

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD SPORTSMANSHIP
AMONG JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BOYS

ES 75

A Thesis

Presented to

The Department of

Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Thomas Michael Tomlin

August 1970

Thesis
1770
T

George Milton
Approved for the Major Department

James C. Boyle
Approved for the Graduate Council

303181²

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Problem.....	1
Importance of the Study.....	2
Limitations of the Study.....	3
Definitions of Terms.....	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
Introduction.....	5
Related Research: A Chronological Study.....	6
Summary.....	11
III. PROCEDURE.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Program.....	14
Selection of Subjects.....	15
Procedure.....	17
Testing Device.....	18
Treatment of Data.....	20
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Analysis of Question One.....	22
Analysis of Question Two.....	22

CHAPTER	PAGE
Analysis of Question Three.....	23
Analysis of Question Four.....	24
Analysis of Question Five.....	24
Analysis of Question Six.....	25
Analysis of Question Seven.....	26
Analysis of Question Eight.....	26
Analysis of Question Nine.....	27
Analysis of Question Ten.....	27
Discussion.....	28
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	42
Introduction.....	42
Findings.....	42
Summary.....	44
Recommendations.....	45
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47
APPENDIX.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Observed Frequency for Questions One Through Ten.....	31
II. Question One - Tabulation Sheet.....	32
III. Question Two - Tabulation Sheet.....	33
IV. Question Three - Tabulation Sheet.....	34
V. Question Four - Tabulation Sheet.....	35
VI. Question Five - Tabulation Sheet.....	36
VII. Question Six - Tabulation Sheet.....	37
VIII. Question Seven - Tabulation Sheet.....	38
IX. Question Eight - Tabulation Sheet.....	39
X. Question Nine - Tabulation Sheet.....	40
XI. Question Ten - Tabulation Sheet.....	41

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Assumptions that participation in athletic competition fosters the development of sportsmanship have often been made by those individuals responsible for their development. This outgrowth is cultivated by frequent opportunities requiring the participants to make ethical decisions under pressure. Although it is generally agreed that athletic competition is an area for the development of sportsmanship, the distinction between unsportsmanlike conduct and good strategy remains debatable. Controversial, too, is the elusive term, "sportsmanship;" consequently, hereafter it will be defined as conduct becoming a sportsman, involving honest rivalry and graceful acceptance of results. It would seem that too frequently the honest rivalry is underemphasized or perhaps overshadowed by a "win at all cost" philosophy. True sportsmanship emphasizes cooperation not only with the letter of the rules, but also with the spirit of the rules rather than ruthless competition or an impressive won-lost record.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem: The purpose of this study was to determine if junior high school males have a positive attitude towards sportsmanship. Specifically this study will ascertain the difference,

if any, between junior high school males participating in an organized athletic program and males not participating in an organized athletic program.

II. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

If the development of sportsmanship is an objective of athletic competition, we must constantly evaluate and re-evaluate our success (or lack of success) in attaining this objective. Since it is impossible to place each participant in the desired situations and observe his behavior, this evaluation must be done by comparing the sportsmanship attitudes of athletes with the sportsmanship attitudes of non-athletes. Previous studies in this area appear to be contradictory; consequently, it becomes necessary to include other variables in an attempt to determine the conditions promoting the maximum development of sportsmanship without slighting the other objectives of athletic competition.

School athletic programs differ in organization for various and sundry reasons. Probably the greatest dichotomy exists between the athletic programs financed and administered entirely by the school system and those financed and administered entirely by an outside organization, such as the Young Mens Christian Association or other religious affiliated programs. Since most of the related studies dealing with sportsmanship have examined students participating in school sponsored programs, it would seem worthwhile to

introduce this variable: sportsmanship attitudes of athletes participating in a program sponsored by an outside organization compared with the sportsmanship attitudes of non-athletes.

The Shawnee Mission Unified School District 512 like many other school districts has athletic competition between its junior high schools. Unlike many other school districts, however, the program is organized and sponsored by the local Young Mens Christian Association. Although participants represent the schools they attend, the similarity with the school sponsored program ends here. The Shawnee Mission athletic program is organized and conducted outside of school time; therefore, facets of the school sponsored program such as pep rallies, games during school hours, and educators as coaches seldom exist in the Shawnee Mission athletic program.¹

By comparing and contrasting sportsmanship attitudes of boys competing in the Shawnee Mission athletic program with the sportsmanship attitudes of boys from the same schools who do not participate in this program, we may discover if a significant difference exists.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations of this study included: 1) The study included only 200 students from the ten junior high schools in the Shawnee

¹ Pep rallies and games during school hours never exist, but occasionally a teacher is among the volunteer coaches.

Mission Unified District 512; 2) No consideration was given to the economic status of the subjects;² 3) A further limitation might be that the subject evaluated the action of another participant in a hypothetical situation, since the reaction of the subject in the actual situation might not parallel his theoretical opinion.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Attitude. "A manner of acting, feeling, or thinking that shows one's disposition or opinion."³

Athletes. Ninth grade boys who have participated in at least two years of interschool competition.

Non-Athletes. Ninth grade boys who have not participated in any form of interschool athletic competition during junior high school.

Sportsmanship. Conduct becoming a sportsman, involving honest rivalry and graceful acceptance of results.

² This might be considered an important factor since each participant is charged a fee by the Young Mens Christian Association; each boy is also responsible for providing his own equipment.

³ Webster's New World Dictionary. (New York: The New World Publishing Company, 1959), p. 95.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
INTRODUCTION

Leaders in the field of physical education believe very strongly that physical education and athletic competition are areas which can stimulate the development of desirable social behavior. Oberteuffer expresses what seems to be a general feeling among physical education leaders when he states, "In physical education, the teacher has an extraordinary opportunity to affect favorably the foundation of moral and ethical behavior. The physical education experience is a behavior experience."³ This behavioral experience is also to be found in both the intramural and the interscholastic programs. Thus one would hope to find that an individual who has shown himself to be superior in both the physical education and intramural programs and who has advanced to the athletic program would also show a development and retention of a proper sportsmanship attitude. In testing sportsmanship attitudes it would be ideal to place each individual in a particular sports situation and observe his actions in this situation. Unfortunately, this method was impractical as the exact situation would be difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct for a subject

³ Delbert Oberteuffer, Physical Education. (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 198.

or a number of other subjects. Therefore, in reviewing the related research, it was found that most studies used a written critical situation test. Instead of physically testing an individual, the subject was asked to place himself mentally into a specific sport situation and give his reaction to it. Because the results of previous studies were varied, and involved different factors, the review of literature was listed chronologically in an attempt to relate the development of studies in sportsmanship.

RELATED RESEARCH: A CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY

One of the earliest studies related to sportsmanship attitudes was conducted by Hartshorne and May⁴ in 1928. Using an attitude questionnaire, they found that the sportsmanship attitudes of fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade children in the New York Public Schools declined progressively as the child advanced mentally to the upper grades in school.

The evidence of an interest in the continuation of exploring the relationship between character traits and physical education was indicated by Blanchard and a test he developed in 1946.

⁴ H. Hartshorne and M.A. May. Studies in Deceit. (New York: Macmillan, 1928), (mimeographed.) As quoted in Myron Ray Rogers, "Sportsmanship Attitudes Held By Kansas High School Junior and Senior Boys," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1968). p.6.

In reporting the findings concerning junior and senior high school boys, he states:

It appears that character and personality traits are affected by participating in physical education activities; the result being that desirable rather than undesirable traits are stimulated. 5

Seven years later, in 1953, Woods developed a situation test which also measured behavioral preferences. In this test the student selected one of four possible actions, choosing the one closest to the action he would have taken in the same situation. Woods' findings were that behavioral choices improved with maturity.⁶

In 1954, Briddulph added an innovative device to the attitude questionnaire, that of comparison. He was one of the first to compare two groups, one with low athletic ability and one with high athletic ability. In so doing, he found that the group with high athletic ability was significantly higher in personal and social adjustment than the group with low athletic ability.⁷ His technique and his results were milestones in the development of sportsmanship questionnaires; they provided the raw materials for contrast and comparison by further explorers. After Briddulph's research was

⁵ G.E. Blanchard, "Analysis of Character Traits," Research Quarterly, (March, 1946), pp. 33-39.

⁶ H.B. Wood, Manual of Behavioral Performance Record. (Hollywood: California Test Bureau, 1953.)

⁷ Lowell G. Briddulph, "Athletic Achievement and the Personal and Social Adjustment of High School Boys," Research Quarterly, (March, 1954), pp. 1-7.

published, there seemed to be a surge of interest in sportsmanship attitude surveys as several other studies followed. In 1955, McAfee used a twenty-point multiple choice questionnaire involving sports situations. His results contradicted Briddulph as he reported that sportsmanship attitudes became progressively worse from the sixth through the eighth grades.⁸

Seymour modified the approach somewhat in 1956 by studying the behavioral characteristics of participants and non-participants in a Little League Baseball Program. He found no significant difference in behavioral characteristics between the two groups he studied. He noted, however, that desirable personality traits recognized by the subjects' teachers were higher in the participant group than in the non-participant group. This difference, however, was not significant at the .05 level.⁹

Continuing the research was Booth who used the Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) in 1958 to compare the personality traits of college athletes and non-athletes.¹⁰ He found that the

⁸ Robert McAfee, "Sportsmanship Attitudes of Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Grade Boys," Research Quarterly, (March, 1955), p.120.

⁹ Emery Seymour, "Comparative Study of Certain Behavioral Characteristics of Participants and Non-Participants in Little League Baseball," Research Quarterly, (October, 1956), pp. 338-346.

¹⁰ E.G. Booth, Jr., "Personality Traits of Athletes as Measured by the M.M.P.I.," Research Quarterly, (May, 1958), pp. 127-138.

non-athlete scored significantly higher in the interest variable. The social responsibility variable showed the upperclass, non-athlete significantly higher than the freshmen athletes, non-athletes, and varsity athletes.

Little League baseball was the concern of Kehr who used the McAfee Preference Record and found no significant difference in participants and non-participants. In a similar manner, she also found that no change in sportsmanship attitudes took place in boys participating in the Little League Baseball Program.¹¹

Haskins' purpose in developing and validating two forms of a written test in sportsmanship was not to test sportsmanship attitudes specifically, but instead to validate a test which could be used to test sportsmanship attitudes. Each of the forms that she developed had twenty multiple choice questions involving critical situations in sports.¹²

In 1963, Bouyer examined the sportsmanship attitudes of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade California children. He divided the children into two groups and read twelve sports stories to the experimental group while the control group did not hear the stories. After administering a sportsmanship test to both groups, Bouyer concluded that

¹¹ Geneva B. Kehr, "An Analysis of Sportsmanship Responses of Groups of Boys Classified as Participants and Non-Participants in Organized Baseball," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, New York, 1959).

¹² Mary Jane Haskins, "Problem Solving Test for Sportsmanship," Research Quarterly, (December, 1960), pp. 601-606.

the reading of sports stories had little or no effect on the sports-
manship attitudes of the children.¹³

Continuing the use of two groups, Bowers divided 119 male mem-
bers of a freshmen physical education class at Louisiana State
University into athletes and non-athletes, and used a ten question
sports situation test to analyze their sportsmanship attitudes. How-
ever, he found no significant difference in the attitudes of the two
groups.¹⁴

In comparing the sportsmanship attitudes of state and denomi-
national colleges, Pearson¹⁵ added a new variable. In testing
athletes, non-athletes, and coaches at both schools he used the
"Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations," which con-
tained twenty questions. Pearson concluded that no significant
difference in sportsmanship attitudes existed among:

1. Basketball players at denominational colleges
and basketball players at state colleges.
2. Non-athletes from denominational colleges and
non-athletes from state colleges.
3. Athletes and non-athletes.

He also found that no significant relationship in sportsmanship
attitudes existed between athletes and their coaches.

¹⁴ Louis E. Bowers, "An Investigation of Sportsmanship
Attitudes Held by Adolescent Boys," (Unpublished Psychology
Research Paper, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, January,
1964).

¹⁵ Donald C. Pearson, "Attitudes of Athletes of State and
Denominational Colleges toward Sportsmanship," (Unpublished
Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville,
1966).

In 1968 using ten critical situation questions, Rogers compared sportsmanship attitudes of Kansas high school boys having experience in varsity athletics with high school boys not having participated in varsity athletics. Rogers also compared athletes in a large high school with athletes in a small high school.¹⁶ His conclusions were:

1. Both the athlete and non-athlete groups disagree with overt unsportsmanlike conduct.
2. The athlete group was more likely to agree with an act that might be considered a borderline case.
3. Athletes and non-athletes from large high schools differ more than athletes and non-athletes from small high schools.

SUMMARY

The review of literature revealed a multitude of dichotomies, and the common swing of the pendulum from thesis to antithesis. Perhaps this was to be expected since the subjects, testing procedures, testing devices, and variables themselves formed distinct groups. When surveying the accumulation of studies, a common thread was visible: controversy. One reason for this controversy was the apparent disagreement among investigators as to what constituted good sportsmanship. The chronological investigation revealed that attitude studies became more abundant and more specific after

¹⁶ Myron Ray Rogers, "Sportsmanship Attitudes Held by Kansas High School Junior and Senior Boys," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1968).

the initial investigations during the 1950s. The studies themselves revealed contrast and similarity. Because so many variables were used, they were impossible to categorize; however, recapitulation of the conclusions and areas of emphasis made this even more apparent.

Contrast is evident in two studies prior to 1950. Hartshorne and May concluded that the sportsmanship attitudes of fifth, sixth, and seventh grade students got progressively worse; Blanchard found that participation in physical education improved personality and character.

Throughout the 1950s studies continued to be varied as well as contradictory. Woods found direct contradiction with the earlier study by Hartshorne and May as he concluded that behavioral preferences improved with maturity. In 1955, twenty-seven years after the Hartshorne and May study, the pendulum again reversed itself with the study by McAfee who agreed with their findings. He concluded that sportsmanship attitudes became progressively worse from the sixth grade through the eighth grade.

As studies became more prevalent, more variables were also introduced. Briddulph's study found that persons with more athletic ability scored significantly higher in personal and social adjustment than those with little athletic ability.

Interest in the effects of little league baseball on participants was revealed by two studies. Seymour and Kehr concluded that no significant difference in behavioral characteristics existed between participants and non-participants, and that little league

baseball produced no change in sportsmanship attitudes.

In the late 1950s, Booth found that college non-athletes scored higher in the interest variable than the athletes did.

Studies conducted in the 1960s by Bowers and Pearson found no significant difference in sportsmanship attitudes of athletes and non-athletes at the college level. Bouyer concluded that reading short sports stories to elementary children had little effect on their sportsmanship attitudes. Rogers' 1968 study found that high school non-athletes had better sportsmanship attitudes than athletes, and also that athletes from larger high schools had poorer sportsmanship attitudes than athletes from smaller high schools.

The many variables in age, testing devices, and testing situations made it difficult to draw any concrete conclusions from the research. It revealed that the pendulum had swung from many a well-supported thesis to its antithesis, which having become a new thesis was again challenged by a later study and a new thesis; however, they generally concluded that athletic competition does not necessarily improve sportsmanship.

CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION

In attempting to determine if a significant difference in sportsmanship attitudes existed between ninth grade males who had participated in interschool athletics and ninth grade males who had not competed interscholastically, a questionnaire was formulated and administered to 189 ninth grade males in ten Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools. Interscholastic competition in the Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools is organized and administered by an outside organization, the local Young Mens Christian Association; this fact afforded a variable not previously examined in studies comparing the sportsmanship attitudes of athletes and non-athletes. The questionnaire was administered by the physical education instructors in each of the ten schools.

I. PROGRAM

Students in the Shawnee Mission Unified School District 512 were selected for this study because their athletic program is financed and administered through the local Young Mens Christian Association rather than the school system itself. The original athletic policy for the Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools did not allow for interscholastic athletics. The founders of the policy felt very strongly that this program should not be conducted in the

junior high schools. Thus, in 1960, the Johnson County Young Mens Christian Association began athletic competition to fill what they felt to be a void. Boys participating in this program are responsible for supplying their uniforms besides being assessed a fee to cover the expenses of officials, field and gymnasium rentals, and insurance.

This organizational structure introduced a variable which had not previously been examined in studies comparing sportsmanship attitudes of athletes and non-athletes.

II. SELECTION OF SUBJECTS

Twenty ninth grade males in each of the ten Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools were the subjects for the study, ten boys who had participated in at least two years of interscholastic basketball competition sponsored by the local Young Mens Christian Association, and ten boys who had not participated in any form of interscholastic athletic competition during junior high school. Boys who had participated in intramurals only were considered in the non-athlete, or non-participant group.

Initially, the physical education teachers at each of the ten junior high schools made inquiries in their physical education classes to determine individual classifications of "athletes" and "non-athletes" according to the definitions set up for this survey. From these large groups each physical education teacher selected twenty boys (ten from each group) to participate in the study. To

guarantee the equality of groups, the questionnaire again requested the athletic background of each student as follows:

<u>SPORT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SEASONS</u>
FOOTBALL _____	_____
BASKETBALL _____	_____
SOCCER _____	_____
TRACK _____	_____
VOLLEYBALL _____	_____
OTHER (please list)	
_____	_____
_____	_____

By examining this data, the athletic background of each student was double-checked. This second check revealed that of the 200 questionnaires returned, 101 boys had participated in the Young Mens Christian Association basketball program for at least two years under the name of their respective schools; they composed the "athlete" group. The cross-examination proved necessary as there were eleven other boys who had competed interscholastically for one year; consequently, they were disqualified from both groups.

Of the remaining questionnaires, 88 boys had not participated in interscholastic athletics in any form during their seventh, eighth, or ninth grade school years; they composed the second group, the "non-athlete" group.

III. PROCEDURE

On January 6, 1969, a letter and a copy of the sportsmanship questionnaire was sent to Dr. Bruning, Assistant Superintendent of the Shawnee Mission High School District (Shawnee Mission, Kansas, since unified). The letter requested permission to administer the questionnaire in the Shawnee Mission Junior High School physical education classes. Within a month the questionnaire was approved, and permission was granted to administer it in the physical education classes.

Next, the physical education teachers at each of the junior high schools were telephoned by the investigator. They were asked to help with the survey by administering the questionnaire, and informed as to the nature of the study. Terms were explained and questions such as the classifications for "athletes" and "non-athletes" were answered. All ten agreed to conduct the survey by giving the questionnaire to ten "athletes" and ten "non-athletes" at their respective schools.

Having received permission from the school district and approval from the physical education teachers, the questionnaire was then given to a sample group of ninth grade students at Trailridge Junior High School in Shawnee Mission. The main purpose of this sample testing was to ascertain any interpretation problems the students might have in taking the test. No interpretation problems developed.

On May 12, 1969, the ten physical education teachers were sent a packet of materials for administering the questionnaires through the interschool mail. The packet not only contained the questionnaires and instructions for their administration, but also a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the questionnaires. The instructions for the administration of the questionnaire left the testing situation (i.e. administered to individual students during study periods, administered to small groups during physical education classes, or administered to all twenty boys during physical education class, etc.) to the discretion of each of the physical education teachers.

The physical education teachers were also asked to remind the boys that the answers were not necessarily right or wrong, but instead involved their personal judgements or opinions. Finally, they were asked to administer the questionnaire within two weeks at their convenience.

IV. TESTING DEVICE

The questionnaire was entitled, "A Survey of Attitudes towards Sports Situations," so that its specific purpose would not be disclosed. It was formulated from theoretical incidents which might occur in football, basketball, and baseball games. These situations were similar to those in the first validated test in sportsmanship

by Haskins¹⁷ which was later modified by Bowers¹⁸ and Rogers.¹⁹ These tests simulated questionable sports situations which gave the participant an advantage or greater possibility of winning by choosing an action which might be interpreted as unsportsmanlike.

The chief difference in previous questionnaires and the one used in this study was that the student rated another participant's action rather than his own or the action of his coach. It was hoped that this change would make the questionnaire more objective since the student being tested might find it easier to reveal his objective opinion if he were rating the action of another rather than his own, or the justification of an action that had been thrust upon him.

The questionnaire included ten game situations in which a student was asked to check one of five responses indicating his opinion of the action of the participant. Each rater was asked to choose one of the following responses: 1) strongly agree with; 2) agree with; 3) strongly disagree with; 4) disagree with; or 5) no opinion. Students were instructed not to sign the questionnaire, but were encouraged to give their honest opinions.

¹⁷ Haskins, op. cit.

¹⁸ Bowers, op. cit.

¹⁹ Rogers, op. cit.

IV. TREATMENT OF DATA

The frequency of percentages of responses for each of the five categories was computed. Each question was computed using the Chi Square Test to determine significant differences between the two groups.

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine if junior high school males have a positive attitude toward sportsmanship. Specifically, this study was made to ascertain the difference, if any, between junior high school males participating in an organized athletic program and males not participating in an organized athletic program. The subjects were 189 ninth grade males from the ten Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools in Shawnee Mission, Kansas.

A ten-point questionnaire was formulated and used to determine whether a significant difference in attitudes towards sportsmanship existed between the two groups. Each question was analyzed using the Chi Square Test for variance as outlined by Freund.²⁰

The sample population was divided into two groups, 101 "athletes" and 88 "non-athletes." The tables cite the results as follows: Table I shows the tabulated observed frequency results for the two groups and for all ten questions. Tables II through XI show the observed frequencies (O_f) and the expected frequencies (E_f) as outlined by Garrett²¹ for questions one through ten respectively.

²⁰ John E. Freund, Mathematical Statistics. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), pp. 272-274.

²¹ Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education. (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 254-255.

II. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION ONE

Question one asked the subjects to strongly agree, agree, give no opinion, disagree, or strongly disagree with the action of a spectator who participated in "booing" his opponent during a free throw attempt. Seventeen percent (or 17 of 101) of the athletes agreed or strongly agreed²² with this action while sixteen percent (or 15 of 88) of the non-athlete group agreed or strongly agreed with this behavior. When subjected to the Chi Square Test to determine if a significant difference existed in the way the two groups responded, a figure of 0.76943 was obtained. Since a figure of 9.488 is required at the .05 level or 13.277 at the .01 level to indicate a significant difference with a degree of freedom equal to four, it was clear that no significant difference existed in the way that athletes and non-athletes responded to this question.

III. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION TWO

Question two asked the subjects to give their opinion of a basketball player who intentionally fouled an opponent in order to prevent an easy lay-up. Of the athlete group, 88 percent (or 89 of 101) agreed with this action while 66 percent (or 58 of 88) of the non-athletes responded in the same manner. At the other end of the

²² Hereafter the agree and strongly agree responses as well as the disagree and strongly disagree answers will be combined and listed simply as agreed or disagreed for discussion purposes.

scale, twenty-five of the 88 non-athletes (35 percent) disagreed with this action while only eleven athletes (eleven percent) disagreed with it. An application of the Chi Square Test for question two yielded a score of 18.136. Since this figure was greater than both 9.488 significant at the .05 level and 13.277 significant at the .01 level with four degrees of freedom, question two revealed a significant difference in the way that athletes and non-athletes responded.

IV. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION THREE

Attempting to intentionally injure or at least temporarily disable the best player on the opposing basketball team was the incident involved in question three. It was found that only seven percent of the athletes and five percent of the non-athletes agreed with this action. Of the 88 non-athletes questioned, 81 (or 92 percent) disagreed with this action while 83 percent of the athletes (84 of 101) responded the same way. Also noteworthy was that ten percent of the athletes chose not to respond to the question while only three percent of the non-athletes were unsure of their feelings concerning this action. When subjected to the Chi Square Test, a figure of 8.607 was obtained. Although this figure did not reach the 9.488 figure required for a significant difference at the .05 level, its proximity coupled with the seriousness of an intentional injury made the results worth discussion.

V. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION FOUR

A baseball player who had developed a technique in which he pretended to tag second base but did not actually do so was the subject of question four. The fake tag was difficult for the umpire to detect, and it enabled the boy's team to complete more double plays than they would have been able to legally. When asked for their opinion of this action, 65 percent (or 66 of 101) of the athletes tested disagreed with this action; 66 of 88 (or 75 percent) non-athletes responded this same way. The difference, however, was not found to be significant as the result of the Chi Square Test was 2.985 which is lower than the 9.488 required at the .05 level for significance.

VI. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION FIVE

Question five described the following situation: After slightly deflecting a pass out of bounds during a basketball game, Jim returned to his defensive position. Rather than stepping out of bounds and pretending that he was not responsible for the deflection unseen by the official, Jim's action makes it obvious that he was responsible. When the subjects were asked to rate Jim's action, their reactions subjected to the Chi Square Test, yielded a score of only .7153, far below the 9.488 required for a significant difference. It was interesting to note, however, that both the athlete and the

non-athlete groups were divided on this question. It was found that of the 101 athletes, 52 percent agreed or strongly agreed, 35 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 13 percent chose no opinion. Of the 88 non-athletes questioned, 45 percent agreed, 40 percent disagreed, and 15 percent chose no opinion of this action.

VII. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION SIX

Question six asked the subjects to rate the action of a baseball player in the following situation. Brad is a base runner on first base when a teammate hits a ball deep into centerfield which could have been an inside-the-park home run. Brad intentionally loafes around the bases and times his dash for home plate so that he will crash into the catcher who is attempting to catch the ball thrown from the outfield. Brad's action permitted his teammate to be safe at home.

Seventy-three percent of the 101 athletes disagreed with this action as compared to 58 percent (or 51 of 88) of the non-athletes. Twenty percent of the 101 athletes and 31 percent of the 88 non-athletes agreed with this action. Although the Chi Square result of 7.945 did not reach the 9.488 figure required for significance at the .05 level, it was felt that its proximity deserved attention.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION SEVEN

Seventy-one athletes (or 70 percent) agreed with the action of a baseball pitcher who intentionally threw a ball high and inside to prevent a league-leading hitter from maintaining a stationary stance. Sixty-two percent (or 65 or 88) of the non-athlete group also maintained that this action was acceptable. Twenty-six percent of the athletes and 25 percent of the non-athletes disagreed with this action.

The fact that the Chi Square score of 8.086 was very close to the 9.488 figure required for significant difference at the .05 level was best explained by examining the "no opinion" responses. Here the difference was evident as only three of 101 athletes (three percent) gave no response while ten of the 88 non-athletes (eleven percent) chose not to reply. Thus the major differences were caused by a higher percentage of athletes agreeing with the action while more non-athletes chose not to make the decision.

IX. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION EIGHT

When asked to rate the action of a basketball player who intentionally claimed a foul he did not commit in an attempt to keep a better teammate eligible for play, no significant difference was found in the attitudes of athletes and non-athletes. The Chi Square Test yielded a figure of 5.478, a figure short of the 9.488

required for significance at the .05 level. Forty-nine of the 101 athletes (or 49 percent) and 38 of the 88 non-athletes (or 32 percent) agreed with this action.

X. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION NINE

Sixty-four percent of the 101 athletes agreed with a basketball player who refrained from taking unfair advantage of his opponents by using a perfected technique of palming the basketball while dribbling. Sixty-five of the 88 non-athletes (or 74 percent) also agreed with this action. No significant difference was found using the Chi Square Test, as a figure of 9.488 was necessary at the .05 level with four degrees of freedom, and a figure of 2.697 was obtained.

XI. ANALYSIS OF QUESTION TEN

This question involved intentional injury to an opponent when victory was no longer possible; the motive was revenge. Eleven percent of both groups agreed with this action, eleven of the 101 athletes and ten of the 88 non-athletes. Eighty-six percent (or 86 of 101) of the athletes disagreed with this action while 74 of the 88 non-athletes (or 83 percent) were opposed to this action. Since a figure of 3.047 was obtained using the Chi Square Test, no significant difference existed in the way the two groups responded to this question. A figure of 9.488 was required at the .05 level with four degrees of freedom for significance.

DISCUSSION

The ten questions were divided into three distinct categories for further analysis: 1) situations that involved neither obvious rule violations nor the possibility of injury; 2) situations that involved rule violations with the intention of gaining an advantage over an opponent, but did not involve intentional injury to an opponent; and 3) situations which involved a rule violation coupled with the potential or intentional act of injuring an opponent.

Those questions which formed category one were questions one (booing an opponent during a free throw attempt); five (a basketball player admitting through his action that he had deflected a pass out of bounds); and eight (a basketball player's attempting to have a teammate's foul recorded against himself.) Previous studies with high school subjects indicated that the athlete was more likely to take advantage of situations such as those in questions five and nine. The studies imply that this difference exists because the athlete is more likely to consider this action good strategy rather than poor sportsmanship, however, this premise was not substantiated by this study with ninth grade male athletes. No significant difference was found in the way that the subjects responded to these "privileged-situation" questions.

The second category involved rule violations with the intention of gaining an advantage over an opponent, however, the situations did

not involve injuring an opponent. Question four (faking a tag at second base in baseball to speed up a double play); nine (refraining from using an illegal dribbling technique in basketball) were considered to be in this category. Question two (an intentional foul in basketball to prevent a lay-up), was also included in this second category, but unlike the other questions, question two revealed a significant difference in the attitudes of athletes and non-athletes. The responses indicated that a boy who had competed interscholastically felt that an intentional foul to prevent a lay-up in a basketball game was not only acceptable, but also the desirable thing to do. Non-athletes disagreed with this action.

The third category involved a rule violation coupled with the potential or intentional act of injuring an opponent. Although none of the questions in this category reached the 9.488 level required for significance at the .05 level, three of the four were found sufficiently close to merit examination. Question three (an intentional foul in basketball for the purpose of injuring or "shaking up" an outstanding opponent) was studied. Upon closer examination, it was evident that the chief difference in the responses of the two groups was not in disagreeing or agreeing with the action, but rather in remaining silent. A higher percentage of athletes chose no opinion in response to this question while the non-athletes preferred to make a decision. Question six involved a baseball player who intentionally crashed into the catcher to help a teammate score

on an inside-the-park home run. Again the figure obtained was not equal to or greater than the 9.488 figure required, but it was sufficiently close to note that the non-athlete was more likely to agree with this action than the athlete. The third question in category three, question seven, involved intentionally frightening the batter by throwing a pitch high and inside in baseball. The figure of 8.086 again did not reach the 9.488 required at the .05 level, but its proximity caused careful examination of this question. As in question three, it was seen that the major difference was not in the opinion responses given, but instead, in the no opinion responses given. Unlike question three, however, question seven showed the non-athlete rather than the athlete choosing the no opinion response. Question ten, the final question for category three involved injuring an opponent when the game was obviously lost. Again no significant difference was found, however, a very low percentage from both groups agreed with this action.

TABLE I

OBSERVED FREQUENCY FOR QUESTIONS ONE THROUGH TEN

Ques.	ATHLETES					NON-ATHLETES				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	15	6	46	32	2	13	6	44	23
2	49	40	1	7	4	22	36	5	13	12
3	0	7	10	36	48	2	2	3	29	52
4	4	19	12	35	31	4	10	8	32	34
5	20	32	14	27	8	16	24	14	26	8
6	4	17	6	42	32	3	28	6	35	16
7	22	49	3	18	9	14	41	10	15	8
8	12	37	7	33	12	5	33	9	23	18
9	31	45	7	12	6	35	30	6	10	7
10	1	10	4	25	61	4	6	4	19	55
Totals	145	271	70	281	243	107	223	71	246	233

TABLE II
 TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION ONE

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	32	29.39	46	48.10	6	6.41	15	14.96	2	2.14
NON-ATHLETES	23	25.61	44	41.90	6	5.59	13	13.04	2	1.86
TOTALS	55	55.00	90	90.00	12	12.00	28	28.00	4	4.00

$$\chi^2 = 0.76943$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE III
 TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION TWO

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	4	8.55	7	10.7	1	3.21	40	40.61	49	37.94
NON-ATHLETES	12	7.47	13	9.31	5	2.79	36	35.38	22	33.06
TOTALS	16	16.00	20	20.01	6	6.00	76	75.99	71	71.00

$$\chi^2 = 18.136$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE IV

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION THREE

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	48	53.44	36	34.74	10	6.95	7	4.81	0	1.07
NON-ATHLETES	52	46.56	29	30.26	3	6.05	2	4.19	2	0.93
TOTALS	100	100.00	65	65.00	13	13.00	9	9.00	2	2.00

$$\chi^2 = 8.60736$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE V

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION FOUR

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	31	34.74	35	35.80	12	10.69	19	15.50	4	4.28
NON-ATHLETES	34	30.26	32	31.20	8	9.31	10	13.50	4	3.72
TOTALS	65	65.00	67	67.00	20	20.00	29	29.00	8	8.00

$$\chi^2 = 2.98578$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE VI

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION FIVE

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	8	8.55	27	28.32	14	14.96	32	29.93	20	19.24
NON-ATHLETES	8	7.45	26	24.68	14	13.37	24	26.07	16	16.76
TOTALS	16	16.00	53	53.00	28	28.33	56	56.00	36	36.00

$$\chi^2 = .71533$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE VII

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION SIX

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	32	25.65	42	41.15	6	6.41	17	24.08	4	3.72
NON-ATHLETES	16	22.35	35	35.85	6	5.59	28	20.95	3	3.26
TOTALS	48	48.00	77	77.00	12	12.00	45	45.03	7	7.00

$$\chi^2 = 7.94478$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE VIII

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION SEVEN

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	9	9.08	18	17.63	3	6.95	49	48.10	22	19.24
NON-ATHLETES	8	7.92	15	15.37	10	6.05	41	41.90	14	16.76
TOTALS	17	17.00	33	33.00	13	13.00	90	90.00	36	36.00

$$\chi^2 = 8.08614$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE IX

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION EIGHT

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	12	16.03	33	29.93	7	8.55	37	37.41	12	9.08
NON-ATHLETES	18	13.97	23	26.07	9	7.45	33	32.59	5	7.92
TOTALS	30	30.00	56	56.00	16	16.00	70	70.00	17	17.00

$$\chi^2 = 5.47833$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE X

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION NINE

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	6	6.95	12	11.76	7	6.95	45	40.08	31	35.27
NON-ATHLETES	7	6.05	10	10.24	6	6.05	30	34.92	35	30.73
TOTALS	13	13.00	22	22.00	13	13.00	75	75.00	66	66.00

$$\chi^2 = 2.69662$$

$$df = 4$$

TABLE XI

TABULATION SHEET FOR QUESTION TEN

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		No Opinion		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f	O _f	E _f
ATHLETES	61	61.99	25	23.51	4	4.28	10	8.55	1	2.67
NON-ATHLETES	55	54.01	19	20.49	4	3.72	6	7.45	4	2.33
TOTALS	116	116.00	44	44.00	8	8.00	16	16.00	5	5.00

$$\chi^2 = 3.0472$$

$$df = 4$$

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

A questionnaire which contained ten hypothetical sports situations was used in this study to discover if a significant difference in sportsmanship attitudes existed between ninth grade athletes and ninth grade non-athletes. Subjects were selected from ten Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools to participate in this study. These subjects were chosen by their physical education teachers who also administered the test.

I. FINDINGS

After computing percentages of responses for both groups on individual questions and subjecting each question to the Chi Square Test for variance, the results revealed that a significant difference in attitudes existed only in question two; questions three, seven, and six, were found to be close to the level of significance. However, questions seven and three seemed to belong in a separate category as their proximity to the significance level was caused by the "no opinion" responses rather than a disagreement or agreement with the action. All other questions showed no significant difference in attitudes, however, an analysis of each question revealed the extent of the findings concerning each question:

Question one: Neither group condoned a spectator who participated in booing an opponent during a free throw attempt.

Question two: Athletes were more likely to agree with an intentional basketball foul executed to prevent a lay-up.

Question three: Neither group tended to agree with an intentional flagrant foul in basketball committed maliciously to injure a superior opponent. It was interesting to note that more athletes than non-athletes were undecided on this question.

Question four: No significant difference was found in the way that the two groups felt about a player who pretended to tag second base to improve the chances of a double play in baseball. Both groups disagreed with this action.

Question five: Both groups were inclined to agree with a basketball player who admitted by his action that he had deflected a pass before it went out of bounds.

Question six: Although no significant difference was obtained, it appeared that non-athletes were more likely to agree with crashing into a catcher in baseball to aid a teammate in a home run than the athletes were.

Question seven: Both groups seemed to agree with throwing a pitch high and inside to prevent a league-leading hitter from keeping a normal batting stance in baseball. However, a higher percentage of non-athletes were uncertain as to how they felt than were the athletes.

Question eight: The subjects appear to be divided on this question as only a slightly higher percentage of both groups disagreed with a basketball player who intentionally attempted to draw a foul for a teammate.

Question nine: Both groups tended to agree with a high school basketball player who did not use an illegal dribbling maneuver because he felt that it was an unfair advantage.

Question ten: A very large percentage of both groups strongly disagreed with a football player who intentionally injured an opponent for the sake of revenge.

II. SUMMARY

It was interpreted from the findings of this study that ninth grade male students classified as athletes and non-athletes differed significantly in sportsmanship attitudes in only one of ten sports situations. The results of the question indicate that if an intentional foul in basketball can be considered unsportsmanlike conduct, the athletes are more unsportsmanlike than the non-athletes in this situation. However, this "unsportsmanlike" action would undoubtedly be interpreted by many of these athletes (and many of their coaches) as "good strategy" rather than "poor sportsmanship." Sports situations such as this borderline incident in which the athlete, non-athlete and many times even the person responsible for the teaching

of sportsmanship do not agree make sportsmanship the controversial subject that this study indicated.

The results of this study do not show that a person who participates in athletic competition has a superior sportsmanship attitude to a person who has not competed interscholastically. Perhaps the fallacy that athletes have a superior sportsmanship attitude developed from the assumption that participation alone provided the experiences necessary for the cultivation of sportsmanship, that it alone fostered good sportsmanship, when actually good sportsmanship attitudes must be cultivated, developed, and practiced much like any fundamental skill in athletics.

It was encouraging to conclude from the results of this study that neither the participant nor the non-participant agreed with actions which were intended to injure an opponent.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that further study in the area of sportsmanship attitudes examine the sportsmanship attitudes of physical educators and coaches of junior high school participants. A comparison might then be made between these two groups to determine the influence of the physical education teacher or coach on the sportsmanship attitudes at this age level.

A further recommendation would be that a comparison of sportsmanship attitudes held by the participants in a school sponsored

athletic program and participants in an athletic program sponsored by an outside organization be made. Since considerably more time and recognition during school hours is allocated to athletic competition in the school sponsored program, and since the coaches are generally persons who have a background in physical education, it would be interesting to compare these two groups.

A third recommendation would be that a more realistic testing method be developed for evaluating sportsmanship attitudes. Although detailed descriptions are given in written tests, it is impossible to know whether all of the subjects are reading and picturing the same situation.

A final recommendation would be that investigation into the exact meaning of sportsmanship be made. More specifically, it would be interesting to have a standard opinion as to what actually constitutes the unsportsmanlike act. It is felt that this type of investigation might be of value in narrowing that fine line between "poor sportsmanship" and "good strategy."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Freund, John E. Mathematical Statistics. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1958.
- Oberteuffer, Delbert. Physical Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Wood, H.B. Manual of Behavior Performance Record. Hollywood: California Test Bureau, 1953.

B. DICTIONARY REFERENCE

- Webster's New World Dictionary. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1959.

C. PERIODICALS

- Blanchard, G. E. "Analysis of Character Traits," Research Quarterly, (March, 1946), pp. 33-39.
- Booth, E. G. "Personality Traits of Athletes as Measured by the M.M.P.I.," Research Quarterly, (May, 1958), pp. 127-138.
- Bouyer, George. "Children's Concepts of Sportsmanship in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grades," Research Quarterly, (October, 1963), pp. 282-287.
- Briddulph, Lowell G. "Athletic Achievement and the Personal and Social Adjustment of High School Boys," Research Quarterly, (March, 1954), pp. 1-7.
- Haskins, Mary Jane. "Problem Solving Test for Sportsmanship," Research Quarterly, (December, 1960), pp. 601-606.

- Kistler, Joy W. "Attitudes Expressed About Behavior as Demonstrated in Certain Specific Situations Occurring in Sports," College Physical Education Proceedings, (1957), pp. 47-55.
- McAfee, Robert. "Sportsmanship Attitudes of Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Grade Boys," Research Quarterly, (March, 1955), p. 121.
- Seymour, Emery. "Behavior Characteristics of Participants and Non-Participants in Little League Baseball," Research Quarterly, (October, 1956), pp. 338-346.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Bowers, Louis E. "An Investigation of Sportsmanship Attitudes Held by Adolescent Boys," Psychology Research Paper, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, January, 1964.
- Kehr, Geneva B. "An Analysis of Sportsmanship Responses of Groups of Boys Classified as Participants and Non-Participants in Organized Baseball," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. New York University, New York, 1959.
- Pearson, Donald C. "Attitudes of Athletes of State and Denominational Colleges Toward Sportsmanship," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, 1966.
- Rogers, Myron Ray. "Sportsmanship Attitudes Held by Kansas High School Junior and Senior Boys," Unpublished Master's Thesis. Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, 1968.

APPENDIX

9306 Reeder, Apt. 1
Shawnee Mission, Kansas
January 6, 1969

Dr. Bruning
Shawnee Mission High School District
Administration Building
7235 Antioch
Shawnee Mission, Kansas, 66204

Dear Dr. Bruning:

In completing work on my Master's Degree in physical education and in the writing of my thesis, "A Comparative Study of Attitudes Toward Sportsmanship Among Junior High School Boys," I need your cooperation.

I chose this subject because I am interested in comparing the sportsmanship attitudes existing between 1) athletes participating in programs sponsored by an outside organization, with 2) non-athletes participating only in physical education class.

I would appreciate your permission to conduct a survey in the Shawnee Mission Junior High Schools. It would involve a questionnaire which can be completed in 15-20 minutes through the physical education class. Only twenty students from each school will be involved, and the questionnaire can be administered to the entire group at one time or individually to students. Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mike Tomlin

cc: Dr. George Milton

9306 Reeder, Apt. 1
Shawnee Mission, Kansas
May 12, 1969

Mr. Howard Knight
Trailridge Junior High School
7500 Quivira Road
Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Re: sportsmanship questionnaire and survey

Dear Mr. Knight:

The enclosed questionnaire's purpose is to examine sportsmanship attitudes existing among ninth grade boys. It has been approved by the Shawnee Mission High School District, and your help in administering it will be greatly appreciated.

The questionnaire should be given to twenty ninth grade boys: ten ninth grade male students who have participated in at least two years of interschool basketball competition sponsored by the Young Mens Christian Association, and ten males who have not participated in any form of interschool athletic competition during junior high school. Boys who have participated in intramurals only should be considered in this second group. You may choose to give the questionnaire in small groups, individually, or to all twenty boys simultaneously at your convenience.

Before administering the test, please remind the boys that the answers are not necessarily right or wrong, but instead involve their personal judgments or opinions.

The enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope is for your convenience in returning the forms to me by May 28, 1969, if possible.

If you are interested in the results of this survey, please let me know, and I will gladly supply you with the results.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mike Tomlin

"A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS SPORTS SITUATIONS"

Please complete the following information:

1. present age _____ present grade _____ school _____
2. Have you ever competed in athletic events against other junior high schools? (circle one) YES NO
3. Have you participated in at least two seasons of basketball competition against other junior high schools? (circle one) YES NO
4. Answer ONLY if you circled YES for questions 2 and 3: If you have participated in athletic competition against other junior high schools, place an X next to the appropriate sport and list the number of complete seasons in which you participated:

SPORT	NUMBER OF SEASONS
football _____	_____
basketball _____	_____
soccer _____	_____
track _____	_____
volleyball _____	_____
other: (please list) _____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

The following incidents have or might have occurred in various sports. Consider the action taken by the person involved and rate his behavior. Place an X in the blank next to the statement which most closely reflects your feelings toward the player's action. You need not sign this paper, but please do give your honest opinion.

1. John is a spectator at a basketball game with the school's biggest rival. He takes part in "booing" the rivals' players each time one of them attempts a free throw. John does this to rattle his opponent in hopes that he will miss the free throw thus giving his team a better chance to win. How would you judge John's action?

- _____ strongly agree with John's action
 _____ agree with John's action
 _____ disagree with John's action
 _____ strongly disagree with John's action
 _____ no opinion

2. During a close basketball game, Bob's opponents steal the ball. Outnumbered two to one at his own end of the court, Bob prevents his opponents from scoring an almost certain field goal by intentionally fouling one of the two players before the shot. Bob fouls so that his opponent will have only one free throw attempt and his team will be in a better position to rebound. How would you judge Bob's action?

- _____ strongly agree with Bob's action
 _____ agree with Bob's action
 _____ disagree with Bob's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Bob's action
 _____ no opinion

3. Early in the first quarter of an important basketball game, the best player for Tom's opponent's team is driving for a lay-up. As his opponent jumps, Tom moves under him so that the opponent will be injured or at least shaken up when he comes down. How would you rate Tom's action?

- _____ strongly agree with Tom's action
 _____ agree with Tom's action
 _____ disagree with Tom's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Tom's action
 _____ no opinion

4. According to the rules of baseball, a player must step on or tag the base before throwing to first base for a double play. This tag forces the runner out going from first to second base. Bill, a second baseman, has developed a technique; he pretends to touch second base before the throw. This technique makes it difficult for the umpire to detect whether or not Bill has touched second base. This speeds up Bill's throw to first base enabling his team to get more double plays each season. How would you rate Bill's action?

_____ strongly agree with Bill's action
 _____ agree with Bill's action
 _____ disagree with Bill's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Bill's action
 _____ no opinion

5. After slightly deflecting a pass out-of-bounds during a basketball game, Jim returns to his defensive position. Rather than stepping out-of-bounds and pretending that he was not responsible, Jim's action makes it obvious that he has deflected the pass. How do you rate Jim's action?

_____ strongly agree with Jim's action
 _____ agree with Jim's action
 _____ disagree with Jim's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Jim's action
 _____ no opinion

6. Brad is a base runner on first base when a teammate hits a ball deep into centerfield which could be an inside-the-park home run. Brad intentionally loafs around the bases and times his dash for home plate so that he crashes into the catches as he attempts to catch the ball thrown from the outfield. This action on Brad's part permits his teammate to be safe at home. How would you rate Brad's action?

_____ strongly agree with Brad's action
 _____ agree with Brad's action
 _____ disagree with Brad's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Brad's action
 _____ no opinion

7. Paul is pitching in a game and his team is leading 1 to 0 with the league's leading hitter at bat. In order to make this batter nervous and to keep him from planting his feet in the batter's box, Paul intentionally throws a pitch high and inside which causes the batter to jump away from the plate. How do you rate Paul's action?

_____ strongly agree with Paul's action
 _____ agree with Paul's action
 _____ disagree with Paul's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Paul's action
 _____ no opinion

8. During a close basketball game, Mike and Jim have an opponent trapped in the corner when Jim fouls him. Knowing that Jim has four fouls and will be removed from the game, Mike raises his hand in an attempt to have the foul charged against him. How would you judge Mike's action?

- _____ strongly agree with Mike's action
 _____ agree with Mike's action
 _____ disagree with Mike's action
 _____ strongly disagree with Mike's action
 _____ no opinion

9. A high school basketball player, Charles, has developed a technique of palming the basketball which gives him additional control in dribbling the ball while not allowing the officials to detect the palming. However, Charles does not employ this method of dribbling because it would give him an unfair advantage over his opponent. How would you rate Charles' action?

- _____ strongly agree with Charles' action
 _____ agree with Charles' action
 _____ disagree with Charles' action
 _____ strongly disagree with Charles' action
 _____ no opinion

10. Matt's team has a twenty game winning streak, but they are doen by two touchdowns in the championship game. In the closing seconds, the star quarterback of the opposing team hands the ball off and is obviously out of the play. Matt and a teammate take this opportunity for revenge and tackle the quarterback attempting to injur him. How do you rate their action?

- _____ strongly agree with their action
 _____ agree with their action
 _____ disagree with their action
 _____ strongly disagree with their action
 _____ no opinion