

THE EFFECT OF COMPETITION ON THE
SPORTSMANSHIP OF COLLEGE WOMEN

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate College
Wisconsin State University - La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by

Karen R. Toburen

May 1969

WT
69
To
c.2

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY--LA CROSSE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

Candidate: Karen R. Toburen

We recommend acceptance of this thesis to the Graduate College in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Science.

Jean Foss
Thesis Committee Member

May 12, 1969
Date

Bertice A. Baird
Thesis Committee Member

May 12, 1969
Date

Norene A. Smith
Thesis Committee Member

May 12, 1969
Date

This thesis is approved for the Graduate College:

James M. Evelson
Dean, Graduate College

May 19, 1969
Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of athletic competition in which the subjects participated. The subjects used were 251 college women physical education majors. All subjects were given a questionnaire and Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations. The number of athletic events the subjects had participated in during the 1967-1968 academic year was the criteria used for placing the subjects into their respective groups: competition self, competition others, noncompetition self and noncompetition others.

The two independent group method chi square design was employed to measure the relationships between the sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of athletic competition in which the subjects participated. An item analysis was used to compare how the subjects in each of the groups answered the test questions.

Results of the chi square indicated no significant relationships between sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of athletic competition. In all situations except item thirteen, the percentage of correct answers was higher for "self" than for others." The discriminatory power on all of the test items for this group were acceptable with the exceptions of item one for competition "self" and item sixteen for noncompetition "self."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Jean Foss, of the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, for her guidance and chairmanship during this study. She also recognizes gratefully the efforts of Dr. Norene Smith and Dr. Beatrice Baird for their time and direction.

To the students and faculty who participated in this study, the writer expresses her thanks for their willingness to help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the problem.	2
Need for the study.	2
Definition of terms	3
Delimitations	4
Limitations.	4
Assumptions and hypothesis.	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	6
III. PROCEDURE	21
IV. ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	26
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
APPENDIX	45

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Levels of Sportsmanship as Perceived for Self by Competitors and Noncompetitors	27
II. Levels of Sportsmanship as Perceived for Others by Competitors and Noncompetitors	29
III. Difficulty Rating of Test Items on Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations.	32
IV. Item Discrimination for Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations for the Competition Self Group.	35
V. Item Discrimination for Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations for the Competition Other Group	36
VI. Item Discrimination for Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations for the Noncompetition Self Group	37
VII. Item Discrimination for Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations for the Noncompetition Other Group.	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Competitive athletic opportunities for women have increased greatly since the early 1900's. The literature on athletic competition for women has focused on the physiological limitations, the cultural and social expectations, the psychological factors and the personal benefits of competition. Qualities of sportsmanship have been defined and are often included in the evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of competitive sports for women. The values of competition in sports continues to be examined by sociologists, psychologists, and educators. This paper was designed to further evaluate the values of athletic competition for women.

In the realm of sports, desirable standards of conduct are implied by the word "sportsmanship." This term, however, seems to have a different meaning for each individual. In general it has been equated with "quality of honor," "philosophy of life," "attitudes," and "applied religion." No one definition of sportsmanship is universally accepted; nevertheless, in the American culture sportsmanship is placed high among the accepted values.

Culture and society today determine what athletic events are feasible or appropriate for women. The expectations of

society for athletics to produce character, initiative, values, sportsmanship and moral integrity for cultural acceptability may affect its attitudes toward women in competition and the way a girl or woman sees herself in competition. Various tools have been developed in an attempt to measure sportsmanship. Little research has been done in the area of self concept and how subjects tend to view themselves. More research is needed in order to get an accurate assessment of the qualities of sportsmanship. A subject when asked to answer for himself and "others," may project a more honest or even a less socially acceptable response when answering for "others" than when he responds for himself.

Statement of the problem

This study investigated the relationship between measures of sportsmanship and the amount of participation in athletic competition among college women. A second purpose was to investigate the responses of the subjects as they answered for themselves ("self") and how they answered for "others." It was thought that possibly the subjects would reveal some personal or "self" attitudes reflected in the responses selected for others.

Need for the study

The physical educator is often asked to advise some type of athletic club or activity for women in addition to

her physical education class assignments. There are diverse opinions about the value of competitive opportunities for women in sports events. A widely held opinion among physical educators is that experience in athletic competition develops sportsmanship. While widely held, the above concept has been rarely tested.

Situations occur in physical education activities which require the participant to make ethical judgments regarding the behavior of his teammates, his opponents, and especially his own behavior. The development of good sportsmanship is frequently stated as one of the values of physical education and is considered important in developing acceptable behavior patterns. It was hoped that the results of this study might be of some significance or value to better weigh the advantages and disadvantages of competition for women in terms of its effect on sportsmanship.

Definition of terms

Sportsmanship. Sportsmanship is defined by Webster

"as the qualities and behavior befitting a sportsman. A sportsman is a person who can take loss or defeat without complaint, or victory without gloating, and who treats his opponents with fairness, generosity, and courtesy." (9:1410)

Sportsmanship measure. The sportsmanship measure used in this study was Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations developed by Betty Grant Hartman, Ph.D. and Mary Jane Haskins, Ph.D. at The Ohio State University in 1960.

Intramural competition. Intramural competition is an athletic event in which all participants are identified with the same school.

Extramural competition. Extramural competition is an athletic event in which participation from two or more schools compete. The forms of extramural competition include: sports days, telegraphic meets, invitational events and intercollegiate programs.

Delimitations

The subjects used in the study were sophomore, junior, and senior women physical education majors at Wisconsin State University - La Crosse, La Crosse, Wisconsin. The data were collected during the academic year 1967-1968.

Limitations

Certain factors, that were beyond the control of the researcher, may have affected the end result of this study. These factors included the length and time of the sport season and the limited number of intramural and extramural activities offered during the year. Pre-college competitive experiences may have influenced the response of the non-participating group. Limited travel facilities, as well as the restrictions imposed on entries, may have limited the opportunity for individual participation.

No attempt was made to measure the motivation of the subjects as they responded to the questions. The Hawthorne

Effect may have influenced the sportsmanship scores of the subjects.

Assumptions and hypothesis

The design rests on the following assumptions: (1) that the responses made to the situations described on the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations are at least indicative of probable attitudes and behavior in similar situations in which the respondent might actually be involved. (2) that subjects answering for "others" would tend to reveal their personal or "self" attitudes.

The following hypothesis was tested: that there was a relationship between the sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of competition in which the subjects participated.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The opinions regarding the true definition of sportsmanship are varied. Much has been written on sportsmanship, but few studies have been done which involved the subjects' responses to sportsmanship test questions. Related studies completed in the last fifteen years were primarily concerned with the reactions of spectators, instructors and officials to sport situations.

Concepts of sportsmanship

In a discussion of sportsmanship, Bryson (1948) implied that sportsmanship and decent behavior are the same basic virtue: "Democracy is impossible and freedom uncertain without sportsmanship." (10:596) Obertueffer and Ulrich in their textbook Physical Education (1962) contended that there is no general quality of sportsmanship, but that it is a relative term used to describe behavior in specific situations.

"To understand sportsmanship one must understand two things; that specific approved behavior patterns vary from place to place and from time to time. . . . What goes for good sportsmanship in Peru may be thought of quite differently in Connecticut, and what is considered quite all right in baseball may be wrong behavior in tennis. We begin our concept of sportsmanship by recognizing the specificity of behavior. There is no such a thing as a general quality of sportsmanship. They are sportsmanlike acts -- and many of them

put together and done by the same person will probably give him the reputation of being a "sportsman" or "sportsmanlike." (5:197)

These authors believed that a sportsmanlike person is one who behaves in relation to the values and ideals beyond the immediate goal of winning. They continued:

"But if he achieves this distinction in a lasting sense, the chances are great that he has become aware of his values. He has studied his behavior in relation to principles and ideals which go beyond the gains or scores of the moment. He has seen sport not merely as amusement, or something to score more points than someone else, but as an opportunity for testing human relationships, for building friendships and understanding, for learning about human nature." (5:198)

The man credited for the 1896 resumption of the Olympic Games, Baron de Coubertin, recognized the need to emphasize human relationships, values and ideals beyond the goal of winning with the Olympic Creed. "The important thing in the Olympic Games is not winning but taking part. The essential thing in life is not conquering but fighting well." (2:118)

In addressing the Sportsmanship Brotherhood in 1936, President Clothier of Rutgers University described sportsmanship as a philosophy of life:

"Sportsmanship is something far broader than a code which is practiced on the athletic field, it is a philosophy of life which makes its demands on all of us. . . Sportsmanship is international." (11:503)

The Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," was referred to in several writings. Staley in "The Program of Sportsmanship Education," described good sportsmanship behavior in relation to the Golden Rule.

"It is the application of fair play, the square deal, and gallant conduct in athletic contests. It is a moral quality like honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, cooperation, all of which it in fact includes." (24:3)

Daniels, addressing the 1962 Conference on Value in Sports sponsored by the Division of Men's Athletics and The Division of Girls' and Women's Sports of the AAHPER stated, "The concept of sportsmanship has long been portrayed as an example of the finest in man's ethical conduct. In this sense, sportsmanship has expressed the Golden Rule." (13:6)

Beisser, a psychiatrist, former athlete, fan, and reporter examined the thoughts and hearts of those who were caught up in the swiftly moving current of American sports in his book, The Madness in Sports (1967). He attempted to examine crowd pressures, sportsmanship, and physical readiness for performance within the framework of the behavioral sciences. Beisser characterized sportsmanship in the following example:

"With a well executed block, a football player knocks his opponent to the ground. When the play is over he assists his opponent to his feet or if he is injured he expresses concern and offers his help. His act of aggression, the block, was completely justified within the rules of the game. This contradiction, the expression at the same time of fraternity and primitive

aggression, of the reaction of society and biologic ways, is the fundamental contradiction of civilization. Lack of integration of these two forces provides the base of many of the problems of the individual and society. The athlete who has truly become a "good sport" has achieved a high level of integration between his individual biological desires and the needs of the society in which he lives." (2:186)

The theory that an individual places himself in the role or position of another person when he attempts to discern that other person's attitudes has long been a subject of study for social psychologists.

An eminent psychologist, Mead, in Mind, Self and Society (1934) wrote:

"The fundamental difference between the game and play is that in the latter the child must have the attitude of all the others involved in that game. The attitudes of the other players which the participant assumes organize into a sort of unit, and it is that organization which controls the response of the individual. The illustration used was of a person playing baseball. Each one of his own acts is determined by his assumption of the action of the others who are playing the game. What he does is controlled by his being everyone else on that team, at least in so far as those attitudes affect his own particular response. We get then an "other" which is an organization of the attitudes of those involved in the same process." (4:153-154)

It is generally recognized that the specifically social expressions of intelligence, or the exercise of what is often called "social intelligence," depend upon the given individual's ability to take the roles of, or "put himself in the place of," the other individuals implicated with him in given social situations; and upon his consequent sensitivity to their attitude toward himself and toward one another. . . (4:141)

Subjects ordinarily answer differently when responding for self and others. Social psychologists generally accept the reason for this as being that when an individual is asked to answer for others, he may project a more honest or less socially acceptable response than when he responds for himself. It is felt that subjects answer differently when responding for self and others.

When the subject seeks to identify some particular attitude of another person, he does so by placing himself in that person's position, imaginatively observing his role and finally perceiving the other's attitude. (12:180-187)

In an inventory of attitudes of college women, Smith (1967) found significant differences in the attitudes reported for self as compared to those reported for others. These attitudes dealt with factors such as cheating, drugs, sex, theft and alcohol which could be placed on a social desirability scale. She found that the students' self attitudes were much more liberal than their reported attitude responses for others. She concluded that students' thoughts regarding certain attitudes were more liberal than their overt actions, as perceived by others. (23)

McPartland and Cumming, a sociologist and director, respectively, of the Greater Kansas City Health Foundation did a study on "Self Conception, Social Class, and Mental Health" (1958). The research was conducted in an active

treatment psychiatric hospital. The paper presented findings that related to social class position and psychiatric disorders. The Twenty Statement Test was employed to measure self identification. Within the limitations of the samples and the research procedures, the following conclusions were found:

(1) there are demonstrable differences in the distribution of self conceptions among groups of middle-class and lower-class origins and that the observed differences in self-conception are consonant with differences in probable social experience; (2) there are demonstrable regularities between self-conception and characteristic modes of behavior on the psychiatric ward; and (3) that differences in self-conception by social class are a degree and kind which correspond to the differences in behavioral pathology in middle- and lower-classes which have been observed and reported by other investigators. The most tentative conclusion reached is that the self-conception of persons provides a link which relates social class origin to behavioral pathology in a meaningful and potentially useful way." (20:29)

In another study by McPartland, Cumming and Garretson (1961), on the subject of self conception in two psychiatric hospitals, it was found that certain formal differences in self-identification are reliably related to differences in the behavior of ward patients. They also found observed relationships between attitudes toward the self and behavior within the dynamics of human social behavior. Self conceptions, as reported in writing by responding to the question, "Who am I?" was reliably related to different levels of ward behavior and to the occurrence of disturbed actions as well. The studies used different kinds of analyses of self-conceptions

to bring the findings into the relationship with the theoretical notions of symbolic interaction. (21:23)

Various methods of measuring sportsmanship are available to meet individual testing needs. One of these is the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations developed by Hartman and Haskins in 1960. Two forms of the test were devised, each consisting of twenty incidents which might occur in sports; five alternative actions for each situation were presented. An individual taking the test was to "choose that alternative which most nearly reflects your feelings about the incident." The correct answer was to relate most closely to sportsmanlike behavior.

Haskins submitted a group of 123 sports situations involving ethical conduct to a jury of three men and two women physical educators. The jury included an administrator, an instructor of sports, an instructor of dance and sports, a physical education instructor and coach, and a professor of physical education who was an official. They were asked to select answers which exemplified the best sportsmanship for each situation.

The sixty items which had eighty to one-hundred per cent agreement on answers were then given to eighty professional women physical education major students and to 120 men and women students in physical education service classes at ^{The} Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The results of the item analysis indicated that twenty items were not usable, and the test was reduced to the remaining forty items.

Two criterion instruments were devised to test the validity of the test for women physical education major students. The first instrument involved having each student rate every other student on standards of sportsmanship and was used as the criterion measure for the juniors. The second instrument required rating of classmates in terms of two specific sportsmanship situations and was used as the criterion instrument for the freshman and sophomores. Correlations between sportsmanship ratings and scores on the forty item test were positive for the three criterion groups and significant at the .05 level of confidence for the freshman and junior groups.

Alternate forms of the test were then constructed and reliability correlations were determined with the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula. The forty items were presented in two twenty-item forms and their reliability was .97 for a group of freshmen students and .92 for a group of students classified as juniors. "The two forms of the test are quite reliable and are valid in so far as the criteria measure the qualities of sportsmanship." (18:33) The forms were found to be reliable at the .01 level of confidence for the freshmen, juniors, and service class students, and significant at the .05 level of confidence for the sophomore students. The raised reliabilities for all groups were significant at the one per cent level of confidence.

Haskins, in her doctoral dissertation, utilized the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sport Situations and pointed out the following limitations of these tests:

"The two tests of twenty items are reliable and valid in so far as the criterion instruments measure the qualities of sportsmanship. The limitations of the criteria are recognized but a dearth of more reliable instruments made this construction necessary. Since there is no universally accepted definition of sportsmanship, judgements based on individual philosophies are probably as valid measurements as can be obtained at this time."
(18:33)

Deatherage (14:167) grouped the questions of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations into six categories. These were as follows: (1) questions on opponent relationships, (2) questions on unintentional violation of rules, (3) questions on intentional violation of rules, (4) questions on the physical welfare of opponents, (5) questions on the official, and (6) questions on spectators. Male and female physical educators, physical education majors, and elementary education majors indicated their choice of responses in each of the six categories.

The subjects' responses to the questions on opponent relationships found that the men agreed with only one of the answers to the questions. Women physical education instructors were in agreement with the test-approved answer on three of the four questions.

There were varied opinions expressed by the different groups with the questions on unintentional violation of the rules. There was agreement with a test-approved answer within all groups on only one question. Women elementary education majors were in agreement with the test-approved answers on five of six questions. Male physical education majors selected only one test-approved answer.

Questions on intentional violation of rules found a wide variance of opinions. All groups were in agreement with the test-approved answer on only one question. No trend in the selection of a response was evident by one or more groups on six of the seven questions.

All groups were in agreement with the test-approved answer on three of the four questions on the physical welfare of the opponents. The male physical educators and male physical education majors were the two groups not answering a test-approved response.

Questions describing relationships between officials and/or coaches and players received varied responses. All groups were in favor of the test-approved response dealing with the behavior of an official when conducting a game. Test-approved answers on all three questions involving the coach and official lacked agreement by all groups.

There was a small variance of opinion regarding spectator situations. All groups agreed with the test-approved answer on three of the five questions. No answer

other than the test-approved answer was selected by any group.

Freeman (15) attempted to determine attitudes and standards of high school boys and college undergraduate men, with respect to specific situations which might occur in sports. He measured the relationship of age between those who had competed in athletics and those who had not competed.

He used a total of fifteen hypothetical situations involving six different sports and arranged them in questionnaire form for the responses of the subject as to whether the situation involved good or poor sportsmanship. In each instance the reply was based upon approval or disapproval, and the reason for the reply was requested.

In part, Freeman's study merely reported percentages revealing the following: only thirty-five per cent of high school juniors and seniors approved of the crowd booing a decision made by an official in a basketball game, while forty-six per cent of the college undergraduates approved of such action. Relative to the same situation, twenty-eight per cent of those who had participated in basketball approved of the action while forty-five percent of the non-basketball players approved.

In another basketball situation used by Freeman, the results showed that eighty-one percent of the college undergraduates approved of a basketball player deliberately using his elbows in a defensive situation while sixty-two per cent

of the high school juniors and seniors approved. In response to the same situation eighty-eight per cent of those who had played basketball approved, but the approval dropped to fifty-eight per cent among the high school students who had not played basketball.

A football situation described a coach who had encouraged his players to "run up" a big score against the opposing team. The results were that fifty-one per cent of the high school juniors and seniors disapproved of the action while sixty-five per cent of the college undergraduates disapproved of the situation.

Freeman concluded as experience and/or age increased the subjects felt increasingly justified in challenging the decision of the officials. Attitudes toward hypothetical situations in specific sports varied with the nature of the sport. Replies also indicated that students, regardless of age or competitive experience, would not rely on their honor if an official were present. The study indicated that both age and experience lead to poorer attitudes and standards of sportsmanship.

In a study by Flory (16), responses to twenty-five situations occurring in various sports were obtained from 2,608 men and women in colleges throughout the United States. These were categorized according to experience, age, year in college, type of college, section of the nation, and church affiliation.

Flory's findings were that forty-two per cent of the students interviewed approved of a coach using visual signs from the sideline in a football game to instruct his quarterback. He found, also, that among college students twenty per cent disapproved of a coach "giving up the ball" in football if his team had mistakenly been given a fifth down by the official. Further study revealed that sixty-one per cent of the college students approved and thirty-nine per cent disapproved of a guard assigned to a "star" player touching and otherwise annoying him throughout the course of a basketball game.

Based on his study, Flory concluded that there was a significant difference between approval and disapproval relative to each of the situations he used and that there was an appreciable percentage who approved of actions of poor sportsmanship, as defined by his study.

In 1954, a study at Louisiana State University by Kistler (19) used ten specific situations often occurring in sports and administered questionnaires to 414 college students enrolled in physical education classes and to some adult spectators in the Baton Rouge area. Subjects were asked to approve or disapprove of the action set forth in the particular situation. Sixty per cent of the men approved of deliberately fouling an opposing basketball player with the ball when he was "outnumbered" in a fast break situation.

Kistler's study revealed that approximately one-third of the men approved of "putting the pressure" on the officials by "booing, razzing, or buzzing" him. It was concluded that athletes had more undesirable attitudes toward sportsmanship than non-athletes and the percentage of college students holding unsportsmanlike attitudes was greater than the attitudes held by adults.

A recent study of Slusher's (22) tested college football players on their overt and covert reactions with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and an electronic psychometer. The findings indicated no differences in covert and overt responses between groups. The covert responses of both groups indicated an unsportsmanlike value structure. In relation to the overt responses, the sportsmanlike group came significantly closer to approaching the ideals of society than did the unsportsmanlike group; however, both groups were so far from the ideal that one would have to conclude that neither group displayed a great degree of sportsmanlike value structure. The sportsmanlike group was merely more actively "honest" than was the unsportsmanlike.

When both groups came in contact with the ideal answer they did not tend to covertly react in a manner which could significantly differentiate between the groups. In relation to the ideal alternatives, excitation was located in very

few cases. Therefore, it appears that neither group recognized the ideal answer as being correct for them.

The selected alternatives were analyzed for covert reactions. It was found that there was no significant difference that could differentiate between the groups. Therefore, it could be concluded that both groups were telling the truth when they selected their choices to the situations.

When the covert responses to the selected answers were compared with the ideal answers for both groups, a significant difference was located within groups. The individuals within both groups tended to become more excited to the alternative they selected than when they were confronted with the ideal response. This might indicate the athletes tested were not aware of the ideals of society; therefore, when they made value decisions the selections were in relation to the sub-culture (athletic culture). It might appear that the athletes were bothered by their "sub-cultured" reply because of the rather high overt reactions in relation to the selected alternatives. (22:540-551)

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between measures of sportsmanship and the amount of athletic competition of college women physical education majors. This study was also conducted to investigate how the subjects answered for themselves and how they answered for "others" to determine if there were any indications of "self" or personal attitudes reflected in the response selected for "others." The study was originally organized to include different levels of competition i.e., intramurals and extramurals. The number of competitive events in which the subjects participated were to be tallied; however, school records of attendance and the number of competitive events in all sports and for all subjects were not sufficiently detailed. Thus, only the sportsmanship measures and the combined number of competitive events in extramurals and intramurals were used. Scores of subjects not participating in any activity were not affected by this combination.

The Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations was selected by this researcher as the tool to measure sportsmanship. The test consists of two forms. Each had a reliability of .97 for a group of freshmen students and .92 for a group

of junior students at The Ohio State University. Barrow and McGee in Measurement in Physical Education (1964) characterized the two forms of the test as being "quite reliable and valid insofar as the criteria measure the qualities of sportsmanship." (1:369) Form A was selected to be utilized in this study because a few of the students had been exposed previously to Form B. Permission to use the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations was granted by Betty G. Hartman, Ph.D., one of the authors.

The subjects participating in the study were sophomore, junior and senior women physical education majors attending Wisconsin State University - La Crosse during the 1967-1968 academic year. A questionnaire and Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations were administered in the major physical education professional classes. Of the 264 major students receiving the test and questionnaire, 251 of them completed the forms.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information for the classification of the subjects into the competitive and noncompetitive groups. The subjects were asked to list the number of extramural and intramural competitive events in which they had participated during the 1967-1968 academic year. Subjects who did not participate answered, "none" and were placed in the noncompetitive group.

Sport activities made available to the students by the Women's Recreation Association during the 1967-1968 academic year were badminton, basketball, fencing, field hockey, gymnastics, riding, softball, swimming, tennis, track and field, and volleyball. Curling and lacrosse were eliminated from the sports selection of this study because participation in these sports was part of a class assignment.

The situations presented in the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations are problem-solving, multiple choice questions which purport to measure sportsmanship attitudes and knowledge. There is only one correct answer for each situation. The score for the test is the number of correct responses made on the twenty items. (See appendix)

The following instructions were given to the subjects taking the test: (1) "Indicate your reaction for each statement by blackening the corresponding space for the letter on the answer sheet, then (2) repeat the entire test by indicating how you think most other college women physical education majors would respond to each statement by blackening out the corresponding space for the letter on the answer sheet." The majority of the subjects completed Form A and the questionnaire in twenty to fifty minutes. IBM score sheet number 516 was used for machine scoring and key punching.

Immediately after the data were collected, the questionnaire information was reviewed and the subjects were placed

into their respective groups. The competitive group was further divided by the number of competitive events in which they had participated. A total of seventy-three subjects did not participate in any extramural or intramural event. Three subjects participated in seven events, ten competed in six events, fifteen participated in five events and thirty-one subjects competed in four sports. The largest group, fifty-four participated in one event, while forty-five participated in two events and twenty subjects were involved in three events.

The number of events and the sportsmanship scores for self and others were key punched on computer cards. Several statistical analyses were attempted. An item analysis was done on each question to determine if there were significant differences in how the groups answered for each question. The Flanagan Index was used to indicate how the subjects in this study answered the questions as compared to the population used when the test was designed.

Chi square was employed to determine the significance or differences and/or relationships between sportsmanship scores and the number of athletic events. The number of activities were divided into three groups: (1) no participation, (2) participation in one to three events, and (3) participation in four to seven events. Sportsmanship scores for "self" and "others" were categorized into three groupings with scores of;

(1) zero to eight, (2) nine to thirteen, and (3) fourteen to twenty.

An item analysis was used to review how the subjects in each of the four areas answered the questions in Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations. The item analysis is designed to reveal the difficulty rating and the discriminatory power for each item.

The Flanagan method was employed to determine the discriminatory power of each test item. The index of discrimination was found for each test question in each of the four areas.

CHAPTER IV

ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A two independent group method design involving 502 test scores was used to evaluate the hypothesis that there was no relationship between the sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of competition in which the subjects participated. Also, an item analysis was performed to evaluate the test questions. Realizing that one can never be certain that apparent favorable effects are the result of a treatment effect, the investigator believed that within the limitations of the research design certain tendencies could be noted. The .05 level of significance was chosen for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis.

The chi square statistic for two independent samples (8:104-107) was used to determine the significance of the relationship between the number of activities and the two independent groups, "self" and "others." The classification system for the number of activities was noncompetition, medium competition and high competition.

In as much as the obtained chi square value, 8.386, for "self" was smaller than the chi square value at the .05 level of significance, 9.49, the investigator accepted the null hypothesis (Table 1). The obtained chi square value, 9.069, for "others" was smaller than the chi square at the .05 level

TABLE I

LEVELS OF SPORTSMANSHIP AS PERCEIVED
FOR SELF BY COMPETITORS AND
NONCOMPETITORS

Sports	Test Scores					
	0 - 8		9 - 13		14 - 20	
	O	\bar{E}	O	\bar{E}	O	\bar{E}
Noncompetition 0 Sports	10	9.88	44	40.42	19	22.68
Medium competition 1-3 Sports	19	16.11	68	65.90	32	36.98
High competition 4-7 Sports	5	7.99	27	32.67	27	18.33

Obtained chi square = 8.368

P.05 = 9.49 (df = 4)

of significance, 9.49; therefore, the investigator accepted the null hypothesis (Table 2).

Although the results were not statistically significant, the investigator summarized several trends which were observed among levels of competition and test scores.

Noncompetition. Noncompetitive subjects when answering for "self" tended to see themselves as being in the low or medium sportsmanship categories. They saw themselves as having less high sportsmanship qualities.

When answering for "others" they saw them as having extreme low or extreme high characteristics of sportsmanship. Very few visualized "others" as being medium in sportsmanship.

Low competition. Low-competitive subjects when expressing for "self" tended to rate themselves as being in the low and medium sportsmanship range. They saw themselves as having less high sportsmanlike qualities.

When answering for "others," they saw them as having less extreme low and less extreme high sportsmanlike qualities and more medium sportsmanship qualities.

High competition. More in the highly competitive group tended to have higher sportsmanship scores when answering for "self."

When answering for "others," the highly competitive group tended to exhibit more medium and high sportsmanlike values and less low sportsmanship measures.

TABLE II

LEVELS OF SPORTSMANSHIP AS PERCEIVED
FOR OTHERS BY COMPETITORS AND
NONCOMPETITORS

Sports	Test Scores					
	0 - 8		9 - 13		14 - 20	
	O	E	O	E	O	E
Noncompetition 0 Sports	36	27.92	18	28.21	19	16.86
Medium competition 1-3 Sports	41	45.51	53	45.98	25	27.49
High competition 4-7 Sports	19	22.56	26	22.80	14	13.63

Obtained chi square = 9.069

P.05 = 9.49 (df = 4)

Subjects who competed a great deal saw themselves as possessing good sportsmanship, while those subjects who did not compete saw themselves as being less sportsmanlike. When rating "others," the highly competitive subjects saw them as having medium to high sportsmanlike values, while the non-competitive group visualized very few as being medium in sportsmanship.

Highly competitive players tend to act within the prescribed limits and etiquette of the particular sport and may tend to see others in the same perspective. Competition with other athletes who display good sportsmanship characteristics may have influenced the responses of the highly competitive subjects. The experiences the subjects encountered through competition may have provided many learning situations from various sports events. There seems to be general support for the idea that the more different experiences one is exposed to the more prepared he is to meet future challenges and to make adjustments.

Noncompetitive subjects and the low-competition subjects may have viewed themselves in the low and medium sportsmanship ranges because of lack of previous experience, interest and skill.

An item analysis was employed to review how the subjects in each of the areas answered the questions in Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations. The

item analysis revealed two qualities about each item in the test: (1) the difficulty rating which was the per cent correct and, (2) the discriminatory power of each test item.

In evaluating the difficulty rating, the test items were grouped into the following classification system: competition self, competition other, noncompetition self, and noncompetition other. The difficulty rating is the per cent of subjects in each group who answered that item correctly. The range of the difficulty rating for acceptable questions is ten per cent to ninety per cent. (1:514)

In all situations except one, (Table 3) the difficulty rating for the "self" response was higher than the rating for "others." The difficulty rating of question thirteen was equal for the competitive group while the "other's" response had a higher rating than the "self" response.

The results of the difficulty rating as listed in Table 3 seemed to substantiate the assumption that subjects answering for "others" would tend to reveal their personal or "self" attitudes. It might be inferred that subjects when answering for self were more conscious of the expectations of society and that when answering for "others" (the lower scores) were free to reveal their "true" feelings.

On the other hand, while subjects rated themselves higher than "others," and therefore, must have considered themselves as sportsmanlike, their actions in competition

TABLE III

DIFFICULTY RATING OF TEST ITEMS ON
FORM A OF THE ACTION-CHOICE
TEST FOR COMPETITIVE
SPORTS SITUATIONS

Test Question	Competition	Competition	Noncompetition	Noncompetition
	Self N=178	Other N=178	Self N=73	Other N=73
1	92	68	89	70
2	97	91	99	93
3	85	67	82	67
4	74	58	64	56
5	91	72	88	64
6	74	69	70	56
7	69	42	71	39
8	33	26	45	21
9	69	51	62	36
10	42	31	48	23
11	79	70	75	67
12	58	52	47	44
13	26	26	36	40
14	60	47	42	41
15	50	44	45	37
16	57	49	62	51
17	72	56	74	59
18	33	29	33	14
19	37	35	40	32
20	34	26	34	30

evidently did not reflect this since when judged by their peers answering for "others," the scores were lower.

Item thirteen questioned setting up plays to cause opponents to foul in a basketball game. Among the highly skilled, such tactics are used occasionally. The particular strategy often places demands on the opponent to demonstrate skill to overcome foul-drawing plays. Athletes are expected to adjust to such situations both mentally and physically. The majority of the subjects in this study have not been exposed to quality intercollegiate competition. There may have been some subjects who were unaware that such tactics might be employed.

Questions 8, 18, 19, and 20 had low difficulty ratings. The questions were on baseball, basketball, football and golf (see appendix). Three of the four questions pertained to situations involving advanced team game techniques. Lack of understanding of the situation or lack of interest in the sport may have accounted for the low difficulty rating. The golf question concerned the officiating of informal golf matches. Perhaps the subjects in this study were not acquainted with golf rules or golf etiquette.

The Flanagan method was used to determine the discriminatory power of each test item. (1:509-514) Four separate item discrimination evaluations were made based on the four groups: competition self, competition other, noncompetition

self and noncompetition other. A test item is considered acceptable if the index of discrimination is above .20. (1:513) The material is summarized in Tables 4 through 8.

Within the design of this study and the subjects used, two test items were rated as questionable. Item one in the competitive "self" group obtained the rating of seventeen. Question four in the noncompetitive "self" group had the discriminatory rating of sixteen. The remaining questions all had acceptable discriminatory ratings.

The raw scores classified as to "self" and "other" and the number of activities are presented in the appendix.

TABLE IV

ITEM DISCRIMINATION FOR FORM A OF THE
 ACTION-CHOICE TEST FOR COMPETITIVE
 SPORTS SITUATIONS FOR THE
 COMPETITION SELF GROUP
 N=44

Question Number	High 27%	Low 27%	Item Discrimination
1	.96	.90	17
2	1.00	.94	37
3	.94	.75	23
4	.88	.50	37
5	1.00	.77	55
6	.88	.67	24
7	.88	.44	45
8	.48	.15	33
9	.88	.40	45
10	.85	.10	70
11	.90	.54	45
12	.83	.25	52
13	.54	.02	64
14	.75	.48	29
15	.88	.15	65
16	.83	.29	52
17	.92	.50	45
18	.79	.02	77
19	.54	.27	25
20	.52	.20	31

TABLE V

ITEM DISCRIMINATION FOR FORM A OF THE
 ACTION-CHOICE TEST FOR COMPETITIVE
 SPORTS SITUATIONS FOR THE
 COMPETITION OTHER GROUP
 N=44

Question Number	High 27%	Low 27%	Item Discrimination
1	.92	.33	59
2	1.00	.75	55
3	.85	.48	41
4	.88	.25	57
5	.96	.38	66
6	.88	.38	49
7	.87	.04	78
8	.44	.06	48
9	.87	.23	61
10	.67	.06	64
11	.96	.35	66
12	.87	.27	57
13	.50	.06	55
14	.79	.29	47
15	.79	.15	57
16	.69	.27	38
17	.85	.23	61
18	.71	.02	75
19	.56	.21	35
20	.50	.06	55

TABLE VI

ITEM DISCRIMINATION FOR FORM A OF THE
 ACTION-CHOICE TEST FOR COMPETITIVE
 SPORTS SITUATIONS FOR THE
 NONCOMPETITION SELF GROUP
 N=20

Question Number	High 27%	Low 27%	Item Discrimination
1	.95	.80	29
2	1.00	.95	24
3	1.00	.55	67
4	.75	.60	16
5	.95	.70	40
6	.95	.45	58
7	.90	.40	52
8	.65	.40	24
9	.95	.45	58
10	.70	.20	47
11	.80	.60	22
12	.85	.20	61
13	.50	.20	31
14	.65	.15	49
15	.70	.15	53
16	.95	.35	64
17	1.00	.50	70
18	.65	.15	49
19	.70	.30	38
20	.40	.15	29

TABLE VII

ITEM DISCRIMINATION FOR FORM A OF THE
ACTION-CHOICE TEST FOR COMPETITIVE
SPORTS SITUATIONS FOR THE
NONCOMPETITIVE OTHER GROUP
N=20

Question Number	High 27%	Low 27%	Item Discrimination
1	.90	.40	52
2	.95	.80	29
3	.80	.50	31
4	.75	.45	29
5	.90	.30	59
6	.85	.35	49
7	.60	.10	52
8	.55	.10	49
9	.75	.20	52
10	.45	.00	67
11	.70	.45	24
12	.65	.30	33
13	.55	.20	35
14	.65	.30	33
15	.55	.25	29
16	.75	.30	42
17	.80	.35	43
18	.35	.00	62
19	.50	.15	37
20	.35	.10	32

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationships between sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of athletic competition in which the subjects participated. Another purpose of the study was to investigate the responses of the subjects answering for themselves and how they thought most "other" college women physical education majors would respond. It was thought that possibly the subjects' response for "others" would tend to reveal their personal or "self" attitudes. An item analysis was employed to find the discriminatory power of each test item and the difficulty rating for each question. Through this, the investigator was able to observe the responses of the population used in this study.

A total of 251 subjects comprised of sophomore, junior and senior college women physical education majors at Wisconsin State University-La Crosse were used in the study. All subjects were given a questionnaire and Form A of the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations. Subjects were grouped upon the completion of both forms. The number of athletic events in which the subjects had participated during the 1967-1968 academic year was the criterion used in placing the subjects in their respective groups.

A chi square was employed to find the relationships between the number of sports in which each of the subjects had participated and the sportsmanship test scores. The chi square results indicated no significant relationships between the sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of competition. The difficulty rating for the test scores of the "self" group were higher than the test scores for the "others" group. The low difficulty ratings of four questions might have been due to the lack of knowledge or understanding of the sport on the part of the women subjects.

The Flanagan method was used to note the discriminatory power of the test questions on the basis of the response elicited from the population used in this study. No one item was found to be questionable by all four groups. One item was rated as questionable for "self" competition, and one item was rated as questionable in the "other" competition group. The original Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations was constructed for a general college population. Based on the results of this study, the test items were also valid for college women physical education majors.

Conclusions based on the administration of the chi square, the difficulty rating and Flanagan's item analysis were:

1. There were no significant relationships between the

sportsmanship measure scores and the amount of competition in which the subjects participated.

2. The subjects had a higher difficulty rating on all items except item thirteen when answering for "self" than when answering for "others."

3. The discriminatory power on all of the test items for this group were acceptable with the exceptions of item one for competition "self" and item sixteen for noncompetition "self."

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. That the Action-Choice Test for Competitive Sports Situations be revised and brought up to date. Since the test was designed (1960) some of the criteria for evaluation of sportsmanship may have changed due to the increase of athletic competition for women.

2. That a similar study be designed to investigate the significance of differences between levels of skill by eliminating the noncompetitive group from the study.

3. That sportsmanship values be assigned to each foil and question in order to provide a sportsmanship profile for the subjects being investigated.

4. That the relationship between skill levels and the degree of competitiveness be examined. The degree of skill once measured could be used as the controlling factor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

1. Barrow, Harold M.; and McGee, Rosemary. A practical approach to measurement in physical education. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1964.
2. Beisser, Arnold R. The madness in sports. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
3. Borg, Walter R. Educational research an introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965.
4. Mead, George H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
5. Obertueffer, Delbert; and Ulrich, Celeste. Physical education. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
6. Rice, Emmett A.; and Hutchinson, John L. A brief history of physical education. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1952.
7. Scott, M. Gladys. Research methods in health, physical education, recreation. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1959.
8. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
9. Webster. New world dictionary. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1962.

B. PERIODICALS

10. Bryson, Lyson. Sportsmanship as a characteristic of an enlightened people. J.O.H.P.E.R. 19:596, 1948.
11. Clothier, R.C. Sportsmanship in its relation to American intercollegiate athletics. Sch. and Soc. 45:501-507, 1937.
12. Coutu, Walter. Role-playing vs. role-taking: an appeal for clarification. Amer. Soc. Rev. 16:180-187, 1951.

13. Daniels, Arthur. Values in sports. A.A.H.P.E.R. 1:6, 1962.
14. Deatherage, Dorothy. Factors related to concepts of sportsmanship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1964.
15. Freeman, Bill L. A study of attitudes concerning situations arising in athletic contests. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas, 1958.
16. Flory, Clarence M. Sportsmanship attitudes of college students toward situations in competitive athletics. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, 1958.
17. Hartman, Betty G. An exploratory method for determining ethical behavior in sports and athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958.
18. Haskins, Mary Jane. A problem-solving test of sportsmanship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1959.
19. Kistler, Joy W. Attitudes expressed about behavior demonstrated in certain specific situations occurring in sports. 60th Annual Proceedings, College Physical Education Association, 1957.
20. McPartland, Thomas S.; and Cumming, John H. Self-conception, social class and mental health. Hum. Org. 17:29, 1959.
21. McPartland, Thomas S.; and Cumming, John H.; and Garretson, Wynona S. Self-conception and ward behavior in two psychiatric hospitals. Socio. 31:23, 1961.
22. Slusher, Howard S. Overt and covert reactions of selected athletes to normative situations as indicated by an electronic psychometer. Res. Quart. 37:540-551, 1966.
23. Smith, Norene A. Inventory of attitudes of women students. Unpublished study, Wisconsin State University - La Crosse, 1967.
24. Staley, Seward L. The program of sportsmanship education. Illinois University Bureau of Educational Research Circulars, 1951.

APPENDIX

Name _____

Classification So. Jr. Sr.
(circle one)

Score sheet number _____

Questionnaire

The following information will be used for a study investigating the effect of competition on attitudes reflecting sportsmanship. Please complete the information as accurately as you can.

Definition of Terms:

Intramural competition is sports competition in which all participants are identified with the same school.

Extramural competition is a plan of sports competition in which participants from two or more schools compete. The forms of extramural competition include: sports days, telegraphic meets, invitational events and intercollegiate programs.

Sports offered during the academic year 1967 - 1968:

Badminton	Field Hockey	Softball
Basketball	Gymnastics	Swimming
Curling	Lacrosse	Tennis
Fencing	Riding	Track and Field
		Volleyball

Have you participated in any extramural events representing La Crosse the academic year 1967 - 1968? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how many? _____

Please list them. _____

Have you participated in any intramural events at La Crosse the academic year 1967 - 1968? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how many? _____

Please list them. _____

Thank you for your cooperation.

ACTION-CHOICE TEST FOR COMPETITIVE SPORTS SITUATIONS (FORM A)
By Betty G. Hartman, Ph.D. and Mary J. Haskins, Ph.D.

The following are incidents which might occur in sports situations. With each incident are five alternative actions. Many of the situations or circumstances offer diverse and different alternatives. You will have the opportunity to give your response to each situation, and, to indicate what you believe would be the response of most other college women physical education majors.

1. After the numbers 1-20, indicate your reaction for each statement by blackening the corresponding space for the letter on the answer sheet; then
2. Repeat the entire test by indicating how you think most other college women physical education majors would respond to each statement. Place the answers between 101-120 (number 101 on the answer sheet would correspond with number 1 on the test booklet) by blackening the corresponding space for the letter on the answer sheet.

1. A football team's linesman gathers hands full of grass or dirt to throw into the opposing line's faces. This enables them to break through the opponent's line freeing their backs to make long runs and score touchdowns.
 - a. It is the official's fault for failing to penalize the players for such actions.
 - b. As long as the officials can't see the linesman do this they might as well try it.
 - c. The opponents should throw dirt or grass at this team when they get the chance in order to pay them back.
 - d. The other team has equal opportunity to try the same thing, therefore, this team is justified in its actions.
 - e. The linesmen's actions are unfair to the opponents and not in the spirit of the game.

2. In little league baseball competition the coaches of some of the teams have been known to tell their players to participate in the "Stamp Act." The stamp act means that the players are to try to stamp on the umpire's feet whenever they can get close to him. The stamping is a means of protesting an umpire's decision. Whenever a disputed decision occurs the coach calls out "Stamp Act" and the players carry out the play.
 - a. Rather than argue, the players have an effective means of protesting the umpire's decision when they use the "Stamp Act."

- b. The coach has no business telling his players to do such a thing.
 - c. The players should carry out the Stamp Act since the coach says this is a good maneuver.
 - d. This action is all right to use as long as the players do not really hurt the umpire by stamping on him.
 - e. This action is all right as long as the umpire knows why the players are doing the Stamp Act. It's all part of the game.
3. Before face masks on football helmets were legalized by the rules, a team might wear them if the other team consented. Team A was playing team B. Team B's coach had consented to allow team A to wear masks. At the half time the score was 21 to 0 in favor of team A. Team B's coach protested the masks. Team B's coach heckled the officials all through the second half.
- a. Team B's coach had a right to protest since his team was losing.
 - b. Team B's coach had no right to protest since he had already consented to team A wearing masks.
 - c. The coach was correct in protesting but not heckling the officials during the second half.
 - d. The officials should have allowed team B's protest and had team A remove the masks the second half.
 - e. Team B should have put on masks to even their chances rather than protest team A's wearing them.
4. An outstanding All-American football player was known for his rough, tough play. When he started to tackle or block an opponent he never stopped even though the opponents might have handed the ball off or they were obviously out of the play. When asked why he played this way he expressed the opinion that once he started for a player he could not stop. If he stopped suddenly he might injure himself.
- a. Little regard for opponents made him an outstanding player. Those who play football should expect such action from opponents.
 - b. The All-American should be penalized for such roughness, especially when the person tackled or blocked was not involved in the play.
 - c. The All-American was right to avoid injury to himself.
 - d. To play roughly is bad enough, but to out and out admit it was because he was protecting himself, is even worse.
 - e. This player is not a true All-American. Good players should consider their opponent's safety as well as personal safety. He should be able to stop.

5. Two rival teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on one of these team's home court. During this game, the visiting team's star player was consistently booed whenever he missed a basket, pass, rebound or maneuver. In the return game on the other team's court, the home crowd took revenge by booing all the players on the opposition. They were retaliating for what the other team's home crowd had done to their star.
- Booing is a good device to use to rattle a player. If this could help the home team in the first game, such action is all right.
 - "Getting back" at the other team during the return game was justifiable under the circumstances.
 - Even though the star player had been booed the other team's crowd should not have paid them back.
 - Booing individual players does more good than booing the whole team. In the second game, the spectators should have singled out one player.
 - Players should learn to play under difficult situations. Having the crowd boo them helps them to ignore future experiences of the same nature.
6. A coach of a college football team taught the end player to use his knee on the head of the opposing backfield player. He was to use this whenever the opponent was trying to prevent the end tackling the kicker. After the end had used this maneuver several times the opposing blocker would become afraid of the end and let him by. The end player could never bring himself to follow his coach's instructions. (It is possible that player's knees can come in contact with an opponent's head during blocks, tackles, or evasive action; however, if this is done deliberately the player could be penalized.)
- Such an action in football is unnecessary. The coach who advised, and the player who would execute such action were wrong.
 - This action would be all right as long as the blocker is not injured.
 - The end player was right not to follow his coach's instructions.
 - The end player should follow his coach's instructions even though he felt the instructions were wrong.
 - This is a perfectly good maneuver to use in football. The coach was right in advising it and the player was wrong not to do it.
7. You are a member of a volleyball team and during a game your opponents hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazes your fingers as it flys out-of-bounds. If you were this player what would you do?

- a. Tell the referee you touched the ball without waiting to see if anyone noticed your touching it.
 - b. Wait to see if your teammates noticed your touching the ball. If they did not notice let the referee's decision stand.
 - c. Since the referee did not notice your touching the ball and it is his job to make decisions, let his decision stand.
 - d. Ask the opponents if they noticed whether you touched the ball. If they did not notice, do not report yourself to the referee.
 - e. Since you discover that the opponents noticed that you touched the ball you should report yourself to the referee.
8. Second basemen, according to the rules of the game, must step on or tag second base before throwing to first base in making a double play. The runner who runs to second base from first base is put out in this manner and if the baseman's throw reaches first base before the batter arrives, the batter is out and thus a double play (or two outs) is made. Some big-league second basemen have been known to deliberately pretend to touch or tag second base, but miss. This allows them to cut down on the time it takes to touch second base and throw to first base, and enables them to get more double plays.
- a. Since it is the umpire's job to tell whether or not the second baseman touches the base before he throws, it is all right for the baseman to pretend to touch to cut down on his time if he can get away with it.
 - b. The second baseman is breaking the rules and should not do this.
 - c. This maneuver does not always help the baseman to get a double play so he might as well try it.
 - d. This is all right for big league players to use, but school or minor league players should not use it.
 - e. This is taking unfair advantage of the other team and therefore should not be done.
9. A baseball team that is losing a game realizes that an opposing player was called safe at first on a trapped fly ball. The catcher of this team argues that the ball was not trapped but legally caught. The argument continues and the catcher calls the umpire names. The umpire finally evicts the catcher from the game.
- a. No player, regardless of the team he is on, should argue with an official.
 - b. The catcher should not argue. He should expect the person who trapped the ball or some other teammate to do this.

- c. It would be all right for a player or catcher to argue as long as he feels the umpire is wrong and he is right.
 - d. He was justified in arguing since his team was losing. If they had been ahead he did not need to argue.
 - e. A player is justified in arguing with the umpire since this is customary in baseball, but he should not call him names.
10. A soccer player receives a chest high pass and taps the ball down to the ground with his hand. The referee does not see this foul. (Soccer players are allowed to play the ball with their feet, not their hands.) The soccer player goes on down the field with the ball.
- a. The player should raise his hand to indicate his foul to the referee.
 - b. It is the referee's responsibility to see these fouls. If he fails to see them the player need not confess he fouled.
 - c. The opponents should tell the referee the player fouled.
 - d. As long as the player can get away with the action it is all right to use.
 - e. This action may have been accidental. If the player does this again, the opponents should complain to the officials.
11. In a championship Little League Baseball game, the score was tied. In the final inning, with the last team at bat and a runner on third base, the following incident occurred: The third base coach, an adult, called to the rival team's pitcher and asked to see the ball. The young pitcher threw the ball to the coach, whereupon the coach stepped aside and let the ball go by. The runner on third base saw the ball rolling away and ran home scoring the winning run. There is nothing in the rules which states that such action is against the rules.
- a. The umpire should make the runner go back to third base even though he did not break a rule.
 - b. The umpire should make the runner go back to third base, and speak to the adult about such tactics.
 - c. The pitcher should have been smart enough not to do such a thing, therefore, what happened was all right.
 - d. This is a perfectly good baseball maneuver and the adult coach was justified in using it.
 - e. Such action is all right for older baseball players, but not for use on Little League players.
12. Horse shows include events in which riders are judged on their ability and skill in riding. Other events involve

judging the performance and appearance of the horse, not necessarily the skill of the rider, although a good rider can help a horse perform better. However, some horses perform well or poorly regardless of the skill of the rider.

During a horse show it became common knowledge that an outstanding horse, who was entered in an event where his performance was to be judged, was easily upset by loud whistles. A rival stable, wishing this horse to lose and their horse to win, stationed people around the outside of the ring. These people were to whistle loudly whenever the horse went by. The horse was upset, performed poorly, and lost the event. The rival stable's horse won.

- a. The whistling was unfair. The favored horse should be allowed to perform without distraction.
- b. The judge should have allowed the favorite to win since he must be aware of the distracting influences.
- c. The losing horse's owners should complain to the judges so they could stop the people whistling.
- d. Since the favored horse's weakness was common knowledge, the rival stable's action was justified.
- e. If the horse was really good and deserved to win, it should not be distracted by such actions and deserved to lose.

13. Certain basketball teams are coached to set up plays which cause the opponents to foul. Some players and coaches believe this is clever basketball since the opponents may foul out of the game and their team may gain extra points by scoring on free throws.

- a. Players should use such plays. The coaches are clever to direct their players in such fashion.
- b. Players who disagree with this type of play may learn them if their coach so directs but should not use such plays.
- c. Players should refuse to play for coaches who insist they use such plays.
- d. The players should tell their coaches they don't approve of such plays but use them if he insists.
- e. Officials, players, and coaches should agree not to use such plays.

14. If a wrestler uses an illegal hold and hurts his opponent, the match is awarded to the victim. If an illegal hold is used and the opponent is not hurt, the opponent is awarded two points. During a wrestling match wrestler A used an illegal hold on wrestler B. The official awarded two points to wrestler B, but wrestler B's coach comes out and tells wrestler B he is hurt. Wrestler B insists he

is all right but the coach says, "No, you are hurt." The referee had to award the match to the "hurt" wrestler B.

- a. Since wrestler A used an illegal hold, wrestler B was right in pretending to be hurt and to take his coach's advice.
- b. Wrestler B had no right to play "hurt" even though his coach told him to.
- c. The referee should have been able to judge whether wrestler B was "hurt" or not. He should not have given the match to wrestler B.
- d. The coach had no right to influence his wrestler B. His wrestler was put on-the-spot as was the official.
- e. Wrestler A should not have used an illegal hold. Wrestler B's coach was right to tell his wrestler to be "hurt" to teach wrestler A a lesson.

15. When a member of a swimming team entered a race he deliberately moved slowly into his position in hopes that it would upset his opponents and make them take false starts. His teammates, entered in other races, did the same thing. Swimmers are allowed to take their time in getting into position. If, however, the swimmers are obviously stalling, they could be penalized. This is difficult for officials to determine.

- a. The opponents of these swimmers should learn not to be upset by such actions.
- b. This is all right to try since it probably works only poor swimmers.
- c. This is all right since the opponents are not good enough to control their starting.
- d. The opponents will eventually catch on and would actually profit by having this trick used against them.
- e. These swimmers are taking unfair advantage of the opponents.

16. A rather good golfer constantly tries to improve his opponent's game. He constantly offers advice on every shot, tells the opponent what club to use, and so forth.

- a. The good golfer gives the appearance of knowing all there is to know. This is annoying to his opponent.
- b. A good golfer should know that unasked-for advice may upset his opponents. He should refrain from this practice.
- c. Such advice may be helpful to his opponents.
- d. A good golfer should know that in a tournament play a golfer may receive advice only from his caddy and therefore should not advise his opponents.

- e. Since his intentions are to be helpful his actions shouldn't bother his opponents.
17. In basketball the spectators and players often attempt to put pressure on the officials by booing, talking, and yelling. This is a way of pressuring the officials into becoming aware that the players and spectators expect them to give the close decisions to their team.
- This is perfectly all right.
 - This is customarily done and is a good way of putting the officials "on their toes."
 - It is all right to yell and talk but not to boo.
 - The spectators should assume that the officials try to be fair, therefore, they should refrain from such action.
 - Such action probably does no good whatsoever so this is useless.
18. During a football game an ineligible pass receiver catches a long touchdown pass and scores. The officials fail to determine that the player was ineligible. The score is allowed to stand.
- The ineligible receiver should have confessed he was ineligible.
 - Since the officials did not see the error the player was justified in keeping his ineligibility secret.
 - The coach or teammates of the ineligible pass receiver should tell the officials about the error.
 - The players or coach of the opposing team should let the officials know that they had made a mistake.
 - Since the officials did not see the error nothing should be done.
19. The crowd booed their basketball coach when he removed a player from the game. The crowd showed the coach, by their actions, that they wanted the player back in the game. After the game, the coach announced to the papers that he was justified in removing the player from the game since it was for the player's own protection.
- The crowd has a right to disagree with the coach.
 - The crowd should leave the decisions to the coach and refrain from criticizing.
 - The crowd has a right to disagree but should not boo.
 - The coach knows more about the game than the crowd so the crowd should realize this and stop their criticisms.
 - The crowd's action is not unusual, and is unimportant in its effect on players or coaches.

20. In informal golf matches when there are no officials to watch each competing player, some players fail to count all the strokes they take. This gives them better scores and sometimes they end up winning the match.
- a. The player who fails to count his strokes is actually harming his golf game. He never knows how well or how badly he is really playing.
 - b. Since this occurs in informal matches it doesn't matter whether players count their strokes or not.
 - c. This type of player may never be a good golfer nor win important matches. In important matches there are officials to check on player's scores and this practice would be uncovered.
 - d. Since there are no officials, players should be extra careful in scoring correctly and should call fouls against themselves.
 - e. This type of play is unfair and should not be tolerated.

CORRECT ITEM RESPONSES FOR FORM A OF THE ACTION-CHOICE
TEST FOR COMPETITIVE SPORTS SITUATIONS
BY HARTMAN AND HASKINS

- | | |
|-------|-------|
| 1. e | 11. b |
| 2. b | 12. a |
| 3. b | 13. e |
| 4. e | 14. d |
| 5. c | 15. e |
| 6. a | 16. b |
| 7. a | 17. d |
| 8. e | 18. a |
| 9. a | 19. b |
| 10. a | 20. d |

RAW DATA

NO. OF SPORTS	TEST SCORES		NO. OF SPORTS	TEST SCORES	
	Self	Other		Self	Other
0 Sports			0 Sports		
1	17	19	43	16	18
2	15	18	44	6	0
3	13	10	45	18	0
4	14	18	46	17	0
5	11	10	47	12	8
6	11	10	48	12	8
7	13	18	49	11	8
8	10	8	50	12	0
9	11	10	51	13	18
10	13	10	52	12	8
11	16	18	53	8	10
12	11	8	54	10	8
13	11	10	55	9	0
14	13	10	56	12	10
15	7	8	57	14	8
16	12	8	58	10	18
17	11	0	59	13	18
18	10	10	60	16	18
19	11	8	61	12	18
20	13	18	62	12	8
21	14	18	63	15	10
22	13	18	64	4	0
23	8	8	65	7	8
24	13	10	66	10	18
25	8	18	67	6	8
26	10	8	68	12	8
27	12	8	69	8	8
28	9	8	70	12	10
29	12	10	71	17	0
30	13	18	72	16	10
31	20	8	73	14	9
32	12	8			
33	12	8			
34	19	0	1 Sport		
35	15	8	1	10	4
36	11	8	2	16	15
37	11	0	3	6	3
38	15	10	4	12	13
39	10	18	5	16	0
40	4	10	6	14	8
41	11	8	7	12	8
42	18	10	8	7	8
43	15	18	9	14	12

RAW DATA (continued)

58

NO. OF SPORTS		TEST SCORES		NO. OF SPORTS		TEST SCORES	
1 Sport	Self	Other	2 Sports	Self	Other		
10	11	10	1	11	10		
11	10	10	2	16	14		
12	13	11	3	13	16		
13	11	10	4	10	15		
14	19	19	5	15	16		
15	18	16	6	16	2		
16	11	11	7	9	9		
17	11	10	8	9	3		
18	16	13	9	7	9		
19	8	14	10	7	15		
20	7	10	11	8	8		
21	11	12	12	15	15		
22	13	12	13	10	6		
23	7	7	14	10	0		
24	5	9	15	8	9		
25	15	13	16	13	12		
26	13	11	17	8	7		
27	10	8	18	13	12		
28	14	14	19	13	10		
29	11	12	20	11	3		
30	9	15	21	12	10		
31	9	6	22	11	6		
32	19	19	23	13	10		
33	10	10	24	10	17		
34	13	14	25	11	9		
35	7	8	26	9	9		
36	10	5	27	12	6		
37	16	11	28	17	17		
38	16	13	29	15	15		
39	10	11	30	9	6		
40	11	5	31	12	11		
41	12	5	32	13	11		
42	6	13	33	7	7		
43	14	12	34	17	17		
44	10	15	35	12	14		
45	13	10	36	13	13		
46	13	10	37	8	8		
47	15	16	38	16	10		
48	12	13	39	13	13		
49	14	14	40	12	18		
50	15	9	41	14	7		
51	10	7	42	13	10		
52	11	3	43	13	8		
53	12	5	44	12	13		
54	16	15	45	11	6		

