

FAIR PLAY:
A Study of Socialization in Sport

BY

Neil B. Burke

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) May, 1996



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13005-3

Canada

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International and *Masters Abstracts International* are arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation or thesis. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

SOCIOLOGY OF SPORT

SUBJECT TERM

0626

UMI

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS
 Architecture0729
 Art History0377
 Cinema0900
 Dance0378
 Fine Arts0357
 Information Science0723
 Journalism0391
 Library Science0399
 Mass Communications0708
 Music0413
 Speech Communication0459
 Theater0465

EDUCATION
 General0515
 Administration0514
 Adult and Continuing0516
 Agricultural0517
 Art0273
 Bilingual and Multicultural0282
 Business0688
 Community College0275
 Curriculum and Instruction0727
 Early Childhood0518
 Elementary0524
 Finance0277
 Guidance and Counseling0519
 Health0680
 Higher0745
 History of0520
 Home Economics0278
 Industrial0521
 Language and Literature0279
 Mathematics0280
 Music0522
 Philosophy of0998
 Physical0523

Psychology0525
 Reading0535
 Religious0527
 Sciences0714
 Secondary0533
 Social Sciences0534
 Sociology of0340
 Special0529
 Teacher Training0530
 Technology0710
 Tests and Measurements0288
 Vocational0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
 General0679
 Ancient0289
 Linguistics0290
 Modern0291

Literature
 General0401
 Classical0294
 Comparative0295
 Medieval0297
 Modern0298
 African0316
 American0591
 Asian0305
 Canadian (English)0352
 Canadian (French)0355
 English0593
 Germanic0311
 Latin American0312
 Middle Eastern0315
 Romance0313
 Slavic and East European0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy0422
 Religion
 General0318
 Biblical Studies0321
 Clergy0319
 History of0320
 Philosophy of0322
 Theology0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies0323
 Anthropology
 Archaeology0324
 Cultural0326
 Physical0327
 Business Administration
 General0310
 Accounting0272
 Banking0770
 Management0454
 Marketing0338
 Canadian Studies0385
 Economics
 General0501
 Agricultural0503
 Commerce-Business0505
 Finance0508
 History0509
 Labor0510
 Theory0511
 Folklore0358
 Geography0366
 Gerontology0351
 History
 General0578

Ancient0579
 Medieval0581
 Modern0582
 Black0328
 African0331
 Asia, Australia and Oceania0332
 Canadian0334
 European0335
 Latin American0336
 Middle Eastern0333
 United States0337
 History of Science0585
 Law0398
 Political Science
 General0615
 International Law and Relations0616
 Public Administration0617
 Recreation0814
 Social Work0452
 Sociology
 General0626
 Criminology and Penology0627
 Demography0938
 Ethnic and Racial Studies0631
 Individual and Family Studies0628
 Industrial and Labor Relations0629
 Public and Social Welfare0630
 Social Structure and Development0700
 Theory and Methods0344
 Transportation0709
 Urban and Regional Planning0999
 Women's Studies0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
 General0473
 Agronomy0285
 Animal Culture and Nutrition0475
 Animal Pathology0476
 Food Science and Technology0359
 Forestry and Wildlife0478
 Plant Culture0479
 Plant Pathology0480
 Plant Physiology0817
 Range Management0777
 Wood Technology0746

Biology
 General0306
 Anatomy0287
 Biostatistics0308
 Botany0309
 Cell0379
 Ecology0329
 Entomology0353
 Genetics0369
 Limnology0793
 Microbiology0410
 Molecular0307
 Neuroscience0317
 Oceanography0416
 Physiology0433
 Radiation0821
 Veterinary Science0778
 Zoology0472

Biophysics
 General0786
 Medical0760

Geodesy0370
 Geology0372
 Geophysics0373
 Hydrology0388
 Mineralogy0411
 Paleobotany0345
 Paleocology0426
 Paleontology0418
 Paleozoology0985
 Palynology0427
 Physical Geography0368
 Physical Oceanography0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences0768
 Health Sciences
 General0566
 Audiology0300
 Chemotherapy0992
 Dentistry0567
 Education0350
 Hospital Management0769
 Human Development0758
 Immunology0982
 Medicine and Surgery0564
 Mental Health0347
 Nursing0569
 Nutrition0570
 Obstetrics and Gynecology0380
 Occupational Health and Therapy0354
 Ophthalmology0381
 Pathology0571
 Pharmacology0419
 Pharmacy0572
 Physical Therapy0382
 Public Health0573
 Radiology0574
 Recreation0575

Speech Pathology0460
 Toxicology0383
 Home Economics0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
 Chemistry
 General0485
 Agricultural0749
 Analytical0486
 Biochemistry0487
 Inorganic0488
 Nuclear0738
 Organic0490
 Pharmaceutical0491
 Physical0494
 Polymer0495
 Radiation0754
 Mathematics0405

Physics
 General0605
 Acoustics0986
 Astronomy and Astrophysics0606
 Atmospheric Science0608
 Atomic0748
 Electronics and Electricity0607
 Elementary Particles and High Energy0798
 Fluid and Plasma0759
 Molecular0609
 Nuclear0610
 Optics0752
 Radiation0756
 Solid State0611
 Statistics0463

Applied Sciences
 Applied Mechanics0346
 Computer Science0984

Engineering
 General0537
 Aerospace0538
 Agricultural0539
 Automotive0540
 Biomedical0541
 Chemical0542
 Civil0543
 Electronics and Electrical0544
 Heat and Thermodynamics0348
 Hydraulic0545
 Industrial0546
 Marine0547
 Materials Science0794
 Mechanical0548
 Metallurgy0743
 Mining0551
 Nuclear0552
 Packaging0549
 Petroleum0765
 Sanitary and Municipal0554
 System Science0790
 Geotechnology0428
 Operations Research0796
 Plastics Technology0795
 Textile Technology0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General0621
 Behavioral0384
 Clinical0622
 Developmental0620
 Experimental0623
 Industrial0624
 Personality0625
 Physiological0989
 Psychobiology0349
 Psychometrics0632
 Social0451

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry0425
 Geochemistry0996

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION**

FAIR PLAY:

A STUDY OF SOCIALIZATION IN SPORT

BY

NEIL B. BURKE

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Neil B. Burke © 1996

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis/practicum and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum..

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the fair play attitudes of a sample of 138 students from Grant Park and St. Johns high schools in Winnipeg. The research instrument was a forty-two item questionnaire which consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions about attitudes toward sport and physical participation. The study defines a fair play attitude and attempts to establish participant fair play attitude scores using a variation of the Webb Professionalization Scale. The research examines the impact of the Fair Play resource manual's lectures and activities upon respondent fair play attitudes; the impact which significant others have on an individual's fair play attitude; and if an individual's sporting experiences have an impact upon their fair play attitude. The results indicate that the curriculum seems to have very little effect on influencing the fair play attitudes of respondents. Respondent's significant others do have a significant influence upon the attitudes of both male and female respondents with the primary influences being from parents and peers. The participation patterns of respondents had very little effect on their attitudes, only female respondents were slightly influenced by their level of competition. The meaning of the results are discussed and conclusions are presented in light of this discussion. The implications of the research are given and recommendations are made to advance the promotion of fair play.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to start by thanking Dr. David Johns, the external examiner on my thesis committee, for his commentary and recommendations throughout the completion of this thesis. His knowledge and love of sports only contributed to mine.

I would also like to thank my second committee member, Professor Wayne Taylor. As both an undergraduate and graduate student, Professor Taylor has provided me with a great deal of insight and instruction in research methods. Without this valuable knowledge this thesis would not have been possible.

I am likewise indebted to Professor Julia Kwong, my advisor. She has challenged my ideas, criticized my writing style, provided focus, and given me nothing but support and encouragement. For her guidance as well as her confidence and belief in my abilities I am eternally grateful.

I would also like to thank my friends and the sociology department support staff. Each one of you has made my time in the department special and something to remember. To all the friends I have made, I will never forget all the good times.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my family. To my parents, Brian and Paddy Burke. Your support of all my activities, both in sports and academics, has only enriched my life. Mom and Dad, thank you. Finally, to my wife Diane. Thank you for all your love and support throughout this endeavor. Without your belief in me this project may never have reached completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: SPORTS AND SOCIALIZATION.....	7
1.1 Socialization.....	7
1.2 Play, Games, and Sports.....	13
1.3 The Socialization Process of Play, Games, and Sports.....	20
1.4 The Function of Sports in Education..	32
1.5 Playing to Win.....	36
CHAPTER 2: THE STUDY.....	39
2.1 Fair Play.....	39
2.2 Proposed Hypotheses.....	56
2.3 The Research Instrument.....	59
A.) The Fair Play Attitude.....	60
B.) Curriculum on Fair Play Attitude..	66
C.) Significant Others.....	67
D.) Sports Participation.....	72
2.4 Data Collection.....	73
2.5 Preparing the Data for Analysis.....	76
2.6 Testing the Three Hypotheses.....	78
A.) Testing Hypothesis 1: Impact of Curriculum on Fair Play Attitude.....	79
B.) Testing Hypothesis 2: Impact of Significant Others upon Fair Play Attitude.....	79
C.) Testing Hypothesis 3: Impact of Sports Participation upon Fair Play Attitude.....	82
CHAPTER 3: DATA ANALYSIS.....	83
3.1 Fair Play Attitude.....	83
3.2 Overall Model.....	84
3.3 Hypothesis 1: The Impact of Curriculum on Fair Play Attitude.....	86

3.4 Hypothesis 2: The Impact of Significant Others on Fair Play Attitudes.....	88
3.5 Hypothesis 3: The Impact of Sports Participation on Fair Play Attitude.....	106
CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	110
4.1 The Study.....	110
4.2 The Findings.....	111
4.3 Conclusions.....	117
4.4 Implications and Recommendations....	127
APPENDIX A: THE INFLUENCE OF SPORTS HEROES ON FAIR PLAY ATTITUDE.....	133
APPENDIX B: THE FAIR PLAY SURVEY.....	137
REFERENCES.....	149

INTRODUCTION

How many times have athletes of all ages and nationalities heard the phrase "Not that you won or lost, but how you played the game."? How many times have those same athletes heard Vince Lombardi's famous (infamous?) words "Winning isn't everything, its the only thing."? Two diametrically opposed ideas. However, both illustrate the broad spectrum of attitudes which must be explored when discussing sport and fair play. These two phrases are representative of the many differing attitudes present within sport. This thesis will address those ideas and attitudes prevalent in the world of sport and athletics. It will examine how such ideas are inculcated, the role of educational institutions, as well as the role of significant others in the perpetuation of those ideas.

The central issue is whether or not fair play, as a viable concept, may still have a place within the world of sport and athletics. In view of this, it should be asked, have we, as a society, lost track of what athletic competition is all about? Is there too much emphasis by the public and by the media on winning in competition as the only achievement worthy of recognition? In other words, does this emphasis affect the attitudes of athletes toward playing fairly in today's competitive sporting milieu?

For some the idea of fair play is a very real concept dominated by the ideas developed from self respect. The International Council for Sport and Physical Education has a declaration of fair play which entails several rules. Briefly, these rules suggest athletes maintain a firm and dignified attitude towards those who do not play fairly along with respect for teammates, opponents and the games officials. Their charter views fair play in both a descriptive and evaluative way. It describes what fair play should be while putting forth the principles of behavior it should follow. In this way fair play is a way of behaving which develops from respect for oneself and one's opponent (Mcintosh, 1979:127).

The antithesis of fair play is the "winning is the only thing" viewpoint. Mcintosh (1979:126) states when this principle "is adopted when any action or behavior which players, spectators, officials, and society at large can be persuaded or forced to accept without disqualifying the victor becomes fair or legitimate". It is in this context that winning has become the ultimate and dominant value. What has been considered unfair, now becomes fair. The behavior is allowed or sanctioned in that it does not negate success or disqualify the victory (McIntosh, 1979:127). However, because the behavior is not evaluated on the basis of right or wrong, only on whether victory is achieved, fairness becomes secondary to the goal of winning.

This is a confusing issue for sport. The problems facing athletes in terms of fair play ultimately come down to decisions of principle. The semantics of fair play can give many different viewpoints on what its definition should be, or what principles should be contained in its definition. Even the adoption of one motto over another, can be viewed as a decision of principle, based in part on semantics. Hence, the definition of fair play may not be driven by rules put in place by sport at all, but may be a personal decision made by the athlete.

Recently, the Commission for Fair Play was formed to promote fair play in sport. The move was the result of a growing concern in Canada that the rules of games such as hockey, baseball, and track and field were flagrantly being disobeyed and the moral conduct of players was deteriorating. Established in 1986, the Commission consists of former professional and Olympic athletes, coaches and referees, along with representatives from the sports media, education, business, and sports medicine fields. All the members of the Commission feel there is a need to return to principles of fair play.

The Commission promotes fair play in four specific ways:

1. Through national advertising and promotional campaigns, within both the sport community and the public;

2. Through informational and educational support materials and joint initiatives with provincial bodies;
3. By encouraging and recognizing outstanding citizens who demonstrate fair play in action;
4. By proposing fair play initiatives to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

It is the purpose of this thesis to examine the Commission's second proposal which deals with informational and educational support materials. More specifically, the thesis proposes to examine whether or not the curriculum-based approach of using informational and educational support materials has succeeded in changing children's attitudes about playing fairly. It will also explore whether a child's significant others have an impact upon the child's attitudes toward playing fairly. As well, the thesis will examine the impact of a child's sports participation upon their attitudes toward fair play.

The Commission for Fair Play distributes copies of an educational resource manual, aimed at grades four to six, to every elementary school in Canada. It claims to be based on the processes for developing moral reasoning and covers a variety of curriculum areas, with the emphasis on physical education. The underlying theme of the resource manual is that fair play can be taught. It is based upon the theoretical framework of Norma Hann (1985). Hann outlines the stages of development of moral judgement as part of the

maturation process. Hann emphasizes that these stages are developed as young people interact with others and with situations (Fair Play for Kids resource manual 1990:78).

The manual, "Fair Play for Kids", is divided into a variety of sections, each consisting of a number of exercises and projects which deal with the topic. There are also a number of propositions advanced for the teaching of fair play itself. The first is the statement that "Active social interaction is a basic element of moral growth" (Fair Play for Kids Resource Manual p.1). From this statement the manual argues that moral decisions are achieved through dialogue where individuals work together to achieve consensus about respective rights and responsibilities. The manual also emphasizes that moral reasoning can be taught by first helping children to recognize moral conflicts and dilemmas as well as the solutions to them. Secondly, it suggests that these dilemmas may be solved by encouraging children to move beyond an egocentric level of moral reasoning by taking the role of others.

Hence, the processes used for teaching moral reasoning are recognizing and resolving moral conflicts along with helping children to learn to change roles and perspectives. The fair play values and attitudes which are stressed are teamwork and cooperation, playing by the rules, and self

esteem. Along with these values and attitudes the ideals of fair play which are also taught are;

1. Respect the rules.
2. Respect the officials and their decisions.
3. Respect your opponent.
4. Give everybody an equal chance to participate.
5. Maintain your self control at all times.

To provide further background for this topic a literature review will follow. It will examine three essential issues of sport which pertain to this thesis; sport as a socializing mechanism, fair play, and the professionalization of children's sports. It will try to highlight those issues which are pertinent to the teaching and coaching of a fair play philosophy. The literature review will also explore the moral dilemmas involved with the fair play philosophy and discuss how these dilemmas impact upon the fair play program.

CHAPTER 1: SPORTS and SOCIALIZATION

Education is designed for enculturation; that is, students/children must learn and internalize the prevailing cultural values, along with the proper behavioral aspects of adulthood. Fair play is an important one among these values. These cultural values are instilled not only in education but through the socialization process which occurs in all aspects of society. Consequently, this thesis will examine whether or not the curriculum-based approach of using informational and educational support materials, as designed by the Commission for Fair Play, has had any impact in the socialization of an individual's attitudes about playing fairly. It will also explore whether an individual's significant others have an impact upon the socialization of attitudes toward playing fairly. The impact of an individual's sporting experiences and participation upon their fair play attitude will also be examined.

1.1 Socialization

The definitions of socialization are many and diverse. Staniford (1981) calls socialization

an interactional process whereby a person acquires a social identity, learns appropriate role behavior and in general conforms to expectations held by members of the social systems to which he belongs or inspires to belong.

This definition is somewhat similar to Barry McPherson's

(1983) in which socialization is viewed as a

complex social process designed to produce as an end product an individual who is prepared for the requirements of participation in society in general, and for the performance of a variety of social roles in specific subgroups within that society.

Both definitions imply that an individual is induced in some measure to conform willingly to the ways of the society or group to which they belong. Social roles must be taken in order for the individual to fulfil certain requirements of society.

Staniford (1981) argues that role play allows the child to identify his/her status within the family and also status within the society as well as the accompanying expectations which coincide with his status. McPherson (1983) further argues that children learn various elements of their social world from the common symbols or established patterns of behavior in certain social positions. Through modelling, imitation, and vicarious learning this social learning theory argues that most social learning, specifically the learning of social roles, is acquired by observing the behavior of significant others or role models. Behaviors are observed, assimilated, and then subsequently used in the proper situation.

These views coincide with the social psychological view presented by George Mead (Calhoun,1987). Role-playing by

young children begins when they take the role of specific others (eg. Mommy, Daddy, nurse, fireman, etc) in certain instances. In doing this, children internalize each character they play, this internalization being carried to the point where the child can further internalize a group, not just an individual. This group then becomes known as the generalized other in which the child can not only see their role but all others as well.

Loy and Ingham (1981) concur with this view that socialization can be seen from either the perspective of the individual or from that of a group. They suggest that individual development may be viewed generically from society to society in terms of certain processes such as role playing. It may also be seen in terms of the experiences and influences that produce notable differences among persons such as the specific roles people learn to play.

This view centers attention on the adaptation of an individual to their social situation as well as their ability to perform appropriately in the social setting. The performance is dependent on the social identities an individual develops as a result of previous participation in certain other social situations (Loy and Ingham,1981). Hence, the socialization process is generic, however, due to a persons experiences and influences the socialization process

is also a very individual one. In short, socialization is a process, not just of learning but also of interaction.

Loy and Ingham (1981) identify three mechanisms within the socialization process. They suggest that socialization is attained through compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when an individual accepts influences from another person or group in order to get a favorable reaction. This individual responds to the influences from significant others and thus learns that the group has the ability to reward or punish. Hence, compliance is equal to reward/reinforcement and noncompliance to punishment.

Identification is almost like imitation. Identification is an adopted behavior from another group or person because the behavior is associated with satisfying a "self-defining relationship with that person or group" (Loy and Ingham, 1981).

The final mechanism is internalization. "The person orients himself to groups/individuals and uses them as significant frames of reference for his own behavior, attitudes or feelings" (Loy and Ingham, 1981). It is like Mead's psychoanalytic approach where the individual uses social norms and values which enable them to confront and appraise their own actions (Calhoun, 1987).

Socialization then is the process which through these processes the child learns the accepted behaviors. Martens (1975) says "society's objective through the socialization process is to produce a competent person". He differentiates between interpersonal competence and social competence. The former being certain skills, attitudes, and personality dispositions to allow interpersonal relationships, the latter being other skills and knowledge which must be acquired to function effectively in society. One is interdependent on the other for both are needed to produce a functioning member of society. A person is competent when they are able to effectively interact with the physical and social environment.

By learning a society's culture an individual is given a set of socially transmitted behavior patterns, beliefs, and other products of society which allow for a coherent outlook and approach to life. In other words, it provides a social reality.

Stevenson (1974) uses the sociological paradigm of institutional socialization. Society believes specific institutional experiences give rise to certain socialization effects. Society then assumes that individuals who undergo these experiences will have been socialized in the proper manner and will behave accordingly (Stevenson, 1974). Individuals then come to have occupational and social roles

assigned to them which are consistent with the assumed institutional socialization. By assuming or taking a particular role, the individual is exposed to a certain set of expectations which are based upon their socialization. Socialization actually occurs "post facto" in response to the pressure of these expectations (Stevenson,1974). Thus socialization to a role and it's expectations can begin prior to an individual actually occupying that role.

The power of institutional socialization lies in the perception of the institution to place individuals into occupational and social roles. Hence, each particular institution leads to particular occupational and social roles. The institution's ability to allocate these roles, along with an individual's anticipation to a role, allows for greater socialization to a role, leaving the individual with little doubt about the role and society's expectations (Stevenson,1974).

This theoretical construct of socialization by Stevenson (1974), based on the power of institutions, makes the assumption that all relationships we face are institutionalized (eg. the family, peer group, school, etc.). However, as an explanation Stevenson (1974) states;

the substitution of the institutional concept for the traditional interaction concept immediately focuses our socialization concerns away from the interaction processes within the sport situation and towards the structural

allocation linkages between sport as a socializing institution and the societal occupational and social structure. The type of sport to which this concept is best suited is, perhaps, the sport which occurs in the context of educational institutions.

For the purposes of this study socialization will refer to a process of social interaction through which people develop, extend, and modify their conceptions of who they are and how they relate to the social world around them. This definition emphasizes that socialization occurs through real, imagined, or anticipated social relationships with others, especially significant others. As well, socialization involves more than a simple one-way process of learning in which a person is passively shaped by the people and social events around them, but is a highly interactive two-way process. Finally, this definition recognizes that socialization is never complete and that it is a constantly emerging process involving the changing interface between a person and the social world.

1.2 Play, Games, and Sports

Play is usually taken to mean or imply an activity that is usually pleasant and voluntary. In common language it is used to describe activities which are not serious or that are indulged in a playful manner. To many, play is seen as behavior which is trivial, fruitless, and not constructive in nature or provides nothing concrete at the time. However,

play is more than this. It is crucial for development.

Classical theories of play were advanced around the turn of the century (Wohl,1975, Ellis,1973). According to Karl Groos' theory of play (Wohl 1974), play is the result of the inheritance of unlearned capacities to emit playful acts. Playful behavior is inherited the same way we inherit our genetic code. This theory ignored the capacity of an individual to learn new responses which could be classified as play. For every new response or observed behavior there could not be a new easily-moved instinct. In order to account for this the explanation that play was instinctive was invoked.

Carr and Claparede (Wohl,1974) developed Groos' theory and suggested that play performed a purifying function in regard to instincts in present day society. Carr saw play as a refining and blunting instrument, purifying the individual of instinct's harmful antisocial influence. Claparede saw play as a preparatory training tool in which instincts in children and youth could turn out to be dangerous if not accompanied by play (Wohl,1974, Ellis,1973).

Herbert Spencer and Friedrich Schiller (1979) viewed play as an outlet for excess energy. This excess energy was the result of a one-sided use of the energy of only some muscle groups and nervous centers used in daily work. Others, which

were not used or were idle during work accumulated energy and for this surplus energy an outlet was needed. This expenditure of excess energy occurred during play, which was seen as the necessary outlet (Wohl,1974).

Ellis argued that play was necessary to provide recuperation from work, or play as relaxation (Ellis,1973). Play allowed an individual to emit responses other than those needed to work, thus allowing for recuperation. The emission of the different responses let the individual get rid of the harmful byproducts of his work (Ellis,1973).

This theory was criticized as being too general as well as failing to explain various forms of play itself. First children play when fatigued or to the point of fatigue, so surplus energy is not required. And second, evolution should have tailored energy available to the energy required (Ellis,1973).

These theories disregard play's social aspects. Play was seen as something eternal and unchanging. The failure to take into account its changeability, endless possibilities or functions based on its geographical and/or historical contexts these theories ignored play as an instrument for a child's development (Wohl,1974).

One theorist did examine much of what had previously been ignored. J. Huizinga (1955), in his work *Homo Ludens*, viewed play as a significant form of activity which has a social function. He examined the relation of play to culture and attempted to differentiate between play in general and social play. Briefly, Huizinga suggests that the function of play in society can be seen as functioning one of two ways; either as a contest for something or as a representation of something.

For Huizinga, the game is play, it is a contest for something, it does not matter what is played for. This is what he calls a free activity and the game is consciously "outside" ordinary life. It begins and ends and is played in accordance with the proscribed rules. This would be what Huizinga calls play in general. Social play also exists outside ordinary life. Huizinga (1955) defines this in terms of play as ritual in that the rules are tantamount. These rituals are not games but he suggests that those involved are playing a part or role and that ritual is outside of ordinary life. However, the differentiating factor between play in general and play as ritual is that the former is to be fun while in the latter play is subordinated to the seriousness of the ritual act (Huizinga, 1955).

However, certain elements of these analyses of play and work have provided a positive beginning for other theories.

There is little doubt that play is viewed as the antithesis of work. Play is aimed at a desire to spend time pleasantly, while work is done to satisfy aims essential for survival in today's society. Work is done by people who are experienced and capable of making the proper use of tools and instruments needed for correct results. Work is a serious activity, and its productiveness allows the free time to play (Wohl,1974).

Once a child enters into a cooperative venture with others he now accepts externally imposed definitions of rules. This occurs in the peer group where there is cooperation and equality among the players. Children now respond to each other through and with a conscious focus on rules. This is the transition from play to games. The rules of the game may have been made by the players themselves; however, they can only be changed by group consensus. Play is a spontaneous, unstructured type of activity which can be done alone or with others.

Games differ from play in that they are more structured and have recognizable rules. Games are those activities

where meanings have been established and legitimated, each participant in the ludic¹ frame knows that the meanings of those with whom he interacts within this frame are also his meanings (Loy and Ingham, 1974).

¹ lu·dic "expressive of a playful but aimless outlook / the ludic uses of rhyme" (Webster's New World Dictionary 1990:350).

Loy and Ingham (1974) have stated that once meanings have been established and legitimated all participants know that their understanding of the activity is shared by all the others.

There can be no games without rules. The fact that the game exists is testament to the existence of clearly defined parameters on how the activity will proceed. These parameters or rules are what transforms play into a game. It is, in fact, that the form the game takes is socially constructed, and it's meanings consensually validated by the individuals who participate in the activity. Hence, without group consensus on what constitutes the game, there can be no game.

Games allow for various elements of skill, chance, and strategy to be combined to give children a chance to experiment with different success styles. Devereux (1971) sees games as occurring on a level of unreality which makes them a good tool for toying with potentially dangerous psychological and emotional problems. In these games there are no rule enforcers, everything is done by group consensus. Hence, through experience of the game, the group learns the boundaries of their relationships, how to achieve consensus and a variety of other skills which keep the game going.

The transition from games to sport can be explained as

follows; to be able to play any game a child must be prepared to learn the roles and attitudes of all other players. These roles and attitudes are a typification. In order to play any game, to take a role, an individual requires an implicit understanding of it, a typification. As a game becomes institutionalized, so are the roles involved. The game now develops through synthesis and habituation (Loy and Ingham,1974). It becomes taken for granted and is made possible through the predictability of it's meaning. It now becomes a phenomenon which is recognized as independent of change, thus becoming an institution unto itself. When the game becomes institutionalized it does not necessarily become sport. It is not a true linear progression that play is a precursor of games, and games are likewise to sport. For example, monopoly is a game with a highly institutionalized set of rules, however, it is not a sport.

Baseball is a game with a highly institutionalized set of rules, it is a sport, or more specifically an athletic contest. We usually think of sport as a specific physical activity which is based on elements of play and games. According to Webster (1990), sport is "that which diverts and makes mirth; it is an amusement, recreation, pastime".

Diverting? Funny? Sometimes. There are two sides to sport. It is an activity which seeks only to be a pleasant

distraction, a form of diversion which has fun and pleasure as its end and is dominated by an attitude of moderation and generosity. These are the elements of play and games which are incorporated in sport. On the other hand, sport can be a struggle to prove personal or group excellence. It is a competitive activity, which has for its end victory in the contest and is characterized by an attitude of sacrifice and intensity. This is the athletic element to sport, which is a serious endeavor based on victory as the end of the persistence.

1.3 The Socialization Process of Play, Games, and Sports

Just as sports is more than a competition, play is more than relaxation. It is a form of socialization. This idea is confirmed in the many forms children's play takes, usually as some form of imitation of what has been observed in adults. Wohl (1974) states

children's play reflects learning to understand the world, though in a childish and not realistic way, marked by ignorance and surprise, in which reality is intertwined with fantasy, nevertheless all this is based on observation, on what the child notices in the world created by work.... Their playing is always an imitation of various functions and activities, connected with the world of work. Playing, children learn to enter life, to prepare themselves for future work, passing through a process of socialization.

Mahler (1974) sees play as more than the beginnings of work; it is also a social activity which has certain practical aims. Play provides a way of perfecting aptitudes and

functions in a biological way toward maturation. It allows the child to learn motor skills and to deal with his body. Play also provides a socializing function in providing interaction with others. Finally, for Mahler (1974), play provides a moral function in that it transmits an entire complex of norms and values of the respective society.

There are three approaches to this contemporary view of play. The first is a psychoanalytical one. It is Freudian in nature and not unlike the classical theory which sees play as a release of frustration and conflict. The second, in contrast, is how behaviorists see play. They view it as imitative learning that uses exploration and investigation as a general means of getting information about the total environment. The third approach is the cognitive approach. Play becomes part of an educational enterprise where one learns through play and experiences. This approach views the human person as a social creature, whose self interacts with other "selves" through play (Staniford, 1981). Play is seen as a powerful socializing agent in a child's life.

Staniford (1981) discusses the four ways by which a child knows the world. First, by imitation children learn and play; this helps both novel response patterns and anticipatory socialization. Secondly, through exploration, children explore people and objects, learn the boundaries of play, what

they can do and with whom. The third and fourth way is to test themselves in both appearance and behavior by the responses of others. Using these elements children attempt to construct a model of their reality by putting all the elements of their experiences together in a unique way.

Loy and Ingham (1974) offer a slightly different but compatible account of this learning process. They note that games with rules are social institutions "transmitted from one generation to the next and are independent of the will of the individuals who participate in them" (Loy and Ingham, 1974).

Loy and Ingham (1974) say this "transmission" occurs in stages. These stages are similar to compliance, identification, and internalization, cited on page three, in the discussion of socialization. The first stage is the motor stage, where the child learns to play. The second stage, or egocentric stage, is where the child accepts externally imposed games but acts them out according to it's own rules. The child passes from this stage to the cooperative stage in which he accepts externally imposed definitions of rules. This stage can only occur where there is cooperation and equality among the players; in other words, the peer group. Children now respond to each other through and with a conscious focus on the rules.

Play offers the child direct, non-verbal modes of communication. The experiences the child gains are valuable because the child must acquire motor skills, develop goal-oriented behavior, learn roles, develop self concept, and learn to consider the feelings and needs of others (Staniford,1981).

More important for my purpose, because play does not have the competitive element present in sport, play develops the values of cooperation and competition. Patrick Doyle (1977) uses an ecological model and applies principles of biological ecology to the study of behavior. Just as biological habitats or contexts determine form or prevalence of plant and animal life, social contexts influence social process. Each species has a niche in the environment, when this becomes overcrowded competition for the limited resources occurs. If an activity is structured so that participation in it by one person precludes others, then competition for the scarce roles in that activity prevails. If participation in an activity is not mutually exclusive, then cooperation is possible.

This argument can be applied to toys (bicycles, teetertotters, etc.) in a preschool or school environment. Single activity toys provide for competition; activities which have the ability to provide participation by two or more

children encourage cooperation. To socialize children in the cooperative norms of society, sociality must occur. Doyle (1977) defined sociality as verbal and non-verbal reciprocative behavior.

Doyle argues that activities or toys which provide for multiple participation should be encouraged. Playing with toys, alone or with others, helps the child to successfully function in a variety of social roles later in life. Children take the roles of specific others, such as parents, in play. In doing this, children internalize each character they play, this is taken to the point where they can internalize the concept of a group. This group then becomes known as the generalized other in which the child can not only see his role but all other roles as well.

A child may take a role, or use a toy, and the rules for the use of each know only the bounds of the child's imagination. Children's play reflects the prevailing norms and values of the society of which they are a part. Hence, play is socially defined. Nevertheless, each role and each toy is usually a specific part of the society of which the child is a part. It is in their specificity that they give certain ideas which are socially transmitted to the child.

Devereux (1971) sees games and play as miniature and

playful models of a wide variety of cultural and social activities. Different game types in which various elements of skill, chance, and strategy are combined in increasing complexity to give children a chance to experiment with different success styles. For children, games occur on a level of unreality which makes them a good tool for toying with potentially dangerous psychological and emotional problems.

Devereux examines the game of baseball in both its institutionalized form of Little League and its less structured form of pick-up sandlot baseball. The latter game follows the form Loy and Ingham (1974) assign to some play; it is played within certain rules which all participants are familiar with. However, depending on numbers, space, equipment, and a variety of other factors, the game changes to suit the situation and imagination of the participants. There are no rule enforcers, everything must be done by group consensus. Hence, through experience of the game, the group learns the boundaries of their relationships, how to achieve consensus and how to get a game going and keep it going, all factors in socialization which have been discussed. As Loy and Ingham (1974) state

it is because the form is socially constructed and its meanings consensually validated that individuals who have vested their energies in this construction tend to reconvene to reproduce the form. Stability in the form and stability in

the fronts reduces the need for redefinition, and more time can be spent on the appreciation and reconsummation of the form.

To be able to play any game a child must be prepared to learn the roles and attitudes of all other players. These roles and attitudes are typification. In order to play any game, to take a role an individual requires an implicit understanding of it or a typification. As a game becomes institutionalized, the roles needed to play become likewise. The game now develops through synthesis and habituation (Loy and Ingham, 1974). It becomes taken for granted and is made possible through the predictability of its meaning. It now becomes a phenomenon which is recognized as being independent of change, thus becoming an institution unto itself.

Sports, especially team sports, provide for a high degree of sociality. However, athletics can also be a single competitive activity. Because there is only one team, there is a limited number of spots on each team. This can be viewed as a basis for competition (Doyle, 1977). Play today is becoming more and more organized and competitive to the extent that some sociologists even question whether this movement has taken the playful element out of culture (Wohl, 1974). Though contemporary sport has its roots in play, the extensive knowledge and technology of today has influenced sport greatly, and to some extent limited its spontaneity. Sport

reflects society's increasing trend toward specialization and professionalization in all walks of life.

Coakley (1990) echoes this thought by suggesting that this trend in society toward specialization and professionalization is based on the concept of competition and reward. Briefly, he states that there exist three orientations within society's reward structure. The competitive orientation can be seen in terms of achievement or how one person compares with others. The goal is to outperform others and judge oneself based on superiority over others.

The cooperative orientation defines itself through the fact that the rewards which are gained in an activity are shared by all. Achievement is based on maximizing rewards for all participants by maximizing the groups potential.

The last one is the individualistic orientation. This is characterized by the individual who views rewards as being unrelated to the actions of others. Hence, performance is based on personal goals related to both past and future standards (Coakley,1990).

Competition is part of sports, it also allows for the combining the competitive, cooperative, and individualistic

reward structures. Sports inculcates the cultural norms, mores, and beliefs associated with this structure in two ways (Stevenson and Nixon, 1974). Sports has a built-in sanctioning system. This rewards or punishes according to a scale of excellence based on sports underlying beliefs which reinforce desirable behavior. Second, sport provides individuals with concrete examples of model or desirable behavior along with the underlying belief systems.

The sheer pervasiveness and degree of involvement which sport engenders makes it an excellent agent of socialization. Because of the interaction and socialization expectations which are held for them, sports constantly provide participants with both modelled behavior and reinforcement. Integration within a sport is the process of ensuring that the individual becomes associated, and identifies with, that collectivity. Like socialization, which inculcates people directly into the cultural pattern, integration accomplishes this indirectly by bringing the individual into a group which itself is integrated into the larger society.

Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) further suggest that the following aspects of sport help to reinforce this integration:

- 1) Intrinsic pleasure and fun received from physical movement. Sport is satisfying in that it can be seen as simply fun.

- 2) The anticipation of extrinsic rewards such as prestige, victory, and money that are part of sport.
- 3) Approval gained from significant others. As has been discussed, reinforcement plays a large part in socializing individuals into society and sport. Also, satisfying relationships are derived from participation in sports.
- 4) Participation to avoid negative sanctions like loss of status, failure, stigma, or embarrassment. This can literally force people to participate in sport out of fear of the sanctions. Conversely, the sanctions can act to discourage participation as well.
- 5) An individual may be committed to a sport because his identity is strongly anchored to the sport. This is especially the case with the professional athlete in that the sport itself encompasses the individual's life.

Each of Snyder and Spritzer's (1983) elements reflect the manner in which the process of socialization through sports serves to integrate the individual. However, certain costs may be deemed too high by the individual, thus reducing the amount of integration into sport. Integration can hold true for both participants and non-participants alike. In the case of a participant, integration occurs through interpersonal ties which bind him to a team or club. However, the collectivity may also take the form outside of sport as in a school, city region, or even a country. These elements are important in that they allow for a certain understanding as to the nature of this integration process.

Coaches and the sports hero are two more significant

others believed to be important in this socialization process. For preadolescent children the coach is the authority figure whose main function is to reward or punish. Smith, Smoll, and Curtis (1978) report that young children are most sensitive to punishment and non-reinforcement. As athletes grow older they become more aware of the positive behaviors such as reinforcement and encouragement. As athletes mature the coach is seen as an authoritative figure who imparts knowledge and maintains team order, rather than one whose main function is to reward or punish (Smith, Smoll, and Curtis, 1978).

The idea of coaches as "character builders" supports the assumption of modelling or providing athletes with concrete examples of desired behavior patterns and lends legitimacy to the claim that school sponsored sports impart more than just physical skills to the participants (Coakley, 1990). Coaches are not only teachers of physical skills, but also teachers of character by way of emphasizing such attributes as discipline, obedience, and sacrifice.

Their influence however, depends on the nature of the player-coach relationship. Coakley (1990) suggests that the coaches influence may exert itself in three ways. The coach may have such total control over the athlete that the athlete is dependent on the coach. In this case the influence of the coach may be great but there is little opportunity for the

athlete to make their own decisions. The coach may act as an advisor or advocate for the athlete. In this case the coach can be seen as an ally who uses their influence to help the athlete gain control of their life. Finally, the coach may be a model for the athlete's own life. This is the case of coach as role model.

Both Coakley (1990) and Snyder (1972) suggest that the more informal and personal the relationship, the greater the influence the coach may have on the athlete. Since sports, in schools have such an important role in socialization I shall explore this process in greater detail focusing in particular on the transmission of the concept of fair play.

One other significant individual worthy of note, is the sports hero or star. Velden (1986) suggests that athletes are seen as role models who embody the best attributes of society. Sports heroes are idolized because the mass media has made them readily recognizable with the amount of information they provide about them. It is easy for people to understand and appreciate what they do. Finally athletes gain a following because they are constantly challenged and tested in the public view (Smith, 1976).

Those athletes who are considered heroes act as reinforcers of those cultural values associated with North

American society such as teamwork, success, and dedication (Smith, 1976). Hero worship of those embodying these values may serve a reinforcement function keeping individuals within the social structure and directing them toward socially approved goals (Smith, 1976, Klapp, 1969).

1.4 The Function of Sports in Education

The educational system is, quite simply, the biggest socializing mechanism in present day society. It provides the necessary training and values needed to survive in today's technological world. Stevenson and Nixon (1972) recognize this when they state

Rather than leave the socialization completely up to chance, educational institutions have attempted to formalize the socialization and have included it deliberately in the curricula. In this manner the content of the socialization, be it concepts, ideologies, normative behavior patterns or whatever, is made more explicit for the socializee.

The question to be asked is, what purpose does sports serve as an educational socializing tool that cannot be provided by academically situated subjects? Originally, with the quick rise of mass public education, extracurricular activities were seen as wasteful or nonproductive (Hanks and Ekland, 1976). However, it was later noted that perhaps sport and extracurricular activities were an ingenious and successful device created and sanctioned by schools to coopt

the adolescent social structure and its leaders (Hanks and Ekland,1976). True, as the previous review of the literature shows, sports have socializing properties.

Preschool and college are at opposite ends of the educational spectrum and play and sport in these levels do not resemble each other at all. Most of the learning in play and sports at the elementary level involves some movement on the part of the child. These develop the individual's potential for skill, cognitive and social learning (Staniford,1981). These skills learned early in life will allow the child to proceed from the unstructured world of play to the structured, rule-oriented world of sport later in high school or college. While unstructured play and not organized sport predominates the elementary level (Staniford, 1981). The school controls play by imposing certain rules or boundaries on it thus making it largely a socializing experience for the young. As Devereux (1971) points out, backyard baseball is more fun than Little League where "the spontaneity is largely killed by schedules, rules and adult supervision..."

Staniford (1981) suggests that the early school years for children are the most overwhelming they will face. The various aspects of adapting to a classroom, such as learning to suppress desires, not interrupting or tolerating interruptions are part of the classroom learning experience

beyond the three R's. The child must also accommodate to adult authority in the form of the teacher. The teacher, of course, uses the same mechanisms of socialization as the child's parents, the ability to reward or punish. This reinforcement helps the child internalize certain social values needed to function in society (Staniford,1981, Martens,1975, Calhoun,1987, et al).

At the higher educational level, sports and not play predominate. Schafer (1976) suggests athletics are an integral part of school because both are oriented to the future. Both stress the pursuit and attainment of goals as well as providing a supportive attitude toward upward mobility. Hence, goal attainment and upward mobility can be equated with winning. The emphasis on winning in sport now becomes a supportive attitude for winning in life which translates itself as goal attainment and upward mobility (Stevenson, 1975). Athletics, then, are helpful in generating high achievement motivation. This results in an athlete who is prepared in the areas of motivation and commitment to succeed which is an established part of society.

Otto and Alwin (1977) found that athletic participation had a "salutary" effect on aspirations and attainments. Scholastic athletics teach interpersonal skills that are transferable and marketable outside of sports; athletics serve

an allocation function by raising the visibility of participants and giving them a definition of success; sports gives participants interpersonal networks and contacts beneficial in establishing careers (Otto and Alwin,1977). They concluded that participation in high school athletics has an effect on attainment and aspirations.

Snyder (1978) has examined the theme of peer groups and academic achievement in school among athletes and non-athletes. Athletes were more academically oriented because they were likely to be members of the "leading crowd". Athletics as a subculture stresses conformity to conventional norms and standards of behavior and achievement as defined by those in authority, teachers and the coaches. Snyder (1978) says that student athletes were usually more visible hence they are given special academic consideration and more encouragement. This special recognition and prestige for the athlete results in the development of a favorable self-image. Finally, athletics teach an achievement orientation, with emphasis on hard work, persistence, self improvement, competition, etc., which the athlete carries over to academics (Snyder,1978).

For Schafer, the scholastic athlete must conform to authority and standards in the form of a coach. Because the team is a complex organization it requires not only leadership

and guidance, but obedience as well. Schafer (1976) states such slogans as "Live by the code or get out" or "Stay out for sports and stay out of courts", are highly influential upon athletes, something which they come to accept.

1.5 Playing to Win

Theories of socialization and play help to give some basis for how sport indoctrinates those who play and coach, as well as how these attitudes may develop. There are two extreme orientations in sport and athletics as illustrated by the phrases "Not that you won or lost, but how you played the game", and "Winning isn't everything, its the only thing". These two phrases not only sum up sport, but the attitudes people develop both playing and coaching them. Both reflect the ethical orientation which individuals may adopt toward sport.

The role of play in socialization is to provide children an opportunity to experiment with various roles of significant others as well as provide a harmless atmosphere in which to experiment with potentially dangerous psychological and emotional problems. However, it shows that the "Lombardian" ethic is very prevalent and reflects our society as a whole. No where is this more clear than in the prevailing ethos of sport where very few teach any significant game as if winning

doesn't matter, or should be seen as secondary to the activity. Kew (1978) suggests that the emphasis on winning has

increased in direct proportion to the interest and involvement of external factors standing outside the construct 'game' (i.e. commercialism, professionalism, politics, nationalism, etc.).

Faced with these aspects of society, games and sport have lost their playful nature and have become intensely serious instead.

The emphasis on winning, commercialism, and professionalism have quickly become the very basic cultural values in North American society. All children are socialized in these values, however, those children involved in sports may be exposed to them to a greater degree than those who are not. Parents, along with the educational system are the major socializing agents in children's lives regardless of their participation in sport. However, once a child is involved in sports the coach now becomes a possible influential role model, one who may even become more important than the parents. One other possible role model for children, regardless of sports involvement, is the sports hero. The sports hero, like the coach, act as a reinforcer of certain cultural values like teamwork, success, and dedication. By stressing these values, both coach and hero help to perpetuate collective values and affirm social norms.

Obviously, sports is a medium of socialization. It is the purpose of this study to investigate how values are transmitted in sports. There are many values associated with sports and just as many persons who transmit those values. This study will examine the concept of fair play and concentrate on how the associated values are conveyed between persons within a sports milieu. It is hoped that by focusing on one sports concept, fair play, that some insight will be gained into those values which seem most prevalent in sports.

CHAPTER 2: THE STUDY

2.1 Fair Play

There is a vast array of ideas and emotions which accompany play, games, sports, and athletics, foremost among them is the idea of fair play. Fair play and sportsmanship can each be seen as an essential ingredient of the other, if not synonymous. Fair play can be seen as a moral category or as a function of rules in a contest. The first implies that it distinguishes itself as a type of spirit of play full of value-laden concepts; the latter implies that it occurs within the context of the rules, what they spell out in order to allow a contest to continue.

The basic underlying assumption of all the definitions of fair play has been that real world values and morality are transferred in their entirety to the playing field. However, the realm of sport is atypical from the endeavors of everyday life. Huizinga (1955) describes sport as a "world within a world" free of the restraints which characterize everyday life but allow for the transgression of typical moral norms. If this is true, then one should expect a varied ethic from the one at work in the real world. Yet it never ceases to amaze us how educators, spectators, sportswriters, and yes, even coaches act surprised or shocked when something other than a "Christian" ethic is demonstrated. Overtly, we all tend to

give the impression that the morality of sport is identified with that of everyday life or some higher morality, perhaps that of the church. However, on the field, the athlete works from another frame of reference. It may be that the athlete goes to church on Sunday, but this is Saturday. And on Saturday, the name of the game is win at any cost (Slusher,1979).

The definitions of fair play are many. In his analysis of fair play, McIntosh (1979) cites the Declaration of Fair Play issued by the International Council for Sport and Physical Education. He makes the distinction between what is "good" and what is "obligatory". The good and obligatory correspond to what is descriptive and evaluative in fair play. An example of a descriptive statement of what one is obligated to do or not to do in order to play fairly would be that one "show strict, unfailing observance of the written rule" (McIntosh, 1979). The evaluative statement would declare those things which it is good to do, but which one is not obligated to follow. Examples are; modesty in victory, graciousness in defeat, and generosity of outlook which creates warm and lasting human relations (McIntosh,1979).

This illustrates the problems of establishing what is meant by fair play. In his analysis, McIntosh (1979) concludes that in order to determine whether something is fair

or not, one must answer the questions "what should I do?" and "what should he/she do?". To answer these questions he suggests that the distinguishing feature comes from three kinds of "ought" statements;

1. Action X is required in order to conform to the standard which people generally accept (statement of sociological fact)
2. I have a feeling that I ought to do X (statement of psychological fact)
3. I ought to do X (value judgement)

McIntosh (1979) suggests the third statement always implies a moral imperative whereas the other two do not. Thus, he says, "If I say 'I ought to play fair' as a moral judgement I am assenting to the command 'Let me do X'"(McIntosh,1979). Because of these different meanings of "ought", McIntosh stresses it is essential to clarify it's meaning. Both sociological and psychological facts involve the questioning of one form of order or the other. In sports for example, a player may question an order to deliberately harm an opponent or retaliate for a foul. But neither question contains an imperative answer. Only the value judgements tend to coincide with both accepted standards and a persons own feelings.

This idea also reflects how the concept of fair play is socially constructed. The conduct which should govern a players action is a very confusing issue. It is suggested the

task of defining fair play should be up to the governing bodies of sport to write clearly into the rules the right values and right conduct. McIntosh (1979) illustrates the confusion in this area by stating

However, in the present state of the world of sport it is very important, when I say I ought to do this and not that, to ask whether I am making a moral judgement as an imperative, or am saying I ought to do this because everyone would say I ought.

A code of conduct is needed irrespective of what players feel they should do and irrespective of what other players and fans expect them to do.

Sportsmanship can be viewed as a type of moral category. Within this category, fair play is the key ingredient, so much so, that the two terms are almost synonymous. James Keating (1979) suggests sportsmanship is not just a combination of moral qualities comprising a code of specialized behavior; but also as an "attitude, a posture, a manner of interpreting what would otherwise be only a legal code". Generosity and magnanimity are also essential in order to describe the conduct and attitudes which comprise sportsmanship. These values in sport help to establish and maintain a "social guarantee" that the pleasure derived from sport will not be sacrificed for more selfish ends, winning (Keating, 1979).

The point Keating makes helps differentiate sport from athletics. Sport is used as a pleasant diversion, for

amusement and joy. Athletics on the other hand, is a serious endeavor, based on victory as the end of the pursuit. Keating (1979) states that athletics and competition

denoted the struggle of two parties for the same valued object or objective and implies that, to the extent that one of the parties is successful in the struggle, he gains exclusive or predominant possession of that at the expense of his competitor. But the goal of sporting activity, being the mutual enjoyment of the participants, cannot even be understood in terms of exclusive possession by one of the parties. Its simulated atmosphere camouflages what is at bottom a highly cooperative venture. Sport, then, is a cooperative endeavor to maximize pleasure or joy, the immediate pleasure or joy to be found in the activity itself.

In this context then, fair play or sportsmanship becomes a necessary part of sport in order to make the activity fun or pleasurable. It becomes a moral imperative as part of sport. This coincides with McIntosh's (1979) view. However, the statement now becomes "I ought to play fairly" in order to maximize the pleasure of the game for myself and others.

This moral imperative of sport is also raised by Joshiah Royce (1979). He uses the concept of loyalty as the rational solution to moral problems, of which fair play would seem to be one. Loyalty means "a willing and thoroughgoing devotion of the whole active self to a chosen cause or to a chosen system of causes" (Royce, 1979). In sports, loyalty is loyalty to; a) rules; b) teammates and; c) opponents out of respect for his loyalty to his teammates. It is this devotion to loyalty which is the essence of fair play for Royce. It reflects a form of morality or human virtue, in an almost

religious sense of "love thine enemy". In support of this, Royce (1979) states

physical training, in so far as it can be used to give expression to the spirit of fair play, may be an aid towards the highest types of morality; namely, to those which embody that spirit of loyalty to loyalty which is destined we hope, some day to bring to pass the spiritual union of all mankind.

One is expected to adhere to certain values (ie. respect for one's opponent, loyalty, etc.) which in the context of playing the game, define fair play. Sport is an activity with fun and pleasure as the goal, athletics is a serious endeavor with winning as the goal. This definition implies the values of sport are a cooperative way of making the game more pleasurable. Cooperation now becomes part of fair play. On the other hand, competition implies the attainment of a goal, which is part of athletics and winning. Once competition enters the game, fair play becomes secondary to the goal of winning.

This viewpoint presents a polarized, dichotomous picture of competition and cooperation. Both are essential social processes in sport and the idea of fair play. These two concepts are not necessarily the antithesis of one another. Competition can be defined as;

opposition; within a set of rules; for acquisition of the same goal; and the goal cannot be achieved by all. Competition implies evaluation. It is a struggle for

supremacy. Someone succeeds in reaching the goal, while someone else must fail. Someone wins and someone loses (Nelson and Cody 1974).

If competition takes place "within a set of rules" then the definition implies that fair play is an integral part of competition. But when the goal becomes so important that players are willing to do anything to obtain it then competition becomes conflict. Conflict, like competition, involves obtainment of the same goal. However, conflict occurs when there are no rules for obtaining the goal (Nelson and Cody 1974). Simply,

one can do anything to get the desired goal; one can deceive, disrupt, or even destroy the opponent. Competition extended beyond the rules of fairness becomes conflict. It results in "survival of the fittest" (Nelson and Cody 1974).

Cooperation is the opposite of competition. Nelson and Cody (1974) view it as people working towards a common goal in such a way so that they all share in the results. Cooperation is an aspect of fair play. It is essential for teams to achieve their common goals. However, it also occurs within competition, beginning with the basic agreement to play a game, meet at certain times and places, along with accepting common rules. Both in society and sport, competition and cooperation go hand in hand. People compete to make a team, but then cooperate to achieve team goals. Teams cooperate with each other and officials to have a game, but also compete against each other to win. Accordingly, "cooperation is

necessary for really meaningful competition, and in turn, competition fosters meaningful cooperation" (Ulrick,1968). This balance between cooperation and competition helps to prevent conflict or playing outside the rules. This is part of fair play.

However, fair play is also the observance of rules, as an attitude of honesty and truth, along with respect for one's opponent and oneself (Nelson and Cody,1974). Recognizing the emotional aspect of sport, Nelson and Cody (1974) suggest that as competition increases in intensity, cooperation must keep pace. To avoid conflict, paramount consideration must be placed on the rules. They also submit that winning is only valuable when it occurs within the context of the written and unwritten rules of the game (Nelson and Cody 1974).

This leads to what Keating (1979) calls the strange paradox of sportsmanship as applied to athletics. Sportsmanship or a code of fair play asks an athlete locked in a deadly serious and emotionally charged situation, to act as if it is a pleasant and fun activity. The athlete, who has trained and sacrificed for years, dreaming of victory, literally exhausting himself physically and mentally in its pursuit, is now asked to play with fairness, be modest in victory and gracious in defeat.

The ultimate expression of this is professional sports where too often defeat spells unemployment for an athlete. It becomes easy to see how athletes can regard opponents, not as cooperative individuals trying to make a competition more pleasurable for both sides, but as those who would seek to deprive the athlete of their livelihood. In this way, it is apparent how fair play becomes secondary to winning (Keating 1979). It is in this case where the sports field takes on an almost war-like environment.

Two more aspects of fair play must be examined. One is the assumption that all those values associated with fair play are the values which have been transposed from the real world or social world to the world of sport. The second is the acknowledgment of unwritten rules. This suggests that there are both implicit and explicit rules which operate during the course of a game which could impact upon a definition of fair play.

Slusher (1979) argues that man's morality is a consequence of the existing social order, alter the order and you possibly alter the reality. Hence, moving from the real world to the athletic field is to move from one moral order to another. Bredemeier (1988) has found that sports involvement may have implications for the development of children's morality in that the social interactions fostered by some

sports may impede moral growth. Research by herself and Shields (1984) also suggests that there is a divergence between life and sport moral reasoning. They suggest that a lower level of sport moral reasoning may be due to "consensually legitimated and contextually limited moral regression, a temporary deviation from typical patterns of processing information". Bredemeier (1994) confirmed this with further research and also showed that age impacts upon these differences. She suggests that as children moved from unstructured play to structured organized sport, with its emphasis on winning, the sports morality subordinates the life morality.

If the realm of sport is atypical from the endeavor of everyday life, then an ethic of fair play based on everyday life is not the answer. There must be an acknowledgment that there are unwritten rules which operate during the course of an athletic contest. These implicit rules, along with the explicit rules help form the boundaries in which the contest will be played.

Overtly, the impression we give to sport is not the same as the covert one most of us condone. The fact that there are unwritten rules which operate during the course of athletic contests shows this ethic exists. Some of these rules seem to step across or supersede the written rules of the game. Some

purists, would call these rules cheating, those involved in the game would say otherwise. They would argue that both the implicit rules, along with the explicit ones define the boundaries of the game and help to make it better.

Cheating, like fair play has many interpretations.

Guenter Lueschen (1976) states

Cheating in sport is the act in which the manifestly or latently agreed upon conditions for winning such a contest are changed in favor of one side. As a result, the principle of equality of chance beyond differences in skill and strategy is violated. Typically changes occur not on the levels of goals, but on that of means.

This suggests that when one breaks both implicit and explicit rules of a game one is cheating. There are all sorts of actions players can use to put off an opponent during a game which are not, in themselves, illegal. Leaman (1988) states,

If such behavior is indeed legal, must we say that A is cheating because he is breaking one of the 'latently agreed upon conditions for winning such a contest'?

It is argued that this player is not playing fairly since the sorts of skills and strategy the individual is employing are not those which are conducive to the notions of the game.

Randolf Feezell (1988) tackles this question of whether or not violation of unwritten rules of a game is cheating. By describing several paradigm cases of cheating he shows it is

the intention of the player, coaches or interested persons to gain unfair advantage by altering certain conditions of the game. Usually, the deception itself is central to the rules of the game, defining such things as who can play, how to keep score or what kinds of equipment can be used. These all interfere with the integrity of the game and would constitute cheating. Feezell (1988) says,

So it's also appropriate to conclude that the central meaning of cheating in sports disallows the cheater from winning since he or she has violated the most basic elements that are constitutive of the game in question.

This develops the "prescriptive atmosphere" of sport which both prescribes and proscribes acceptable means in which the goals of the game may be achieved.

It defines an atmosphere of competitive expectations in which the participants may gain a competitive advantage, and perhaps win, only in the context of an underlying equality expressed in the rules (Feezell, 1988).

The notion of cheating within the prescriptive atmosphere of sport is based on the assumption that when engaging in a sport the participants have agreed to play in a specific and delimited way. The sport of baseball illustrates the power of prescriptive rules of sport.

Baseball's prescriptive side includes such actions as a good, aggressive base runner going out of the base path to break up double plays, stealing signs, as well as using the most artful techniques of making the baseball do unexpected

things (Feezell,1988). These actions are all part of the sanctioned "history" and "tradition" of the game. This tradition also generates the expectation that one's opponent will use the same techniques to gain an advantage to win. It could be argued that there is nothing unfair about this. To learn the sport, and understand the strategies and how to deal with them is only to know the game.

It has been suggested that to learn a sport, understand it's strategies, and take advantage of them is only to know the game. Hughes and Coakley (1991) state that this viewpoint may indicate that a form of positive deviance exists among athletes. The cause of this deviance is an overconformity to what they call the "sport ethic". This sport ethic emphasizes sacrifice for "The Game". The guiding behaviors of this ethic in sports participation are seeking distinction, taking risks, and challenging limits. Hughes and Coakley (1991) point out that these behaviors are generally viewed as positive norms, however, they argue that it is the ethic which

becomes the vehicle for transforming behaviors that conform to these positive norms into deviant behaviors that are prohibited and negatively sanctioned within society and within sports organizations themselves.

Briefly, Hughes and Coakley (1991) suggest that as a society, we support all those norms which are inherent in sport. Some of those norms are that athletes must make

sacrifices for their sport, athletes must play with injuries and when they do they are seen as courageous. Other norms are the need to be dedicated to goals, to keep working until the goals are met, and to define adversity as a challenge. These are all norms which function in society both in and outside of sports. Hughes and Coakley (1991) state that in this case the deviance does not result in rejection of these norms but to an overconformity to the value system, including both the goals and means.

The overconformity to goals and means may not be seen by the athlete as deviant but seen as confirming their identity as an athlete and a member of a select sports group or team. Hughes and Coakley (1991) hypothesize that an athlete's vulnerability to group demands along with the desire to reaffirm group membership makes the athlete susceptible to positive deviance through overconformity. Further to this notion, they (Hughes and Coakley, 1991) suggest that it may be one of the qualities of a great coach to be able to exploit this penchant toward overconformity in their athletes.

Other studies would seem to support Hughes and Coakley's position. Shields, Bredemeier, Gardner, and Bostrom (1995) examined how a sport team's collective norms influenced behavior. They found that players would engage in unfair tactics if they believed that their teammates would play

unfairly. As well they found that the level of team cohesion influenced an individual's belief that winning was to be prioritized over fair play. Further to this, Shields, Bredemeier, Gardner, and Bostrom (1995) found a positive relationship between playing on a winning team and the expectations of cheating and aggression suggesting that those who play to win do win more often.

Ikuya Sato (1988) focused on a more general, informal context than sport but he used concepts which are very similar to those used by Hughes and Coakley, as well as Shields, Bredemeier, Gardner, and Bostrom. Sato examined the active pursuits of youths or more specifically youth gangs in Japan. Briefly, he found that there were three aspects of group delinquency; collective encouragement, intense involvement, and a challenge to reach the limit. Hence, interaction among peers can lead to an excessive commitment to action. It is this action, that is used to reconfirm group membership or attachment to peers, which often pushes the limits or takes extreme forms. When dealing with group membership and overconformity it is easy to see how the lines between fair play and cheating become blurred.

There are those who suggest that no matter what the "ethos" of the game, once the rules have been violated that is cheating. Warren Fraleigh (1988) says there are three kinds

of rules and rule violations. First, rules function to tell participants what they must do and what they are allowed to do. They define the contest and the prescribed skills and tactics of the contest. Second, they identify the goal at which the skills and tactics are aimed. Third, rules tell players what actions are prohibited during the course of a game. When these three functions work together, they form the basis for a game or contest.

Fraleigh (1988) also recognizes three rule violations which take place. The most common violation is the one which is inadvertent or unintentional. These violations may disrupt a game, but do not destroy the mutually agreed upon rules. The second violation is one which is done intentionally to gain advantage while not getting caught. The third rules violation is when a participant purposely breaks a rule to achieve what otherwise could not be done, but also willingly accepts the penalty. For athletes, this is known as the "good foul". This concept, however, can have an impact upon a definition of fair play.

Fraleigh (1988) argues that

Cheating destroys the good sports contest because 'competing, winning, and losing in athletics are intelligible only within the framework or rules which define a specific competitive sport; a person may cheat at a game or compete at it, but it is logically impossible for him to do both. To cheat is to cease to compete.

However, it could be argued that games are not only played within a given set of rules, they are also played within a framework of social practices and priorities, and violations must be assessed within this framework to determine whether cheating has occurred.

The interference of the intended purpose of a game by breaking the rules intentionally could be considered an unethical act. Unethical acts in athletics are usually referred to as unsportsmanlike. If an act is unsportsmanlike, it certainly falls outside the bounds of what has thus far been designated as fair play. Kathleen Pearson (1988) says of the "good" foul, "a player who deliberately breaks the rules of that game is deliberately no longer playing that game".

Does cheating destroys the game's integrity within the definition of fair play? The definition of a game is contained within its rules. If there were no rules for that game, obviously, there would be no game. Because the rules of the game contain penalties for fouling, the deliberate foul is definitely outside the rules of the game. Pearson (1988) sums this position up nicely when she says,

It violates the ludic spirit, it treats the process of playing as mere instrument in the pursuit of the win, and it reflects a view of one's competitor as both enemy and object rather than a colleague in noble contest. All of these pleas, however, fall short of the ultimate and most damaging testimony; deliberate betrayal of the rules destroys the vital frame of agreement which makes sport possible.

The literature has focused on two primary themes; the respect for ones opponent; and, the respect for the rules of the game, contest, or sport that the individual or team may be participating in. For the purposes of this research the formal definition will be the one which is emphasized by the Fair Play philosophy "respect for the rules, the officials, and the opponents. In addition to providing participants with an equal opportunity to participate" (Commission for Fair Play, 1989). Further to this definition, it should be noted that the term "respect for the rules" delineates a firm adherence to the proscribed rules of sport and not the prescribed rules which so often take precedent.

2.2 Proposed Hypotheses

The Commission for Fair Play distributes copies of an educational resource manual, "Fair Play for Kids", to elementary schools in Canada. The manual claims to be based on the processes for developing moral reasoning and covers a variety of curriculum areas, with the emphasis on physical education. "Fair Play for Kids" is divided into a variety of sections, each consisting of a number of exercises and projects which deal with the topic. The underlying theme is that fair play can be taught to children.

The manual advances a number of propositions for the

teaching of fair play. The first proposition states that "active social interaction is a basic element of moral growth" (Fair Play for Kids Resource Manual, 1990). The manual argues that moral decisions are achieved through dialogue where individuals work together to achieve consensus about respective rights and responsibilities.

The manual also emphasizes that moral reasoning can be taught by first helping children to recognize moral conflicts and dilemmas as well as the solutions to them. Secondly, it suggests that these dilemmas may be solved by encouraging children to move beyond an egocentric level of moral reasoning by taking the role of others. Hence, the processes used for teaching moral reasoning are recognizing and resolving moral conflicts along with helping children to learn to change roles and perspectives. It is with these processes in mind that the Fair Play program has been designed as a curriculum-based approach for educators to instill a fair play attitude in their students. This thesis will examine some of the socialization processes occurring in the schools. More specifically, it studies how the concept of fair play is learned by the students.

Since the schools socialize children mostly through classroom learning, I shall study the impact of the "Fair Play" curriculum to socialize individuals into a "fair play"

attitude. Do the support materials, along with the appropriate lectures and activities socialize individuals toward a "fair play" attitude? Or do an individual's sporting experiences or their significant others have a greater impact upon their socialization toward a "fair play" attitude?

The main thesis was subdivided into three component hypotheses: (a) that "Fair Play" lectures and activities (the curriculum) have an impact upon an individuals socialization toward a fair play attitude; (b) that an individual's significant others have an impact upon an individuals socialization toward a fair play attitude; and (c) that an individual's sporting experiences have an impact upon their socialization toward a fair play attitude.

The first component hypothesis suggests that the support materials and techniques offered in the "Fair Play for Kids" manual do have an impact upon the socialization of the individual toward an attitude of fair play. The manual suggests that the teacher should create opportunities for cognitive conflict and stimulate social perspective. In this way the individual's moral development is guided by the curriculum insofar as a fair play attitude is concerned.

The second component hypothesis suggests that an individual's significant others will influence that

individual's fair play attitudes insofar as the individual's perceptions of those attitudes impact upon his/her socialization toward or away from a fair play attitude. The significant others are those individuals who have some influence over an individual's fair play attitude in sport; parents, physical education teachers, friends, teammates, and coaches. This second hypothesis postulates that the socialization of an individual's attitudes is dependent on the perceived attitudes and influence of their significant others.

The third component hypothesis is that the Fair Play attitude of an individual is impacted by the recreational or competitive nature of the sports they choose to participate in. This suggests that an attitude of fair play may occur in games or sporting situations which are viewed as recreational by the participants. Once the game or sport becomes competitive the attitude is suspended or constrained in favor of one which promotes self or team gains, to the relative neglect of an opponents needs or interests. Hence, this would suggest that those who are primarily involved in competitive sport will have less of a fair play attitude than those who are primarily involved in recreational sport.

2.3 The Research Instrument

To study these questions, I developed a questionnaire

with forty-two items (see Appendix B). The survey consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions about attitudes toward sport and physical participation. The questionnaire was divided into five sections and asked for general information about the respondent, participation in physical activities, attitudes towards physical activity, attitudes toward coaches, and reaction towards sports scenarios. The questionnaire was pretested on 20 respondents to discover any major flaws that may have been in the survey. The pretest resulted in a few minor changes to the format of the survey as well as some changes in the wording of certain questions. The questions took approximately twenty-five minutes to complete. The researcher was present to answer any questions which the respondents may have had concerning the survey.

A. The Fair Play Attitude

A fair play attitude is one which exhibits "respect for the rules, the officials, and the opponents. In addition to providing participants with an equal opportunity to participate". In order to establish participant fair play attitude scores the Webb Professionalization Scale was used in the study.

The Webb Professionalization Scale (Webb 1969:166) and index were developed for a study carried out in the midwestern

United States. The study employed a group administered questionnaire and was given to a group of children enrolled in classes ranging from grades three to twelve. The reliability of the scale was found to be consistently around the .90 level (Maloney and Petrie, 1972).

The Webb scale uses forced rank ordering which results in six different combinations of answers. These six combinations provide a range for indicating the strength of a significant others orientation toward either a fair play attitude, an attitude which encourages skill, or a play to win attitude. A play orientation is determined by a ranking score of 1 or 2, a skill orientation by a ranking of 3 or 4, and a win orientation by a ranking of 5 or 6. The scale uses a forced rank ordering which results in six different combinations of answers. The orientation combinations are as follows:

Table 2.1
Webb Professionalization Scale
Table of Combinations

Fair Play Orientation			Play to Win Orientation		
1	2	3	4	5	6
fair	fair	play	play	beat	beat
play	beat	fair	beat	fair	play
beat	play	beat	fair	play	fair

It should be noted that the Webb Scale has been criticized for being both ambiguous and for the use of

rankings which may reveal the relative importance of winning, fair play, and skill instead of their actual importance (Knoppers, Zuidema, and Meyer, 1989). In order to support this argument Knoppers, Zuidema, and Meyer compared the Webb scale to their own Game Orientation Scale. The latter contains descriptions of both recreational and competitive sports scenarios where respondents use a Likert scale to indicate the degrees of importance they give to winning, skill, fun, and fair play. Not surprisingly, they found that the Webb Scale lacked validity and was unidimensional whereas their Game Orientation Scale was not.

However, further to this criticism, Lacy and Greer (1992) investigated the relative merits of both scales. They did agree that the Webb Scale did lack the element of context specificity but the problem was not insurmountable. As well they contend that data have failed to show that Webb's forced measurement of relative values is in any way artificial. They also suggest that Knopper's (1989) Game Orientation Scale raises just as many validity questions as have been raised about the Webb Scale.

Five questions (questions 31-34, 23) are used to determine the respondent's attitude toward fair play. The five questions were all based on the Webb Professionalization Scale. However, to compensate for the Webb Scale's lack of

context specificity, the study borrowed from the Game Orientation Scale and made four of the questions sports scenarios. Questions thirty-one to thirty-four took the form of a sports scenario. Each scenario presented a sports participation situation at the end of which respondents were asked to rank, in order of importance from one to three, three statements. These statements indicated a respondent's preference for a fair play, competitive, or a play to win attitude. The forced ranking of the three statements is then used to determine the respondents priority. Low scores (1 or 2) were indicative of a fair play orientation, medium scores (3 or 4) indicated an orientation toward skill, while high scores (5 or 6) were indicative of a play to win orientation.

The fifth question (question 23) asked the respondent when playing a game if they tried to beat the other player or team, tried to play the game fairly, or if they tried to play as well as they could. This "self assessment" of a real situation as opposed to hypothetical ones would also be an indicator of the respondents fair play attitude. The five questions were then added together and averaged to provide a Fair Play attitude score for each respondent.

Question seventeen was used to establish the reliability of the fair play attitude score (see Appendix B). This question involved a total of eleven questions (a to k). The

questions were set to a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree, agree, disagree, to strongly disagree, a don't know response is also included. Six questions (d, f, h, i, j, k) asked the respondent's attitude toward various aspects of the fair play philosophy. Of the six questions three (d, h, i) asked respondents a variation of the three Webb scale forced ranking questions. The other three questions (f, j, k) also asked about fair play concepts that the Webb scale does not deal with. It was felt that by also measuring fair play attitude on a Likert scale along the lines of Knoppers (1989) Game Orientation Scale would provide an independent measure to check the Webb scale against.

Respondents were not told that the survey was exploring fair play attitudes and the questions dealing with the subject were asked in matter of fact statements in order to not prejudice respondent's answers. The results of the six questions were added together and averaged to produce one score labelled the attitude two score.

To establish the reliability of the fair play attitude scores the "parallel-forms" technique (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1987) was used. This technique uses two independent measures of the same variable, the fair play attitude and question seventeen, and then correlates the two measures to obtain an estimate of reliability. Correlation analysis is

used to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables. Correlation analysis and a general linear models procedure were done in order to correlate the two measures to obtain an estimate of reliability.

To briefly sum up this technique there are two results which should be noted. First, in order to arrive at a reliability score of .90 for the Webb Professionalization Scale, the Webb study had the luxury of being able to test and then retest the scale of measurement. This study did not have such a luxury so it relied upon the "parallel-forms" technique (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1987). This technique uses two independent measures of the same variable and then correlates the two measures, in this case fair play attitude and the secondary attitude indicator, to obtain an estimate of reliability.

The second result of which to take note is the study estimate of reliability of .64 of the fair play attitude. This correlation coefficient shows there is a strong positive correlation between the two measures. High scores in one measure will tend to be associated with high scores in the other and vice versa. With the parallel-forms technique the problem lies in determining whether the two instruments used to measure are parallel. The evaluation of the content of each measurement is made on a judgmental basis. Hence, while

the correlation of .64 is high it is not as high as what has been reported by Webb (1969). However, it is felt that a fair amount of confidence may be placed in this as a measure of respondent attitudes though some caution will be exercised in terms of interpreting the results.

B. Curriculum on Fair Play Attitudes

Hypothesis one examined the impact of the Fair Play curriculum upon respondent's Fair Play Attitudes. To this end the variables which were examined were; the number of years a respondent had been taught the Fair Play course; whether respondents were able to give specific Fair Play ideals taught in the course; and what other items and/or concepts respondents remembered from the classes.

The first hypothesis suggests that the support materials and techniques offered for teaching Fair Play have an impact upon an individual's attitude toward playing fairly. In order to find out if an individual had been exposed to a Fair Play curriculum respondents were asked six specific questions about Fair Play (questions 35-40). Question thirty-eight asked the grades in which respondents had been taught the Fair Play program. The answer would indicate the amount of exposure to the program. The greater the amount of exposure should lead to a greater knowledge of the subject.

Questions thirty-nine and forty attempted to establish the extent of the respondents knowledge of the program. Respondents were asked in question thirty-nine to give the five main concepts of fair play and what they remembered most about the classes on the subject. A respondents ability to provide the answer would indicate that the respondent knew something of fair play. The more correct answers given would then be indicative of a greater knowledge of the subject. This question could be an indicator of the impact of the lectures/activities upon students.

Question forty asked respondents to answer with any concept which pertained to the fair play classes. Any answer which was associated with the classes was accepted, any answer which was not was coded as a "don't know". The answers received would be indicative of the extent of knowledge on the subject and could be compared to whether the respondent had been exposed to the concepts. The answers given by respondents would then be compared to those questions used to determine respondents fair play attitudes. In this way any correlation between the amount of knowledge of Fair Play and a corresponding fair play attitude might be established.

C. Significant Others

Hypothesis two examined the impact of respondent

significant others upon their Fair Play Attitude. This hypothesis posits that an individual's significant others have an impact upon an individual's socialization toward a fair play attitude. The significant others are those individuals who have the greatest influence over an individual's participation in sport. The variables which were examined were the perception a respondent had of how their mother, father, friends, teammates, physical education teachers, and coaches encouraged them to play when participating in sports. The research also placed more emphasis on examining the role of the coach. To this end the coach, as a significant other, was explored independently from the others.

In order to establish the basic influence several of these significant others have on the respondent to play fairly six questions (18-23) were asked. Each question corresponded to a specific significant other, question eighteen to a respondent's physical education teacher, nineteen to their father, twenty to their friends, twenty-one to their mother, and twenty-two to their teammates. Question twenty-three asked respondents about themselves. The questions were used to determine if the influence of these significant others encouraged the respondent to beat the other player or team, to play the game fairly, or to play the game as well as they could. The forced rank ordering of the answers, based on the Webb Professionalization Scale (Webb 1969:166), would then

help determine the influence of each specific significant other. These orientation combinations appeared earlier in Table 2.1.

The greatest interaction in sport occurs between the individual and their coach. Thus, coaching styles and differences in coaches should have an effect upon an individual's fair play attitudes. This study uses two polarized views of coaching styles or approaches. The first is the "Lombardian" coaching style which teaches an attitude of winning is everything, and the activity itself is secondary to the outcome. The second style would reflect the Fair Play approach which believes that games and sport should be enjoyed as pure fun, for the love of physical activity and the skills involved. The belief is that the socialization of an individual's attitudes is dependent on their interaction with and perception of their significant others. This socialization process occurs between individuals and their coaches during the course of all interaction between the two. Hence, if a coach has a "Lombardian" approach to a sport it would follow that there is a good chance that those individuals playing on that team may adopt such an attitude. The same could be said for the Fair Play attitude as well.

In order to explore the coach/player relationship three primary questions were asked of respondents (questions

24,27,28). Question twenty-four determined whether or not each respondent had a coach for any activity which they participated in. Question twenty-seven tried to determine the strength of the athlete/coach relationship. Respondents were asked if they respected their coach, liked their coach, disliked their coach, or had no respect for their coach. These items were placed on a descending scale of four to one, four indicating respect, three indicating like, two indicating dislike, and one indicating no respect. The strength of the relationship is then indicated by the respondent's choice. Respondents were asked this for all their athletic coaches up to a maximum of three.

Respondents were also asked to rate their coaches perceived attitudes on a five-point scale where one was "not at all important" and five was "very important". The attitudes the respondents were asked to rate were how important it was to the coach that his/her players beat the other player or team, to play the game fairly, and to play as well as they could. Depending on the strength of the athlete/coach relationship, along with the athletes perceptions of their coaches attitudes, and athletes fair play attitudes it was felt that some correlation may be found as to effects of this significant other.

The survey examined the athlete/coach relationship in

more depth than those relationships with the remaining significant others for one reason: to consider the relationship between coach and athlete as the most influential one in sport. Hence, it was felt that more depth was needed from those questions which dealt with this relationship. While questions twenty-eight to thirty asked for essentially the same information as eighteen to twenty-three, the questions also examined how important it was to the coach to win, play fairly, or to have fun. By using this information along with question twenty-seven, the athletes feelings toward their coach, it was hoped some correlation might be established between an athlete's feelings for a coach, the athletes fair play attitude, and the perceived fair play attitude of the coach.

The last significant other who may have had an effect upon respondent's attitudes toward sport is the sports hero. Respondents were asked two questions (3,4). Question three asked respondents if they had a hero and who it was, while question four asked why that person was their hero. It was hoped that if the hero was a role model/significant other respondents would answer as to why that person was theirs. The reasons given would provide some understanding as to how sports heroes may influence young athletes.

D. Sports Participation

The third component hypothesis states that the Fair Play attitude of an individual is impacted by the recreational or competitive nature of the sports they choose to participate in. This suggests that an attitude of fair play may occur in games or sporting situations which are viewed as recreational by the participants. It also suggests that once the game or sport becomes competitive the attitude of fair play may be suspended or constrained in favor of one which promotes self or team gains, to the relative neglect of an opponents needs or interests. Hence, this would propose that those who are primarily involved in competitive sport will have less of a sense of fair play that those primarily involved in recreational sport. In exploring this hypothesis the variables were; if a respondent participated in sports; the amount of time spent participating; and the level of competition.

In order to determine the competitive nature of sporting activities respondents were asked to describe their participation habits in questions five to sixteen. Respondents were asked in question nine if they engaged in team or individual sports, and in question ten if the sports they engaged in most often were recreational, casual, or competitive. Question twelve asked how often during the week

they participated in physical activities, while question fourteen asked how many years they had been doing their favorite activities. Question sixteen asked why they chose to do their favorite activities. The indicators for the majority of these questions determined whether or not a respondent did one thing over another. By examining the answers, one can then determine the extent to which respondents could be seen as competitive athletes or recreational athletes. The respondent fair play attitudes could then be measured against the level of competitiveness of a respondent's physical activities for any correlation.

2.4 Data Collection

My original intent was to test the three hypotheses in a variety of grades and among different age groups. However, a project of this magnitude would have been too large and time consuming. Consequently the project was scaled down.

A research proposal application form was submitted to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 on February 28, 1992. The research proposal requested access to three Winnipeg high schools and a student sample size of approximately 180 students. The original three schools requested were Kelvin, Gordon Bell, and St. John's High Schools. These schools were chosen because Kelvin High School was representative of a

"middle class" area; Gordon Bell High School was representative of the core area; and St. John's High School was representative of an area with a strong working class background.

In May 1992, the school board granted access to only two high schools, St. John's High School, which had been in the original proposal, and Grant Park High School. St. John's was located in the "working class" area, while Grant Park was in a "middle class" area.

The school division indicated that the sample could be drawn from two high schools which represented a wide diversity of social backgrounds among the student population. Access to the student populations however, was limited by the respective school principals and their choice of teachers whom they felt had the most accommodating schedule and who would have a basic understanding of the fair play program. These choices dramatically affected the availability and size of classes available for research.

In March of 1993 the first set of students surveyed from the sample were from St. John's High School in Winnipeg's north end. The survey was administered to three classes of grade 10 students and upon final count the number of surveys returned was 111. The second set of students from the sample

were from Grant Park High School in Winnipeg's south end. The survey was administered to three classes of grade 10 students of which all 27 students responded to the questionnaire. The small classes at Grant Park were the only ones made available to survey for the research.

The students surveyed were given the option not to participate if they felt for any reason they should not. The final sample size for the survey was 138 students (n=138), and all those chosen completed the survey. This response represented a survey completion rate of 100 percent. In view of the limitations imposed upon selection of the sample it should be noted that the sample size of 138 students has a 90 percent degree of confidence with a desired accuracy of plus/minus 7 percent (Jones 64, 1971). The composition of the sample is shown in Table 2.2.

TABLE 2.2

Composition of the Sample by School and Sex

School	Male	Female	Students
Grant Park	19	8	27
St. John's	65	46	111
Total	84	54	138

2.5 Preparing the Data for Analysis

Once the completed surveys were received they were then coded. For the close-ended questions the answer code which had already been developed were used. The answers for the open-ended questions were examined. A list was made of all answers for each of the open-ended questions, those answers which were similar were collapsed into one category. Once the coding for all the open-ended questions was completed, the code book was completed and coding of the surveys began. For the complete code book please see Appendix C.

Each question was coded according to the scale which was in place for that question. Questions which received no response were coded as '0', '00', or 'NR', and those questions which were deemed not applicable to a respondent due to question ordering on the survey were coded '9', '99', or 'NA'. The no response and not applicable coding was dependent upon the indicator scale used for each question. Once all surveys were coded, the data was then entered into a file containing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) for analysis.

To insure that all data was correctly entered, the complete data set showing missing values for each question and each specific respondent was printed. This allowed the data to be corrected to insure the data analysis would not be

affected by incorrectly entered codes. Once the errors were corrected a frequency distribution was run for all questions in order to get a preliminary idea and feel for the data. The frequency distribution contained a break down of all responses to each question and presented it in the form of frequency, percent, cumulative frequency, and cumulative percent. The data was also run for the means and standard deviations for all questions.

The next step was to take those questions which contained "don't know", "not applicable", and "no response" answers and treat those cases as missing values. Only those questions in which those responses did not impact on specific attitudes were done. Those questions in which "don't know" was considered a legitimate answer were not treated as missing cases. A frequency distribution was run which gave the results for each question as well as the number of missing values for each question.

These frequencies were further divided into male/female to examine any gender differences in the responses. The mean and standard deviation was also run on the same questions with a similar male/female breakdown. In terms of data analysis these breakdowns provide a positive starting point for comparisons among specific groups. For those questions that used the forced rankings, and the four or five-point scales,

comparisons of specific means between males and females could be made, as well as with each group to the overall sample.

2.6 Testing the Three Hypotheses

The examination of the dependent variable of Fair Play attitude and its relationship with the three hypotheses was undertaken in a number of steps. The dependent variable and the three independent variables were analyzed using regression analysis. The General Linear Models procedure in Statistical Analysis System (SAS) estimates and tests hypothesis about linear models. A regression procedure is used to study the relationship between variables to learn if one variable can be expressed in terms of another, or to predict one or more variables's values from another's values. This type of analysis is used to account for changes in the dependent variable. What made this the most appropriate form of analysis is this study has three component hypotheses or independent variables. Hence, if a single independent variable fails to account for most of the change in the dependent variable, this type of analysis lets one examine the impact of two or more independent variables.

First, the SAS General Linear Models or regression procedure was used to examine the relationship between the three independent variables and the dependent variable in the

three hypotheses. Next, the same procedure was repeated controlling for sex to find out if there were any significant differences between the male and female respondents. The individual r-squared values for each independent variable in the overall model will reveal the contribution each made to the overall model.

A. Testing Hypothesis 1: Impact of Curriculum on Fair Play Attitude

Regression will be used to establish if there is a relationship between the dependent variable of Fair Play attitude and the independent variable, the teaching of fair play in schools. The analysis will control for sex to see if the curriculum produces any significant differences between male and female respondents. The analysis will also examine the individual r-square values for each variable related to the teaching of fair play (ie. whether respondents have received the Fair Play course, how many grades in which they were taught the course, and if they remember any of the concepts or ideals which were taught in the course) in order to determine the influence each one has within the independent variable of curriculum.

B. Testing of Hypothesis 2: Impact of Significant Others upon Fair Play Attitude

In order to establish the basic influence of a

respondent's significant others on the dependent variable of Fair Play Attitude a general linear models procedure will be run. This regression procedure will produce an r-value which will help establish the strength of the relationship between respondent Fair Play attitudes and all of their significant others. The procedure will also be done controlling for sex to examine for any significant differences between male and female respondents.

Further analysis will be done to establish the individual influence each significant other may have on respondent Fair Play Attitude. An examination of all perceived significant other Webb scale scores will be done which will allow for a ranking of each significant other according to their influence on respondents. Then a comparison of mean respondent Fair Play Attitude scores to those of mean significant other Webb scale scores will be done.

Correlation analysis will also be used to compare the perceived encouragement from significant others to respondent Fair Play Attitudes in order to see if any relationship does exist. This analysis will also be done controlling for sex. A General Linear Models procedure will be used to further establish any relationships between respondent Fair Play Attitudes and those attitudes respondents perceived of their significant others. The regression analysis will look at the

individual contribution each significant other makes to the overall influence of this model as well as the influence each has within the male and female samples.

Since the literature suggests that coaches have a significant influence on one's attitudes on fair play, their influence are examined separately. Not all respondents participate in sports which have coaches. Only those respondents who have coaches are included in the analysis. First correlation analysis is used to establish if there is any relationship between respondent Fair Play Attitudes and those they perceive of their coaches.

To determine the influence of the coach within the overall model of significant others a comparison of all common respondent significant others will be done between those respondents who have coaches and those who do not. It is hoped that this will help establish the magnitude of the player/coach relationship. Multiple regression will be used to show if there is an increase or decrease in r-values when coaches are included with all significant others.

The research will also try to examine how the coaches' influence affects player/coach relationship. Respondents were asked how they felt about their coaches, if they respected, liked, disliked, or had no respect for each of the coaches

they listed. A comparison will be made between the Fair Play attitude scores of those respondents who have a positive view of their coach with those respondents who have a negative view of their coach.

The influence of the sports hero will then be examined for this hypothesis which is that of the sports hero and these results will also be controlled for sex in order to see if there are any significant differences between male and female respondents.

C. Testing of Hypothesis 3: Impact of Sports Participation upon Fair Play Attitude

The third hypothesis examines the impact of an individual's sporting experiences on their Fair Play Attitude. Regression analysis will be used. Again, the procedure will be run on the entire sample and then again controlling for sex. To investigate this model further it will be broken down into incremental r-values for the specific variables of level of competition, respondent participation in sports, and amount of participation per month. This will be done to examine the specific influence of each. An analysis of each variable will be done for sample and again for the male and female samples.

CHAPTER 3: DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 FAIR PLAY ATTITUDE

Of the 138 respondents 134 answered all the necessary questions needed to determine a respondent's fair play attitude score. To establish the reliability of the respondent's scores several secondary questions pertaining to fair play were used to confirm the accuracy of the fair play attitude scores. These secondary questions measured fair play attitude using questions which determined a respondents feelings toward various concepts of fair play. The questions which were used were 17D, 17F, 17H, 17I, 17J, and 17K. These additional questions provide a secondary indicator for a fair play attitude. This study relied upon the "parallel-forms" technique (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1987) to determine confidence in the reliability of the questions used to establish overall Fair Play Attitude. This technique uses two independent measures of the same variable and then correlates the two measures, in this case Fair Play Attitude and the secondary attitude indicator, to obtain an estimate of reliability.

The correlation analysis between the dependent variable, Fair Play Attitude, and the secondary attitude indicator produced a value of 0.614 for the sample. When sex was controlled for, the female sample had a correlation value of

0.563 while the male sample had a correlation value of 0.648.

The Fair Play Attitude scale in this study has a reliability of 0.62 of the Fair Play Attitude. The problem with the parallel-forms technique lies in determining whether the two instruments used to measure are parallel. The evaluation of the content of each measurement is made on a judgmental basis. Hence, while the correlation of 0.62 is fairly high it is not as high as what has been reported by Webb (1969). However, it is still felt that a fair amount of confidence may be placed in this as a measure of respondent attitudes though some caution will be exercised in terms of interpreting the results.

The mean Fair Play Attitude score for the sample was 3.67 out of a maximum of 6 (minimum of 1). The mean Fair Play Attitude score for the male sample was 3.90 and the female sample had a mean Fair Play Attitude score of 3.35.

3.2 OVERALL MODEL

Multiple regression was used to test the effect of all the variables in the hypothesis on the dependent variable of respondent Fair Play Attitude scores. The result for the General Linear Models (GLM) test provided an r-square value of 0.397 for the sample which was significant. This suggests that about 40% of the variation in the respondent attitudes

can be explained using all the questions entered as independent variables.

When the overall model was controlled for by sex the results remained consistent. The female sample had an r-square value of 0.355, this coefficient was significant suggesting that 35% of the variation in female attitudes can be explained using all the questions. The male sample, on the other hand, produced an r-square value of 0.489 which was also statistically significant. The r-square value of 0.489 suggests that almost 50% of the variation in male attitudes can be explained using all the questions entered as independent variables.

These results also suggest that exposure to the Fair Play curriculum, their significant others, along with their sporting experiences may have some impact upon respondent fair play attitudes. It also appears that these three variables have a greater impact on male respondents than they do on female respondents.

At this point it should be made clear that for this study, the research has focused on the differences between the male and the female samples. It was the analysis of male/female differences which produced the most significant results from the study. These differences may also allow

some insight into the different ways males and females are treated within the sporting milieu. This is not meant to discount the results which were produced for the total sample which will also be discussed.

3.3 HYPOTHESIS 1: The Impact of Curriculum on Fair Play Attitude.

Hypothesis one was to determine whether or not the Fair Play curriculum had an impact upon the attitudes of children. To this end several questions were asked on the survey to determine the extent of a child's exposure to the curriculum and whether or not the curriculum may have had an impact upon the child. The three main questions in this section examined years of Fair Play course experience, respondent knowledge about specific items of the course, and general respondent knowledge about the course.

In order to determine if any relationship existed at all between respondent Fair Play attitude and exposure to curriculum a General Linear Models (GLM) procedure was run. The procedure produced a r-square value for the sample of 0.002 at a 0.05 level of significance. This suggests that there is a relationship between the dependent variable of attitude and the independent variable of curriculum. However, in spite of this significance, the result is so small that practically speaking it is of no importance. Controlling for

sex produced no different results between the two variables.

A brief examination of the survey questions devoted to this hypothesis show that 51% of respondents had received some form of the Fair Play course. While 17% of respondents had not had the course, 30% did not know if they'd had the course. Those respondents who had received the course had been taught in at least one grade level with 18% having received it in seven successive grades.

However, having received the course was no guarantee that a respondent learned anything about the concepts related to fair play. Of the respondents who answered the survey only 24% of the sample respondents were able to provide any information on the Fair Play ideals taught in the program. Only 14% of respondents were able to give an answer when asked to remember any concepts at all from the Fair Play classes. These concepts are those general values which may result from having been exposed to the five ideals. For example, the first ideal of Fair Play is "respect the rules". As a concept respondents have said such things as "don't cheat", "go by the rules", and "play fair no matter what". Yet only twenty respondents could provide any answer.

Generally all respondents, whether they possessed a fair play attitude or a play to win attitude, were unable to give any of the concepts. The number of years of exposure in

receiving the course also had no specific pattern and no impact. Years of experience was not a determinant of a Fair Play Attitude.

If the survey results are any indication, it appears that children do not retain the knowledge taught in class. One wonders if they view the classes as a break from the tedium of other classroom work or as just another tedious class to sit through. Or they may recognize the ideals and concepts as something which may not be relevant to them or as something which does not always work in the real world.

3.4 HYPOTHESIS 2: The Impact of Significant Others on Respondent Fair Play Attitude.

Hypothesis two states that an individual's significant others have an impact upon an individual's socialization toward a fair play attitude. As with hypothesis one, a general linear models procedure was run between the dependent variable of Fair Play Attitude and the questions which examined significant others (Table 3.0).

Table 3.0
Regression Analysis of
Significant Others Model

	R-Square
Sample (n=138)	.301*
Males (n=84)	.369*
Females (n=54)	.244*

* significant at the 0.05 level or higher

The GLM procedure produced an r-square value of 0.301 for the sample which was significant. When sex is controlled, using this procedure produced an r-square value of 0.244 for the female sample. It also produced an r-square value of 0.369 for the male sample. Both male and female coefficients were significant. These results seem to suggest there is a relationship between respondents and their significant others which requires further investigation.

Next, I examined the perceived influence of each significant other. The significant others were rank ordered in terms of how much perceived influence they exerted on respondents to play fairly, play their best, or play to win. The preliminary results show that respondent's see their peers as those significant others who want them to play to win. Respondents view their physical education teachers as the person who emphasizes skill and see their mothers emphasizing

fair play. Table 3.1 illustrates the ranking of all significant others in terms of perceived influence.

Table 3.1
Ranking of Significant Others for Fair Play
influence on respondent perceptions based
on Webb Scale assigned rankings

Ranking	Play to win	Play one's best	Play fairly
1.	Teammates	P.E. Teacher	Mother
2.	Friends	Mother	P.E. Teacher
3.	Father	Father	Father
4.	Mother	Friends	Friends
5.	P.E. Teacher	Teammates	Teammates

A comparison of respondent mean Fair Play Attitudes and significant other mean Webb score attitudes was done in order to determine if any similarities existed. Table 3.2 displays those means.

Table 3.2
Comparison of Respondent mean Fair Play Attitudes
and Significant Others Perceived Webb Scale scores

	Teacher	Father	Friends	Mother	Teammates
Males (n=84) 3.90*	2.58	3.58	4.84	2.51	4.70
Females (n=54) 3.35*	2.42	2.80	4.37	2.61	4.96
Sample (n=138) 3.67*	2.52	3.29	4.65	2.55	4.80

* Male and female scores calculated using the Fair Play Attitude scores while significant others scores calculated using Webb Scale assigned rankings (min score 1, max 6).

The mean scores of the male sample and the female sample were slightly different. The male sample is higher at 3.90 than the female sample score of 3.35. This suggests that the male sample has a greater tendency toward a play to win attitude than does the female sample. However, these results also suggest that male and female respondents both place the emphasis on playing as well as they can over winning and playing fairly. As well, the majority of respondent's significant others encourage them to play their best. This is reflected in the fact that no significant others have a Webb score of 5 or higher.

Respondent's physical education teachers, and mothers appear to encourage fair play with low Webb scale scores, recalling that the minimum score is 1 while the maximum score is 6. It also appears that respondent's fathers encourage them to play as well as they can with a medium Webb scale scores. The perceived mean scores of respondent's teammates and friends were high on the Webb scale. It would appear that a respondent's peers encourage them to play as well as they can. However, these scores also suggest that respondent's peers place winning above fair play when playing a game more often than the other significant others.

Correlation analysis was then used to compare the perceived encouragement from significant others to

respondent's Fair Play Attitudes in order to see if any possible relationships did exist. Table 3.3 is a summary of those results.

Table 3.3
Correlation Analysis of Respondent Fair Play Attitude
and Perceived Attitudes of Significant Others

	Phys.Ed. Teacher	Father	Friends	Mother	Teammates
Males (n=84)	-.014	.388	.258	.340	.464
Females (n=54)	.298	.408	.259	.306	.191
Sample (n=138)	.101	.422	.281	.307	.340

This analysis shows that as a sample, respondent Fair Play attitudes correlate closest to those encouraged by their fathers. As well, the analysis shows that the sample has the lowest correlation with their physical education teacher. When sex is controlled, the analysis shows that male respondent's Fair Play Attitude correlates closest to the one they perceive is encouraged by their teammates, while female respondent's correlate highest with the attitude they perceive is encouraged by their fathers.

In order to see which significant other was most influential upon the respondents a GLM procedure was done. The results for the sample produced the largest r-square value of

0.178 which was statistically significant for the significant other of father. This would also be consistent with the correlation analysis which produced the highest correlation between the two variables. Table 3.4 reflects the individual r-square value of each significant other in the entire sample (n=138) along with both the male and female samples.

Table 3.4
R-Square values for Individual
Significant Others

Significant Others	Sample (n=138)		Males (n=84)		Females (n=54)	
	R-SQ	Est	R-sq	Est	R-sq	Est
Phys. Ed. Teacher	.01	.083	.00001	-.0006	.089	.248
Father	.178*	.272	.151*	.255	.166*	.251
Mother	.094*	.225	.116*	.236	.094*	.224
Friends	.079	.195	.066	.199	.067	.144
Teammates	.115*	.255	.215*	.336	.036	.140

* significant at the 0.05 level or higher

When sex was controlled, the female sample showed the greatest influence from their fathers with an r-squared value of 0.166. This was consistent with the correlation analysis which produced the highest correlation between the two variables. It was also consistent with the results for the entire sample which produced similar results between with the same significant other variable of father. Female respondents mothers did produce the next highest r-square value of only

0.094 suggesting that they have limited influence on their daughters fair play attitudes.

The male sample, on the other hand, showed that they most closely correlated with the perception they have of their teammates. The regression procedure produced an r-squared value of 0.215 which was significant. This suggests that males place a greater emphasis on and were influenced by the opinions of their teammates. However, like their female counterparts, they also produced a comparative significant r-square value of 0.151 with their fathers. Also, like female respondents, males did show some influence from their mothers as a significant other, though the influence was not as strong as that of their fathers or teammates. However, it should be noted that mother's influence on males was greater than mother's influence on females.

It should also be noted that the physical education teacher, as a significant other, had a very low correlation with respondent Fair Play Attitude scores. This suggests that respondents perceive their physical education teachers fair play attitude to be quite different than that of their own. As was seen earlier, respondents view their physical education teacher as having a high fair play attitude, while respondents tend toward an attitude on which the emphasis is playing one's best. This perception, along with the fact that it is usually

the physical education teacher who is most likely to teach about fair play, may be one of the reasons for respondents poor showing on the questions related to curriculum.

Though the analysis has attempted to deal with all respondent significant others it also recognizes that many respondents may not share the same significant others. One significant other who may have a great impact upon a person's fair play attitude is the coach. The literature has posited that the coaches influence as a socialization agent may also depend on the nature of the player-coach relationship. Since the literature has demonstrated the importance of the coach, the coach as a significant other will be explored independently.

It was realized that there would be those respondents who participate in organized sports which did not involve coaches. The survey did attempt to establish if respondents played sports that involved having coaches. Respondents were asked how many sports in which they participated had coaches. Those respondents (n=84) were involved with a total number of 185 coaches. Those who participated in sports without coaches were excluded.

In the total sample there were 84 respondents who had at least one coach, 63 with two coaches, and 38 respondents

who were involved with three coaches. There were 53 males involved with one coach, 42 with two coaches, and 23 males who had three coaches. Thirty-one of the female respondents had one coach, 21 had two, and 15 females had three coaches. Earlier results demonstrated that both male and female respondents Fair Play attitudes tend toward an attitude of playing one's best or placing the emphasis on skill. When the mean Webb score was calculated for coaches it was 2.87 out of a maximum of 6 for the sample (n=84) of those who had coaches. Male respondents who had coaches, those coaches had a mean Webb score of 2.94 while female respondents coaches produced a mean Webb score of 2.75. These mean Webb scores show is that respondents perceive the attitude of their coaches as one which encourages them to play as well as they can with secondary emphasis on playing fairly.

Correlation analysis and regression analysis were both used to determine if there was any relationship between respondent Fair Play attitudes and those attitudes perceived of their coaches. When those respondents who did not have coaches were eliminated from the correlation analysis the following results in Table 3.5 were produced;

Table 3.5
Correlation Analysis of Respondent Fair Play Attitudes
and their Perceived Encouragement from Coaches

	Sample (n=84)	Males (n=53)	Females (n=31)
Coaches	.164	.199	.05

Table 3.5 shows that there is a low correlation between respondent Fair Play attitudes and those attitudes they perceive from their coaches. The sample as a whole has a low correlation with all the coaches. The male sample has a slightly higher correlation to their coaches than does the entire sample. Female respondents showed almost no correlation at all between their attitudes and those they perceived of their coaches.

Those respondents who had coaches were next compared to those who did not by examining the overall influence of all significant others excluding coaches. A GLM procedure was done for each group in order to see if there were any differences in those significant others who were common to each group. Table 3.6 reflects the results;

Table 3.6
 Comparison of R-Square Values between
 Respondents Common Significant Others
 excluding Coaches

	W/out Coaches	W/Coaches
	R-SQUARE	R-SQUARE
Males	.671* (n=31)	.351* (n=53)
Females	.520* (n=23)	.492* (n=31)
Sample	.346* (n=54)	.330* (n=84)

*significant at the 0.05 level or higher

When both groups are examined for common significant others, the group who is not involved with coaches has significantly higher R-square values for not only the entire group but male and female samples as well. Males who do not have coaches produce a r-square value of 0.671. This suggests that 67% of male respondent Fair Play attitudes can be explained by those perceived attitudes of their significant others. Female respondents who did not include coaches in their influential significant others are also strongly influenced to the point of accounting for 52% of female Fair Play attitudes.

The possible explanation for this is that the respondent sample which has no interaction with coaches places a greater emphasis on the other primary relationships in which they are

involved. Hence, the influence from those significant others may be stronger because there is less competition for respondents time. In turn, those respondents who do interact with coaches as significant others have lower r-square values due to the fact that the coaches influence has been removed. Hence, coaches may increase the overall influence of significant others as a group due to their perceived influence.

When coaches are included with all other significant others in the GLM procedure, the R-square value for all significant others increases significantly. However, these increases do not raise the significant others influence to the level of the group who have no interaction with coaches.

Table 3.7 shows the results;

Table 3.7
Comparison of Respondents with Coaches
R-Square values when Coaches are both
excluded and included

	Coaches Excluded	Coaches Included
	R-SQUARE	R-SQUARE
Males (n=53)	.351*	.406*
Females (n=31)	.492*	.495*
Sample (n=84)	.330*	.356*

*significant at the 0.05 level or higher

The results in Table 3.7 suggest that when respondents have a coach as a significant other, the coach's influence does contribute to the overall influence by all of the significant others on the respondent. This contribution to the overall influence is especially strong for the male sample (n=53) where including the coach's influence produced an r-square value of 0.406. This suggests that the coach is an integral member of the male sample's significant others. It appears that the coach has almost no effect on the overall influence of significant others as a group on female respondents.

In order to establish the magnitude of the influence placed on respondents by their coaches a GLM procedure was run for all significant others for those respondents who were involved with coaches as well as those who were not. Table 3.8 shows the results;

Table 3.8
R-square values for
Individual Significant Others
with and without Coaches

Significant Other	Males		Females		Sample		
	w/o coach (n=31)	with coach (n=53)	w/o coach (n=23)	with coach (n=31)	w/o coach (n=54)	with coach (n=84)	
P.E Teacher	Rsq	.071	.004	.158*	.029	.124*	.0004
	Est	.251	-.0004	.364*	.129	.330*	-.016
Father	Rsq	.160*	.170*	.102	.215*	.155*	.192*
	Est	.269*	.268*	.255	.249*	.257*	.279*
Friends	Rsq	.0001	.116*	.124*	.025	.042	.095*
	Est	.010	.266*	.192*	.083	.135	.213*
Mother	Rsq	.453*	.061*	.001	.236*	.171*	.072*
	Est	.429*	.174*	-.030	.305*	.319*	.188*
Teammates	Rsq	.425*	.153*	.002	.130*	.117*	.134*
	Est	.514*	.275*	.046	.233*	.283*	.261*
Coaches	Rsq	-	.039	-	.002	-	.026
	Est	-	.245	-	.043	-	.183

*significant at the 0.05 level or higher

The male sample (n=53) who include coaches with their significant others is influenced most by their fathers. This influence was closely followed by that of teammates and friends. However, when referring to Table 3.8, none of these significant others has a large amount of influence. Males correlated with their fathers who may be the primary reason

for their original sports participation. The influence of male respondent's teammates, in those sports which have coaches, may be somewhat influential over those attitudes particular to sport because they may also be friends. However, other friends may not necessarily be teammates. This would explain why teammates have a slightly larger perceived influence. In this case, those respondents with coaches, who play organized sports, neither friends nor teammate attitudes are more influential than the others. It should also be noted that this group also had no significant influence from their coaches.

Similarly, those male respondents without coaches are also influenced almost to the same amount by their fathers. Likewise, this group was also influenced by their teammates. However, the influence of teammates on those respondents without coaches was extremely strong. This relationship produced an r-square value of 0.425 which was significant. This may explain why for those male respondents who do not participate in highly organized sports teammates may be most influential on attitude because this may be the only direct contact during informal sports. Hence, the sports attitude becomes the one shared with teammates during sporting activities. Surprisingly, for this group of respondents, their friends had no influence on their Fair Play attitudes at all.

One significant other who had a great amount of influence on this group was their mother. This group produced a significant r-square value for their mother of 0.453. This suggests that 45% of this groups Fair Play attitude can be accounted for by the perceived Webb score attitude of their mothers. While this shows that this groups mother has a profound effect on their sports attitudes the only explanation that this study can put forth is the influence of the mother as primary care giver.

Those female respondents who had coaches (n=31) had the highest r-square values with their mothers, fathers, their teammates. The female respondents who did have coaches had high r-square values with their mothers suggesting that they may be a primary influence over female attitudes toward sport. One possible explanation for this might be that those females who participate in sports organized enough to have coaches may be influenced by a mother who may have had similar experiences and thus encouraged them for their daughters. This female sample also had a high r-square values with their fathers in direct contrast to those female respondents who did not participate in coached sports. Fathers also produced a slightly smaller r-square value to that of mothers and may function in much the same as they do for males by encouraging their daughters to participate in sports. Teammates were also an influence and may work in much the same way for females as

they do for males. Again, like their male counterparts, females who had coaches did not receive any influence from them as an individual significant other.

One interesting result appears in the female sample (n=23) of those respondents without coaches. The highest r-square value between Fair Play Attitude and significant others was produced by the significant others Physical Education teacher and friends while the r-square value for respondent's mothers was insignificant at 0.001. In this case the Physical Education teacher may be the closest substitute for a primary sporting influence that these respondents have. Hence, these respondents may then take their attitudes toward sports from their Physical Education teacher. These respondents may also adopt those attitudes toward sports from their friends. These female respondents may be influenced by the attitudes of their friends in that these are the significant others with whom they engage in informal sporting activities.

Respondents were also asked how they felt about their coaches, if they respected, liked, disliked, or had no respect for each coach of the sport(s) they had listed. Table 3.9 gives a summary of those results.

Table 3.9
Respondent Views of Coach

	Respect	Like	Dislike	No Respect	# Coaches
Males (n=52)	59 (54%)	34 (31%)	12 (11%)	5 (4%)	110
Females (n=31)	31 (46%)	34 (51%)	2 (3%)	0	67
Total	90 (51%)	68 (38%)	14 (8%)	5 (3%)	177

As the table shows the majority (51%) of respondents respect their coach or coaches while another 38% said they liked their coach. The fact that 89% of these respondents have what would seem to be positive relationship with their coaches may suggest that the coach has some influence. One other result to note is that females appear to like and respect their coaches more than males do. Ninety-seven percent of the females fell into this category as compared to 85% of males. Conversely, more males, 15%, did not like and/or did not respect their coaches as compared to only 3% of females.

The overall results suggest that the majority of respondents have a positive relationship with their coaches. These results, when examined along with the attributed Attitude scores, may again make a case for the suggestion that coaches by asking their athletes to play their best may help to instill the same attitude in their athletes. However,

while some of the previous results may support this the coaches influence as an individual significant other may be tenuous at best.

The influence of one last significant other was dealt with by the survey and that was the sports hero. Respondents were asked to name their favorite sports figure and then to tell why it was they chose him or her. The results of this exercise yielded some inconclusive evidence about the role and influence of sports heroes. Because the nature of the analysis is insignificant, the results, for those who are interested, are discussed in Appendix A.

3.5 HYPOTHESIS 3: The Impact of Sports Participation on a Fair Play Attitude.

The third and final hypothesis examined the impact of an individual's sporting experiences on their fair play attitude. These questions examined participation in and out of school, level of competitiveness of the sports, and the amount of time spent participating in the sports.

Again, the GLM procedure was used to measure the model. The procedure was run on the entire sample, and then was done controlling for sex. Table 3.10 illustrates the results:

Table 3.10
Regression Analysis for
Fair Play Attitude and
Sports Participation Model

	Sample (n=115)	Males (n=78)	Females (n=37)
R-Square Values	.021	.011	.167*

*significant at the 0.05 level or higher

The preliminary results from the initial r-square procedure suggested that there was no relationship between the sample's Fair Play attitude and their level of sports participation. This result also held true for the male sample. However, the female sample did show that there was a small correlation between female Fair Play attitude and their sports participation. In order to investigate this further, the model was broken down into individual r-square values for specific variables to see the influence each one had.

When this model was broken down into individual r-square values, the results were not significant in any way for the entire sample. The r-square values for all the variables decreased and did not become significant factors by themselves as illustrated in Table 3.11. This suggested that sports participation does not have a large influence upon respondents Fair Play attitudes insofar as playing sports does not develop attitudes. This result also holds for the male sample which differs very little from the entire sample. There is,

however, a large change in the r-square value of female respondents. What becomes apparent for females is that the relationship between Fair Play attitude and participation was influenced by the level of competition they participated in. The female sample had an r-square value of 0.138 while the male sample had an r-square value of 0.022. The r-square values for all other variables also rose, though not high enough to become a significant factor by themselves (see Table 3.11).

Table 3.11
Individual Regression Analysis
of Fair Play Attitude and
Sports Participation variables

	Level of Competition		Participation		Amt of Participation Per Month	
	Rsq	Est	Rsq	Est	Rsq	Est
Sample (n=115)	.008	.082	.002	.100	.005	.009
Males (n=78)	.005	.068	.003	-.138	.003	-.008
Females (n=37)	.137*	.340*	.042	.398	.035	.021

*significant at the 0.05 level or higher

The r-square value of 0.137 suggests that females Fair Play attitudes are more influenced by their level of competition of the sports they participate in. This suggests that either females attitudes become very competition specific when engaged in different levels of sport. The results also

suggests that male attitudes are not influenced by level of competition, participation, and amount of participation. It was also discussed earlier that male respondents attitudes reflected those attitudes they attributed to their fathers, friends, and teammates while female attitudes reflected those attributed to their mothers, fathers and teammates. These significant others could impact in very different ways upon the two sexes and their attitudes in regards to their participation.

Male Fair Play attitudes may not come from participation itself but from their fellow participants, such as teammates and friends. Their attitudes may be influenced more by the amount of exposure to the prevailing attitudes of significant others in the due course of competition. Hence, the more a male competes and plays sports the more he is exposed to those attitudes held by friends and teammates, the more he adopts those attitudes. Females, on the other hand, may not have as great an exposure to these attitudes from teammates or friends. However, once competition begins may adopt an attitude suitable for the level of competition which may or may not come as a result of the male influence in the form of fathers and coaches. This may explain why female attitudes correlate with the level of competition.

CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

4.1 The Study

This study examined if the curriculum-based approach of using informational and educational support materials has succeeded in changing children's attitudes about playing fairly. It also tried to determine the impact a respondent's significant others and sports participation have on influencing a respondent's fair play attitudes. To investigate the effect these three variables on respondents' attitudes a forty-two question survey was developed. The questionnaire contained both closed-ended and open-ended questions about attitudes toward sport and physical participation.

One hundred and thirty-eight students at St. Johns and Grant Park high schools were surveyed between March and June of 1993. There were eighty-four male respondents and fifty-four female students in the sample. Five questions were used to establish each respondent's fair play attitude. The five questions were added together and then averaged to provide a Fair Play attitude score for each respondent. In order to establish the reliability of the Fair Play attitude scores the "parallel-forms" technique was utilized. This technique uses two independent measures of the Fair Play attitude and then

correlates the two measures, this provides an estimate of reliability.

Once respondent's Fair Play attitudes were validated the research used multiple regression to establish the influence of the overall model, as well as the three independent variables upon the dependent variable of Fair Play attitude.

4.2 The Findings

Initially, the research used multiple regression to test the effect of all variables in the hypothesis on the dependent variable of Fair Play attitude. The result provided an r-square value of .397 for the sample (n=138) at a .05 level of significance. This showed that approximately 40% of respondent fair play attitudes can be explained using all three independent variables. When the overall model sex was controlled the r-square value decreased to .355 for the female sample (n=54). However, the male sample (n=84) r-square value increased significantly to .489. Both the male and female r-square values were significant at the .05 level. These results suggested that either one, two, or all three independent variables have an effect on respondent Fair Play attitudes. These results also suggested that the independent variables have a greater effect on male respondent's fair play attitudes than on female respondent's fair play attitudes.

The research then examined each independent variable separately. The first independent variable was to determine whether or not the Fair Play curriculum had an impact upon respondent Fair Play attitudes. The results showed that at least fifty-one percent (n=71) of respondents had received some form of the Fair Play curriculum. A regression procedure produced an insignificant r-square value for the sample (n=138) of .002. This suggested that no relationship existed between the two variables.

The analysis also showed that those respondents who had been exposed to the curriculum had not necessarily gained any knowledge from it. Respondent's abilities to name concepts and ideals from the curriculum were poor, at best. Only twenty-four percent (n=33) were able to give any ideals and only fourteen percent (n=20) were able to give any general concepts. There was no correlation between a respondent's ability to name concepts and ideals and their Fair Play attitude. There was also no relationship between the number of years of Fair Play curriculum experience and Fair Play attitude. As well, there was no relationship between a respondent's ability to name concepts and ideals and the number of years of Fair Play curriculum experience.

The findings for the Fair Play curriculum, may however, not give the entire picture of the effect of curriculum on

respondent attitudes. One problem which could be considered is the survey questions may not measure the effect of the curriculum. The survey does establish that respondents have or have not had the course as well as the number of grades in which they were taught the course. However, asking respondents to give the five ideals of Fair Play or what they remember most about the classes may not entirely establish the effect of the curriculum on attitude. These results may give a better indication of classroom learning among respondents in a school context but not in a sporting one.

The study also explored the impact of a respondent's significant others perceived attitudes upon those of the respondent's fair play attitude. Using regression, the relationship of individual's significant others and one's fair play attitude produced significant results; an r-square value of .244 for the female sample (n=54) and an r-square value for the male sample (n=84) of .369, both coefficients were significant. These results seem to suggest that there is a relationship between an individual's fair play attitude and the perceived attitudes of their significant others. The data showed that for male respondents teammates and their fathers have the greatest influence. However, for female respondents the greatest influence comes from their fathers.

The research examined the influence of the coach

independently from other significant individuals because it was felt that the coach may have a greater impact upon the fair play attitudes of respondents. Correlation analysis showed that the male sample (n=53) had a moderate correlation with their coaches the female sample (n=31) had no correlation with their coaches.

Regression was used to establish the strength of the relationship between respondents and their coaches. The male and female respondents who had coaches were then compared to those who did not. The comparison showed that for the common significant others the group which was not involved with coaches had higher r-square values. Both groups produced significant r-square values, however, the group which was not involved with coaches had a value of .346 at the .05 level. The group with coaches produced a value of .330 at the .05 level. When coaches were included with all significant others, the r-square values for the male and female samples increased significantly. Males increased moderately from an r-square value .351 to .406 while females increased negligibly from .492 to .495 at the .05 level. These results would suggest that the coach's influence does contribute to the overall influence of all significant others.

This relationship was explored further using regression analysis. It was found that the r-square values between male

respondents and their coaches as well as female respondents and their coaches were insignificant.

With this in mind, the amount of influence a coach had on respondents was then compared to the amount of influence other significant others had on respondents. This was done for two reasons; one, to see if the coach was a significant contributor toward a fair play attitude; and two, to examine which significant others contributed the most influence on those respondents without coaches. The research found that for those males who had coaches, the coach was not the most influential contributor, but that they were most influenced by their fathers. Those males without coaches were most influenced by their mothers and teammates in those sports which did not have coaches.

Those females respondents who had coaches were most influenced by their mothers and fathers. It should also be noted that these female respondents were also influenced by their teammates. The female respondents who participated in sports that did not include coaches were most influenced by their physical education teachers, and then their friends. One similarity all female respondents shared was that each group was influenced by their fathers. This suggests that both groups fair play attitudes may be somewhat influenced by the attitudes of their fathers regardless of participation in

sports involving coaches.

Respondents who had coaches were also asked how they felt about their coaches in terms of respect, disrespect, liking them, or disliking them. The majority of respondents (51%) said they respected their coach or coaches while another 38% stated they liked their coach or coaches. This suggests that a positive relationship existed between these respondents and their coaches. Though this was not reflected in the individual R-square values between respondents and coaches this influence may account for the rise in R-square values when coaches are included with the influence of all significant others. When these results were examined along with the attributed attitude scores the suggestion could be made that coaches, by asking their athletes to play their best, may be able to instill this attitude in their athletes due to the respect which is given them.

The third hypothesis examined the impact of an individual's sporting experiences upon their fair play attitudes. Preliminary results from regression analysis proved insignificant suggesting that there was no relationship between sports participation and respondent's fair play attitudes. However, when the sample was controlled for by sex, the male sample changed very little but there was a large change in the female sample, from an r-square value of .021 to

a value of .167, which made the coefficient significant.

The changes which occurred for female respondents were produced in the relationship between the respondent's fair play attitude and their sports participation. As the level of competition increased, female respondents fair play attitudes moved closer toward the attitude of playing to win. This relationship between the two variables suggests that female respondent's fair play attitudes may become very competition specific when engaged in sports. The higher the level of competition, the more the fair play attitude moves toward a winning orientation. Male fair play attitudes, on the other hand, seem to remain constant regardless of the competitive nature of the sports participated in.

4.3 CONCLUSIONS

What can be concluded about the affect of Fair Play classes, the influence of significant others, and a child's sports participation on their fair play attitude? It is known that children are taught ideals, concepts, and rules of sports etiquette, but they do not retain much of this knowledge. The results of the survey confirm this. The mean fair play attitude scores for the sample (n=138) reflected this apparent apathy on the part of respondents to the Fair Play curriculum. The mean fair play attitude scores for the entire sample, the

male sample, and the female sample all place the emphasis on skill before winning or fair play.

With the emphasis being placed on skill in sports, fair play now becomes secondary. By prioritizing what is important in sports in terms of skill, winning, and fair play, respondents seem to transfer this attitude to the classes and teachings on Fair Play instead of the other way around. Hence, in the student's eyes, the classes are secondary, unimportant, or irrelevant to sports. This perceived lack of relevance to sports is why respondents assign a low priority to the class as a learning experience. This results in a general apathy toward trying to learn about Fair Play. This view would tend to support the literature in terms of learning. As was discussed, play allows those involved to test the boundaries of the game and the relationships which the game produces. What the Fair Play classes lack would be the context of the game which would allow those involved to test the boundaries they have been taught.

If this is the case, the classes and games which are meant to become a learning experience now become little more than a break from the tedium of other classes, or just another tedious class to go through. The results obtained from this research suggest one would be safe in concluding that the Fair Play program, as it stands for class room teaching within the

present curriculum, does not instill an understanding of fair play nor does it apparently affectively change or instill a Fair play attitude.

The data did show that there was a relationship between a respondent's fair play attitude and the perceived attitudes of their significant others. It also suggested that there is a great deal of influence from many significant others as opposed to just one or two. Early results suggested that respondent's perception of what their significant others expected from them in terms of fair play went from playing fairly to playing to win.

One conclusion which may be drawn from these results confirms what is in the literature. A child's most influential significant others are their fathers and mothers. Both Staniford (1981) and McPherson (1983) argue that children first identify their status and learn elements of their social world within the family. Using regression analysis to examine the contributed r-square values for each of the significant others, the sample showed that fathers and mothers were the most influential significant others.

However, as the literature pointed out, sports also inculcates norms, mores, and beliefs. It does this by rewarding or punishing to reinforce desirable behavior as well

as providing individuals with concrete examples of model or desirable behavior. The social unit which integrates the individual and reinforces their behavior is the team (Stevenson and Nixon, 1974). When sex was controlled, teammates were the one of the most influential significant other for males both with and without coaches. Fathers and then mothers also influenced those respondents with coaches while those male respondents without coaches had their mother as their primary influence followed by their teammates. For females, their fathers remained as the most influential significant other followed by their mothers. Teammates were a moderate influence on those female respondents who participated in sports involving coaches whereas friends were the influence on those who did not have coaches.

While fathers and mothers do have a significant influence on the male respondent's fair play attitude, teammates produced the highest significant r-square value of .215. It seems that for this age group (15 to 17 years), peer pressure in sports has a greater influence on males than do their parents. One might conclude that males may originally develop their fair play attitudes due to the influence of their parents. However, this parental influence may diminish with time as males spend more time with teammates and adopt the attitudes of the team, or group, over those of their parents. This theory would seem to be supported by the literature in

the discussion of the overconformity to goals and positive deviance as by products of team participation (Hughes and Coakley 1991, Shields, Bredemeier, Gardner, and Bostrom 1995, Sato 1988).

In this study it was the father who most influenced his daughter's fair play attitude. This influence may be due to many reasons which can only be guessed at, but one might conclude that it is the father who places the emphasis on sports in the family. However, the results also noted that female respondent's mothers also contributed significantly to their daughters fair play attitudes. Mothers, were second only to fathers, with a very low r-square value of .094 which was still significant. This value was significantly higher at .236 for females who participated in sports with coaches. Those mothers who do greatly influence their daughter's fair play attitude may do so because of similar experiences with sports. Athletic mothers may influence athletic daughters attitudes towards winning and losing. The same may be said for those mothers and daughters who are unathletic. Unfortunately, the research has not examine this area so this remains speculative.

The research examined the influence of the coach independently from all the other significant others due to the perception that the coach may have had the greatest influence

on fair play attitudes. Correlation analysis did establish that there was a minor relationship between the sample respondents (n=84) who had coaches and the perceived encouragement they received from their coaches and the results showed that coaches do contribute to the overall influence of significant others on respondent fair play attitudes. It can be concluded that coaches for both males and females do have some influence the fair play attitudes of those who play for them.

For those respondents (n=54) who had no interaction with a coach, those significant others common to both groups, produced higher r-square values. Without the influence of a coach or coaches, the influence from those significant others on fair play attitude becomes stronger. It appears that these respondents place greater emphasis on these primary relationship with which they are involved. One might conclude this occurs because there is less competition for respondents time which might otherwise be devoted to one or more relationships with a coach.

When the results were examined for those males who had coaches two effects appeared. The first was that coaches do contribute to the overall influence significant others do have on those male respondents in this group. The second was that while contributing to overall influence, separately, the coach

is not the primary influence upon male fair play attitude, it is the father and teammates. Hence, what may be suggested is that those coaches who coach male sports may serve to reinforce those attitudes already in place, but the primary influence on those attitudes are their players fathers and teammates.

Those male respondents (n=31) who did not participate in organized coached sports, their teammates and mothers were the most influential significant other on their fair play attitude. Teammates are, in all likelihood, the only direct contact during any type of informal sports, hence, those attitudes may become shared attitudes on sports. It is also likely, that because there is no coach to run and organize the "team", that those respondents run and organize their own activity, or that it is organized by an adult, but once the activity begins the players are left on their own. In this case, teammates all function as both player and coach, ensuring that the team and activity function as smoothly as possible. Hence, when all members fill these dual roles on the team, in order for the team to function, shared attitudes would seem necessary for team harmony. As was suggested earlier the only explanation which can be put forth for the significant influence of the mother is that of primary care giver.

As was shown in chapter three female respondents with coaches had the highest r-square values with their fathers, mothers, and teammates. A possible explanation for the maternal influence is that those females who participate in sports with coaches, may be influenced by a mother who has had similar experiences and thus encouraged them for their daughters. This would also explain why those females who do not have coaches are influenced very little by their mothers. Fathers and teammates of these female respondents may function in much the same way as they do for males, by encouraging participation in sport and reinforcing attitudes.

One interesting result appears in the female sample (n=23) without coaches. The highest r-square value was produced by the significant other of Physical Education teacher. In this case the Physical Education teacher may substitute or function as a coach or as the primary sporting attitude influence that these respondents have. The Physical Education teacher may be the only significant other who has any contact with these respondents as far as sporting activities are concerned. For some of this sample (n=23) the physical education class is the only time their participation in sports is required. Because this is their only sports participation, these respondents may then take their fair play attitudes from their physical education teachers. As well this group was influenced by their friends. In this case

friends may take the place of teammates in any informal sporting activities this group may participate in.

The third hypothesis examined the impact of sports participation on fair play attitude. Regression analysis produced results which originally showed that as a sample, respondents fair play attitudes were not influenced by their sports participation. However, when controlling for sex, the sports participation model showed that while males were still not influenced by their participation in sports, females were.

What became apparent for female respondents was that the relationship between their fair play attitude and their sports participation was influenced by the level of competition they participated in. Hence, for female respondents, the more competitive the sports participated in the more their fair play attitude shifted toward winning. This leads to the conclusion that while female fair play attitudes are influenced by specific significant others, these attitudes are also competition specific within sports participation.

As was suggested earlier, male respondent fair play attitudes reflected those attitudes attributed to their friends and teammates while female fair play attitudes reflected those attributed to mothers, coaches and fathers. These significant others could impact in very different ways

upon the two sexes and their attitudes with regards to sports participation. Male attitudes might not be developed during participation but result from the influence of their fellow participants, such as teammates and friends.

Male fair play attitudes may not only be influenced by exposure to the prevailing attitudes of significant others during competition and participation but also in the due course of relationships outside of competition. This exposure both in and out of sports, to attitudes toward sports held by friends, teammates, and coaches may impact upon male fair play attitudes. Hence, male fair play attitudes may drive their participation in competitive sports, while sports participation may not contribute to or reinforce their attitude. In this way those males who display an attitude consistent with wanting to win would gravitate toward more competitive forms of participation and vice versa for more fair play attitudes.

What is apparent is that female respondents are influenced very little by friends and teammates when it comes to attitudes towards sports. Hence, the only sports attitudes they are influenced by are from mothers, coaches, and fathers. Females may be exposed to these attitudes only during the course of competition and not outside of it. Because of this, females may be able to separate attitudes in and out of sports

or adopt a suitable attitude for sports once competition begins. This may explain why female attitudes correlate with the level of competition. This suggests that they are much better at compartmentalizing their attitudes, i.e. one for sports, one for outside of sports, than are males.

Again, as for males, female attitudes may drive participation instead of the other way around. However, the higher correlation with competition may be the result of female attitudes leading them to appropriate levels of participation as well as that participation level having some effect on their attitude. What then appears to be the case is that the level of competitive participation serves to reinforce existing female attitudes whereas for males the attitudes are not reinforced by level of competition.

4.4 Implications and Recommendations

What are the implications for this study? The most obvious would seem to be that the socialization of a fair play attitude in children cannot merely be approached as a simple classroom subject. The examination of socialization in the literature emphasized that the educational system, along with the family and peer group, can be an influential institution in the process of sports socialization. The study suggests that children retain very little from the Fair Play classes

given to them in elementary school. This is not surprising considering that the public elementary system seems to play a minor role in sport socialization while it is the family, peer group, and the voluntary sport associations which play the major roles.

Further to this, the study has also helped to confirm the discussions explored in the literature on socialization. As was suggested by the literature, the family was seen as the foremost socialization influence of a child's attitudes. This study did show that respondent's fathers and mothers do have a great deal of influence on their fair play attitudes.

The literature also touched upon the influence of peer groups, the study showed that the influence of the peer group is high, especially in the case of male athletes. The evidence presented in this study supports the importance and significance of peer group influence upon attitudes towards fair play in sports. The study also confirmed that males and females are influenced quite differently by their various significant others and that their attitudes towards fair play are also influenced by to varying degrees by their significant others.

The study also examined the influence of participation on respondent's fair play attitudes. The results were less than conclusive and there were no significant findings. The

results did confirm that there were differences in male and female sports participation patterns and that these in turn may influence fair play attitudes. It was suggested that attitude may drive the level of participation for both males and females instead of the level of competition influencing attitude. It was also suggested that the level of competition may serve to reinforce female fair play attitudes.

While this study has examined the issues of the curriculum based approach to fair play and it's effectiveness, the impact of significant others on respondent fair play attitudes, and the impact of sports participation on fair play attitudes, it also raised more questions along with the answers which were found.

It would seem that a curriculum based approach to fair play needs to have some changes made to it if it is to continue being taught at the school level. There is of course no guarantee that changing the program to will make it any more successful. One practical solution for the Fair Play program; instead of teaching the program at the elementary school level it would seem more practical to integrate it into the secondary school curriculum. By doing this the program would be taught at the same time respondents are beginning to participate in more highly competitive sports and are more exposed to prevailing attitudes toward winning. This suggests

the need for a program which considers the impact of the socialization process on athletes attitudes.

While the program does consider this to a point it makes no effort to train those responsible for implementing the program other than distributing a resource manual. In order to better prepare Physical Education teachers for the job of teaching fair play there should be training sessions which cover both socialization theory and the practical implementation of the program within those theoretical boundaries. Included in this the training should recognize that there are differences in male and female attitudes toward sports and these should be accounted for.

This study also raises many questions about the influence of a person's significant others. Both the literature and this study have shown that their influence upon a person's fair play attitude is great. The study did show with some success the influence specific significant others exerted upon the study's respondents. The study also showed there is some influence by specific significant others which may be a determining factor on respondent attitudes.

With this in mind, it would seem that there is a definite need for further research into the influences of specific significant others, most specifically parents, coaches and

peers. Further to this, the Fair Play Commission should recognize the important role which significant others do play in influencing the attitudes of others. By targeting parents and coaches and enlisting their help the Commissions goals may be easier to meet. In order for this to happen the Commission must make information readily available to all community based sporting activities. The possibility also exists to have trained community volunteers who can train both coaches and parents in the Fair Play concepts and philosophy.

Finally, because of the interactive hi-tech age we now live in and with the constant exposure of children to this vast array of technology there exists the possibility to incorporate the fair play philosophy into this medium. The Fair Play commission could approach one or all manufacturers of video games to include a fair play element with some of their games. Those games which offer interactive choices in order to proceed could be based on making the fair choice or move. Failure to do so would force the participant to start over.

Further to this, it would not be to far removed for the Fair Play Commission to get an address on the Internet. They could ask high profile athletes to be accessible at certain times, provide articles and statistics about sports all aimed at fair play. Not only might this generate interest in fair

play but it could also generate incidental funds to continue what could be an effective program.

APPENDIX A: THE INFLUENCE OF SPORTS HEROES ON FAIR PLAY ATTITUDE.

The influence of the sports hero was explored by the survey. Respondents were asked to name their favorite sports figure and then to tell why it was they chose him or her. The results of this exercise yielded 54 different names of sports heroes from 111 respondents. Thirteen respondents said they did not have a favorite sports figure, 1 respondent did not know, and 13 respondents did not answer the question.

The majority of sports figures were only named once or twice by respondents while six figures were named more than twice. The six most popular figures were Michael Jordan with 21 responses, Teemu Selanne with 16, Wayne Gretzky with 9, Mario Lemieux with 7, and Magic Johnson and Eric Lindros with 3 apiece. The sports figures were also examined in terms of sex or whether or not the favorite athlete was a male or female. Of the 111 responses, 108 respondents named male athletes while only 3 respondents named female athletes.

The respondent's reasons for choosing the athletes were also evaluated. The responses were as diverse as the sports figures who were named. Five categories were established which reflected specific characteristics/reasons of why the athlete was chosen by the respondents. The determining

categories were nationality, personality, skill, materialistic concerns, and if the athlete was said to be a role model. It should also be noted that almost twice as many females failed to answer this question as males. As well, the same held true for those respondents who stated they had no favorite sports figure. These results are reflected in Table A.1.

Table A.1
Reason for Sports Hero

Trait	Sample (n=100)	Males (n=68)	Females (n=32)
Nationality	10	9	1
Athletic Skill	74	53	21
Personality	9	4	5
Role Model	2	1	1
Materialistic Concerns	5	1	4

The sports hero can certainly be considered as one who may be influential on children. When examining the results it becomes apparent that children find them appealing for many different reasons other than directly as a role model. However, all the reasons listed in Table A.1 may operate as a function of a role model while not being directly realized or stated by respondents.

Respondents seem to place a higher value on athletic skill than any of the other traits given to the sports heroes. They may try to emulate this skill or talent in their athletic endeavors. Hence, this may be an explanation for why the majority of respondents have a fair play attitude which places the emphasis on skill.

This emphasis upon skill may be the only influence the professional athlete as role model may exert on children. The study has shown that children tend to correlate more closely with the fair play attitudes of their significant others, more specifically peers, parents, and coaches. There is an element of personal contact with these people in respondent's personal lives. This contact with sports heroes is not readily available to the everyday person. If contact is achieved it is often fleeting and impersonal at best. Hence, the only available contact with sports heroes is through the media, more specifically, television. It is television which places the emphasis upon the sports contest and to a large extent the personal skills of all participants. It only seems natural that the skill with which these sports heroes play these games should be admired. However, lacking personal contact with these people, emphasis upon skill becomes the only trait available to be admired. Or so it would seem in the majority of respondent cases (n=74).

Without the element of personal contact, sports hero as significant other may be dismissed. It may well have some influence on the way children play games, by placing the emphasis on skill. However, this study has no results which suggest they do influence the fair play attitudes of respondents.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY:

ATTITUDES TOWARD SPORT

This study is designed to find out about what you think about sports and your sports activities.

Your answers will form part of a larger study being conducted in a number of schools in Winnipeg on this subject. You should know that your answers are important, but this is not a test!!!

All answers are anonymous. Individual results will be kept confidential. The survey is looking for information relating to participation in sports by students as a group, not to individuals.

Please answer all questions on the survey unless the instructions direct you to skip a question. Please follow all instructions which are given. Please put an **x** in the () unless the instructions tell you not to.

For example:

Which of the activities do you enjoy the most?

- () hockey
- () baseball
- () football
- (**x**) soccer

If you enjoy soccer the most, you would place a **x** in the () next to the response "soccer".

Unless the directions tell you to do something else, give only ONE answer for each question.

survey #_____

col1-3

SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. You are:
() male () female col 4
2. How old are you? I am _____ years old. col 5-6
3. Who is your favorite sports figure? col 7-8

4. What is it about this person that made you choose
him/her? col9-10

SECTION 2: PARTICIPATION IN PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

5. Do you participate on any school teams or in intramural
activities?
() yes >>>> go to question 6 col 11
() no >>>> go to question 7
6. On which school teams or intramural teams do you
participate?
1. _____ col12-14
2. _____
3. _____
7. Do you participate in any physical activity or sports
outside of school activities?
() yes >>> go to question 9 col 15
() no >>> go to question 8

8. Why do you not take part in any sports outside of school? Please choose the **ONE** which best describes your reason.

col 16

- I'm too busy with other things/don't have time
- I'm not interested/don't enjoy sports
- None of my friends participate
- I'm not good at sports
- I have to help out at home after school
- I have a job
- I can't participate because of medical reasons
- Don't know/not sure

Other (please explain): _____

If you answered question 8, now go to section 3 on page 4.

9. Do you engage in: col 17

- team sports (eg. hockey, soccer, ringette)
- individual sports (eg. gymnastics, jogging, tennis)
- both team and individual sports

10. Are the sports you engage most often in:

- competitive (eg. playing in a league) col 18
- recreational (eg. organized for fun only)
- casual (eg. informal activities)
- both competitive and recreational

11. Do the activities in which you participate usually include:

- girls only boys only col 19
- both girls and boys I do the activity alone

12. Outside of school, how often do you usually participate in physical activities?

- every day 4 to 6 times a week col 20
- 2 to 3 times a week once a week
- 2 to 3 times a month once a month or less

SECTION 3: ATTITUDES TOWARDS PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

13. Please list the 3 physical activities/sports you enjoy participating in the most. List only 3.
1. _____ col 21
2. _____ col 22
3. _____ col 23
14. For the three activities/sports you picked in question 14, how many years have you played each one?
- activity #1 _____ years col 24
- activity #2 _____ years col 25
- activity #3 _____ years col 26
15. Out of the three activities/sports you picked in question 13, which is your favorite?
- My favorite activity/sport is; _____ col 27
16. Why did you choose the activity/sport you picked as your favorite in question 15? Choose all applicable answers.
- () I am good at the activity. col 28
- () I enjoy the activity. col 29
- () My friends are involved in the activity. col 30
- () I can do this activity when I want. col 31
- () I can compete against others in this activity. col 32
- () I can do this activity by myself. col 33
- () The activity is not competitive. col 34
- () The activity does not cost much. col 35
- () I do the activity to keep fit. col 36
- () I do the activity for fun. col 37
- () Other: _____ col 38

17. Please mark (x) how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	dont know
a) I enjoy phys.ed. classes.	()	()	()	()	() col139
b) I like to participate in sports even if I'm not really good at them.	()	()	()	()	() col140
c) I like playing on teams.	()	()	()	()	() col141
d) I play more to win than for enjoyment.	()	()	()	()	() col142
e) I like taking part in physical activity/sports which I can do by myself.	()	()	()	()	() col143
f) I always keep score in any game I play.	()	()	()	()	() col144
g) I like to learn new sports.	()	()	()	()	() col145
h) It is better to play fairly than to play to win.	()	()	()	()	() col146
i) I always play my best even if I know I will lose.	()	()	()	()	() col147
j) Everyone should be allowed to play in games no matter how good or bad they are.	()	()	()	()	() col148
k) I do not like to lose.	()	()	()	()	() col149

NEW INSTRUCTIONS QUESTIONS 18-23

Please place a 1 next to the one you think happens the **MOST**. Then place a 3 next to the one you think happens the **LEAST**.

18. My physical education teacher encourages me;

To beat the other player or team. _____ col50

To play the game fairly. _____

To play as well as I can. _____

19. My father encourages me;
- To beat the other player or team. _____ col51
- To play the game fairly. _____
- To play as well as I can. _____
20. My friends encourage me;
- To beat the other player or team. _____ col52
- To play the game fairly. _____
- To play as well as I can. _____
21. My mother encourages me;
- To beat the other player or team. _____ col53
- To play the game fairly. _____
- To play as well as I can. _____
22. My teammates encourage me;
- To beat the other player or team. _____ col54
- To play the game fairly. _____
- To play as well as I can. _____
23. When playing a game I try;
- To beat the other player or team. _____ col55
- To play the game fairly. _____
- To play as well as I can. _____

SECTION 4: COACHES

24. Those sports in which you participate, how many have coaches? col56

() none () one () two () three () more than three

If you answered (x) none to question 24, now go to Section 5: Sport Situations on page 8.

25. Those sports in which you presently engage, which ones have coaches? Please list the sports.

1. _____ col57
 2. _____ col58
 3. _____ col59

26. For those sports listed above please mark (x) whether the coach is a man or a woman.

Sport #1	() male	() female	col60
Sport #2	() male	() female	col61
Sport #3	() male	() female	col62

27. For each of the sports you listed, which best describes how you feel about the coach. Pick one only.

	I respect the coach.	I like the coach.	I dislike the coach.	I have no respect for the coach.	
Sport #1	()	()	()	()	col63
Sport #2	()	()	()	()	col64
Sport #3	()	()	()	()	col65

28. For the first sport you listed, which best describes your coach. Please rate each statement for this coach on the scale where 1 is **Not at all Important** and 5 is **Very Important** and you can choose any number between 1 and 5. Please rate how important or unimportant it is to this coach that he/she encourages you:

		Not at all Important				Very Important	
To beat the other player or team.	1	2	3	4	5		col66
To play the game fairly.	1	2	3	4	5		col67
To have fun.	1	2	3	4	5		col68
To play as well as I can.	1	2	3	4	5		col69

29. For the second sport you listed, which best describes your coach. Please rate how important or unimportant it is to this coach that he/she encourages you:

	Not at all Important				Very Important	
To beat the other player or team.	1	2	3	4	5	col70
To play the game fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	col71
To have fun.	1	2	3	4	5	col72
To play as well as I can.	1	2	3	4	5	col73

30. For the third sport you listed, which best describes your coach. Please rate how important or unimportant it is to this coach that he/she encourages you:

	Not at all Important				Very Important	
To beat the other player or team.	1	2	3	4	5	col74
To play the game fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	col75
To have fun.	1	2	3	4	5	col76
To play as well as I can.	1	2	3	4	5	col77

SECTION 5: SPORTS SITUATIONS

In this section there are four short examples of a sports situation a person could encounter. Please read each situation carefully and then answer the question at the end. Read the instructions before you answer the question.

SITUATION 1

You and your friends get together after school to play soccer. The group sets the rules and decides to keep score. Teams are picked and then everyone begins to play. The teams are very even and the game is very close. During the game an argument occurs over a goal. If it counts your team will win. After a while the argument is settled and the game continues.

Please place a 1 beside the statement you feel is **most** important

Then place a 3 beside the statement you feel is **least** important

31. In this game I felt it was most important to beat the other team. col01

In this game I felt it was most important to play the game fairly. _____

In this game I felt it was most important to play as well as I could. _____

SITUATION 2

Your team is in it's league finals for basketball. You have practiced hard all season to get to the finals and it has paid off. If your team wins it means the team will travel to another province to play some games there. If your team loses this will be the last game of the season.

Please place a 1 beside the statement you feel is **most** important.

Then place a 3 beside the statement you feel is **least** important.

32. In this game I felt it was most important to beat the other team. col02

In this game I felt it was most important to play the game fairly. _____

In this game I felt it was most important to play as well as I could. _____

SITUATION 3

You are playing tennis against a friend. It is a sunny afternoon and you both wanted to get some exercise. You both agree that this is a fun way to spend your day. The two of you decide that you will play five games and then go for something cold to drink. The two of you are about to play the last game, each of you has already won two games a piece.

Please place a 1 beside the statement you feel is **most** important.

Then place a 3 beside the statement you feel is **least** important.

33. In this game I felt it was most important to beat the other player. col03 _____

In this game I felt it was most important to play the game fairly. _____

In this game I feel it was most important to play as well as I could. _____

SITUATION 4

You are on a track and field relay team. Your team is in the finals at a big meet. Your team is running against another team which your team has never beaten. This is the most important track meet of the school year and all your family and friends are there to watch.

Please place a 1 beside the statement you feel is **most** important.

Then place a 3 beside the statement you feel is **least** important.

34. In this game I felt it was most important to beat the other team. col04 _____

In this game I felt it was most important to play the game fairly. _____

In this game I felt it was most important to play as well as I could. _____

SECTION 5: MORE GENERAL INFORMATION

35. Have you heard of the Fair Play program?
 yes no don't know col105
36. My phys. ed. teacher, teaches fair play.
 yes no don't know col106
37. The school I attend promotes fair play activities.
 yes no don't know col107
38. Beginning at Grade 4, in which grades do you remember being taught **Fair Play**. Please mark (x) all grades in which it was taught. col108
- | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> grade 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> grade 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> grade 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> I don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> I was never taught fair play |
39. What are the 5 ideals of Fair Play?
- | | |
|----------|--------|
| 1. _____ | col109 |
| 2. _____ | col110 |
| 3. _____ | col111 |
| 4. _____ | col112 |
| 5. _____ | col113 |
40. What do you remember most about the classes on Fair Play?
- | | |
|-------|--------|
| _____ | col114 |
| _____ | col115 |
| _____ | col116 |
| _____ | col117 |
| _____ | col118 |
| _____ | |

41. Who do you feel **is most** responsible for teaching you Fair Play? Pick only one.

- col19
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parents | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Athletes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coaches | <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your Teammates | <input type="checkbox"/> Yourself |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sports Officials | |

42. Who do you feel **should be most** responsible for teaching Fair Play? Pick only one.

- col20
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parents | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Athletes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coaches | <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Your Teammates | <input type="checkbox"/> Yourself |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sports Officials | |

This is the end. Thank you for your participation.

REFERENCES

- Bredemeir, B.J., & Shields, D.L. (1985). "Values and Violence in Sports Today". *Psychology Today*, (Oct) 23-32.
- Bredemeier, B.J. (1994). "Children's Moral Reasoning and Their Assertive, Aggressive, and Submissive Tendencies in Sport and Daily Life". *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16, 1-14.
- Bredemeier, B.J., & Shields, D.L. (1984). "Divergence in Moral Reasoning About Sport and Everyday Life". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1, 348-357.
- Coakley, J.J. (1990). Sport in Society: Issues and Controversies. St. Louis. Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.
- Commission for Fair Play. (1986). "Fair Play for Kids: a resource manual". Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Center.
- Delattre, E.J. (1988). "Some Reflections on Success and Failure in Competitive Athletics". in William J. Morgan and Klaus V. Meier (eds). Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics Publishers. Lea and Febiger.
- Diggs, B.J. (1979). "Rules and Utilitarianism". in Ellen Gerber and William J. Morgan (eds). Sport and the Body: a philosophical symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Dubin, Charles L.(Commissioner) (1990). Commission of Inquiry into the Use of Drugs and Banned Practices Intended to Increase Athletic Performance. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Center.
- Feezel, R.M. (1988). "On the Wrongness of Cheating and Why Cheater's Can't Play the Game". *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 15. 57-68.
- Fraleigh, W. (1988). "Why the Good Foul is Not Good" in William Morgan and Klaus Meier (eds) Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics Publishers Inc.

REFERENCES

- Greer, D.L., & Stewart, M.J. (1989). "Children's Attitudes Toward Play: An Investigation of Their Context Specificity and relationship to Organized Sport Experiences". *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 336-342.
- Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). "Positive Deviance Among Athletes: The Implications of Overconformity to the Sport Ethic". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8, 307-325.
- Huizinga, J., (1950). Homo Ludens. Boston. Beacon Press.
- Johns, D., & Eldridge, G. (1990). "Fair Play and the Organization of Sport". *C.A.P.H.E.R. Journal*.
- Keating, James, W. (1979). "Sportsmanship as a Moral Category". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds) Sport and the Body: a philosophical symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Knoppers, A., Zuidema, M., Meyer, B.B. (1989). "Playing to Win or Playing to Play". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 6, 70-76.
- Knoppers, A. (1985). "Professionalization of Attitudes: A Review and Critique". *Quest*, 37, 92-102.
- Lacy, M.G., & Greer, D.L. (1992). "Conceptualizing Attitudes Toward Play: The Game Orientation Scale and the Context Modified Webb Scale". *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9, 286-294.
- Leaman, Oliver. (1988). "Cheating and Fair Play in Sport". in William Morgan and Klaus Meier (eds) Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics Publishers Inc.
- Lehman, Craig, K. (1988). "Can Cheaters Play the Game". in William Morgan and Klaus Meier (eds) Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics Publishers Inc.
- Lueschen, G. (1976). "Cheating in Sport" in Daniel M. Landers Social Problems in Athletics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

REFERENCES

- Mangan, J.A. (1985). The Games Ethic and Imperialism. Middlesex, England. Penguin Books Ltd.
- McIntosh, P. (1979). Fair Play: Ethics in Sport and Education. London. Heinemann
- Nachmias, D., & Nachmias, C. (1987). Research Methods in the Social Sciences 3rd edition. New York, New York. St. Martin's Press Inc.
- Nelson, K., & Cody, C. (1974). "Competition, Cooperation, and Fair Play". International Review of Sport Sociology, 1, 97-103.
- Pearson, K. M., (1988). "Deception, Sportsmanship, and Ethics". in William Morgan and Klaus Meier (eds). Philosophic Inquiry in Sport. Champaign, Illinois. Human Kinetics Publishers Inc.
- Ralls, Anthony. (1979). "The Game of Life". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds). Sport and the Body: a philosophical symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Rawls, J., (1979). "The Practice Conception of Rules". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds). Sport and the Body: a philosophic symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Royce, J., (1979). "Physical Training and Moral Education". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds) Sport and the Body: a philosophical symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Sato, I., (1988). "Play Theory of Delinquency: Toward a General Theory of "Action"". Symbolic Interaction, 11, no.2, 191-212.
- Shields, D.L.L., Bredemeier, B.J., Gardner, D.E., and Bostrom, A., (1995). "Leadership, Cohesion, and Team Norms Regarding Cheating and Aggression". Sociology of Sport Journal, 12, 324-336.
- Slusher, H.S., (1979). "Morality as an Intimate of Sport". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds). Sport and the Body: a philosophical symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.

REFERENCES

- Spencer, H., (1979). "The Ethics of Pleasure". in Ellen W. Gerber and William Morgan (eds). Sport and the Body: a philosophic symposium. Philadelphia. Lea and Febiger.
- Sudman, S., (1976). Applied Sampling. New York: Academic Press.
- Webb, H., (1969). "Professionalization of Attitudes Toward Play Among Adolescents". in G. Kenyon (ed) Aspects of Contemporary Sport Sociology. Chicago: The Athletic Institute.