helps attain this goal, regardless of whether the behavior is congruent with his or her moral ideals. Athletes with high ego orientation tend to demonstrate less concern for “the process of competitive sport” (Duda et al., 1991, p. 85) than their lower ego oriented counterparts. Higher ego orientation tends to have a detrimental effect upon athletes moral reasoning in sport when the players need to “maximize their superiority or dominance” (Nicholls, 1992, p. 48) over opponents. As can be seen in Table 4-43, there was a significant correlation between ego orientation and sport morality levels at the $p < .05$ level. Therefore, hypothesis three – “SA’s high on ego orientation will have lower sport morality levels than SA’s low on ego orientation” was supported.

Table 4-43

Pearson Correlations for Ego Orientation and Sport Morality Level

Test	hbvci
Pearson Correlation	-.199
Sig. (2-tailed)	.002
N	233

Research Question Four

Question four inquired if there were differences in sport morality levels based on gender/race/year in school. Cohn’s (1991) meta-analysis of literature found that women tend to score higher on tests of moral judgement. Beller and Stoll (1995) also found in a study of college students that women recorded higher moral reasoning scores than did all college men. A multitude of studies demonstrated an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of sportsmanship values (Allison, 1982; Beller &

Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). Related literature reviews show a negative correlation between the length of one's involvement in sport and the development of sportsmanlike values (Coakley, 1982; Kroll, 1975; Stevenson, 1975). Furthermore, the negative trend of sportsmanship values is even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982). Priest et al. (1999) found SA's sportsmanship levels declined over their four years in college.

To determine if there was a significant gender difference on the basis of sport morality levels between males ($M=58.36$, $SD=9.48$) and females ($M=64.25$, $SD=8.27$) a oneway ANOVA was performed. Means and standard deviations of task and ego orientations and sport morality level by gender can be found in Table 4-44.

Table 4-44
Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels by Gender

		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
task	male	114	3.9591	.65595	.06144	3.8373	4.0808	2.71	5.00
	female	118	4.1005	.64764	.05962	3.9824	4.2186	3.00	5.00
	Total	232	4.0310	.65417	.04295	3.9464	4.1156	2.71	5.00
ego	male	114	3.3333	.82875	.07762	3.1796	3.4871	1.17	5.00
	female	118	3.0367	.87411	.08047	2.8774	3.1961	1.17	5.00
	Total	232	3.1825	.86317	.05667	3.0708	3.2941	1.17	5.00
Sport morality	male	114	58.3596	9.47669	.88757	56.6012	60.1181	30.00	82.00
	female	118	64.2458	8.26582	.76093	62.7388	65.7527	33.00	88.00
	Total	232	61.3534	9.33991	.61319	60.1453	62.5616	30.00	88.00

The results of the univariate analysis $F(1, 230) = 25.468$, $p < 0.001$ indicated significant differences exist between males and females regarding sport morality levels. Consequently, hypothesis four – “There will be no difference in sport morality levels according to gender, race or year in school” was rejected. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 4-45. A power level of .996 was discovered between genders on sport morality levels, and utilizing the Cohen (1988) Effect Size measure, this signified a large effect size.

Table 4-45

Analysis of Variance showing the difference in Sport Morality levels between Genders

Group	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Between subjects					
Task	1.160	1	1.160	2.730	.100
Ego	5.101	1	5.101	7.025	.009
Sport Morality	2008.890	1	2008.890	25.468	.000
Within subjects					
Task	97.695	230	.425		
Ego	167.008	230	.726		
Sport Morality	18142.127	230	78.879		

With regards to race, descriptives showed the following statistics and can be seen in Table 4-46; African Americans (M=60.91, SD=8.75), Asian Americans (M=62.40, SD=13.70), Caucasians (M=61.11, SD=9.55), Hispanics (M=62.38, SD=8.60) and Others (M=63.10, SD= 8.46)

Table 4-46
Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels
by Race

Group	N	M	SD	SE	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Task								
African American	32	4.089	.66290	.11718	3.8503	4.3283	2.71	5.00
Asian American	5	3.971	.68809	.30772	3.1171	4.8258	3.29	4.71
Caucasian	162	4.029	.65581	.05153	3.9276	4.1311	2.86	5.00
Hispanic	13	4.0110	.56683	.15721	3.6685	4.3535	3.00	4.71
Other	20	3.9786	.72736	.16264	3.6382	4.3190	3.00	5.00
Total	232	4.031	.65417	.04295	3.9464	4.1156	2.71	5.00
Ego								
African American	32	3.192	.79437	.14043	2.9063	3.4791	2.17	5.00
Asian American	5	3.033	1.06979	.47842	1.7050	4.3616	1.50	4.33
Caucasian	162	3.206	.85243	.06697	3.0745	3.3390	1.17	5.00
Hispanic	13	3.359	.98094	.27206	2.7662	3.9518	1.33	5.00
Other	20	2.891	.94942	.21230	2.4473	3.3360	1.33	5.00
Total	232	3.182	.86317	.05667	3.0708	3.2941	1.17	5.00
Sport morality								
African American	32	60.903	8.74499	1.54591	57.7533	64.0592	33.00	74.00
Asian American	5	62.400	13.70401	6.12862	45.3842	79.4158	45.00	77.00
Caucasian	162	61.11	9.55078	.75038	59.6293	62.5930	30.00	88.00
Hispanic	13	62.384	8.59785	2.38462	57.1890	67.5802	42.00	76.00
Other	20	63.100	8.45981	1.89167	59.1407	67.0593	44.00	76.00
Total	232	61.353	9.33991	.61319	60.1453	62.5616	30.00	88.00

A univariate analysis $F(4,227) = .272$, showed no significant differences between races on Sport Morality levels, and can be seen in Table 4-47.

Table 4-47
 Analysis of Variance Showing the Difference in Sport Morality Levels Between Race

Group		<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
task	Between Groups	.334	4	.083	.457	.767
	Within Groups	41.418	227	.182		
	Total	41.752	231			
ego	Between Groups	1.816	4	.454	.544	.704
	Within Groups	189.563	227	.835		
	Total	191.379	231			
Sport morality	Between Groups	96.222	4	24.055	.272	.896
	Within Groups	20054.796	227	88.347		
	Total	20151.017	231			

As far as class descriptives, they were as follows; Freshmen (M=61.93, SD=9.51), Sophomores (M=61.94, SD=9.63), Juniors (M=59.48, SD=9.80), Seniors (M=63.50, SD=7.41) and Fifth Years (M=56.27, SD=7.44) and can be seen in Table 4-48.

Table 4-48
Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels
by Class

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SE</i>	95% Confidence		Min.	Max.
					Interval for Mean			
					Lower	Upper		
					Bound	Bound		
Task								
Freshman	75	4.0876	.67207	.07760	3.9330	4.2422	3.00	5.00
Sophomore	64	4.0804	.66320	.08290	3.9147	4.2460	3.00	5.00
Junior	50	3.9781	.62955	.08903	3.7992	4.1570	3.00	5.00
Senior	32	3.9554	.62685	.11081	3.7294	4.1814	2.71	5.00
Fifth Year	11	3.8182	.70012	.21109	3.3478	4.2885	2.86	4.71
Total	232	4.0310	.65417	.04295	3.9464	4.1156	2.71	5.00
Ego								
Freshman	75	3.1622	.89374	.10320	2.9566	3.3679	1.33	5.00
Sophomore	64	3.2083	.81542	.10193	3.0046	3.4120	1.17	5.00
Junior	50	3.3033	.81905	.11583	3.0706	3.5361	1.67	5.00
Senior	32	2.9896	.89497	.15821	2.6669	3.3123	1.33	5.00
Fifth Year	11	3.1818	1.06837	.32213	2.4641	3.8996	1.33	4.67
Total	232	3.1825	.86317	.05667	3.0708	3.2941	1.17	5.00
Sport Morality								
Freshman	75	61.9333	9.50723	1.09780	59.7459	64.1207	30.00	82.00
Sophomore	64	61.9375	9.63109	1.20389	59.5317	64.3433	33.00	82.00
Junior	50	59.4800	9.80054	1.38601	56.6947	62.2653	37.00	88.00
Senior	32	63.5000	7.41402	1.31063	60.8270	66.1730	48.00	74.00
Fifth Year	11	56.2727	7.44434	2.24455	51.2716	61.2739	41.00	66.00
Total	232	61.3534	9.33991	.61319	60.1453	62.5616	30.00	88.00

The different classes were then analyzed by performing a univariate analysis $F(4,227) = 1.903$, showing no significant difference between classes and the results can be seen in Table 4-49.

Table 4-49
 Analysis of Variance Showing the Difference in Sport Morality Levels Between Class

Group	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between subjects					
Task	1.218	4	.304	.708	.587
Ego	1.995	4	.499	.665	.617
Sport Morality	653.939	4	163.485	1.903	.111
Within subjects					
Task	97.637	227	.430		
Ego	170.114	227	.749		
Sport Morality	19497.078	227	85.890		

There were no differences in relation to year in school or race, however, based upon the findings regarding gender, hypothesis four was rejected due to the difference between males and females as mentioned above.

Research Question Five

Question five inquired if there were any differences between gender/race/year in school and task or ego orientation. Males and females have been socialized over the years to adopt different goal orientations (Nicholls, 1989). Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis of the literature regarding moral judgement found that women tend to score higher on tests of moral judgement. This was corroborated by Beller and Stoll in 1995 on college age students. Rest (1979) however, did not report significant gender differences on general moral development.

Little research has been done in regards to race on this issue. Greendorfer and Ewing (1981) found that African-American children placed a higher value on sport than did Caucasian children, seemingly implying an ego orientation.

A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of higher moral levels, e.g. Rainey (1986). White and

Duda (1994) showed that extensive sport involvement was linked to higher levels of ego orientation. However, Smith (1977) was unable to show any effect on morals development dependent upon athletic experience. Beller and Stoll (1999), were unable to find a difference when comparing 9th through 12th graders (assuming more experience for the 12th graders).

In studying gender and task orientation, males (M=3.96, SD= .66) and females (M=4.10, SD=.65) through the utilization of a univariate analysis $F(1,230) = 2.730$, there was determined to be no statistically significant difference. However, in utilizing the data with regards to ego orientation, males (M=3.33, SD=.83) and females (M=3.04, SD=.87) the data $F(1,230) = 7.025$ showed a statistically significant difference at the $p=.009$ level, showing that males involved in this study exhibited a higher ego orientation. Statistics can be found in Table 4-45. A power level of .752 was discovered between genders on ego orientation, and utilizing the Cohen (1988) Effect Size measure, this signified a medium effect size. Race and ego and task orientation was then considered through the use of a univariate analysis. No statistically significant difference was discovered as can be seen in Table 4-47.

Lastly, year in school was considered with regard to ego and task orientation. Neither task orientation $F(4,227) = .708$ nor ego orientation $F(4,227) = .665$ showed any statistically significant difference between classes. Please refer to Table 4-49 for specifics. Due to the statistically significant difference between genders with regard to ego orientation, hypothesis five – “There will be no difference in ego or task orientation levels according to gender, race or year in school” was not supported.

Research Question Six

Question six asked if there was a difference in sport morality levels between team sport SA's and individual sport SA's. For the purposes of this study, SA's were considered team-sport if they participated on the baseball, soccer, softball and volleyball teams. They were considered individual-sport if they participated on the men's and women's golf, men's and women's swimming and diving, men's and women's tennis, men's and women's track and field and cross country teams.

Priest et al. (1999) found that individual sport SA's had higher sportsmanship levels than team-sport athletes, but showed greater decline over their four years in college. As can be seen in Table 4-50 team sport members (n=77) and individual sport athletes (n=156) included the following descriptives, team sport SA's (M=58.94, SD=7.98) and individual sport SA's (M=62.46, SD=9.78).

Table 4-50
Means and Standard Deviations of Task and Ego Orientations and Sport Morality Levels between Team and Individual Sport SA's

Group	N	M	SD	SE	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Task								
team	77	4.0445	.63392	.07224	3.9006	4.1884	3.00	5.00
individual	156	4.0205	.66548	.05328	3.9152	4.1257	2.71	5.00
Total	233	4.0284	.65395	.04284	3.9440	4.1128	2.71	5.00
Ego								
team	77	3.0887	.85651	.09761	2.8943	3.2831	1.17	5.00
individual	156	3.2350	.86590	.06933	3.0981	3.3720	1.17	5.00
Total	233	3.1867	.86372	.05658	3.0752	3.2982	1.17	5.00
Sport morality								
team	77	58.9351	7.98409	.90987	57.1229	60.7472	30.00	74.00
individual	156	62.4615	9.78569	.78348	60.9139	64.0092	33.00	88.00
Total	233	61.2961	9.36072	.61324	60.0879	62.5044	30.00	88.00

A univariate analysis shows a significant difference with individual sport SA's exhibiting a higher sport morality level as can be seen in Table 4-51. Therefore, hypothesis six – “There will be no difference in sport moral levels between team sport SA's and individual sport SA's” cannot be supported.

Table 4-51
 ANOVA showing the difference in Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Morality Levels
 between Team and Individual Sport SA's

Group	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Between subjects					
Task	.030	1	.030	.070	.792
Ego	1.103	1	1.103	1.482	.225
Sport Morality	641.122	1	641.122	7.523	.007
Within subjects					
Task	99.186	231	.429		
Ego	171.970	231	.744		
Sport Morality	19687.445	231	85.227		

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes an overall summary of this study, its results, and a discussion of significant research findings regarding the relationship of gender, race, and year in school on sport morality levels. The intent of this study was to investigate the goal orientations of non-revenue producing team student-athletes and the potential correlation to sport morality levels. Implications for the field of athletics are presented to provide practitioners with increased knowledge and the ability to implement these findings when working with student-athlete's (SA's) representing both team and individual sports at various competitive levels.

While both survey instruments utilized in this study (TEOSQ and HBVCI) have been administered previously, this study is the first to use them in conjunction. The most recent study utilizing the HBVCI to study collegiate SA's (Priest, et al., 1999) reported research conducted over a decade ago (though obviously reported more recently). More importantly to this researcher, the above referenced research was conducted utilizing SA's who were attending a military academy and therefore not receiving athletic scholarships. Athletics is usually not the primary reason a student attends a military academy, athletic prowess is generally a secondary consideration for the majority of cadets. The level of competition is not at the highest compared to many other higher education institutions. Further, by attending an academy, you have an immediate military commitment upon graduation, removing the ability to move into the professional ranks for at least a few years. With a diminished opportunity to have a professional career, could this presuppose a task orientation? Receiving an athletic scholarship brings a factor of stress to a student-athlete to perform at a high level, or face the consequence of perhaps being forced to leave college altogether. Either of these points would be enough to warrant a further exploration in this area utilizing a different subset of SA's.

Discussion of Findings

The questionnaire was administered to SA's participating in non-revenue sports at a major southeastern university. Collectively, 233 questionnaires were returned of the 270 distributed, with the gender breakdown consisting of 48.9% male (n=114) and 50.6% female (n=118) with one respondent failing to opt for either choice. One respondent failed to list gender and one failed to list year in school for a total of 231. Questionnaires were totally excluded if pertinent classification questions were incomplete. Of the questionnaires returned, only one was determined to be in this category. If the classification areas were completed, but a question from one of the two survey instruments was not answered, the questionnaire was utilized where possible. One person failed to answer all the required questions on the TEOSQ and two people did the same on the HBVCI, and thusly were disqualified.

The breakdown by year in school can be seen by referring to Table 4-2. It was interesting to note the decline in participation from Freshman to Fifth Year, not necessarily unexpected, but very graphically represented in the above percentages. There is also a chance that revenue-producing sports would have a higher incidence of Fifth Year participants. Football players especially tend to red-shirt early in their collegiate careers to gain size and strength. Alternatively, a few football players do leave school early to pursue professional options, but this is usually a very small number.

With regards to race, as can be seen in Table 4-3, the limited number of Asian Americans was a concern, though there were no significant findings in regard to race. This could be due to limited numbers in some areas however. Once again, had football and basketball been included, the number of African American respondents would have been a higher percentage.

The sport breakdown is as seen in Table 4-4. No respondents were considered multi-sport.

In regards to the TEOSQ, it was interesting to note, on the odd questions related to Task, no respondent chose Strongly Disagree on any of the seven questions (and Disagree was never chosen by more than 1.3% of the respondents). On question 13 ("I do my very best.") in addition to Strongly Disagree, no respondent selected Disagree

either. Contrastingly, in the even questions related to Ego, Strongly Disagree was always chosen by at least nine respondents.

Conclusions

Question one inquired whether SA's from one non-revenue sport were different than SA's in any other non-revenue sport in task or ego orientation. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with both task and ego orientations and sport as the dependent variable, this analysis revealed a significant effect, indicating significant differences between sports on either task or ego orientation.

It was determined there was no significant difference between non-revenue sports on task orientation. (Although not significant, volleyball SA's task orientation mean (4.49) was higher than any other sport, with only track and field (4.11) coming close.) This may be due in part to the fact that the opportunities for future professional options for these two sports are very limited for the majority of participants.

However, there was a difference in the area of ego orientation. Specifically, it was discovered the differences were between the sports of baseball and soccer, and golf and soccer, with soccer showing a significantly lower level of ego orientation than either golf or baseball. In explaining these results, it could be argued that both golf and baseball participants have an opportunity to pursue their chosen sports at the professional level. However, professional soccer opportunities for women are generally thought to be improving, partially due to factors such as the first Women's World Cup won by the United States in 1991, the addition of soccer to the Olympics in 1996 and finally to the first U.S. Professional Women's Soccer league in 2001.

While it might be interesting to evaluate the gender issues inherent with these sports and their differences in ego orientation, it must be remembered that while baseball is a strictly male sport, and soccer is a strictly female sport (at least at this particular institution), that golf consists of both male and female athletes. The Tukey HSD revealed track and field respondents reported a much higher level of ego orientation when compared to soccer student-athletes. An alternative explanation for this result is that this reflects a difference between individual SA's and team SA's. While not statistically

significant, individual SA's in this study showed a slightly higher ego orientation overall (3.24 to 3.08) than team sport SA's.

It was also interesting that track and field respondents were high in both ego and task orientations (third highest sport in ego, second highest in task). The highest team in task orientation (volleyball), was fifth highest in ego orientation, while the team highest in ego orientation (golf), was the lowest in task orientation. Once again, this might be due to the inherent difference between individual and team sport SA's.

Question two inquired whether the level of task orientation correlated to sport morality levels. Previous research had theorized that task oriented SA's should be more likely to believe in the prosocial consequences of sport involvement (Duda, et al., 1991). However, upon performing a Pearson Correlation it was discovered there was no significant correlation between task orientation and sport morality level in this study. This was surprising and there was no specific or obvious reason for this conflict with Duda et al.'s (1991) and Nicholl's (1989) previous research. It would appear the sport morality levels were low across the board in this study. Task orientation may not be the prized attribute it appeared to be in earlier years. Ego orientation may be taking over as the mental frame of reference to have if you would like to be considered an exceptional athlete.

Question three asked if there was a correlation between the level of ego orientation and sport morality levels. Previous research indicated that higher ego orientation was related to lower levels of judgment and intention indices of moral functioning and greater acceptance of intentionally injurious acts in a study of college aged basketball players from the midwest from all three divisions (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). Vallerand et al. (1996) revealed that high ego oriented athletes were more inclined to approve of aggressive behaviors than those with low ego orientation. As Duda et al. found in 1991 in her study on high school basketball players and was predicted in this study, there was a significant inverse correlation between ego orientation and sport morality levels. In essence, SA's with a high ego orientation have a lower sport morality level than SA's with a low ego orientation. This can manifest itself in willingness to break rules to win, willingness to harm opponents or generally go outside the rules in any manner to accomplish what they see as the ultimate goal (winning the

game, getting recognition, being the star, moving to the next level). Lower ego oriented SA's were shown to have higher sport morality levels, abiding by the rules was more important to them than winning at all costs.

The fact this hypothesis was not supported was an intriguing development. It would appear that non-revenue SA's at this institution are not assuming the positive attributes of task orientation, but displaying the negative attributes associated with ego orientation only. The alternative could be that the sport morality levels are just low for this research group.

Beller and Stoll (1992b) studied over 4000 team and individual sport SA's from ninth grade through college and found means of 59.12 for team SA's and 66.01 for individual SA's. Corresponding means for the current study were 58.94 for team SA's and 62.46 for individual SA's, so there is support that respondents from this study did respond at a lower level than in previous research. Likewise, the previous research included revenue sport SA's while this study did not. It was theorized by Miller that Title IX, which increased opportunities for women in athletics, could have the effect of strengthening athletic programs ethical dimensions (Miller, 1980). This study would appear to show an overall decline in sport morality levels, corresponding with research done by Fields (1978), which showed rules violations growing in women's sports.

Beller and Stoll (1992b) found similar comparisons involving males and females reported means of 60.07 for male SA's and 67.83 for female SA's, while the current study found corresponding means of 58.36 for male SA's and 62.25 for female SA's, both noticeably lower. This may be in part attributable to the inclusion of high school SA's in the Beller and Stoll study. Perhaps this could be due to the fact the current study occurred at a higher profile institution. But this does agree with Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis and Beller and Stoll's 1995 findings that females tend to score higher on tests of moral judgement. However, Rest (1979) did not report significant gender differences on general moral development in his research.

Numerous studies have reported that morality levels decline the longer SA's participate in sport (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). This negative

trend has been shown to be even greater for elite athletes (Allison, 1982), which could be argued to be the case with these current respondents. College students in general show a decrease in admiration for other values (Astin, 1977; Priest & Beach, 1993) and an increase in relativistic thinking (Perry, 1970), i.e., a willingness to rationalize behavior with perceived end goals in mind.

This could also be due to a cultural shift in ethics over a period of many years. Things are seen as permissible in today's society that many years ago would have been perceived as abhorrent, such as corporations acting with only the bottom line in mind, managers and coaches being fired for not achieving winning records (or sometimes not achieving good *enough* winning records), and even youth coaches willing to do anything to win. All of the above have projected for today's youth a view of behavior deemed acceptable as long as winning is the end state. This shift in culture is in agreement with Beller and Stoll's (1993) findings that students felt athletes were expected to win, not be moral, and athletes agreed, stating that winning was more important than being moral. Additionally, many of the coaches cited in the Beller and Stoll (1993) study were of the opinion they were not hired to teach morals.

A potential regional bias in sport morality levels cannot be dismissed either. It might be argued the current findings be a southeastern sport phenomenon. It could also be argued that people in particular areas of the country take their sports a little more seriously than people in other areas of the country.

Question four inquired if there was any difference in sport morality levels based on gender/race/year in school. Cohn's (1991) meta-analysis of the literature regarding moral judgment found that women tended to score higher on tests of moral judgment. This was corroborated by Beller and Stoll in 1995 on college age students. Rest (1979) however, did not report significant gender differences on general moral development.

As predicted, the results indicated significant differences exist between males and females regarding sport morality levels with females having significantly higher sport morality levels. This can be theorized to have some relationship to professional opportunities potentially available to male SA's (or to socialization factors in the larger society).

Analysis showed no significant differences existed between races on sport morality levels. However, for SA's selecting Other's, their mean was much higher at 63.10, while the African Americans mean was the lowest at 60.91, although this difference was not deemed significant. Once again, it should be noted that the Other's cell size was smaller (n=20), which might have affected the possibility of a significant finding. Had the cell sizes been closer in size, any difference would have been more impactful, therefore nothing can be surmised from the current findings.

Previous literature reported a negative correlation between the length of one's involvement in sport and the development of sportsmanlike values (Coakley, 1982; Kroll, 1975; Stevenson, 1975). Priest et al. (1999) found that SA's sportsmanship levels declined over their four years in college. As far as class, there were no significant differences, though it was interesting that Seniors had the highest sport morality levels (63.50) and Fifth Year SA's had the lowest (56.27). Once again, it can be theorized that SA's remaining in school for five years to complete their athletic eligibility, do so with the hope of gaining experience to play professionally. Perhaps the Fifth Year SA's were still in school due to injuries, and felt betrayed by their sport or other SA's, leading them to feel less "sportsmanlike". However, it should be remembered there were only 11 Fifth Year SA's responding in this study. Smith (1977) found no difference between years of experience and sportsmanship attitudes when studying 7th through 12th graders, for either sex.

Question five inquired as to whether there was a correlation between gender/race/year in school and task or ego orientation. It has been suggested that males and females have been socialized over the years to adopt different goal orientations (Nicholls, 1989). Petrie (1971b) found that males had a stronger professional (ego) orientation than females at the college level for both American and Canadian undergraduates. Loy (1972) also found higher professional orientations in the male varsity athlete group.

In studying gender and task orientation, there was determined to be no statistically significant difference. However, in utilizing the data with regards to ego orientation, males reported a statistically significant higher ego orientation than females. In the current study, as one might have predicted, females scored slightly higher on levels of

task orientation and slightly lower on levels of ego orientation, though not at significant levels.

Only a few empirical studies have examined race and goal orientation. Greendorfer and Ewing (1981) found that African-American children placed a higher value on sport than did Caucasian children, seemingly implying an ego orientation, however this work is almost twenty-five years old. In this study, while there were no significant differences, Hispanic SA's did show higher levels of ego orientation (3.36) particularly when compared to Others (2.89). African American SA's (3.19) and Caucasian SA's (3.21) were almost identical. Once again it must be remembered that there were only 13 Hispanic SA's responding.

A multitude of studies have shown an inverse relationship between length of participation and the development of higher moral levels (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992a; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a; Lakie, 1964; Rainey, 1986; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986; Silva, 1983; Stevenson, 1975; Stoll & Beller, 1994). Even more interesting were the two studies (Potter & Wandzilak, 1981; Vallerand & Losier, 1994) that found this inverse relationship occurring within a single season. White and Duda (1994) showed that extensive sport involvement was linked to higher levels of ego orientation. However, Smith (1977) was unable to show any effect on moral development dependent upon athletic experience. Beller and Stoll (1999), were unable to find a difference when comparing 9th through 12th graders (assuming more experience for the 12th graders). While four years is a relatively short "length of participation", it is still worthy of being researched, to ascertain whether differences are occurring on a smaller scale. Year in school was considered with regard to ego and task orientation. Neither task orientation nor ego orientation showed any statistically significant difference between classes.

However, it was interesting to note that task orientation declined every year from Freshman (4.09) to Sophomore (4.08) to Junior (3.98) to Senior (3.96) to Fifth Year (3.82). This was in agreement with studies done by Astin (1977) and Priest and Beach (1993) where value scores declined over the four year period of college for both athletes and non-athletes. This trend was even greater for elite athletes in another study (Allison, 1982). This could be an indicator of task oriented SA's being driven out or leaving their

teams (as noted earlier, the numbers of SA's declined by year as well), or it could be a sign of coaches philosophies or fellow SA's will to win influencing task orientation. Ego orientation increased gradually through the Junior year, bottomed out the Senior year before rebounding a bit in the Fifth Year. Baseball might be the team driving this particular finding. Baseball was the second highest team in ego orientation (by only .03) and baseball SA's have an opportunity to turn professional after their Junior year, i.e., which is unique to their sport. This may cause them to have a professional mindset, and this leads to a limited number of Senior and Fifth Year baseball SA's.

Question six asked if there was a difference in sport morality levels between team sport SA's and individual sport SA's. Priest et al. (1999) found individual sport SA's had higher sportsmanship levels than team-sport athletes, but showed greater decline over their four years in college. This difference was regardless of game situation. In low utility situations (little was at stake in the game), the individual sport athletes showed significantly more concern for opponents. Additionally, Vallerand, Deshaies et al., (1997) found that team sport athletes reported lower levels of concern for opponents at a significantly greater level than individual sport athletes. As expected, analysis showed a significant difference with individual sport SA's exhibiting a higher sport morality level than team sport SA's. Individual sport SA's have more time to consider moral imperatives, there is less "group-think" or mob mentality taking place, they spend more time considering the ramifications of their actions and what it might be like to be on the other side of an offending action (Vallerand, Deshaies et al., 1997). Miller and Jarman (1988) theorized that perhaps team sport athletes abrogated moral responsibility to game officials. Unfortunately, this study did not ask the specific question as to whether team sport or individual sport SA's sport morality levels declined over their years at this institution.

Limitations

Due to the difference in team sizes and race, there were some instances of unequal cell sizes. While it would have been preferable to have equal cell sizes, the statistical tests utilized for these analyses (i.e., MANOVA and Pearson Product Moment Correlation) are relatively robust to this violation. Therefore unequal cell sizes do not

pose a serious problem. Gender and year, while being a little different in cell sizes, were more than adequate. There were twice as many individual SA respondents (n=156) as team SA respondents (n=77), but again, both statistical analyses utilized take different cell sizes into account. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices and Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances were both run to ascertain any violation due to inadequate cell size and neither test produced a finding of significance. The Box's M was $F(21,26313.140) = .621, p=.907$. While Levene's Test found an $F(7,225) = .323, p=.943$ for task orientation and $F(7,225) = 1.822, p=.084$ for ego orientation.

It should be noted that in almost every case the respondents completed the surveys while their team coaches were also in the room with them. While the coaches were not paying particular attention to the survey process, one should wonder if the SA's might have answered differently in a different (less team related) setting. Could a team related setting actually inspire a higher ego orientation in participants? Might they have a higher sense of moral judgment if the survey were taken in a different setting, a different time of day, or a different time of the season? While the coaches were helpful in facilitating the distribution and timely completion of the survey instrument, perhaps the respondents felt (incorrectly) that the results would find their way to their particular coaches, and that they might held accountable for the overall findings.

As mentioned above, this has inherent issues in regards to pressure to perform at a certain level, that may or may not have a sense of morality incorporated within. Also, these results cannot be generalized to any other institution, sport team or to other division levels.

Contributions

This research provides athletic administrators a snap shot into the goal orientation and sport morality levels of the SA's competing in a Division IA athletic program. Furthermore, it has built upon previous research and perhaps in future research this study can be referenced in a continuing search for potential differences and/or trends in goal orientations and sport morality levels of college SA's.

Sportsmanship continues to increase in importance to Athletic Administrators nationally, particularly to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) which

has recently begun rewarding SA's nationally for outstanding sportsmanship displays, and recommending to conferences they do the same at a conference level. This could be an opportunity for Administrators to discover how their SA's rate compared to other SA's from around the country. This could serve as an impetus for moral development training in athletic departments. Administrators could test their SA's to determine their goal orientations with an eye to improving task orientations. Sport morality levels should also be measured and ways to improve these levels could be considered as well. At least it is hoped this will impress coaches to initiate discussions on sportsmanship issues with their own team members.

Future Research

The following recommendations are included for scholars considering this line of inquiry. If one is studying collegiate SA's, the survey should be administered in the fall semester if possible in order to improve data collection numbers. Because SA's quit teams, fall sport SA's become harder to reach, and seniors do not take part in off-season conditioning. If at all possible, SA's should be surveyed in as neutral a setting available (away from team rooms, locker rooms, and in one instance sitting on their competition field).

It would also be of interest to compare SA's and non-SA's from the same institution. Another interesting study would be to compare former SA's to current SA's to determine potential differences and to see if there were any detectable trends. Also intriguing would be to study the same institution's SA's over their four or five years to see if their morality levels did decrease while they were here, or if they entered the institution at a certain level and remained there during their time in college. While non-revenue sports are an acceptable population to study, this researcher would advise future studies to include both football and basketball SA's, but to be aware of the tendency for these SA's to be of a higher ego orientation due to professional prospects.

There are many Division IA schools with athletic budgets approaching the \$100 million mark, some with as many as 40 sport teams. The institution utilized in this study has a fairly small athletic program with only 19 sports and a budget closer to \$40 million. It would be interesting to see where other non-revenue sports (gymnastics, lacrosse and

wrestling to name a few) might fall in relation to the sports considered in this study. It would also be interesting to see where Division I-AA, Division II, and Division III, or perhaps even NAIA schools might differ in their orientation and sport morality levels, between sports at each school, and between the different levels of institutions.

Future researchers might consider testing within collegiate conferences, or selecting one institution from a number of conferences to see if there might be geographical differences. Perhaps schools from other regions should be studied in the future. One way this might be incorporated would be to include a question with regards to which state the SA attended high school and then compare.

Another question that would be interesting to take into account might be one concerning future plans, particularly as they relate to wishes to play their sport professionally in the future. It would be theorized that SA's contemplating future professional sporting plans would be higher in ego orientation and lower in task orientation. Another related factor might be the age at which they first started competing, and at what level or sport. Many SA's may have started in a different sport, or multiple sports, so the age they started sports altogether would be interesting to take into account and determine if it could be a differentiating factor.

Socio-economic status might play a part in task and ego orientations, so perhaps a question could be asked regarding parental income. This would be tricky to factor in as family's fortunes rise and fall sometimes and there is a tendency for wealthier SA's to lean towards participating in the "country club" sports, ie. tennis and golf.

There has been talk of incorporating morals education in freshmen SA classes at other institutions. With the use of pre and post tests, it would be easy to see if this education had an impact. But the better query would be to see how the moral levels were influenced by their senior year. Would the moral education they received as freshmen still be pertinent, and apparent in their actions and answers as it was four (and sometimes five years) previously? Should this education be ongoing in some fashion during their entire college career, and in what fashion should it be presented?

In summation, it would appear this line of questioning has a future. There are an infinite number of potential respondents to question, as well as many hypotheses to investigate. With the emphasis on sportsmanship being promoted by national

organizations such as the NCAA, this area of investigation would appear to be on the cusp of studies on morals and sportsmanship being seen on a more regular basis. Practitioners in this field, particularly athletic administrators in the areas of life skills, academics, and even coaches and athletic directors themselves would and should be intrigued by this area of research.

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Florida State University Student-Athlete,

This research is being conducted by John Lata, a doctoral student in the Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education at Florida State University. The purpose of this study is to investigate the sport morality levels of student-athletes when compared with their ego and task orientation levels.

By electing to complete the attached form, you are freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consenting to be a participant in the research project entitled “An Analysis of Goal Achievement Orientation and Sport Morality Levels of Division I-A Non-Revenue Collegiate Athletes.”

You will be asked to fill out a paper and pencil questionnaire. The total time commitment will be about 20 minutes. Your participation is totally voluntary, and you may stop participation at any time, without prejudice or penalty. All answers to questions will be kept confidential and identified by subject code number, information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. Only group findings will be reported.

You have the right to ask and have answered any inquiry concerning this study. You may contact John Lata, Florida State University Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management & Physical Education, for answers to questions about this research or your rights. All questions will be answered to the fullest extent possible.

Return of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and participation in this study.

Additional questions or problems concerning your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Institutional Review Board, Human Subjects Committee, Mail Code 2763 or 2035 E. Paul Dirac Drive, Box 15, Sliger Building, Innovation Park, Tallahassee, FL 32310; Telephone (850) 644-8633.

Sincerely,

John Lata

200 Tully Gymnasium

Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management & Physical Education

Florida State University

(850) 644-3281

Major Professor

Dr. Michael Mondello

200 Tully Gymnasium

Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management & Physical Education

Florida State University

(850) 644-4825

APPENDIX B: INVENTORY (PARTS 1 AND 2)

GENDER (Circle one): Male Female

CLASS (Circle one): Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Fifth Year

HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN PLAYING YOUR SPORT
OVERALL: _____

IF APPLICABLE, ARE YOU CONSIDERED (Circle one): DEFENSE OR
OFFENSE

RACE (Circle one):

African American

Asian American

Caucasian

Hispanic

Native American

Other

YOUR SPORT (Circle one, if multi-sport, circle both):

Baseball

Basketball

Cross Country

Football

Golf

Soccer

Softball

Swimming/Diving

Tennis

Track/Field

Volleyball

PART 1.

Directions: Please read each of the statements listed below and indicate how much you personally agree with each statement by circling the appropriate response.

When do you feel MOST successful in sport. In other words, when do you feel a sport activity has gone really well for you?

I feel most successful in sport when...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I learn a new skill and it makes me want to practice more.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I'm the only one who can do the play or skill.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3. I learn something that is fun to do.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. I can do better than my friends.	SA	A	N	D	SD
5. I learn a new skill by trying hard.	SA	A	N	D	SD
6. The others can't do as well as me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
7. I work really hard.	SA	A	N	D	SD
8. Others mess-up and I don't.	SA	A	N	D	SD
9. Something I learn makes me want to go and practice more.	SA	A	N	D	SD
10. I score the most points/goals/hits, etc.	SA	A	N	D	SD
11. A skill I learn really feels right.	SA	A	N	D	SD
12. I'm the best.	SA	A	N	D	SD
13. I do my very best.	SA	A	N	D	SD

PART 2.

An Instrument to measure sportsmanship level.

Directions: The following questionnaire describes incidents that have occurred in sport settings. Each question addresses moral values. Because there are no right or wrong answers, please circle the answer that best describes your feelings.

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
N = NEUTRAL
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

Please circle your choice.

1. Two rival basketball teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on team A's court. During the game, team B's star player was consistently heckled whenever she missed a basket, pass or rebound. In the return game on team B's court, the home crowd took revenge by heckling team A's players. Such action is fair because both crowds have equal opportunity to heckle players.

SA A N D SD

2. During the double play in baseball, players must tag second base before throwing to first. However, some players deliberately fake the tag, thus delivering a quicker throw to first base. Pretending to tag second base is justified because it is a good strategy. Besides, the umpire's job is to call an illegal play.

SA A N D SD

3. Blood doping is not potentially dangerous to an athlete even though it violates rules in all major competitions. Just before a race, athletes use the technique to freeze their blood and return the red blood cells to the body. The elevated red cell content enables the body to send more oxygen to the muscles, resulting in an enhanced performance. Because there is no physical harm in blood doping, an athlete should be given the choice "to dope or not to dope".

SA A N D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
 A = AGREE
 N = NEUTRAL
 D = DISAGREE
 SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. Swimmers are taught to stand completely still just before the gun shot that starts the race. Some coaches teach their swimmers to move their head and upper body slightly which possibly forces an opponent to false start. If swimmer B false starts he will probably stay in the blocks a fraction longer when the race starts. Consequently, swimmer A may have an advantage during the race. Because all competitors have equal opportunity for this strategy, this is an acceptable means for swimmers to increase their advantage.

SA A N D SD

5. Soccer players are allowed to play the ball with any part of their body except the hands or outstretched arms. A soccer player receives a chest high pass and taps the ball to the ground with his hand. The referee does not see this action and the play continues. Because it is the referee's job to see these actions, the player is not obligated to report the foul.

SA A N D SD

6. In golf, there is an unwritten rule that players generally observe silence while other golfers are preparing for and executing shots. Player A is preparing to "tee off". Player B notices that he can break player A's concentration by rattling his clubs and making other noises. Player B believes this is a good strategy. Player B does not believe he is violating a rule because "observed silence" is an unwritten rule.

SA A N D SD

7. Basketball player A skillfully dribbled the ball around her opponents to the basket. Just as she moved toward the basket, she was tripped by player B, causing the basket to be missed. If player A had not been tripped, two points probably would have been made. Player B is charged with a foul and player A must shoot two free throws. Player A missed the two shots from the free throw line. Player B is demonstrating good strategy by forcing player A to shoot two foul shots instead of an easy lay-up.

SA A N D SD

8. A gold medal track athlete was told to undergo drug testing during recent international competition. Because she played by the rules, competed on her merits, and did not use performance enhancing drugs, she opposed the drug testing. She believed that athletic organizations had no moral authority to force her to be tested. Because she and other athletes are truthful and drug testing assumes they are untruthful, drug testing should not be mandatory.

SA A N D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
 A = AGREE
 N = NEUTRAL
 D = DISAGREE
 SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. Certain basketball teams are coached to run plays that cause the opponents to foul. Players and coaches believe this is clever strategy because the opponents may foul out of the game, giving their team an advantage. Because the coach orders this type of play, the players should follow his directions.

SA A N D SD

10. A star football player had a history test on Friday, the day of the cross-town rival football game. He knew about the test for several weeks, however he waited until Thursday to study. Other teammates prepared for the test. On Friday he said he was having difficulty concentrating on his studies. If the instructor permits the athlete to take the test at a later date, the instructor would be acting fairly.

SA A N D SD

11. Coaches display confidence and trust in the officials by remaining on the bench and calming their players when questionable calls are made. During a basketball game the center blocked a shot, however she was called for a foul. The players, fans, and coaches clearly believe she blocked the shot by only touching the ball. The team and fans were outraged but the coach calmed her players and encouraged them to forget the call and continue playing. Because the coaches must place mutual confidence in the officials, the coach acted properly.

SA A N D SD

12. A tennis star is preparing to play a match. She complains of not feeling well during the warmup. This star player finally lost a match. When discussing the game, she continually remarked that "I just did not play my best game". Because the player believed her best game was not played, her statement was acceptable.

SA A N D SD

13. Player A who is the center on an ice hockey team skated the puck down the ice, around several opponents. He had a clear shot at the net as he passed player B. Player B, while pretending to go for the puck, decided to turn at the last second to trip player A with his stick. Consequently, player A missed the goal. Because player A must now attempt a penalty shot instead of an easy goal, this is demonstrating good strategy.

SA A N D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
N = NEUTRAL
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

14. During a volleyball game player A hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazed off player B's fingers and landed out of bounds. However the referee did not see player B touch the ball. Because the referee is responsible for calling rule violations, player B is not obligated to report the violation.

SA A N D SD

15. A field hockey player is permitted to hit the ball hard, providing the ball is not hit purposely at an opponent. Player A (intently concentrating on the net) hit the ball towards the goal, but hit player B instead. Player B complains that player A purposely hit the ball into her, however the foul was not called. Down the field, player B gained possession of the ball, retaliated, and hit the ball at player A. Player B's action was acceptable.

SA A N D SD

16. Football players are not allowed to move beyond the line of scrimmage until the ball is snapped. Some coaches encourage their players to charge across the line of scrimmage a fraction of a second before the ball is snapped. The officials have difficulty seeing the early movement, therefore, the team has an advantage compared to their opponents. Because the strategy is beneficial and the officials must call the infraction, the team's actions are fair.

SA A N D SD

17. During an intramural basketball game, a student official awarded one free throw shot instead of two to team A. Team B knew the call was wrong, however chose to remain silent, knowing the call was to their advantage. Because the official's job is to make the proper calls, and it is not a formal game, team B's action was acceptable.

SA A N D SD

18. One of our rights as human beings is the freedom of choice. Because we have freedom of choice, we should be able to take any performance enhancing drug we choose. Also, because drug ingestion only affects our bodies, we are not hurting anybody else. Hence when a governing body bans a drug, our freedom of choice is violated.

SA A N D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
N = NEUTRAL
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

19. Many athletes use drugs such as steroids to gain maximum strength, while others do not. Some athletes feel that unless they take such drugs, they are at a disadvantage compared with those who do. Athletes, who do not use drugs, state that competition against their drug using opponents results in not having an equal opportunity to win the game. For an equal opportunity, these athletes decide to take drugs. This decision is acceptable.

SA A N D SD

20. During a youth sport football game, an ineligible pass receiver catches a long touchdown pass and scores. The officials fail to determine that the player was ineligible. Because it is the referee's job to detect the ineligible receiver, the player or the coach does not have to declare an ineligible receiver.

SA A N D SD

21. Ice hockey is often a violent game. Even though players are often hurt, hitting hard and smashing players into the boards is normal. Player A and B are opponents playing in a championship game. While trying to control the puck, player A smashed player B into the boards. Even though the puck is on the opposite side of the arena, player B a few minutes later, retaliated by smashing player A into the boards. Because "hitting hard" and "smashing players into the boards" are an inherent part of the game, player B's action was acceptable.

SA A N D SD

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: 1. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs*, 70 (9).
- Allison, M. (1982). Sportsmanship: Variation based on sex and degree of competitive experience. In A. O. Dunleavy, A. W. Miracle and C. R. Rees (Eds.), *Studies in the sociology of sport* (pp. 153-165). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Backman, C. W. (1985). Identity, self-presentation, and the resolution of moral dilemma: Towards a social psychological theory of moral behavior. In B. R. Schenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 261-289). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baldwin, M. W., & Holmes, J. G. (1987). Salient private audiences and awareness of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1087-1098.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bateson, G. (1955). A theory of play and fantasy. *Psychiatric Research Reports*, 2, 39-51.
- Beamish, R. (1982). Sport and the logic of capitalism. In H. Cantelon & R. Gruneau (Eds.) *Sport, culture, and the modern state*. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.
- Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1992a). A moral reasoning intervention program for division I athletes. *The Academic Athletic Journal*, (Spring), 43-57.
- Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1992b). Moral Reasoning and Moral Development in Sport Review and HBVCI Manual. Moscow, ID: Center for ETHICS.
- Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1993). Sportsmanship: An antiquated concept? *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 8, 74-79.
- Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student athletes and general students: An empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 352-363.
- Blair, S. (1985). Professionalization of attitude toward play in children and adults. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 56, 82-83.
- Blanchard, K., & Peale, N. V. (1988). *The power of ethical management*. New York: Morrow.

- Blasi, A. (1987). Comment: The psychological definitions of morality. In J. Kegan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 83-90). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyver, G. (1968). Children's concepts of sportsmanship in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. *Research Quarterly*, 34, 282-287.
- Brand, M. (2003). Advocacy involves entire membership. *NCAA News*, 40(9), 4, 23.
- Bredemeier, B. J. (1983). Athletic aggression: A moral concern. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports violence* (pp. 47-82). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bredemeier, B. J. (1984). Sport, gender, and moral growth. In J. Silva & R. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 400-413). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Bredemeier, B. J. (1985). Moral reasoning and the perceived legitimacy of intentionally injurious sport acts. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 110-124.
- Bredemeier, B., & Shields, D. (1983). The utility of moral stage analysis in the prediction of athletic aggression. In W. Straub & J. M Williams (Eds.), *Cognitive sport psychology* (pp.89-101). Lansing, NY: Sport Science Associates.
- Bredemeier, B., & Shields, D. (1984). Divergence in moral reasoning about sport and everyday life. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1(4), 348-357.
- Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1986a). Moral growth among athletes and non-athletes: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 147, 7-18.
- Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1986b). Game reasoning and interactional morality. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 147, 257-275.
- Card, A. P., (1981). Orientation toward winning as a function of athletic participation, grade level, and gender. Unpublished manuscript. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International
- Carpenter, P. J., & Yates, B. (1997). Relationship between achievement goals and the perceived purposes of soccer for semiprofessional and amateur players. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19, 302-311.
- Chaumeton, N., & Duda, J. L. (1988). Is it how you play the game or whether you win or lose? The effect of competitive level and situation on coaching behaviors. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 11, 157-174.

- Chi, L. & Duda, J. (1995). Multi-sample confirmatory factor analysis of the task and ego orientation in sport questionnaire. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 91-98.
- Coakley, J. J. (1981). Sociological perspective: alternative causations of violence in sport. *Arena Review*, 5(1), 44-56.
- Coakley, J. J. (2004). *Sport in society*. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Cohn, L. (1991). Sex differences in the course of personality development: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 252-266.
- Corbin, C. (1971). A study of spectator attitudes about sportsmanship. *The Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Journal*, 60, 6-7, 53-55.
- Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Crown, J., & Heatherington, J. (1989). The costs of winning? The role of gender in moral reasoning and judgements about competitive athletic encounters. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 281-289.
- da Gloria, J. (1984). Frustration, aggression and the sense of justice. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression: From individual behavior to social interaction* (pp. 127-142). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- de Coubertin, P. (1986). Sport and morality. *Olympic Review*, 224, 316-318.
- Duda, J. L. (1988). The relationship between goal perspectives, persistence and behavioral intensity among male and female recreational sport participants. *Leisure Sciences*, 10, 95-106.
- Duda, J. L. (1989). The relationship between mastery and competitive orientation and the perceived purpose of sport among male and female high school athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 11, 318-335.
- Duda, J. L., & Nicholls, J. G. (1992). Dimensions of achievement motivation in schoolwork and sport. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 290-299.
- Duda, J. L., Olson, L. K., & Templin, T. J. (1991). The relationship of task and ego orientation to sportsmanship attitudes and the perceived legitimacy of injurious acts. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62, 79-87.
- Duda, J. L. & White, S. A. (1992). Goal orientations and beliefs about causes of sport success among elite skiers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 6, 334-343.

- Dunn, J. G. H., & Dunn, J. C. (1999). Goal orientations, perceptions of aggression, and sportspersonship in elite male youth ice hockey players. *The Sport Psychologist, 13*, 183-200.
- Dweck, C., & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 643-691). New York: Wiley.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eitzen, D. S. (1988). Ethical problems in American sport. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 12*(1/2), 17-30.
- Elliott, E. & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychological, 54*, 5-12.
- Feezell, R. (1986). Sportsmanship. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 13*, 1-13.
- Felson, R. B. (1981). An interactionist approach to aggression. In J. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fields, C. M. (1978). Rule violations grow in women's sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 17, 1978 (pp. 7-8).
- Fox, K., Goudas, M., Biddle, S., Duda, J., & Armstrong, N. (1994). Children's task and ego goal profiles in sport. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 64*, 253-261.
- Gill, E. (1982). *Fair Play*. Netanya: Wingate Institute.
- Gill, D. L. (1986). Competitiveness among females and males in physical activity classes. *Sex Roles, 15*, 233-247.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 481-517.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Graziano, W. G. (1987). Lost in thought at the choice point: Cognition, context, and equity. In J. C. Masters & W. P. Smith (Eds.), *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation* (pp. 265-294). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greendorfer, S. & Ewing, M. (1981). Race and gender differences in children's socialization into sport. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 52, 301-310.
- Gruneau, R. (1983). *Class, sport, and social development*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Haan, N. (1977). *Coping and defending. Process of self-environment organization*. San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Haan, N. (1978). Two moralities in action contexts: Relationship to thought, ego relation and development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 286-305.
- Haan, N. (1983). An interactional morality of everyday life. In N. Haan, R. N. Bellah, P. Rabinow, & W. M Sullivan (Eds.), *Social science as moral inquiry* (pp. 218-250). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hahm, C. H. (1989). *Moral reasoning and development among general students, physical education majors, and student athletes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho.
- Hall, E. (1981). *Moral functioning levels of athletes in sport specific and general social situations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University.
- Hall, E. (1986). Moral development levels of athletes in sport specific and general social situations. In L. Vandervelden, & J. H. Humphrey (Eds.), *Psychology and sociology of sport: Current selected research* (pp. 191-204). New York: AMS Press.
- Harris, J. C., Blankenship, K., Cowley, M. E., Crouse, K. R. & Smith, M. D. (1982). Ethical behavior and victory in sport: Value systems at play. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 53(4), 37, 98-99.
- Haskins, M. J. (1960). Problem solving test of sportsmanship. *Research Quarterly*, 31, 610-616.
- Hernandez, M. A. (1977). *A comparative study of attitudes towards athletics as expressed by Mexican-American and non-Mexican-American high school boys*. Eugene, OR: Microform Publications.
- Hoffer, R. (2003) 1954. *Sports Illustrated*, 99(2), 74-77.

- Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 217-232.
- Hopkins, E. F., & Lantz, C. D. (1999). Sportsmanship attitude differences between defensive and offensive youth soccer players. *Physical Educator*, 56(4), 179-185.
- Horrocks, R. (1977). Sportsmanship. *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation*, 48(9) 20-21.
- Horrocks, R. N. (1980). Sportsmanship moral reasoning. *The Physical Educator*, 37, 208-212.
- Huizinga, J. (1955). *Homo Ludens: A study of the play element*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hyde, J. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 722-736.
- Institute for International Sport http://www.international sport.com/nsd/nsd_quotes.cfm
- Johnson, M. L. (1969). Construction of sportsmanship attitude scales. *Research Quarterly*, 40(2), 312-316.
- Johnson, A. T., & Frey, J. H. (1985). *Government and sport: The public policy issues*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Kavussanu, M., & Roberts, G. C. (2001). Moral functioning in sport: An achievement goal perspective. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 23(1), 37-54.
- Keating, J. W. (1973). The ethics of competition and its relation to some moral problems in athletics. In R. G. Osterhoudt (Ed.) *The Philosophy of Sport: A Collection of Original Essays*, (pp. 157-198). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Keating, J. (1978). *Competition and playful activities*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Kidd, T., & Woodman, W. (1975). Sex orientations toward winning in sport. *Research Quarterly*, 46(4), 476-483.
- Kistler, J. W. (1957). Attitudes expressed about behavior demonstrated in certain specific situations occurring in sports. *National College Physical Education Association for Men Proceedings*, 60, 55-58.
- Kjeldsen, E. (1992). The manager's role in the development and maintenance of ethical behavior in the sport organization. *Journal of Sport Management* 6(2), 99-113.

- Kleiberg, D. A., & Roberts, G. L. (1981). The effects of sports experience in the development of social character: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 3, 114-122.
- Knight, G., & Kagan, S. (1982). Siblings, birth order, and cooperative-competitive social behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13, 239-249.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: The case against competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-481). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays of moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L., Kauffman, M., Scharf, P., & Hickey, J. (1975). The just community approach to corrections: A theory. *Journal of Moral Education*, 4, 243-260.
- Kroll, W. (1975). *Psychology of sportsmanship*. Paper presented at the sport psychology meeting, National Association for Sport and Physical Education, Atlantic City, NJ.
- Kroll, W. (1976). Psychological scaling of the AIWA code-of-ethics for players. *Research Quarterly*, 47, 126-133.
- Kroll, W. (1977). Psychological scaling of the AIWA code-of-ethics for coaches. *Research Quarterly*, 48, 233-238.
- Kurtines, W. M. (1986). Moral behavior as rule governed behavior: Person and situation effects on moral decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 784-791.
- Lakie, W. (1964). Expressed attitudes of various groups of athletes towards athletic competition. *Research Quarterly*, 35, 497-503.
- Lapchick, R. E., & Slaughter, J. B. (1989). *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport*. New York: Macmillan.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

- Lochbaum, M. R. & Roberts, G. C. (1993) Goal orientations and perceptions of the sport experience. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology* 15(2), 160-171.
- Loy, J. (1972). Sociological inquiry. In R. N. Singer, et al (Eds.) *Physical Education: An interdisciplinary approach*, (pp. 178-228). New York: Macmillan.
- Loy, J., Birrell, S., & Rose, D. (1976). Attitudes held toward agonistic activities as a function of selected social identities. *Quest*, 26, 81-93.
- Lumpkin, A. (1983). Sport and human values. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 16(4), 4-10.
- Lynch, J. G., & Cohen, J. L. (1978). The use of subjective expected utility theory as an aid to understanding the variables that influence helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1138-1151.
- Maloney, T. L., & Petrie, B. M. (1972). Professionalization of attitudes toward play among Canadian school pupils as a function of sex, grade and athletic participation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 4, 184-195.
- Mantel, R. & VanderVelden, L. (1974). The relationship between the professionalization of attitude toward play of preadolescent boys and participation in sport. In G. H. Sage (Ed.), *Sport in American Society*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Marantos, J. (1985). The moral problems in competitive physical activity in an achievement-oriented society. *Flinders University of South Australia Adelaide*, 1.
- Massaro, J. (1994). Whatever happened to sportsmanship? *The Executive Educator*, 16, 40.
- McAfee, R. (1955). Sportsmanship attitudes of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade boys. *Research Quarterly*, 26, 120.
- McCutcheon, L. E. (1999). The Multidimensional Sportpersonship Orientations Scale has psychometric problems. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 14(3), 439-444.
- McElroy, M., & Kirkendall, D. (1980). Significant others and professionalized sport attitudes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 51, 645-667.
- McIntosh, P. (1979). *Fairplay: Ethics in sport and education*. London: Heinemann.
- McMurtry, W. P. (1974). *Investigation and inquiry into violence in amateur hockey*. Ministry of Community and Social Services. Public Inquiries Act of 1971, Province of Ontario, Toronto, Canada.

- Metheny, E. (1965). *Connotations of movement in sport and dance*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Co.
- Michener, J. A. (1976). *Sports in America*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.
- Miller, D. M. (1980). Ethics in sport: Padoxes, perplexities and a proposal. *Quest*, 32(1), 3-7.
- Miller, R. J., & Jarman, B. O. (1988). Moral and ethical character development-views from past leaders. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 59(6), 72.
- Mintah, J. K., Huddleston, S., & Doody, S. G. (1999). Justifications of aggressive behavior in contact and semicontact sports. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(3), 597-605.
- Miscisco, D. R. (1976). The influence of distinct coaching styles on personality and sportsmanship attitudes of elementary age girls playing competitive basketball. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia, Canada.
- Morgan, W. J. (1985). "Radical" social theory of sport: A critique and a conceptual emendation. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2(1), 56-71.
- Mummendey, A., Linneweber, V., & Loschper, G. (1984). Aggression: From act to interaction. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression: From individual behavior to social interaction* (pp. 69-106). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Nelson, K., & Cody, C. (1979). Competition, cooperation, and fair play. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 1, 97-104.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984a). Conceptions of ability and achievement motivation. In R. Ames, & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Student motivation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984b). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, mastery choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328-346.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nicholson, C. S. (1979). Some attitudes associated with sport participation among junior high school females. *Research Quarterly*, 50, 661-667.

- Nixon, H. L. (1980). Orientation toward sports participation among college students. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 3, 29-45
- O'Brien, M. (1987). *Vince: A personal biography of Vince Lombardi*. New York: Quill William Morrow.
- Ogilvie, B., & Tutko, T. (1971). Sport: If you want to build character try something else. *Psychology Today*, 5, 60-63.
- Oglesby, C. (1978). *Women and sport: From myth to reality*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Orlick, T. (1978). *Winning through cooperation: Competitive insanity, cooperative alternatives*. Washington, DC: Acropolis Press.
- Osterhoudt, R. G. (1973). The Kantian ethic as a principle of moral conduct in sport. *Quest*, 19(Winter), 118-123.
- Panagiotopoulos, D. (1998). The legal aspects of sports ethics and the protection of fair play. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 35, 99-105.
- Penny, W. J., & Priest, R. F. (1990). *Deontological sports values choices of United States Military Academy cadets and selected other college-aged populations*. Unpublished manuscript, U.S. Military Academy.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Petrie, B. (1971a). Achievement orientations in adolescent attitudes toward play. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 6, 89-99.
- Petrie, B. (1971b). Achievement orientations in the motivations of Canadian university students toward physical activity. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation*, 37(3), 7-13.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Free Press.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgement of a child*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Clark, R. D. (1981). *Emergency intervention*. New York: Academic Press.
- Potter, G. & Wandzilak, T. (1981). Youth sports: A program evaluation. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 52, 67-68.

- Priest, R. F., & Beach, J. (1993). *Stability of findings in longitudinal studies of college impact*. Paper presented at the 101st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Priest, R. F., & Bridges, J. (1983). *Development of values and moral judgments of West Point cadets* (Office of Institutional Research Report). West Point, NY: United States Military Academy.
- Priest, R. F., Krause, J. V., & Beach, J. (1999). Four-year changes in college athletes' ethical value choices in sports situations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70(2), 170-178.
- Promoli, F. (1982). *Cheating in sport: A comparison of two basketball teams*. Unpublished manuscript, Dalhousie University, U. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.
- Rainey, D. W. (1986). A gender difference in acceptance of sport aggression: A classroom activity. *Teaching of Psychology*, 13(3), 138-140.
- Rest, J. R. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J. R. (1984). The major components of morality. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 24-40). New York: Wiley.
- Richardson, D. E. (1982). Ethical conduct in sport situations. *Annual Proceedings of National College Physical Education Association*, 66, 98-104.
- Roberts, G. C., Treasure, D. C., & Kavussanu, M. (1996). The orthogonality of achievement goals and its relationship to beliefs about success and satisfaction in sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 10, 398-408.
- Romance, T. J., Weiss, M. R., & Bockoven, J. (1986). A program to promote moral development through elementary school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 126-136.
- Runes, D. D. (1959). *Pictorial history of philosophy*. New York: Bramhall House.
- Sage, G. (1980). Orientations toward sport of male and female intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 355-362.
- Sage, G. (1990). *Power and ideology in American sport*. A critical perspective. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Shields, D. L., & Bredemeier, B. J. (1984). Sport and moral growth: A structural developmental perspective. In W. F. Straub, & J. M. Williams (Eds.) *Cognitive sport psychology* (pp.89-101). Lansing, NY: Sport Science Associates.
- Shields, D. L., & Bredemeier, B. J. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Silva, J. M. (1983). The perceived legitimacy of rule violating behavior in sport. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5, 438-448.
- Simon, J. (1983). A humanistic approach to sports. *The Humanist*, 43, 25-26, 32.
- Smith, M. D. (1974). Significant others' influence on the assaultive behavior of young hockey players. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 9, 45-58.
- Smith, E. D. (1977) *Sportsmanship evaluation of athletes and non-athletes in junior and senior high schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Smith, M. D. (1978). Social learning of violence in minor hockey. In F. Smoll, & R. Smith (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives in youth sports* (pp. 91-100). Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publication.
- Smith, A. (1999). Ethical Dilemmas in sport. *The Sports Factor – Radio National Transcripts*. Sept. 17.
- Snyder, E., & Sprietzer, E. (1979). Orientations toward sport: intrinsic, normative and extrinsic. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1, 170-175.
- Stephens, D. (1993). *Goal orientation and moral atmosphere in youth sport: An examination of lying, hurting, and cheating behaviors in girls' soccer*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Stephens, D. E., & Bredemeier, B. J. (1996). Moral atmosphere and judgments about aggression in girls' soccer: Relationships among moral and motivational variables. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 18, 158-173.
- Stephens, D., Bredemeier, B., & Shields, D. (1997). Construction of a measure designed to assess players' descriptions and prescriptions for moral behavior in youth sport soccer. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 370-390.
- Stevenson, C. L. (1975). Socialization effects of participation in sport: A critical review of the research. *Research Quarterly*, 46, 287-301.
- Stewart, C. C. (1996). Parents and sportsmanship: Contemporary expectations. *Physical Educator*, 53(1), 51-55.

- Stoll, S. K. (1992). *Sportsmanship: Dead or alive?* Unpublished manuscript, University of Idaho, Center for Ethical Theory and Honor in Competitive Sports, Moscow, ID.
- Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (1992). *Division I athletes: Sportsmanship qualities.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Idaho, Center for Ethical Theory and Honor in Competitive Sports, Moscow.
- Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (1994). The importance of methodology in cognitive moral reasoning. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport Abstracts*, 17, A97-A98.
- Tedeschi, J. (1983). Social influence theory and aggression. In R. Green, & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Theberge, N., Curtis, J., & Brown, B. (1982). Sex differences in orientations towards games: tests of sport involvement hypothesis. In A. Dunleavy, A. Miracle, & O. R. Reese (Eds.), *Studies in the Sociology of Sport* (pp. 285-308). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.
- Thompson, J. (1995). *Positive coaching: Building character and self-esteem through sports*. Portola Valley, CA: Warde Publishers.
- Treasure, D. C., & Roberts, G. C. (1994). Cognitive and affective concomitants of task and ego goal orientations during the middle school years. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19, 197-206.
- Treasure, D. C., & Roberts, G. C. (1998). Relationship between female adolescents' achievement goal orientations, perceptions of the motivational climate, belief about success and sources of satisfaction in basketball. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 29(3), 211-230.
- Turiel, E. (1983). Domains and categories in social-cognitive development. In W. Overton (Ed.), *The relationship between social and cognitive development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tutko, T., & Bruns, W. (1976). *Winning is everything and other American myths*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ulrich, C. (1968). *The social matrix of physical education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Vallerand, R. J. (1991). A social psychological analysis of sportsmanship. In J. Bilard & M. Durand (Eds.), *Sport and psychology* (pp. 289-299). Montpellier, France: Ed. Revue EPS.

- Vallerand, R. J., Briere, N. M., Blanchard, C., & Provencher, P. (1997). Development and validation of the Multidimensional Sportspersonship Orientations Scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 19*, 197-206.
- Vallerand, R. J., Deshaies, P., & Cuerrier, J. P. (1997). On the effects of the social context on behavioral intentions of sportsmanship. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 28*(2), 126-140.
- Vallerand, R. J., Deshaies, P., Cuerrier, J. P., Briere, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1996). Toward a multidimensional definition of sportsmanship. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 8*, 89-101.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Losier, G. F. (1994). Self-determined motivation and sportsmanship orientations: An assessment of their temporal relationship. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 16*, 229-245.
- Vaz, E. W. (1974). What price victory? *International Review of Sport Sociology, 9*, 33-55.
- Walker, H. J. (1993). Youth sports: Parental concerns. *The Physical Educator, 50*, 104-112.
- Walling, M. D., & Duda, J. L. (1995). Goals and their associations with beliefs about success in and perceptions of the purpose of physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 14*, 140-156.
- Wann, D. L. (1997). *Sport psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Webb, H. (1969). Professionalization of attitudes toward play among adolescents. In G. S. Kenyon (Ed.), *Aspects of contemporary sport sociology* (pp. 161-187). Chicago: The Athletic Institute.
- Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (1995). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Weiss, M. R., & Bredemeier (1990). Moral development in sport. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews, 18*, 331-378.
- White, S. A., & Duda, J. L. (1994). The relationship of gender, level of sport involvement, and participation motivation to task and ego orientation. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 25*, 4-18.
- White, S. A., Duda, J. L. & Keller, M. R. (1998) The relationship between goal orientation and perceived purposes of sport among youth sport participants. *Journal of Sport Behavior 21*(4), 474-483.

White, S. A., & Zellner, S. R. (1996). The relationship between goal orientation, beliefs about the causes of sport success, and trait anxiety among high school, intercollegiate, and recreational sport participants. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*, 58-72.

Whitely, J. (1982). *Character development in college students*. New York: Character Research Press.

Williams, L. (1994). Goal orientations and athletes' preferences for competence information sources. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 16*, 416-430.

Zillmann, D. (1979). *Hostility and aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zumkley, H. (1984). Individual difference and aggressive interactions. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression: From individual behavior to social interaction* (pp. 33-50). New York: Springer-Verlag.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

John W. Lata was raised in Lawrence, Kansas and received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees from the University of Kansas in 1984 and 1994 respectively. He was accepted in the Sport Administration program at Florida State University in the fall of 1997. Upon arriving in Tallahassee, he taught golf at Florida A&M for a year, and taught golf at FSU for three years, as well as tennis and aerobic conditioning classes. John also taught Fiscal Management in Sport at the graduate level, and Facility Management in Sport at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, as well as being a teaching assistant in the Sport Marketing course. John has taught a Career Planning course at FSU and has been instructing First Year Experience courses for four and a half years. After a short stint as a graduate assistant in the Compliance office at FSU, he was hired as the Coordinator of Student Services in the summer of 2000. He is currently the Director of Student Services in the Florida State University Athletic Department and is on numerous university-wide committees as well as the NCAA Leadership Conference Selection Committee. He is also a member of the board of directors of the non-profit Dick Howser Center for Childhood Services, Inc. in Tallahassee. John is the father of three boys, Brenden, Jeff and JT.