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The erosion of ethical values of athletes and the rise of unsportsmanlike behaviors by our nation’s athletic programs is at near epidemic levels. This study evaluated the four-year Fair Play Project intervention in its attempt to correct the problem of poor sportsmanship behaviors created by a lack of ethical reasoning.

Beginning in the summer of 1996 as an initiative from athletic directors representing an interscholastic athletic conference in Southwest Michigan, the Fair Play Project had four goals: (1) Plan and implement an annual student leadership conference; (2) Create a school-based student Sportsmanship Task Force in order to improve the sportsmanship climate; (3) Attempt to create conference-wide impact by involving diverse subcultures of students; and (4) Conduct the leadership conference and school-based task force initiatives for a minimum period of 4 years. First and fourth year ethical-value choices were measured using the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory in the Sport Milieu (HBVCI). Results indicated women made significantly more ethical value choices than men. Athletes demonstrated lower levels of ethical reasoning than non-athletes. While the Fair Play Project provided exploratory demonstration of a sportsmanship intervention aligned with the PRECEDE model it did not significantly influence ethical reasoning.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

While sport is most often celebrated for many good reasons, a number of educational and sport organizations have focused on the darker side of sport and have declared their own “war on crime.” The crime reported is the erosion of ethical values of athletes and the increase of unsportsmanlike behavior in our nation’s athletic programs (Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1994; Shields & Bredemeir, 1995). In the thought provoking text by D. Stanley Eitzen (1999), Fair and foul: Beyond the myth and paradoxes of sport, the duality of sport to be both an agent of positive social technology as well as negative social technology is clearly depicted within the notion of sportsmanship. Eitzen suggests:

Thus there is a fundamental paradox in sport. On the one hand, sport inspires as it fosters the admirable traits of courage, determination, hard work, fairness, respect, sacrifice, selflessness and loyalty. But sport also promotes rule breaking, selfishness, greed, contempt for opponents, and violence on the field as well as deviant behaviors off the field (1999, pg. 43).

The irony of the sport paradox, is that many athletes, coaches, and fans believe that to be good in sport you have to be bad (Bredemeirer & Shields, 1985).

Despite the altruistic claims made by physical educators and sports enthusiasts that sport builds character and teaches social values such as sportsmanship, justice, honesty, and ethics, limited research and highly publicized athlete and fan indiscretions simply do not support the positive claims (Eitzen, 1999). Youth sport organizations,
high school athletic administrators, and even collegiate athletic associations have taken a renewed interest in issues relating to the character of competition (Gerdes, 1996). The common theme across many new initiatives is that ethical choices and unsportsmanlike behavior cannot be legislated; rather, it must be learned. While legislation may clearly define and coerce acceptable behaviors, athletes, coaches, parents, and other supporting adults such as teachers and administrators must also acquire the mindset to make personal ethical decisions that lead to moral action. Simply participating in sport is not enough. For too many years the assumption has been that physical activity is good and that positive outcomes from the involvement in the activity are automatically acquired. In fact, unless great care is taken to produce positive results, negative results are more likely to occur (Greendorfer, 1987).

Sportsmanship

Although the term sportsmanship has been used to loosely describe the behaviors an athlete should demonstrate while participating in a sport contest, finding a universally accepted definition is very difficult (Green & Gabbard, 1999). Consequently, many different definitions of sportsmanship have come into being. To some, sportsmanship can be defined as the behavior and mindset that athletes show through their action and/or words (Green & Gabbard, 1999). Allison's (1982) idea of sportsmanship is playing by the rules and treating an opponent with respect. Vallerand, Deshaies, Cuerrier, Briere, and Pelletier (1996) defined sportsmanship as having a general or core tendency toward respect of and the concern for the sport environment, the rules, and its participants (coaches, teammates, referees and
officials, and the opponent), and a concomitant [sic] avoidance of the negative win-at-all-costs approach toward participation in sports (p. 96).

Taking a similar behavioral point of view, sportsmanship can be thought of as the conduct in the sports arena that displays values including fairness, honesty, integrity, generosity, courtesy and a graceful acceptance of results of competition (Green & Gabbard, 1999).

Feezel (1986) takes a less behavioral point of view and suggests rather that sportsmanship is an attitude based on certain values that mediate behavior. “Sportsmanship is a mean between excessive seriousness, which misunderstands the importance of the play-spirit, and the excessive amount of playfulness, which might be called frivolity and which misunderstands the importance of victory and achievement when play is competitive" (p. 10).

Regardless of the various interpretations, there is a common theme supporting the many definitions of sportsmanship. Sportsmanship depends on ethical values, including honesty, being fair to one's opponents, and deciding to do the right thing (Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999). However, different circumstances in sporting contests often lead to alternative actions by the contestants because it is inevitably an individual choice that determines the right action for each situation. A critically important component, therefore, is the need to explore sportsmanship in a way that allows for the development of good ethical value choices within the total sport environment.

The Great Game and Ethical-Value Choices

The inherent principles leading to sportsmanship for this investigation are the
principles that lead to the *Great Game*. According to Fraleigh (1984), the Great Game is built on six key right actions in sport. First, the contest, or in the context of this study, the school athletic program must be able to determine a winner and loser. Second, competition is based on equal opponents, with equal demands on participants. Third, all participants are motivated to play well and try hard. Fourth, all agents in the sport contest adhere to both the letter and spirit of the established formal and informal rules. Fifth, there should be compatible personal goals between athletes, coaches, and spectators. Sixth, participants view their opponents as facilitators rather than obstacles.

Another and perhaps most important characteristic of the Great Game (Fraleigh, 1984), is that participants come to a realization of the value of complete and true knowledge of the relative abilities of the contestants to move mass in space and time (perform the object of a particular sport). Such a realization, along with the other characteristics of the Great Game, will help perpetuate more and more Great Games.

The use of Fraleigh's (1984) Great Game model as a basis for understanding how ethical value choices are made provides a unique approach for studying moral development in relational sport situations (Hahm, Beller, & Stoll, 1989). Rather than inferring ethical reasoning from justification of an act, the ethical value is based on whether the act itself is ethical according to deontological criteria (Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999). Deontological ethics is the judgement of rightness of inherent principles (the moral point of view) held to be universal in application (Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999).

Decisions to act in certain ways or to do certain things inevitably stem from one
of three points of view: (1) self-interest, (2) convention, and (3) moral reasoning (Fraleigh, 1984). The self-interested actions are those taken because they are, or they are believed to be, in the best interest of the person who is acting. For example, a basketball player intentionally fouls an opponent because he/she may want to prevent him or her from scoring. Another example of this point of view could be one in which the agent does something to make someone else laugh because it makes the acting agent feel good. Fraleigh (1984) suggests this type of action, although beneficial to someone else, is not the best reasoning from which to act because it contributes to the enjoyment of the acting agent and not for the primary concern of another's welfare. There is no way to determine what the right thing to do is if behavior serves conflicting interests.

Conventional or customary reasons are the second reason why an action may be taken. In this instance, acting agents engage in behavior because that is the way things have always been done. From the previous example, the reason for the intentional foul could have been because they were taught to act that way in certain situations or they were simply following the example of other players they have witnessed. In either case, self-interest and conventional reasons are not "ethical" since they are not based on any universal moral principles (Fraleigh, 1984).

Fraleigh (1984) suggested that a third point of view, the moral one, is the best kind of reason for acting in an ethical manner. Four characteristics support the moral point of view since it will lead to the Great Game:

1. The moral point of view resolves conflicts of interest. Having a moral point of view will allow mutual sport participants to make an ethical value choice when faced
with an action that seems contradictory to opposing self-interest or convention. A moral point of view is functional in that the ethical action can be identified and could be reasonably carried out. For example, an athlete can decide whether to commit a personal foul or not by being able to ascertain if acting in that manner is ethical, based on the identified principles of the Great Game. A moral point of view resolves conflict by creating a framework to actually make an ethical decision.

2. The moral point of view is universal, meaning it is meant for everybody because it can apply to everybody. For example, if it is judged morally right to decrease the possibility of injury in basketball by teaching defensive players not to undercut their offensive opponents attempting to score, then it must also be judged morally right in football to teach defensive rushers to avoid contact with the quarterback after he has released the ball (Fraleigh, 1984).

3. The moral point of view is for the good of everyone alike. Fraleigh stated, "the substance of the moral guides adopted should be reversible, that is, not merely for the good of the agent, but at least not detrimental to the persons who are affected by the agent's behavior" (1984, p. 18). An example would be an athlete who might think it right to injure an opponent in order to eliminate him from the game might not think it right if his opponent sought to intentionally injure him for the same reason.

4. The moral point of view is one where actions are based on principle and not on opportunistic reasons or rules of thumb (Fraleigh, 1984). An example might be a baseball fielder admitting that he missed tagging a base runner after an umpire mistakenly called it as an out.
Arnold (1996) supports the moral point of view of sportsmanship in that sport can be best understood as a "family of valued human practices," such as medicine or law, which utilizes ethical principles or the moral point of view to bind them all together (p. 94). Sport is a "competitive, rule-bound, physically demanding activity whose internal goals, skills and standards are, for their own sake, pursued in a moral way" (Arnold, 1996, p. 95).

Review of Literature About Athletes' Moral Development

Priest and Bridges (1983) did some of the first research in the area of athletes' moral development. Their research examined United States Military Academy (USMA) cadets in a longitudinal study over a 4-year period. Using a Defining Issues Test (DIT) to compare the changes in the cadets' moral reasoning abilities, the researchers found that USMA students increased in their moral reasoning over the course of the 4-year study. This study is relevant because all students at the USMA participate in some level of athletics and therefore implied that athletes do have the ability to develop in their abilities to make ethical value choices.

Bredemeier and Sheilds (1986) performed another early landmark study. In this research, high school basketball players and non-athletes were found to have similar moral reasoning values. Among college students, however, basketball players' moral reasoning scores were found to be somewhat lower than their non-athlete counterparts. In the same study, the basketball players were noted for using lower levels of moral reasoning in sports scenarios than in non-sport situations.
Wandzilak, Potter, and Ansorge (1995) conducted two studies three years apart on 12 through 14 year-old players in a youth basketball league. The players’ attitudes on values-related sports issues were determined with an 18-item Nebraska Youth Sports Inventory (NYSI). The respondents were measured both before and after the regular seasons. The initial study showed a significant increase from pretest to posttest on values such as "cheating is okay as long as you're not caught," "winning is more important than having fun," and "arguing with referees is acceptable." While the second study showed some of the same trends, values such as honesty, fair play, and having fun is more important than winning, were better maintained throughout the second season study than the first. This indicated that the basketball league coaches had improved in instilling values of sportsmanship in its young participants.

Another study by Allison (1982) employed a questionnaire using a Likert scale to examine the moral reasoning of college athletes and non-athletes. Allison found athletes possessed less mature moral reasoning abilities than non-athletes. Other findings of this study revealed that males had inferior moral reasoning levels than females. Allison's study not only revealed that athletes had a lower moral reasoning ability than non-athletes, but it was also found that "there does appear to be a tendency for those who have been involved in competitive programs longest to have less sportsmanlike attitudes" (p. 160). The Ethical Theory and Honor in Competitive Sport (ETHICS) Institute as the University of Idaho as well as other studies (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992; Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999; Stevenson, 1975) document that, not only do athletes tend to have lower moral reasoning than non-athletes, but that the
longer students are involved in competitive sport, the less able they are to reason morally. This was true of Allison's (1982) study of college students with varying degrees of athletic experience. In Priest, Krause, and Beach's (1999) study of college athletes at a military academy where ethics and character development were emphasized, it was found that moral reasoning scores of a class of cadets were lower upon graduation than they were as incoming freshmen.

Priest, Krause, and Beach (1999) conducted further investigation of their earlier work on athletes’ and non-athletes’ level of moral reasoning. The later study explored the question of whether athletes’ ethical reasoning abilities would develop over a four-year college career when character development was highlighted in the institutional climate of a military academy. While some colleges have a few specific programs that concentrate on developing sound moral character, only a few like the United States Military Academy (USMA) utilize required participation in some form of athletics and a strict attention to an honor code to purposely develop ethical values and leadership skills. The results indicated that the sport context and length of participation influenced ethical reasoning, but in a negative direction. The authors found that intramural athletes scored higher in ethical reasoning at the beginning as well as upon graduation from college than did their intercollegiate counterparts. Both groups’ scores on a test of ethical values choices were higher at the beginning of the four-year period than at the end. Individual-sport athletes outscored team-sport athletes but showed a greater decline over four years, and women outscored male athletes and decreased at the same rate as men over four years. The institutional use of required athletic participation with an
instructional program that focused on honor, integrity, and personal leadership was not effective as an intervention in building ethical character in sport.

The Fair Play Project

Effective implementation of sportsmanship initiatives in high school sports has been compromised by inadequate attention to the special circumstances and motivating factors that predispose the high school sport participants and spectators to unsportsmanlike behaviors. Due to the void of research on the development of athletes' ethical behavior or the effectiveness of sportsmanship interventions, the Fair Play Project was constructed to be a model that systematically defined and organized critical relational actions which may impact the development of good sport behavior specific to a high school athletic conference. The Fair Play Project was designed as an outcome-based educational process for a target high school population as part of an ongoing four-year program.

The Fair Play Project began in the summer of 1996 as an initiative from athletic directors representing an interscholastic athletic conference in Southwest Michigan. The primary interest was to build leadership qualities in their respective athletic school settings. After consultation with a local university, the Fair Play Project leaders outlined the following goals: (a) Plan and implement an annual student leadership conference for the respective athletic conference schools; (b) Utilize the leadership conference and create a subsequent school-based student Sportsmanship Task Force to impact the respective school climate relative to good sportsmanship; (c) Attempt to create
conference wide impact by involving students who would represent athletes and non-
athletes, 9th through 12th grade classes, both genders, and various student sub-cultures;
(d) Conduct the leadership conference and school-based task force initiatives for a
minimum period of 4 years.

To this end the Fair Play Project hosted a Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference
in the early fall of four consecutive years. Each year approximately 25 different students
from each of eight schools were selected by their athletic administration to participate,
which would then formulate the school-based student Sportsmanship Task Force.

The annual Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference provided a keynote speaker,
interactive break-out sessions targeted to develop specific sportsmanship skills, time for
informal social interaction between students from different schools, and a systematic
school-based strategy session to develop a sportsmanship plan for the current school
year. Students attending the conference were provided materials and information about
the success of their respective school-based strategic sportsmanship plans.

Individual school-based Sportsmanship Task Forces were to conduct ongoing
sportsmanship behavioral observations and meet on a regular basis in conjunction with
conference-wide Fair Play Task Force meetings (approximately four a year). The goals
of the conference-wide Fair Play Task Force was to provide ongoing education on
specific sportsmanship issues such as generating school spirit, recognizing good fan
behavior, and identifying the role of the coach in maintaining good sportsmanship.
Topics were selected by the students in the eight school-based Sportsmanship Task
Forces and facilitated by university personnel trained in sportsmanship and ethics.
Finally the conference-wide Fair Play Task Force was responsible for using the ongoing student dialogues and observation data to plan the goals and programs for the following year’s Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference.

The PRECEDE Model

A model from the field of health promotion was adopted and applied as a means to strategically plan and evaluate the outcome-based educational process for the Fair Play Project. The PRECEDE Model, developed by Green and colleagues (1980), allows program planners to identify the Predisposing, Reinforcing, and Enabling Causes in Educational Diagnosis and Evaluation (PRECEDE) that influence an individual’s intention and ability to make successful behavior change. This is the first unique application of this model to an intervention for interscholastic sportsmanship, although it has been applied to a collegiate athletic health program (Frauenknecht, Brylinsky, & Zimmer, 1998).

The PRECEDE model systematically defines and organizes critical variables that impact programming specific to a population and setting (Frauenknecht, Brylinsky, & Zimmer, 1998; Gilmore & Campbell. 1996). With regard to the Fair Play Project, the PRECEDE model provides a vehicle to more accurately assess sportsmanship from the perspective of the people in that setting, therefore increasing the attractiveness and commitment to the planned sportsmanship intervention. The PRECEDE model also provides an efficient means for adjusting the intervention program when planned conditions change (Marsick, 1987). This is consistent with the suggestion that if
research on ethical action in sport is to progress, researchers need to systematically
investigate how different internal processes and components of the context interact in
the production of moral behavior (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

The PRECEDE model's components are explained below and illuminated in
Table 1 as well as Figure 1. The following six phases of the PRECEDE model were
applied to the Fair Play Project: (1) social diagnosis, (2) epidemiological diagnosis, (3)
behavioral diagnosis, (4) educational diagnosis, (5) administrative diagnosis, and (6)
strategic planning, implementation and evaluation.

Social Diagnosis

The social diagnosis addresses quality of life issues and provides the motivation
for behavior change in the form of program goals by asking, "What do you want to be
happening in the sport setting?" An assessment of the quality of sport experience was
generated through input from the Task Force comprised of administrators and students
from each of the participating schools. All school-based Task Forces met at bi-monthly
meetings to review existing information and expectations of the Fair Play Project.
Information was then translated into Fair Play Program Goals and Objectives for each
succeeding year (see Table 1). Information for the Social Diagnosis was also gained
from participants who attended the annual Fair Play Conference during the School
Strategy Session. Students were asked to brainstorm ideas about how they see
sportsmanship occurring in their respective schools. This procedure was replicated
during each of the subsequent Fair Play Sportsmanship fall conferences.
Table 1
PRECEDE Model Applied to the Fair Play Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECEDE COMPONENT</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Diagnosis</td>
<td>Reviewed existing information &amp; expectations of Fair Play Project. Task Force meetings - addressed quality of life issues and provides motivation for change.</td>
<td>Subjectively defined problems of individual schools. What does the school value about sport? What are the sportsmanship problems in your school?</td>
<td>Translated information into Fair Play Program Goals and objectives for the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiological Diagnosis</td>
<td>School Demographics, Sportsmanship Awards, Rule Violation Reports, Normative Data ETHICS, school improvement priorities, MEAP scores. Gathered from each school and MHSAA.</td>
<td>What does the school value about sport? Analysis of existing data to identify sport and non-sport factors.</td>
<td>Fair Play Project &quot;sportsmanship&quot; objectives relative to program outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Diagnosis</td>
<td>Environmental Factors: Institutional Self-reports, sport attendance rates, existing policies, pertinent MHSAA rules. Behavioral Assessments: on-site observations.</td>
<td>Utilization of existing programs, preventive actions, compliance patterns. Dimensions of sportsmanship atmosphere; range, frequency, quality of unsportsmanlike actions on site.</td>
<td>Sportsmanship Objectives - Participant Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Diagnosis</td>
<td>Predisposing factors: HBVCI Student focus group data on enabling factors Reinforcing factors - Program Reports, Parent and Coach feedback</td>
<td>Pretest and Post test of HBVCI, Booster Club Involvement in development/support of Strategic Plan</td>
<td>School Based Strategic Plan Objectives - Participant Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Diagnosis</td>
<td>Report of School-Based Sportsmanship Activities, report of School/Community Staff development, review of school policies and enforcement. Evaluation of Fair Play Workshop-Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Frequency of school sponsored activities, &amp; relevance to strategic plan. Sport related discipline activities, generation of athletic school policy. Evaluation Strategic Plans</td>
<td>Considered for evaluation of program goals and recycled into social diagnosis for next year program goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>List of identified problems and possible areas for change - student focus groups.</td>
<td>Ongoing student committee reports on progress on strategic plans.</td>
<td>Recycled for next year's Behavioral diag.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. The PRECEDE Model Applied to the Fair Play Project.
**Epidemiological Diagnosis**

The epidemiological diagnosis analyzes existing data to help identify current sportsmanship and academic factors. It assists in identifying the motivations for behavior change to be realized through identification of relational variables impacting existing behaviors. A diagnosis of the sportsmanship climate was gained by answering the question: "What has happened in your school and community?" The communities serving each of the eight participating schools and school census provided the source for baseline information. Non-sport factors such as demographic make-up, school improvement priorities, and academic proficiency indicators (i.e., MEAP scores, graduation rates) were also collected from each school. Sport-related data included ejection summary data and other available incidents reported to the Michigan High School Athletic Association (MHSAA). Data was inclusive of the State of Michigan, with identification of participating schools when reported as such.

Another contributing factor in the epidemiological diagnosis was the determination of common goals and values of participants. Fraleigh (1984) states that a great sports contest can be undermined by incompatible goals between contestants. To this end, the Fair Play Task Force was asked to assess what they believed to be the goals for their athletic program and what their respective school valued about sports. The product of the epidemiological diagnosis was the creation of sportsmanship objectives relative to the sport participation outcomes. Such outcomes would then structure the behavioral diagnosis.
Behavioral Diagnosis

The behavioral diagnosis determines the sample population's current level of behavior targeted for change. The level of moral reasoning and environmental factors contributing to unsportsmanlike behaviors were used to address the question "What is happening in your school relative to sport?" Non-sport environmental factors were assessed by institutional self-reports, attendance rates of sporting events and other extracurricular activities, and review of student codes and pertinent MHSAA policies. Each school's administrator and Sportsmanship Task Force were asked to collect documentation and review related school activities such as attendance of sporting events, creation of school policy guiding extracurricular activities, and compliance with MHSAA rules throughout the year. Information was shared with the planning committees at each school as well as the conference-wide Fair Play Task Force.

Each school was observed in a minimum of four selected athletic events across the academic year (two visits in the fall, two in winter/spring). These observations made assessments of fan, player, and school personnel behavior. Unobtrusive observational methods were used to conduct structured assessments of sportsmanship based on a multidimensional definition of sportsmanship (Vallerand, Deshaies, Cuerrier, Briere, & Pelletier, 1996). Results of the behavioral diagnosis were also considered in the revision of Fair Play Sportsmanship program objectives and participation outcomes. Observations were also used to evaluate progress on current year school-based strategic plans and creation of the following year's strategic plans. Information was shared with participants during the fall Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference during the Strategic
Planning Sessions.

**Educational Diagnosis**

The educational diagnosis was used to answer the question: "What could be happening in your sport program?" The educational diagnosis identifies predisposing, enabling, and reinforcing factors that encourage or discourage change in unsportsmanlike behaviors. The educational diagnosis concentrates on those factors that have the potential for affecting behaviors identified through the behavioral diagnosis.

Predisposing factors include individuals' existing knowledge, values, beliefs, and attitudes regarding specific behavioral practices. For example, if a person believes that sportsmanship can positively improve the sport experience, there is a greater likelihood that person will engage in ethical sport behavior. Enabling factors are either barriers or facilitators that affect one's ability to engage in a specific behavior (Green & Kreuter, 1991). These factors are economic, legal, and environmental. In the sportsmanship setting this translates into established rules and penalties for violating established codes of conduct. Reinforcing factors are those consequences of behavior-change actions that determine whether the individual receives positive or negative feedback and are supported socially after it occurs (Green & Kreuter, 1991). In the sport setting, reinforcing factors include social support, peer influence, and acknowledgement by influential others such as coaches, parents, and fans. The benefit of applying the PRECEDE model is that, when program planners address the factors that encourage and support participation, individuals are more likely to begin and continue with behavior
changes (Green & Kreuter, 1991).

Assessment of moral reasoning or ethical value choices as a predisposing factor in sportsmanship behavior was conducted by a representative sampling of high school students in each participating school. It is the results of this diagnosis that the present study utilized to measure and compare levels of ethical value choices of students from the participating schools in both the first and fourth year of the Fair Play intervention.

**Administrative Diagnosis**

The administrative diagnosis is used to determine what are the available resources to be used in implementing the desired behavior change. Administrators and Fair Play Task Force participants were asked, "What did happen to change sportsmanship?" and what are available resources to be used in implementing school-based strategic plans and future Fair Play Sportsmanship Conferences. This provides an ongoing assessment of sportsmanship related activities and review of school policies affecting athletics and the Fair Play Conference itself. To this end, each participant was asked to complete a written evaluation during the Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference. Using Fraleigh's (1984) "Right Actions in Sport" as a guide, the Fair Play Task Force participants were also asked in the last meeting of each year to consider the sportsmanship climate after the previous year of the Fair Play Project. Informal listings were developed and reported as progress in meeting the strategic plan. It was important to identify existing and ongoing avenues for support in each school.
Strategic Planning, Implementation and Evaluation

The planning, implementation, and evaluation of the school-based sportsmanship strategic plans for each participating school were to coincide with the annual Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference. During the Strategic Planning Session of the Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference, each school's Task Force was asked to engage in a systematic planning of how best to accomplish the goals of the Fair Play Sportsmanship Conference. The strategic planning process consisted of the following steps: (a) review existing sportsmanship behaviors relative to the specific Fair Play program goals, and review progress on previous years strategic plan; (b) prioritize the need for action on identified areas of concern; (c) establish both long and short-term goals to impact prioritized goals; (d) identify needed resources; (e) and establish a time line to use in evaluation of progress on the strategic plan.

Statement of the Problem

Despite growing concerns about ethical behavior in athletic programs, there is surprisingly little research on the development of athletes' ethical behavior or the effectiveness of sportsmanship interventions (Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999). The opportunity to study the impact of a sportsmanship intervention was made available when an interscholastic athletic conference in Southwest Michigan sought assistance with a four-year project to improve the attitudes and behaviors of students, parents, and school staff attending athletic events. Conference administrators requested that a local university assist in the development, implementation, and evaluation of an educational
program called The Fair Play Project.

The purpose of this study was to investigate one component of the Fair Play Project, specifically, the development of ethical value choices or moral reasoning in the sport context. This research will address three questions: (1) Can an intervention program such as the Fair Play Project work to increase the likelihood of ethical value choices of high school students? (2) Are there differences in the ethical value choices between high school athletes and non-athletes? and (3) Did the Fair Play intervention influence athletes’ and non-athletes’ ethical values choices in similar ways?

It was hypothesized that high schools that implement sportmanship programs based on the information obtained through the PRECEDE model, and whose athletes participate in the Fair Play Conferences will successfully improve the ethical choices of their constituency in the sports context. It is further hypothesized that the difference in ethical choices and moral reasoning between athletes and non-athletes will be minimized by the Fair Play Project intervention.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for this study were drawn from the eight high schools participating in the Fair Play Project. A non-probability sampling procedure was employed in the selection of subjects. Athletic directors from eight participating high schools each selected three to four classrooms of students using the following criteria: (a) the classrooms would be representative of grades 9-12, (b) males and females would be equally represented, and (c) athletes and non-athletes would be fairly represented. This procedure resulted in five schools completing the first year ethical-value assessment and seven schools completing the fourth year assessment. Only schools having first year and fourth year classroom involvement were used in the main analysis. A total of 781 students completed both the first and fourth year of data collection from four high schools and were, therefore, included in the main analysis. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for this sample by year, gender, and athletic status.

Since the PRECEDE model focuses on outcomes rather than cause-and-effect relationships of specific activities (Marsick. 1987), the need for control groups or other experimental controls were unnecessary. However, the first year of the project may serve in a limited capacity as a control setting in comparison to the fourth year analysis.
Table 2

Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument

The dependent variable for this study was the measure of ethical values choices based on deontoic theory as reported by the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory in the sport Milieu (HBVCI. Hamn & Bellar. 1989). The HBVCI consists of 21 sports scenarios that focus on ethical issues such as arguing with the officials, retaliation, heckling the opposing team, and purposely breaking the rules when the official cannot witness the act. These situations may occur in any sport and cover everything from obvious rule violations to player conduct that are within the letter of the law, yet
violated the spirit in which the rule was written. Often the situations listed options between good sportsmanship and good "gamesmanship" which utilizes underhand strategies that facilitate winning.

HBVCI scores provide an indication of to what extent the respondent believes he or she would act in ambiguous sport-conflict situations. Responses reflect the three universal codes of conduct of honesty, responsibility, and justice when making cognitive decisions about right actions in sport. High scores in each of the three codes of conduct would suggest the respondent is thinking at a higher level of moral reasoning and therefore more likely to act with good sportsmanship behavior given a supportive climate and behavioral skills (Beller & Stoll, 1989).

Respondents are asked to rate their acceptance of the written scenario using a Likert scale response (Beller & Stoll, 1989). The Likert scale lists responses along a five-point continuum: "strongly agree", "agree", "no opinion", "disagree", and "strongly disagree." Scoring the HBVCI is done by adding up the points for each item. In 18 of the 21 items in the HBVCI, 1 point is awarded to "strongly agree", 2 to "agree", 3 to "no opinion", 4 to "disagree" and 5 points to "strongly disagree". The other three items are scored in a reverse manner. Scores on the HBVCI range from a possible high score of 105, denoting a high level of moral reasoning to a low of 21, showing a low level of moral reasoning. A score of 63, the scale's midpoint, would demonstrate a modest use of moral reasoning.

Normative tables have been developed from more than 20,000 high school students who have used the HBVCI. Test development reliability coefficients for
deontological scores range from 0.75 to 0.88 (Beller & Stoll, 1989). Numerous validity measures have indicated that the HBVCI has content, criterion, and construct validity (Beller & Stoll, 1989).

Procedures

Specific instructions about the administration of the HBVCI instrument were distributed to various contact personnel at each of the eight participating conference schools. A copy of the specific instructions are located in Appendix B. Participating schools were each asked to select three to four classrooms to participate in the evaluation, depending on classroom size, across the 9th through the 12th grades (n=120 students). Administrators were asked to conduct administration of the HBVCI as a pretest before the educational program began in October of the initial year, and again as a posttest, at the study's conclusion four years later. Classroom teachers were to administer the HBVCI as part of normal classroom activities. The completed instruments were then collected by the schools' athletic directors and returned to the principal investigators for analysis.

This project was approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University in 1996 and 1999 (See Appendix A). Data analysis was conducted on aggregate data across participating schools and will therefore be confidential.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Data Analysis

A between-groups experimental design was used to examine the main effects of the Fair Play Project intervention and its interaction effects. *A priori* gender differences led to two separate analyses for the dependent variable of ethical value choices across independent variable of year (year one and year four of the Fair Play Project), athlete status (non-athletes and athletes), and school (each of the four schools completing both year one and year four data collection). The data were analyzed using a 2 X 2 X 4 analysis of variance (ANOVA). Table 2 shows the sample size, mean, and standard deviation of HBVCI for males and females by athlete status, year, and school.

**Question 1: Do Students’ Ethical Value Choice Scores Improve With the Influence of the Fair Play Intervention?**

The data demonstrated a significant gender difference as expected with women scoring higher ethical value choices (M = 69.26, SD 9.35) than men (M = 61.44, SD 11.10), *F* (1, 782) = 101.30, *p* < .000. The between subject effects show that overall HBVCI scores did not significantly change over the span of the Fair Play intervention for men, *F* (1, 419) = .010 , *p* < .921 or for women, *F* (1, 330) = .646, *p* < .422. The results for men were consistent across the four schools, *F* (1, 419) = 1.145, *p* < .330.
Table 3
HBVCI scores by Year, Gender, and Athletic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>61.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>60.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>69.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>68.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>65.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However there appears to be a small but significant school-by-year interaction effect for women, $F(3, 330) = 2.801, p < .040$. Tables 4 and 5 show HBVCI by school for men and women respectively in year one and year four. While school three reported almost no change from year one to year four (difference of means = .33), schools one and four reported a lower HBVCI in year four than year one (difference in means were $-1.53$ and $-3.69$, respectively). Only school three showed a positive gain in HBVCI from year one to year three (difference in means = $4.48$).
Table 4

HBVCI Scores by School, Athletic Status and Year for Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.050
Table 5

HBVCI Scores by School, Athletic Status and Year for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athlete</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.050
Question 2: Are There Differences Between Athletes and Non-Athletes in Ethical Value Choices?

The ANOVA for men, $F(1, 419) = 17.805, p < .000$ and the ANOVA for women, $F(1, 330) = 5.380, p < .021$, showed a significant effect for athletic status on ethical value choices as measured by the HBVCI. Athletes scored lower ($M = 60.16, SD = 9.47$ for men; $M = 68.46, SD = 9.36$ for women) than non-athletes ($M = 64.80, SD = 11.23$ for men; $M = 70.83, SD = 9.16$ for women).

Question #3: Did the Fair Play Intervention Influence Athletes' and Non-Athletes' Ethical Values Choices in Similar Ways?

It was hypothesized that the above noted differences in ethical value choices between athletes and non-athletes would have been influenced by the main effect of year, reflecting the impact of the Fair Play Project intervention. Results indicated no significant difference between athletes and non-athletes and year in HBVCI for men, $F(1, 419) = .000, p < .993$, and for women, $F(1, 330) = 1.349, p < .246$. There was no significant school–athlete status-year interaction effect for either men, $F(3, 419) = .309, p < .819$, or for women, $F(3, 330) = 1.721, p < .162$. 
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Influence of Fair Play Project on Ethical Value Choices

This study attempted to utilize a sportsmanship intervention, the Fair Play Project, which would systematically define and organize critical relational actions to impact the development of good sport behavior. Planned, systematic, and evaluative sportsmanship activities aligned with the PRECEDE model were to have enabled each school's intention and ability to increase the frequency of good sport behaviors. One factor hypothesized to contribute to good sport behavior was the level of ethical reasoning measured during the educational diagnosis of the Fair Play Project intervention.

The results of this study indicate that Fair Play Project activities that were planned and evaluated by a conference-wide sportsmanship task force and implemented on a local basis by school-based sportsmanship student committees had no noticeable impact on the predisposing factor of ethical reasoning. Students sampled from year four of the Fair Play Project had no higher ethical value choices than students sampled prior to the start of the project. However, given the exploratory nature of this study and comprehensive approach to the design of the Fair Play intervention, further discussion is warranted.

Similar to previous studies (Beller & Stoll, 1989; Priest, Krause, & Beach,
1999), students across the participating schools in the Fair Play Project demonstrated a moderate level of ethical reasoning. Thus, the findings of this study reflect the typical high school environment in which students do not utilize the principles of the Great Game in deontological reasoning in regard to sportsmanship. When students were asked to apply ethical considerations in sport situations, value choices seemed guided by the premise of win at all cost rather than honesty, justice, and responsibility for others, the key constructs of the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory in the Sport Milieu (HBVCI, Hamn & Bellar, 1989). The HBVCI theoretically assumes that by applying the defined principles of honesty, responsibility, and justice, any abused or confused situation should be solved deontologically. This implies that an already established rightness or right action/rule might be followed in order to avoid violating other players (Beller & Stoll, 1989).

It is possible that the activities in the Fair Play Project did not adequately address the principles of honesty, justice, and responsibility as measured by the HBVCI. Fair Play Conference goals and objectives focused on behavioral skills identified by students and sport personnel in the social and administrative diagnoses. However, if the Fair Play Project activities were to impact ethical reasoning, it may have needed to be practiced through a more direct approach. Eitzen (1999) suggested, "If sport is to exalt the human spirit, it must be practiced within a context guided by fairness and humane considerations" (p. 55). Fraleigh (1984) states that a great sports contest can be undermined by incompatible goals between contestants. For example, unless building school spirit, understanding the role of the official, and dealing appropriately with the
media, were seen as ethical dilemmas which, when solved ethically would enhance the sport experience, the Fair Play message may have been lost. When faced with a stronger message that winning is more important than playing fair, students were more likely to take a conventional or self-interest point of view rather than a moral or ethical choice.

Data from this study support previous findings that gender does impact the level of moral reasoning of high school students (Beller & Stoll, 1995; Blair, 1985; Crown & Heatherington, 1989; DuBois, 1990). Female high school students participating in the Fair Play Project were found to have higher overall ethical value-choice scores than did males. However, contrary to previous studies (Cohn, 1991; Dubois, 1990), gender did not influence receptivity to interventions directed at changes in ethical reasoning. The female students in this study's population sample were no more receptive to the principles of the Great Game used to base ethical values choices than were the males. The findings also did not support Cohn's (1991) higher verbal ability hypothesis that would have predicted girls would have been more receptive to this type of sportsmanship intervention than boys. Much of the Fair Play Project involved verbal dialogue among students, written observations, and written analysis of strategic plans. Cohen's (1991) hypothesis would have suggested women are better able to detect the nuances in these verbal presentations of sport situations and therefore more capable of applying ethical reasoning to the situation. Girls would have then been expected to utilize the Fair Play process better than boys.

Previous findings from others studies suggest whatever gender differences exist are most likely due to explanations of less female aggressiveness and competitiveness
than men (Eagly, 1987). Other studies also indicate women place greater emphasis on achieving and maintaining positive relationships than men in sporting competitions (Crown & Heatherington, 1989) and are not as prone to having a "professional" orientation, which emphasizes winning over fair play (Blair, 1985).

Eitzen (1999) found that the more time individuals participate in sport, the less they are able to apply moral reason due to the professionalization effect. Professionalization is the shift of attitude from that of a "play" orientation to that of a "professional game" orientation. The play orientation emphasizes having fun, skill development, and fair play, whereas a professional orientation suggests winning is the major focus. Knoppers (1985) said sport and play is a continuum of attitudes ranging from a play orientation that values equity, skill, and success in that order, and a professional game orientation that values the tenants in reverse order stressing winning or success above all else. A professional orientation would contradict the moral point of view therefore rendering the guides for action identified by the Great Game theme as unrealistic and less desirable when making value choices.

The significant interaction of school on the main effect year for ethical reasoning suggests that the Fair Play Project did have a positive impact on one specific subgroup of the sample. Females in one school improved significantly from a mean score of 66.98 to 71.46. A similar positive but insignificant trend for males showed improvement from a mean score of 59.61 to 62.58 in the same school. The one school that did report a positive change in ethical reasoning had the lowest mean score and smallest variation of HBVCI scores of the four participating schools. The Fair Play
Project may have had more impact in improving predisposing factors of ethical reasoning given the lower starting point. It is also possible that a contributing factor were more meaningful social and epidemiological diagnoses in the Fair Play activities. The smaller variance in HBVCI scores and poor sportsmanship climate allowed participants to identify common goals and values of improving sportsmanship behaviors.

Differences Between Athletes and Non-Athletes in Making Ethical Choices

It stands to reason that those students who would receive the greatest exposure to the planned Fair Play intervention would be athletes who were most consistently involved in sports and had the most investment in Fair Play activities. Many of the school-based strategic plans centered on the role of the student athlete, such as pep assemblies, school spirit and support of specific teams, athletes as spectators. It was therefore hypothesized that the Fair Play Project would have a greater impact on athletes than non-athletes by either minimizing or nullifying the participation effect. The findings of this study did not support this notion.

As was the case in earlier studies (Allison, 1982; Beller & Stoll, 1992; Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999; Stevenson, 1975), athletes demonstrated a lower score on ethical values than did non-athletes. For both men and women across all schools, athletes were less likely than non-athletes to identify the ethical choice given sport dilemmas. One reason athletes' scores may be lower than non-athletes is the reported influence of athletic participation itself, the consequence of pressures to win at all cost.
that is valued in our American culture (Blair, 1985; Eitzen, 1999; Priest, Krause, & Beach, 1999; Stevenson, 1975; Webb, 1969). The reason for the conventional rather than ethical point of view could have been because they were taught to act that way in certain situations or they were simply following the example of other players they have witnessed. A sad example of how badly sport culture has stressed the win-at-all-cost attitude was demonstrated a few years ago. A fifth-grade football team that had just gone to their first state championship after enjoying an undefeated season. At the season banquet following a very close loss in the championship game, the coach awarded each boy with a plaque inscribed with a quote from Vince Lombardi:

> There is no room for second place. I have finished second twice at Green Bay and I never want to finish second again. There is a second place bowl game but it is a game for losers played by losers. It is and always has been an American Zeal to be first in anything we do and to win and to win and to win (Eitzen, 1999, p. 44).

Bredemeier and Shield's (1986) concept of "bracketed morality" suggests that even if athletes understand the ethical implications and identify with the principles of the Great Game, they are still more willing to take advantage of any game situations that increase their chances of success regardless of the ethical implications. The winning-at-all-cost philosophy permeates sport at every level causing some coaches and athletes to value it over all things including fair play, honesty, and integrity. Conn and Gerdes stated it well:

> When winning becomes the primary objective, other potential outcomes are lost. Coaches are usually the ones initially caught up in the win-at-all-cost attitude. To fulfill their own ego needs, coaches too often pressure their young players to play when injured, to violate the rules to their advantage, and to quit if they are not good enough (1998, p. 267).
Sports norms that stress winning at all costs may override athletes' willingness to use moral principles for resolving ethical dilemmas in athletic competition. Sportsmanship interventions such as the Fair Play Project will have to attempt to directly influence this core competitive ethic to see a change in sportsmanship behavior.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Using a critical relational actions approach to address the special circumstances and culturally motivating factors impacting sportsmanship behaviors seems to be theoretically sound and warranted. However, The Fair Play Project sportsmanship intervention appears to have limited success and effectiveness as determined by the educational diagnosis through ethical value choices. It is possible that other areas of the Fair Play Project diagnosis may be able to detect more precisely the impact of the project than the singular educational item analyzed in this study. Some potential limitations of the study should be discussed in order to direct future research in this area.

One limitation of the study was the failure to control the proper mix of students being analyzed in the educational diagnosis. School administrators were asked to select classrooms that would provide a balanced population of students across gender, age, and athletic status. By not guaranteeing that balance, the data received might have been disproportionately skewed. For example, if the population in the fourth year contained more seniors than underclassmen, the "professionalization" effect discussed earlier might have brought down the overall mean score. The same thing could happen if the
number of athletes outnumbered non-athletes, because athletes statistically test lower than non-athletes as shown in this study as well as others. The use of a stratified random sampling procedure would help to alleviate many of these problems.

Another limitation was the sample size and subject attrition. Only four out of eight schools participating in the Fair Play Project completed and returned the HBVCI instrument to the principal researchers. In addition three out of those four schools averaged 43% attrition in subjects from year one to year four. This not only affects statistical error but may also indicate a decline in the enthusiasm the schools took in implementing the program. If the environment doesn’t support change, there would be little expectation for individual students to demonstrate better attitudes. A repeated measures design would better account for confounding influence of student body make-up over the course of the intervention.

Another limitation of this study was the failure to control the robustness of the individual school Fair Play actions. While school-based sportsmanship task forces were involved and enthusiastic at conference wide Fair Play meetings, there may have been less enthusiasm and inclusion of other students when they returned home to carry out strategic plans. Without this information it is difficult to determine if the lack of influence on ethical reasoning was attributable to the intervention itself or fidelity of adherence to the intervention. Future research should consider ways of controlling and reporting quality of intervention compliance.

Finally, with 80% of respondents in a 1996 ESPN/Chilton Sports Poll saying that sportsmanship has declined within the past decade (Spencer, 1996), more work is
definitely needed in this area. Eitzen (1999) suggests that society can make changes in
sport by making changes in social arrangements. Such arrangements would result in the
"raising of consciousness" whereby formerly unconvinced sport constituencies will be
mobilized into action. The positive influence of the Fair Play Project on one school, but
not others receiving the same intervention, should not be discounted. Future studies
should look at using an experimentally based design utilizing a control group. This may
prove beneficial in providing better evidence that improvement in ethical value choices
can be gained. Perhaps with the development of additional intervention studies, the
problems of poor sportsmanship could be more effectively managed.
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HBVCI Administration Instructions Letter
To: FAIR Play IN KVA
    Administrators and Task Force Participants

From: Jody Brylinsky, Dept. of HPER
    Western Michigan University
    brylinsky@wmich.edu
    fax:616-387-2704 phone:616-387-2677

RE: Moral Reasoning 4th year follow

Believe it or not we are about to complete the 4th year of FAIR PLAY in KVA project. I hope you feel your efforts have been worth while. I believe you are making a positive difference on the level of sportsmanship in the KVA. Part of our ongoing efforts to do more than just believe we are making a difference, and actually see if this program is working. To do that I am asking for your signed consent and participation in the final year evaluation material.

An important part of formative and summative evaluation of the Fair Play project involves measuring the level of moral reasoning of your students. We need you to once again administer the Hahm Beller Values Choice Inventory to 100 or so students in your schools. Copies of the Hahm Beller Values Choice Inventory have been color-coded for your school. If you need more please try to use the same color. Please consider how you might administer this short (15 minute) inventory to the SAME representative sample of your students as you did in the fall of 1996. (I have a few handouts to share with you.) We don’t need you to actually give the test to the same students, but the same type of students, i.e. across grades, gender, and academic areas. Many of you used several classrooms as your subjects that seemed to work well.

The only problem we had last time was in some students just not taking the inventory very serious. Information was missing from their demographic page or they simply circled all responses on the right without reading the questions. Please do what
ever you can to have the student actually read and consider each question before they respond. We would rather have fewer people respond and take it seriously, than have data that misrepresents your school. We will ask the inventory to be completed by BEFORE the FAIR PLAY Conference Oct. 11. We will do a final analysis again in May or June.

Once again, congratulations for your efforts to bring quality athletic programs to your communities. You will be receiving updates on the data analysis throughout the year. If you have a special interest or need pertinent to your school – let me know. For example, you might want something more unique to your specific strategic plan. The evaluation is for your benefit so don’t hesitate to let me know how best to help.

Thanks again.

Please use the enclosed form or copy onto your letterhead the following permission to use student material for evaluation purposes:
Please identify on the enclosed how you went about obtaining subjects. i.e. Inventories were administered to all of the 5th hour class or all of a certain instructor’s classes were given the Inventory:

Remember to balance across 9th through 12th grade, boys and girls, and different academic strengths. Athletes and non athletes should be responding as well. It is OK if the students were part of the fall sample, but necessary that they had to be.

HBVI was given to this group of students:

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

PLEASE RETURN THIS SHEET WITH YOUR COMPLETED HBVI TO BY JODY BRYLINSKY

DEPT. OF HPER
STUDENT RECREATION CENTER
WMU
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008

______________________________

Oct 11, 1999
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