

Toward a Multidimensional Definition of Sportsmanship

ROBERT J. VALLERAND

Université du Québec à Montréal

PAUL DESHAIES AND JEAN-PIERRE CUERRIER

Université de Sherbrooke

NATHALIE M. BRIERE

Gaspé, Québec

LUC G. PELLETER

University of Ottawa

One major problem with research conducted on sportsmanship is the absence of an accepted definition. The purpose of this study was to attempt to derive a definition of sportsmanship by applying premises from social psychological theories and research. A major assumption of this perspective is that sportsmanship meanings and labels attached to given behaviors are learned through interpersonal interactions with various sport participants and that eventually a consensual agreement develops regarding the nature of sportsmanship. It thus follows that a meaningful definition of sportsmanship should be obtained through the athletes themselves. In this study, 1056 male and female athletes completed a questionnaire which contained various items pertaining to sportsmanship. Results from a factor analysis revealed the presence of 5 factors corresponding to the respect and concern for: a) one's full commitment toward sport participation, b) the rules and officials, c) social conventions, d) the opponent, as well as e) a negative approach toward sport participation. Implications of this multidimensional definition for future sportsmanship research are drawn.

Much research has focused on the concept of sportsmanship (see Bredemeier & Shields, 1993; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Weiss & Bredemeier, 1986, for reviews). While research on sportsmanship has progressed, it has been plagued by a major problem, namely a definition

This study was supported by a research grant from the Régie de la Sécurité dans les Sports du Québec to the authors. This manuscript was prepared while the first author was supported by grants from le Fonds pour la Formation des Chercheurs et l'Aide à la Recherche (FCAR-Québec), the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. We would like to thank Bert Carron for his comments on a previous version of this article. We also wish to thank Pierre Provencier for his help with some of the statistical analyses reported in this paper. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Robert J. Vallerand, Laboratoire de Recherche sur le Comportement Social, Département de Psychologie, Université du Québec à Montréal, P.O. Box, 8888, Station Centre-Ville, Montréal, Qc, Canada, H3C 3P8.

problem (Weiss & Bredehoefer, 1986). A host of different definitions have been proposed without consensus on what would be the most appropriate one. Thus, sportsmanship has been conceptually defined as a general attitude toward certain sport behaviors (Haskins, 1960; Kistler, 1957; McAfee, 1955), as respect for prescribed and proscribed norms from an ethics code (Kroll, 1976), as positive social interaction related to game play (Giebink & McKenzie, 1985), and as "the tendency to behave in accordance with one's most mature moral reasoning patterns, even when conventional dictates or success strategies would encourage alternative behaviors" (Weiss & Bredehoefer, 1986).

Several issues need to be addressed with respect to the definition of sportsmanship. We will focus on two. A first point concerns the fact that up until now, there has not been any agreement with respect to the content of sportsmanship. In other words, researchers are still looking for the conceptual domain of sportsmanship, for what it is as well as for what it is not. Thus, is violent behavior (such as fighting in ice hockey) part of the sportsmanship concept or the aggression concept? Without a proper definition of sportsmanship, it is impossible to answer this question. Furthermore, without a clear definition of the content of sportsmanship, it becomes impossible to further our knowledge on three key aspects of sportsmanship, namely sportsmanship behavior (behavior pertaining to the content of sportsmanship as scientifically defined), sportsmanship orientations (i.e., individual differences in the propensity to act in a sportsmanlike fashion), and sportsmanship development (the processes that lead to these individual differences). By providing a definition of sportsmanship, however, it would become feasible to clearly delineate the proper domain of application of sportsmanship and to unite research on the concept on all fronts (sportsmanship behavior orientations, and development).

The second issue dealing with the definition of sportsmanship pertains to the processes through which athletes come to learn what behaviors are related to sportsmanship and which ones are not. Much social psychological research reveals that moral meaning and labels attached to situations and behaviors are learned through interpersonal interactions (Bakeman, 1985; Damon, 1988; Graziano, 1987). We believe that the same process applies to sportsmanship (see Vallerand, 1991; Vallerand, Deshaies, & Guerrier, in press; Vallerand & Losier, 1994). It is through interactions with not only coaches, referees, parents, and other adults, but also through communication with their peers (see Fine, 1987) that children come to learn what sportsmanship is and what it is not. It is the social context, and more specifically the various interactions and observations it allows, which provides participants with the necessary background with which to define the various behaviors emitted (Damon, 1988; Shweder & Much, 1987). Eventually, through repeated interactions in given sport settings, athletes develop a consensual agreement regarding the nature of sportsmanship.

An important implication of this proposition is that athletes should be

in a prime position to identify the nature of the sportsmanship concept. In fact, it may even be posited that the most meaningful and ecological understanding of the nature of sportsmanship should be obtained from the very individuals who participate in sport settings: the athletes themselves. A similar position has been espoused by Quinn, Houts, and Graesser (1994). These researchers proposed and showed that a meaningful definition of morality can be obtained by asking subjects' perceptions of morality in naturally occurring situations. It thus appears that such an approach might be useful in leading to an ecological definition of sportsmanship.

In light of the importance for the field to propose a valid definition of sportsmanship, it was the purpose of this study to test the above proposition and to identify athletes' definition of sportsmanship. In the present study, athletes were presented with items (collected in a previous pilot study) describing various behaviors and attitudes toward sport situations and were asked to rate each item regarding its pertinence to sportsmanship. Subjects' assessments were then subjected to a factor analysis. It was hypothesized that a meaningful conceptualization of sportsmanship would be obtained.

METHOD

Subjects

A total of 1056 French-Canadian athletes from 10 to 18 years of age ($M = 14.8$ years) participating in seven different sports (track and field, hockey, gymnastics, volleyball, badminton, swimming, and basketball) were recruited from lists of teams and sport clubs provided by Quebec sport organizations. Participants were from four different areas of the Province and were representative of Quebec sport participants for this age group. All athletes were participating in competitive leagues at various levels as a function of their age (e.g., Pee-Wee, Bantam, Midget etc.) and were representing their schools or civic clubs depending on the sport.

The sampling procedures were as follows. First, it was decided to subdivide the Province of Quebec into four regions representing the largest possible portion of the Quebec population. Second, 7 individual and team sports were identified (see above). Third, lists of teams for these 7 sports were obtained for each of the 4 regions from the provincial sport bodies. Fourth, both male and female teams were then selected at random. Finally, coaches of these teams were contacted and asked to participate in the study. When a coach refused to participate, another team from the same region and sport was randomly selected. Overall, these procedures ensured that approximately the same number of male ($n = 563$) and female ($n = 492$) athletes participated in the study and that each sport was equally represented. Furthermore, these procedures also ensured that athletes who participated in the study were representative of athletes from the Province of Quebec participating in these sports for these age groups. Table 1 presents the breakdown of participants as a function of sex and sport.

Table 1
Breakdown of athletes by sex and type of sports

Sport	Gender		N	%
	Males	Females		
Badminton	76	60	136	12.9
Basketball	87	80	167	15.8
Gymnastics	0	115	115	10.9
Hockey	171	1	172	16.3
Swimming	61	76	137	12.8
Track and field	84	79	163	15.5
Volleyball	84	83	167	15.8
Totals	563	492	1,055	100%
	53.4%	46.6%		100%

Note: 1 subject did not indicate his/her sex.

Questionnaire

Before presenting the questionnaire, we emphasized the fact that subjects should not put their name down and that anonymity would thus be preserved. Subjects were then presented the questionnaire which was made up of various parts. On the first page, it was explained that we were interested in finding out how athletes perceive various sport situations or behaviors. It was underscored that we wanted subjects to indicate how they *themselves* perceived these various situations or behaviors. It was emphasized that we did not want to know how subjects felt personally regarding these situations, but rather if they perceived these situations to be related to the concept of sportsmanship or not. On the following pages, subjects were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt that each item was related to the concept of sportsmanship on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (not related at all to the notion of sportsmanship) to 4 (greatly related to the notion of sportsmanship). An example of an item (different from the ones used in the actual study) and how it could be scored by subjects was presented. Following this example, the 21 items to be rated were presented.

These items were selected from two major sources. First, the major part of the items were selected from results of a pilot study. In this study, 10 males and 10 females for each of the following age groups: 10-14 years, 15-18 years, and 19 and over ($n = 60$;) with a mean age of 18.3 years were asked to complete a questionnaire. All subjects had been (or were still) involved in a variety of competitive sports, including those performed by subjects of the main study. Subjects were asked to present their definition of the "sportsmanship" concept. They were then told to provide as many examples of their definition as they wished (see Boyer, 1963 for a similar strategy). This procedure assured that different aspects of the definition would be highlighted through examples. Similar exam-

ples were coded into a category and one item per category was selected to create the items that would be presented to the subjects of the main study. Second, 3 items were added by the researchers. This was because some of the definitions presented by subjects of the pilot study were not translated into examples. Doing so might allow some aspects of the sportsmanship concept as perceived by subjects to come out more clearly. Overall, 21 items were included in the questionnaire and rated by subjects of the main study.

Finally, on the last page of the questionnaire, subjects were asked to indicate their sex, age, as well as the number of years of participation in competitive sports, and the number of hours of training per week.

Procedures

Prior to the testing sessions, the experimenters phoned the head coaches of the various randomly selected teams in order to solicit their collaboration in the study. Coaches were told that participation was important because it could lead to a better understanding of sport competition as it can be found in their respective sports.

Only one team was assessed per meeting. Athletes completed the questionnaire either in a classroom near the gymnasium (if applicable), or in the locker room. Subjects were thanked for agreeing to participate in the study. It was explained that "this study is not a test but rather some kind of survey on sport competition". They were told that their answers would not serve for selection purposes and that their coach would not see their individual answers. Subjects were told, however, that their answers were important as they could contribute to a better understanding of their sport. Subjects were finally told that they should not put their names down and were thus assured of confidentiality. Following these instructions, the questionnaire was verbally described and distributed. Athletes then completed the questionnaire on their own. It should be noted that for athletes 14 years old and under, items were read to them. Subjects were encouraged to ask questions at any time. These overall procedures ensured that the questionnaire was clear for all subjects. Following completion of the questionnaire, subjects were told the purpose of the study, thanked for their cooperation, and dismissed.

RESULTS

A factor analysis was performed on the 21 items using the maximum likelihood approach (Jöreskog & Lawley, 1968). Results revealed the presence of 5 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 and explaining 50% of the variance. An oblique rotation was used because it was expected that the factors would be correlated. The factor loadings as well as an abridged presentation of the items appear in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, the five factors reflect a coherent picture. Factor 1 reflects respect and concern for one's full commitment toward sport participation. Such a commitment is displayed through behaviors such as obeying the coach and showing up (and working hard) during practices and games

Table 2
Mean, standard deviations, and factor loadings from the factor analysis, for each sportsmanship item

Abridged item	Mean	SD	Factor loadings					
			F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	
1. Show up for all practices and games	3.33	.91	.67					
2. Do not give up after mistakes	3.51	.81	.56					
3. Maximum effort in practices and games	3.40	.92	.55					
4. Obey the coach even when do not want to	3.21	.92	.47					
5. Derive pleasure from competition	3.26	.94	.46					
6. Swing stick or racket aggressively after losing	2.50	1.33		.90				
7. Ridicule a less competent opponent	2.42	1.29		.74				
8. Take steps against which there are no rules to hinder the opponent's performance	2.54	1.13		.43				
9. Play only to win	2.17	1.11		.40				
10. Do not retaliate cheap shots from the opponent	3.29	.93			.41			
11. Stay calm when frustrated after making a mistake	3.34	.84			.41			
12. Respect the rules even when the opponent cheats	3.32	.90			.36			
13. Recognize own mistakes	3.46	.87	(.30)		.33			
14. Do not criticize the referee for mistakes against self	3.04	.98			.30			
15. Always shake hands after the game	3.78	.58				.68		
16. Encourage and help teammates even if they make mistakes	3.74	.58				.62		
17. Be a good loser	3.69	.68				.43		
18. Lend opponent equipment if it enables him or her to play	3.33	.92						.61
19. Agree to play rather than winning by default if the opponent is late	3.16	.96						.46
20. Refuse to take advantage of an injured opponent	2.65	1.07						.45
21. Inform referee when he or she makes a mistake in one's favor	3.09	1.04						.41
Factor mean			3.35	2.41	3.30	3.74	3.05	
Factor standard deviation			.61	.90	.55	.48	.66	

Note 1: F1: respect and concern for one's full commitment toward sport participation; F2: negative approach toward sport participation; F3: respect and concern for the rules and officials; F4: respect and concern for social conventions; and F5: respect and concern for the opponent.

Note 2: Only loadings greater than .30 are reported.

Table 3
Correlation matrix of the sportsmanship factors

Factors	1	2	3	4	5
1	.71	-.25	.38	.40	.23
2		.72	.02*	-.09	-.01*
3			.59	.42	.40
4				.66	.34
5					.59

Note 1: F1: respect and concern for one's full commitment toward sport participation; F2: negative approach toward sport participation; F3: respect and concern for the rules and officials; F4: respect and concern for social conventions; and F5: respect and concern for the opponent.

Note 2: All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ except those correlations with an asterisk which are not significant.

Note 3: Scores on the diagonal are the factor Cronbach alphas.

(i.e., not letting the team down and always offering the best opposition). In Factor 2, the approach toward sportsmanship is negative wherein the athlete takes a win at all costs approach toward playing, ridicules opponents, and shows a temper after losing. In Factor 3, the emphasis is on respect and concern for the rules and officials: respecting the rules even when the opponent cheats, not criticizing the referee when he or she makes mistakes, not retaliating against opponents' cheap shots, and remaining calm after making a mistake. Factor 4 reflects respect for social conventions to be found in sports: shaking hands after the game, encouraging teammates, and being a good loser. Finally, in Factor 5, the emphasis is on true respect and concern for the opponent. This form of sportsmanship is evidenced through lending one's equipment to the opponent (and thereby allowing him or her to compete), agreeing to play even if the opponent is late (rather than winning by default), refusing to take advantage of an injured opponent, and informing the referee when the latter has made a mistake in one's favor. Overall, the 5-factor structure reflects a readily interpretable multidimensional definition of sportsmanship.

Table 2 also presents the mean and standard deviation of each item and for each of the five factors. Inspection of the mean for each factor reveals that subjects perceived the five sportsmanship dimensions somewhat differently. While all factors were perceived as being part of the sportsmanship concept, subjects perceived Factor 4 (social conventions) as reflecting sportsmanship the most and Factor 2 (negative approach toward sport participation) the least.

Cronbach alphas of each factor, as well as the factor correlations were also computed. These values are presented in Table 3. Results revealed that each factor was somewhat reliable, especially in light of the low number of items per factor. Nevertheless, results also revealed that there

was somewhat more consensus with respect to the content of Factors 1, 2, and 4 (which had alpha values of .71, .72, and .66, respectively) than with respect to Factors 3 and 5 (which had alpha values of .59). Thus, findings with these last two factors must be interpreted with caution. In addition, results from the factor correlations revealed the presence of positive and moderate values (ranging from .24 to .42), except for the values involving Factor 2 (a negative approach toward sport participation) where correlations with the other factors ranged from $-.25$ to $.02$. Thus, these 5 factors are only moderately correlated and can be perceived as somewhat independent of one another.

Finally, correlations were also conducted between the 5 factors and the socio-demographic variables assessed in this study (sex, age, number of years of participation in competitive sports, and number of hours of training per week). Results revealed that correlations were very small (the average correlation was $r = +.01$). Only one correlation exceeded $.12$. It involved age and Factor 2. The older the subjects, the higher the tendency to perceive items pertaining to Factor 2 as reflecting sportsmanship ($r = .23$). Thus, socio-demographic variables had little impact on how sportsmanship items were assessed.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to identify a meaningful definition of sportsmanship. In line with much social psychological research, this was done by asking athletes to rate the extent to which various items, previously obtained from other athletes, pertained to the concept of sportsmanship. The results from the factor analysis revealed the presence of 5 factors corresponding to the respect and concern for: a) one's full commitment toward sport participation, b) the rules and officials, c) social conventions, d) the opponent, as well as e) a negative (win at all costs) approach toward sport participation. The present findings have important implications for sportsmanship research.

A first major implication of this study is that the present findings represent the first preliminary step toward an ecologically valid definition of sportsmanship. Three points should be underscored in this respect. First, sportsmanship is essentially multidimensional in nature. This entails that sportsmanship can be perceived as a core concept which encompasses a certain number of related and more specific dimensions. From this conceptualization, it appears that sportsmanship reflects a general or core tendency toward the 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 avoidance of a negative win-at-all-costs approach toward participation in sports.

Second, the present definition underscores the fact that if we are to make sense of sportsmanship as it exists in sports, we need to go beyond the justice dimension as postulated by certain theorists (e.g., Kohlberg, 1981, 1984). In fact, it would appear that justice is only one element of the concept of sportsmanship. Rather, it may be posited that the main

characteristic of the concept is the concern and respect for others, social conventions, as well as oneself. This is not to say that the notion of justice is not important for an understanding of sportsmanship. It is indeed important especially as pertains to the respect of the rules. However, in line with suggestions from other researchers in the moral area (e.g., Gilligan, 1977), to base the concept of sportsmanship only on the dimension of justice would lead to a limited view of sportsmanship and phenomena related to it.

In line with the second point above, a third and final point concerning the definition of sportsmanship leads to the suggestion that the change of focus from a justice to a social concern approach should have profound consequences for which theories should be used in future research to scrutinize the sportsmanship concept. Up to now, research has been largely atheoretical (see Weiss & Bredemeier, 1986). The few studies conducted from a theoretical perspective have adopted a structural-developmental perspective focusing largely on age, individual stages, and other intrapersonal variables (e.g., moral reasoning) as the cause of various types of behaviors such as aggression (Bredemeier, 1985, 1994; Shields & Bredemeier, 1986)¹. By putting the emphasis on the social component of sportsmanship, the present position underscores the fundamental importance of contextual and interpersonal variables in the display of sportsmanship behavior and the development of sportsmanship orientations. Thus, social psychological theories and concepts, such as equity (Adams, 1976), social comparison (Masters & Keil, 1987), relative deprivation (Cosby, 1976; Folger, 1987), competition (Gelfand & Hartmann, 1978), altruism and prosocial behavior (Latane & Darley, 1970), conformity (Asch, 1956), obedience (Milgram, 1974), observational learning (Bandura, 1986), social justice (Lerner, 1977; Reis, 1987), and intergroup bias (Tajfel, 1982) known to explain interpersonal behaviors, now become relevant to the understanding of sportsmanship. The present definition of sportsmanship puts the focus back on the interpersonal aspect of sportsmanship and this should serve to reorient future research in this direction.

A second contribution of the present findings is that the 5-component definition of sportsmanship may allow an integration of the extant literature on sportsmanship. Indeed, some of the factors uncovered in the present study have been previously postulated or used by sport researchers. For instance, the factors dealing with the respect for one's full commitment toward sport participation, and the negative approach toward sport participation bear similarity with the "Play" and "Professional" orientations proposed by Webb (1969) where the athlete plays with either a positive or a negative (a win at all costs) approach toward the game. The respect for the opponent dimension is similar to the concept of Fair-

¹ Recently, Shields and Bredemeier (1995) have acknowledged the role of the social context in their 12-component model of moral action. However, the impact of the social context on sportsmanship behavior has yet to be empirically tested from this perspective.

play, wherein the athlete strives to assure that the opponent can compete on equal footing (International Committee for Fairplay, 1981; McIntosh, 1979). Similarly, various types of behaviors subsumed under the "social conventions" and the "rules and officials" factors have also been studied in sportsmanship research (see Boyver, 1963; Kistler, 1957; McAfee, 1955). By reviewing previous research in relation to the 5 sportsmanship dimensions, it may become possible to make sense of a literature which at present appears in a state of disarray.

A third major implication from the findings of this study deals with the measurement of sportsmanship orientations. Previous measures of sportsmanship orientations (e.g., Haskins, 1960) and moral reasoning (e.g., Bredemeier, 1985) are largely unidimensional in nature. Based on the present findings, it appears that it is feasible to devise a sportsmanship orientations questionnaire that would capture the multidimensional nature of this sportsmanship definition. Such a questionnaire should be comprised of 5 scales assessing each of the 5 sportsmanship components. Because the 5 dimensions are only moderately related among themselves (see correlations in Table 3), individuals can be expected to show intra-individual differences on the 5 scales. For instance, an athlete could be high on the "Respect for the rules and officials" orientation but low on the "Respect and Concern Toward the Opponent" orientation. The use of such a questionnaire would be useful in research because it could lead to very specific hypotheses. We (Vallerand, Brière, & Provencher, 1995) have recently constructed such a questionnaire (the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientations Scale; MSOS) and preliminary results are very encouraging. For instance, the five-factor structure of the MSOS was supported by confirmatory factor analyses and each of the MSOS subscales related to specific behavioral intention and psychological measures. In addition, it was possible to predict young athletes' intention to use steroids from their scores on the MSOS. Thus, it would appear that the MSOS which makes use of the present sportsmanship definition should lead to fruitful research in the area.

Finally, a fourth contribution of the proposed definition of sportsmanship is that it provides a clear operationalization of the concept of sportsmanship behavior to be studied in future research. While past research did not distinguish among the various types of sportsmanship behavior, it is suggested that future sportsmanship research clearly spell out which dimension of sportsmanship is being studied because the 5 dimensions may not be subjected to the same influences or yield the same results. In addition, because sportsmanship is now clearly operationalized into 5 dimensions, it becomes possible to study behaviors corresponding to these dimensions and to tease out the personal and contextual determinants of such behaviors.

In closing, we should identify certain limitations of this study that point to the need of future research in order to assess the generalization of the present findings. First, only French-Canadian athletes were used. It remains to be seen whether their definition of sportsmanship corresponds

to that of other cultures. Second, only athletes' definition was assessed. It is not clear how their definition of sportsmanship would compare to that of other sport participants such as coaches and parents. Third, athletes of the present study were rather young and performed at low to moderate levels of the competition hierarchy. It would be important to test whether similar findings would be obtained with older athletes that perform at elite levels (i.e., members of national, olympic, and professional teams). In sum, an ecologically valid definition of sportsmanship is proposed. This multidimensional definition delineates for the first time the domain of sportsmanship. It also promises to lead to a better integration of the field as well as to redirect future research toward fruitful avenues. It is believed that a better understanding of the concept of sportsmanship offered by the definition should lead to greater knowledge of the processes involved in the display of sportsmanship behavior, and hopefully to the design of sport environments conducive to the development of sportsmanship orientations in athletes.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J.S. (1976). Equity revisited: Comments and annotated bibliography. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 9, pp. 43-90). New York: Academic Press.
- Asch, S. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs*, 70 (9) (whole number 416).
- Backman, C.W. (1985). Identity, self-presentation, and the resolution of moral dilemmas: Towards a social psychological theory of moral behavior. In B.R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life* (pp. 261-289). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Boyver, G. (1963). Children's concepts of sportsmanship in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. *Research Quarterly*, 34, 282-287.
- Bredemeier, B.J. (1984). Sport, gender, and moral growth. In J. Silva & R. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 400-413). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Bredemeier, B.J. (1985). Moral reasoning and the perceived legitimacy of intentionally injurious acts. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 110-124.
- Bredemeier, B.J. (1994). Children's moral reasoning and their assertive, aggressive, and submissive tendencies in sport and daily life. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16, 1-14.
- Cosby, F. (1976). A model of egotistical relative deprivation. *Psychological Review*, 83, 85-113.
- Damon, W. (1988). *The moral child*. New York: Free Press.
- Fine, G.A. (1987). *With the boys: Little league baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Folger, R. (1987). Reformulating the preconditions of resentment: A referent cognitions model. In J.C. Masters & W.P. Smith (Eds.), *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation* (pp. 183-215). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gelfand, D.M., & Hartmann, D.P. (1978). Some detrimental effects of competitive sports on children's behavior. In R. Magill, M. Ash, & F. Smoll (Eds.), *Children in sport: A contemporary anthology* (pp. 165-173). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Giebink, M.P., & McKenzie, T.L. (1985). Teaching sportsmanship in physical education

- and recreation: An analysis of interventions and generalization effects. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 4, 167-177.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 481-517.
- Gratziano, W.G. (1987). Lost in thought at the choice point: Cognition, context, and equity. In J.C. Masters & W.P. Smith (Eds.), *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation* (pp. 265-294). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Haskins, M.J. (1960). Problem solving test of sportsmanship. *Research Quarterly*, 31, 610-616.
- International Committee for Fairplay (1981). *Manifeste de l'entente internationale pour un sport sans violence et pour le Fair Play*. Paris: C.I.E.P.
- Jöreskog, K.G., & Lawley, D.M. (1968). New methods in maximum likelihood factor analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 21, 85-96.
- Kistler, J.W. (1957). Attitudes expressed about behavior demonstrated in certain specific situations occurring in sports. *National College Physical Education Association for Men Proceedings*, 60, 55-58.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays of moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kroll, W. (1976). Psychological scaling of the AIWA code-of-ethics for players. *Research Quarterly*, 47, 126-133.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J.M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Leuner, M.J. (1977). The justice motive: Some hypotheses as to its origins and forms. *Journal of Personality*, 45, 1-52.
- Masters, J.C., & Keil, L.J. (1987). Generic comparison processes in human judgment and behavior. In J.C. Masters & W.P. Smith (Eds.), *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation* (pp. 11-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McAfee, R.A. (1955). Sportsmanship attitudes of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade boys. *Research Quarterly*, 26, 120.
- McIntosh, P. (1979). *Fairplay: Ethics in sport and education*. London: Heinemann.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Quinn, R.A., Houts, A.C., & Graesser, A.C. (1994). Naturalistic conceptions of morality: A question-answering approach. *Journal of Personality*, 62, 239-262.
- Reis, H.T. (1987). The nature of the justice motive: Some thoughts on operation, internalization, and justification. In J.C. Masters & W.P. Smith (Eds.), *Social comparison, social justice, and relative deprivation* (pp. 131-150). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shields, D.L., & Bredehoefer, B.J. (1986). Morality and aggression: A response to Smith's critique. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 3, 65-67.
- Shields, D.L., & Bredehoefer, B.J. (1995). *Character development and physical activity: Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics*.
- Shweder, R.A., & Much, N.C. (1987). Determinations of meaning: Discourse and moral socialization. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development through social interaction* (pp. 197-244). New York: Wiley.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.
- Vallerand, R.J. (1991). Une analyse psycho-sociale de l'esprit sportif (A social psychological analysis of sportsmanship). In J. Bilard & M. Durand (Eds.), *Sport et psychologie* (Sport and psychology) (pp. 289-299). Montpellier, France: Ed. Revue EPS.

DEFINITION OF SPORTSMANSHIP

- Vallerand, R.J., Brière, N.M., & Provencher, P. (1995). *On the development and validation of the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientations Scale (MSOS)*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Vallerand, R.J., Deshaies, P., & Guertier, J.-P. (in press). On the Effects of the Social Context on Behavioral Intentions of Sportsmanship. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*.
- Vallerand, R.J., & Loiser, G.F. (1994). Self-determined motivation and sportsmanship orientations: An assessment of their temporal relationship. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16, 229-245.
- Webb, H. (1969). Professionalization of attitudes toward play among adolescents. In G.S. Kenyon (Ed.), *Aspects of contemporary sport sociology* (pp. 161-187). Chicago: The Athletic Institute.
- Weiss, M.R., & Bredehoefer, B.J. (1986). Moral development. In V. Seefeldt (Ed.), *Physical activity and human well-being* (pp. 374-390). Reston, VA: AAHPERA.