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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Because of the many opportunities in athletics for the teaching of socially sound values and the development of socially acceptable character traits, this study was undertaken to try to reveal some of the conditions which make for conflict in individual responses to provocative situations.

The problem is not a new one and its age does not lessen the need for its solution. Carmalt¹ quotes George Eliot as having said, "to every man comes a crisis when in a moment, without chance for reflection, he must decide and act instantly. What determines this decision? His whole past, the daily choices between good and evil that he has made throughout his previous years -- these determine his decision."

It is in this area, the development of the individual's daily choices, that the physical education teacher must work. It is in this area that the physical education teacher must attempt to give the student a past, which in the future, will enable him to make socially acceptable choices between good and evil. To say that an individual has already developed patterns of behavior which defy

alteration, despite the most persistent direct teaching, is no excuse for the teacher; and does not minimize his responsibility in attempting to alter unacceptable social values and in attempting to instill acceptable ones. The development of socially sound values is similar to habit formation in that it depends on many repetitions of the same act. Thus the teacher of physical education must take advantage of every opportunity to have his pupils participate in and repeat those elements of behavior which are sound and socially acceptable.

However, when one begins to analyze behavior or conduct, he begins to analyze activities with moral connotations; and to analyze morality there must be standards by which it is judged. There will always be two sets of standards, those upheld by the society of which the individual is a part, and those upheld by the individual which, in many cases, are not consistent with those upheld by the group. A very good example of this point of view is expressed by Bower when he states:

Moral personality finds itself set in the larger social milieu with certain senses of tension arising out of differing and frequently conflicting views and purposes which it does not share with the larger group. At its highest level, moral personality finds itself not only adjusting itself to the larger and sometimes hostile Great Society, but attempting to bring influences to bear for the reconstruction of the Great Society.2

2 William Clayton Bower, Character Through Creative Experience, pp. 19, 42.
The most interesting point of view is that expressed by Braden when he discloses that morality is of two types - absolute morality and relative morality. To him, the absolute conception posits a morality which if actually attained, would be the best -- and possibly final; it refers to the highest social conduct of which man is capable. Relative morality refers to what is socially approved; it implies that man has not certainly learned what is the best and the highest. He states:

....relative morality must never be considered as man's final achievement in social conduct. Man must be kept aware of his own possibilities of moral improvement.....But if a man is to improve, he must have something toward which to aim, some goal, some ideal of life which presents something bigger and better than that which he has at present attained. In this sense it will be helpful to think of absolute morality as man's highest goal.

Fairchild states:

Morality is the wisdom of human experience, religious experience as well as secular, and as a body of ideas it is more important to the welfare of the children and of their nation that morality be understood and appreciated than that any other body of knowledge should be learned.....The National Education Association has recognized by many resolutions that the development of character is the supreme object of education.

To say that an understanding and appreciation of morality is more important than that any other body of


4 Ibid.

knowledge be learned, is a powerful statement. Yet it cannot be denied, "For what profits it a man to gain the whole world and yet lose his soul?"

The crisis of which George Eliot spoke, arises quite often in athletics, and the student should not have to depend wholly on his own "hit or miss" past experience for a solution. He should also have the benefit of the experiences of his teachers and their teachings. Too many of the individual responses to provocative situations, where the responses made or the values chosen, are in direct opposition to all that we teach and believe to be true. In most of such instances the individual's responses are qualified by what is at stake (the price). So many are the happenings in athletics where the individual fails to tell the truth because of the closeness of the score, or of fear of the wrath of the coach or spectators, or of fear of any social consequence which he recognizes, that a study of this sort became imperative. May and Doob reveal that:

In the competitive or cooperative situation among Western Europeans and Americans, the presence of other people (either as competitors, cooperators, or as an audience) or the knowledge that they will be present changes the social form of the behavior and the performance of the individual or individuals concerned.

In a competitive or cooperative situation among Western Europeans and Americans, the knowledge of the

6 See page 1.
opinions, judgments, or attitudes of others concerning the situations changes the social form of the behavior and the performance of the individual or individuals concerned.\footnote{Mark A. May and Leonard W. Doob, \textit{Competition and Cooperation}, p. 30.}

As teachers we must try to understand these things and make this knowledge a part of our teaching. For there is more to teaching than the spoken word. The worth of teaching is revealed in the conduct of the students. It is for values that are socially sound that we must teach, and we must see to it that these values are manifested in conduct. To tell an individual the difference between right and wrong is good, but it is not enough. Knowing what is right does not necessarily mean that one will do what is right. Whenever the opportunity arises, teachers must insist that the student put into practice those teachings of right. Teachers must see to it that the individual experiences the act of doing right and being honest, and understands and appreciates the worth of sound values.

Cummings states:

In considering methods of moral training it should be borne in mind that there is no royal road to morality, but desirable results in this line of effort are won only with that labor and care that excellence always exacts.

Of what value to the individual or the state is a well-trained intellect when yoked with a corrupt heart? It but adds to the wolf the qualities of the fox.
Advantage should be taken of every opportunity to get the pupil to perform moral acts and form moral conclusions and determinations. In the field of impulse, action follows ideation immediately and without deliberation.8

It is the intention of this study to try to reveal some of the responses made by individuals today to provocative situations. Some of such responses are far from those which are held to be a representation of values that are socially approved. And if this be the case, what does it imply? It implies either that teachers today have accepted relative morality as a final goal and have been negligent even in attaining this, and that little, if anything, is being done to keep students aware of their own possibilities and to keep them striving for that ultimate goal (absolute morality); or it implies that public opinion (of which the opinion of teachers is a part) is failing to exact from its members those social responses of which it approves. On this point Braden states:

For the most part the sanctions of moral conduct are to be found in the laws of society, in public opinion, and in religion. But no one of these three factors is permanent. Laws may be changed from time to time. What is more likely, laws may cease to be enforced because of indifferent public opinion.9

---


9 Braden, op. cit.
Is the seeming prevalence of dishonesty, foul play, and genuine disrespect for the laws of morality, an indication that public opinion is becoming more and more indifferent, and is ceasing to enforce its moral laws? It could be, but the writer prefers to believe that the fault lies with teaching; especially with the type that ceases to be direct and which emphasizes learning from precept rather than by doing.

In an interesting paper on the moulding of character, Gray comments as follows:

The essence of teaching is influence, and unless a teacher can cause a "flow into" another soul of a desire to be had and do, he cannot be called successful. Teaching facts does not create character, although teaching accurately helps in the approach to honesty.

A well informed mind is a good thing, but it is not to be compared with a well-formed character.¹⁰

To illustrate this point, Gray asks the following pertinent questions:

Have you as a teacher learned skill in self-sacrifice and abnegation? Show your skill, not as a spectacle, but as a hidden, but not the less forceful, spirit that sees another try, cheers his effort and helps in time of failure to be glad to try again.

Have you as a teacher learned a skill in honor? Show your skill, not as a circus spectacle, but as a gracious influence to see another try, to cheer his

effort, to help him in time of failure, till at last his success cheers him and you.

Have you as a teacher learned a skill in smiling in disappointment — a skill in being brave in defeat? Show your skill, not as a comedian, but as an invincible optimist. Show your students how to go smiling through.

Have you as a teacher learned a skill in being honest in word and deed and thought? You can't help passing on such contagion, for, thanks be, good life and morals are also contagious. 11

In a study of moral evaluation of college students, Snyder and Dunlap 12 report, "strong evidence of conflict between traditional and reflective morality, traditional generally dominating except in cases where the welfare of others is involved." The very nature of athletics, the social interaction involved, makes for abundant opportunities to drive home the choice of those values which education holds inviolate. But even in the athletic situation, right choices of values do not just automatically come. There must be direct teaching for these choices by those who know and believe in them. Carr quotes MacCunn as having said:

It is not by warnings, however well meant, which suggest that they are capable of evil that we can best help the young. It is by persuading them that they are capable of good that we can hope to make them good in

11 Ibid.
reality....The best moral antidote lies not in warnings however particular, but in that positive nurture of character which is the real source of strength in the hour of temptation.13

Hicks adds:

We hear the statement that this school is a poor loser or a good one; a player is a gentleman or a "mucker". Take the same individuals under almost any other circumstances, and they would all be classed as gentlemen. In the excitement of a physical contest, men act and appear as they really are, and not as they assume to be. The athletic field.....is the final analysis of character, and (a man) succeeds or fails because of what he really is.14

What a man really is depends on what he holds valuable in life. Through athletics we can and should teach an individual those values which will profit him and society most. One point of view expressing the basis of these values is revealed by Hartshorne when he says:

When a great ship goes down at sea, and all cannot be saved, beyond all exercise of force there lies the necessity of choice. Each must choose whether he will go or stay. And so it is in every situation. The principle of sacrifice is the principle on which alone a permanent social order can be built in which mankind can realize its vast potentialities. What is achieved is not primarily this or that particular value but increase of the capacity to go on valuing--to be and to


have persons, to create persons. Here is a cosmic principle. To deny its operation is the death of human selfhood. To yield to it is life. This is the absolute right. All values are judged in terms of their contribution to this ultimate principle of life itself.15

In conclusion, it is quite fitting to quote once more from Hartshorne as he replies:

The chief obstacle to moral progress today is the absence of a Utopia to capture the imagination and loyalty of men. The glamour of our promised land has failed. Our frontiers have gone. In greedy haste we have lost the sense of the dignity and sweep of the centuries. The far horizons of space and time no longer call us. We lack a cause which can command us. Until we find it, each for himself, there is little hope of building again the great characters of a less sophisticated age.16

15 Hugh Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, pp. 264-267.
16 Ibid., p. 268.
CHAPTER II

Methods, Procedures, Subjects

The nature of this study was prompted by the physical education course #805 under the instructorship of Mr. Delbert Oberteuffer. The title of the course was, "Physical Education in Schools and Colleges," and consisted of an analysis of existing school and college programs considered in the light of acceptable practices in school administration and educational philosophy and the presentation of some case studies with summaries drawn in terms of principles. It was the discussion of such principles drawn from individual case studies reported by Mr. Oberteuffer, that inspired the writer to make this study.

The nature of the stories reported was so intriguing and yet true to life, especially to happenings in athletic contests, that the writer decided to make his investigation along the same line. Four types of provocative situations in athletics were set up, each portraying an individual in a predicament demanding an ethical and moral response. It was assumed that the individual's response would be an indication of his ethical values, in that they would represent his conduct, in those cases where conduct was called for. It was not assumed that knowledge and conduct are synonymous in ethics, for there are many unethical and immoral responses to predicaments in which the individual knows better.
The four types of situations drawn up are as follows:

1. the type in which a player's actions cause disagreement among the officials as to the legality of such actions. The officials then proceed to resolve their disagreement by asking the player directly if his actions were legal. The predicament arises when such a player is called upon to make the official decision based upon some discrepancy on his own part.

2. the type in which a player is convinced that the officials have made a wrong decision that favors him. The predicament arises when the player's conscience insists that he do something to right the matter.

3. the type in which a player is the sole witness to serious misconduct on the part of teammates or fans. The predicament arises when the player is in doubt as to whether or not he should report the incident to the proper authority.

4. the type in which players, because of their close friendship for one another, go all out to grant a favor or to ask one. The predicament arises when the favor asked or the method of granting is socially questionable.

The writer then proceeded to collect stories portraying these various situation types above. The method of collecting stories was by securing appointments with various instructors, administrators, and coaches. During these appointments, the instructors, coaches, or
administrators related to the writer all of the incidents they could recall which portrayed any or all of the situation types. The writer took written notes during these interviews so as to be able to reproduce adequately these stories in forming the problem list.\(^1\) In the end, the stories that made up the questionnaire were a compilation of the stories of the class, the stories related to the writer during personal interviews with coaches, administrators, and physical education teachers, and the stories that were an out-growth of the writer's personal experience.

The situation types mentioned above are represented in the questionnaire in the following manner:

1. type I, by stories G and H and their variations.
2. type II, by stories A and B and their variations.
3. type III, by stories C and D and their variations.
4. type IV, by stories E and F and their variations.

As was aforementioned, the stories involved a study of social values in athletics. Because of variations in individual responses to similar stimuli, the stories were constructed with variations to the original predicament to try to detect some of the situations which make for differences in individual responses, and to uncover a number of different kinds of factors -- to stimulate a variety of the typical considerations -- that tend to make people hesitate and change their responses. These variations are represented by Part II of each story, and a Part III in the case

\(^1\) See appendix.
of Story E. From the nature of the stories collected, and from the nature of the responses of many individuals with whom the writer has come in contact, the writer assumed that to many people their code of ethics and the values they uphold, are really, after all, relative values and in very few cases absolute. To many individuals the response to any moral situation depends on the price involved, how much at stake. It was hoped that this study would reveal some of these prices and stakes which make for an alteration in individual behavior.

During the establishment of the situation types and the formation of the questionnaire, the writer was fully aware that to some individuals, certain supposed predicaments would really be no predicaments at all, since their solution would simply be the application of what these individuals hold as absolute values. To other individuals, however, it was hoped that the situations would be indeed provocative and bring forth a conflict in values.

The incidents, as nearly as possible, are patterned after those used by Hartshorne and May\(^2\) in their Provocation Test. There is one outstanding difference, however, and that is, that this problem list is designed not only to test a knowledge of right and wrong, but also to test the

\(^2\) Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Others, *Testing the Knowledge of Right and Wrong*, pp. 8-9.
application of such knowledge. The problem list was pur-
posely given to those persons believed already mature
enough to have some well established values, in this case
to male physical education majors at Ohio State University.
Another source of information used as a model for the
problem list was the work done by Sharp, examples of
which are as follows:

2. (a) In a small western village a switchman was
just about to turn the switch for an approaching ex-
press train when he saw his little son, his only child,
playing upon the track. The choice has to be made be-
tween the life of the babe and the lives of the passen-
gers. What ought he to have done?

5. The following might have happened at the
Johnstown (Penn.) flood. A man found he had just time
either to warn his wife or two other women (not rela-
tives). Both these women have family ties, etc., so
that looked upon purely from an objective standpoint
the death of any one will involve as great a loss to
all concerned as the death of another. What is it his
duty to do?

The following are representative answers to the above
situations taken from the same source:

Question 2. (a)

103. (a) I think he ought to save the life of his
child. I can give no definite reason for it, but it
seems to me it would be right.

179. (a) Duty should outweigh any other considera-
tion in the man's mind. He did right in sticking to
his post.

3 Frank Chapman Sharp, "An Objective Study of Some
Moral Judgments," American Journal of Psychology, Vol 9,
pp. 202, 203, 208
Question 5.

164. If he knew hundreds of people were to be swept away and drowned, without time enough to warn both of the parties, I should say it was his duty to save his wife.

45. It was his duty to warn the two women, even if he had to lose his wife. Two whole families should not be made desolate to save his wife. It was plainly his duty.

The writer believes that there is a difference between the moral judgment elicited when one has simply to say what he believes another should do, and that elicited when one finds himself in the same predicament. The answers noted above might have been quite different if the person answering had been asked to state what he would have done. The stories that make up the writer's questionnaire are designed to cover both types of responses.

After drawing up the problems, the problem of scoring the answers thereto was encountered. One of the best methods of scoring questionnaires is to obtain the direction of the questions by a consensus of several competent persons, then proceed to compare the answers of subjects with the judgment of these prominent persons. In this study, the method consisted of forming a jury of a combination of physical education instructors, coaches, and administrators; the jury used consisted of four members who studied the questionnaire and established what they believed to be the application of correct values to these provocative situations. It was to these established correct values that the answers of the subjects were compared. The writer was fully
aware throughout the study that any conclusions drawn would be a matter of opinion and purely subjective. This realization is adequately expressed in the words of Hartshorne and May when they say:

In the case of facts, one's opinion is of small moment. The veridity of the fact is not dependent on any single man's opinion regarding the importance of the fact. Ford cars are made in Detroit whether the (person)\textsuperscript{4} that takes the test containing the statement agrees or not. But in the case of questions involving moral principles, such as whether one should steal when starving, the relevant knowledge has to do with laws, consequences, concepts of society, the ethics of property, and we are once in the field of opinion. It is well to "know" what the current opinions are, and to know what one's own opinion is, if one has any independent opinion, but as opinions vary from time to time and from group to group, and as opinion as to what is the prevailing or the best or standard or conventional opinion is rarely based on scientific study, the answers to moral knowledge tests cannot be treated in the same way as answers to general information tests where the data to be reported on may be verified.\textsuperscript{5}

A preliminary draft of the problem list was given to three graduate students who were to answer the questions and offer suggestions for correction and improvement. These graduate students approved the questionnaire, with one exception. This exception was in the case of Story E, Parts I and II. It was suggested that in establishing the questions following the story, another alternative be given Jim\textsuperscript{6} in

\textsuperscript{4} Parentheses are mine.
\textsuperscript{5} Hartshorne and May, op. cit., p. 31.
\textsuperscript{6} All names of players herein used are fictitious.
solving the situation. Rather than have Jim either bluntly report or ignore the incident, it was believed best to give Jim a chance to reproach or reprimand Fred and not report the incident. And so, this third alternative was added to the possible solutions.

As to the minimum number of subjects to be used, the writer and his adviser decided that fifty would be effective; however, in mimeographing the questionnaires, seventy copies were drawn up and given out. This surplus twenty copies proved indeed advantageous, because twelve subjects failed to return their questionnaires due to loss, negligence, or indifference. Four of the returned questionnaires were thrown out because the individuals failed to answer all or parts of certain stories. Four copies were given to the jury by which they were to draw up their set of socially acceptable values (one copy was for each jury member).

In selecting the subjects, there was no particular age limit considered, nor was there a particular class rank considered. The only requirements were that the subject be male and majoring in physical education at Ohio State University. There was no particular testing environment; the subjects were given the questionnaire, told to read the directions carefully, and permitted to go anywhere to read the stories and answer the questions. Many questionnaires were taken home and returned the following day.

To establish a particular "mind set" in the subjects,
they were forcibly warned that all of their replies should be strictly anonymous. It was hoped that such warnings would allay any fears the subjects might have in answering questions which delved so deeply into their sense of value and morality. To ease further the minds of the subjects, they were allowed to place their answered forms on the top, in the middle, or on the bottom of the forms already collected. In the beginning the subjects held their questionnaires until at least ten were ready, then all were handed in together and thoroughly mixed. In this way there was no chance to know which form belonged to which subject.

Before answering the questionnaire, each subject was instructed verbally by the writer, to give his immediate impression, choice, or leaning, since it was believed that such answers would be less influenced by thought and reflection and more influenced by those sets or inclinations that determine a person's immediate responses to certain stimuli. For, as Garnett\(^7\) says, "there is no better way of distinguishing one man's nature from another's than by seeing how each reacts to the same environment, how differently they behave when treated alike."

\(^7\) Maxwell Garnett, *Knowledge and Character*, p. 274.
CHAPTER III

An Analysis of Questionnaire Answers

I. Jury Judgments.

II. Answers of the Subjects and a Comparison with the Jury's Judgments.

I.

It was hoped that the jury members would unanimously agree upon the sound social values applicable to the situations portrayed in the questionnaire. However, this hope did not materialize, for there was disagreement in Parts I and II of Story E and in Part II of Story A. In all other elements of the questionnaire there was unanimity of opinion. The stories and the jury's answers to the questions follow.

Story A.

Part I.

During a dual match in collegiate fencing, the teams were evenly matched and the scoring close. In fact the score was tied when the final bout between the opposing team captains took place. A victory by either would decide the entire match in his school's favor.

The bout began with each captain confident of victory. However, after several expert offensive maneuvers, the
captain of team "A" thought he made a touch and therefore stepped back for the referee's decision. The referee and judges halted the bout and closely inspected the uniform of the captain of team "B", but could find no evidence of a touch having been made; immediately they ordered the bout resumed.

Instead of resuming the bout, the captain of team "B" stepped up to the referee, saluted, and said, "Sir, the touch was here" (indicating the spot and the evidence).

Because of the confession, the entire match including this bout was awarded to team "A".

There are two alternative responses to the situation which the captain of team "B" might have chosen.

1. He could have resumed the bout and proceeded to try to defeat the captain of team "A".
2. He could have confessed as he did and thereby relinquish all hopes of winning.

To the questions:

a. Of the alternatives above, which would you have chosen, 1 or 2;
the jury was in complete agreement in favor of alternative 2.

b. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a student of yours to choose, 1 or 2;
the jury unanimously favored alternative 2.
c. Was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch; the jury unanimously agreed, Yes.

Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:

1. this was not the deciding bout.
2. the captain of team "A" had not indicated that he believed that he had made a touch,

answer the following questions.

a. Which alternative of Part I above would you have chosen, 1 or 2?
The jury split its decision, with 3 in favor of alternative 1 and 1 in favor of alternative 2.

b. If you were coach, which alternative of Part I above would you teach a student of yours to choose?
The jury split its decision, with 3 in favor of alternative 1 and 1 in favor of alternative 2.

c. Was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch?
The jury unanimously agreed, Yes.

Story B.

Part I.

During a hectic interclass hockey contest, Johnny accidentally scored a goal with his foot instead of with his stick. The coach (who was refereeing) and all the
players thought Johnny had scored with his stick, and so the score was allowed. Johnny alone knew his score had been illegal. This thought worried Johnny very much, for he believed that it was wrong. Nevertheless, he made no mention of the fact until after the class period was over. Then he called the coach aside and confessed that the goal he had scored was illegal.

There are three alternative responses to the situation which Johnny might have chosen:
1. confess after the game as he did,
2. confess to the referee during the game,
3. keep quiet about the incident.

To the questions:

a. Which of these alternatives should Johnny have chosen, 1, 2, or 3; the jury chose alternative 2.

b. Which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3; alternative 2 was the jury's choice.

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach players of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3; the jury unanimously preferred alternative 2.
Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:
1. this particular match was an interscholastic contest,
2. Johnny was team captain,
3. the goal Johnny had illegally scored was the winning goal,
answer the following questions.

a. Should Johnny have confessed?
The jury agreed, Yes.

(1). If so, During or After the game?
The jury agreed, During.

b. What would you have done,

(1). Confess During, Confess After, Not Confess?
The jury chose, Confess During.

c. If you were the coach, how would you teach a player of yours to do,

(1). Confess During, Confess After, Not Confess?
The jury chose Confess During.

Story C.

Part I.

Jack, Bob, and Vince were great sprinters and had been close friends all through college. Jack and Bob went to the same school, but Vince to a different school. Each year they looked forward to track season and a chance to compete against each other. When they raced against each
other, however, their rivalry was intense and each gave his all to defeat the other two.

This year Vince was a senior and today's race his last against his friends. He intended for it to be a good one. They smiled at each other, each beaming confidence, as they and the other sprinters took their marks for the 100 yd. dash.

The starter called, "On your marks; get set," but Bob and Jack jumped the gun (a false start) so the sprinters were called back for a new start. "On your marks; get set," the starter called, but again Jack and Bob jumped the gun; and were, according to the rules, disqualified.

Vince, however, interceded immediately; and by pleading with the official, the other sprinters, and even by threatening not to run, he got permission for Jack and Bob to remain in the race and try again. This time the start was successful and Vince won.

To the questions:

1. Was Vince's act justifiable?
The jury agreed, No.

2. Was Vince's act Necessary or Unnecessary?
The jury agreed Unnecessary.

3. Should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor?
The jury chose, Yes.
Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. Jack and Bob were not Vince's personal friends, but on the contrary were unfriendly,
2. Vince was not a senior and this was not his last race; answer the following questions.
   a. Was Vince's act justifiable?
      The jury unanimously agreed, No.
   b. Was Vince's act Necessary or Unnecessary?
      The jury said, Unnecessary.
   c. Should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor?
      The jury preferred, Yes.

Story D.

Part I.

The following year when Jack and Bob competed against Vince's school in a dual meet, Vince was on hand as a spectator. The meet was very close and it appeared that the winner of the 100 yd. dash would undoubtedly clinch the meet for his school. Vince realized that Jack would most likely win, and he didn't want his school to be defeated; so, on the basis of friendship, Vince furtively approached Jack and urged him to throw the race.

To the questions:

1. Was Vince justified in making such a request on the basis of friendship?
The jury answered, No.

2. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded,
   a. Comply with the request, Not Comply with the request?

The jury chose the latter.

3. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond,
   a. Comply or Not Comply?

The jury chose to, Not Comply.

---------

Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. the meet did not depend on this one race,
2. Jack and Vince were not close friends, but on the contrary, were unfriendly;

answer the following questions.

a. Was Vince justified in making such a request?
The jury agreed, No.

b. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded,
   (1) Comply with the request or Not Comply with the request?

The jury chose to Not Comply.

c. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond,
(1) Comply with the request or Not Comply?

The jury preferred, Not Comply.

Story E.

Part I.

Jim was a second string guard on his college basketball team. All season he had kept the training rules faithfully and as a result was in excellent condition. One of the severest of the training rules was that there should be no smoking at any time. A player caught smoking was immediately dismissed from the team.

So far, the season had been a success with 16 wins and only 4 defeats. Tonight's game, if won, would insure the conference championship.

On his way to the gymnasium to get dressed for this all important game, Jim was delayed in a traffic jam so he took a short cut and entered the gymnasium from the rear to save time. As he was bounding up the steps to the locker room, he noticed Fred (the first string guard) crouched beneath the steps and smoking. Fred noticed that Jim had seen him, so he beckoned Jim over and asked him not to report the incident.

To the questions:

1. Should Jim have reported the incident?

The jury answered unanimously, No.

2. Should Jim have reproached Fred and not reported the incident?

The jury split its decision with one (1) saying Yes and
3. Should Jim have ignored the incident?
The jury split with one (1) saying Yes and three (3) saying No.

4. What would you have done, Reported it, Reproached Fred and Not Reported it, or Ignored it?
The jury split, with one (1) in favor of Reproaching Fred and three (3) in favor of Ignoring it.

5. Was Fred justified in asking Jim not to report it?
The jury agreed, No.

6. If you were coach, would you teach your players to report incidents of this kind?
The jury agreed, No.

Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. Tonight's game was not a championship one,
2. Fred did not ask Jim not to report the incident;
answer the following questions.

a. Should Jim have reported the incident?
The jury answered, No.

b. Should Jim have ignored the incident?
The jury split, with three (3) saying Yes and one (1) saying No.

c. Should Jim have reproached Fred and not reported the incident?
The jury split, with one (1) saying Yes and three (3)
saying No.

d. Had you been in Jim's place, what would you have done, Reported it, Reproached Fred and not reported it, or Ignored it?
The jury split, with one (1) saying Reproach Fred and three (3) saying Ignore it.

Part III.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:

1. Jim was team captain;

answer the following question.

a. If you were coach, would you teach the team captain to report such incidents?

The jury unanimously stated, No.

Story F.

Part I.

In Eddie's hometown, tennis was the outstanding sport, and being on the high school tennis team was a major achievement for any boy. Eddie was fortunate in being team captain and #1 in singles. His ability as a tennis player was known throughout his hometown and the rest of the state. This year he had been chosen to represent his state in a tri-state meet to take place within a week at Eddie's high school.

Eddie's hometown was aglow with activity due to the
tremendous influx of strangers and spectators from all over the state to witness this tennis spectacle. The intentions of some of these visitors were questionable, however, for, on the night before the meet, Eddie was approached by two strange men who offered to pay him $50 to allow himself to be defeated.

There are three alternative responses Eddie might have chosen:

1. Accept the bribe and ignore the incident,
2. Reject the bribe and report the incident,
3. Reject the bribe and ignore the incident.

To the questions:

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which of the alternatives do you believe Eddie should have chosen, 1, 2, or 3?

The jury decided alternative 2.

b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3?

The jury judged in favor of alternative 2.

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3?

The jury preferred unanimously, alternative 2.

Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,
1. Eddie had been offered $500 instead of $50,
2. Eddie's life had been threatened if he refused to comply;
answer the following questions.
   a. Which alternative should Eddie have chosen, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury chose alternative 2.
   b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury chose unanimously, alternative 2.
   c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury decided in favor of alternative 2.

Story G.
Part I.

During the finals of the state high school basketball championship, Bob was suddenly sent in the game as a substitute. Because of his excitement at getting a chance to play, the heat of the game, and the closeness of the score (31 to 30 in his favor and only 2 minutes to go), Bob forgot to report to the scorer, but he did report to the referee. The scorer for Bob's team thought he saw Bob indicate that he was substituting, so he made the entry in the book. At the first play after the substitution, the
scorer for the opponents sounded his horn to indicate an infraction of the rules. He insisted that Bob had not officially reported. The scorer for Bob's team insisted that Bob had reported to him. After much arguing with neither scorer able to convince the other, and with the referee unable to settle the matter, they decided to ask Bob if he had reported. Bob realized that he hadn't.

There are three alternative answers Bob might have chosen:
1. Yes, I reported to the scorer,
2. No, I did not report to the scorer,
3. Refuse to answer or evade the issue.

To the questions:

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3?
The jury unanimously supported alternative 2.

b. Had you been in Bob's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3?
The jury unanimously chose alternative 2.

c. If you were the coach, which answer would you teach a player of yours to give, 1, 2, or 3?
The jury answered unanimously, alternative 2.

Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,
1. Bob's team was leading by ten (10) points and there were twelve (12) minutes left to play,
2. The game was not the state finals but just a game of much less importance;
answer the following questions.
   a. Under these altered circumstances, which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury unanimously judged in favor of alternative 2.
   b. Had you been in Bob's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury preferred answer 2.
   c. If you were the coach, which answer would you teach Bob to give, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The unanimous decision of the jury was, answer 2.

Story H.
Part I.

John was a senior and a first string tackle on his college varsity football team. Today's game was to be his last and the chance for which he had been waiting to avenge last year's humiliating defeat at the hands of today's opponents (his school's bitterest rival). All season he had pointed and prepared for this game. His coach and teammates were set and ready, the student body was frantic for action, and the fans were pouring into the stadium by the thousands. The loudspeaker had already announced 83,000
in the stands and still more were coming. As he lined up for the kickoff, John thought of these things and how it would please him to defeat this team just as badly as he had been beaten by them last year.

The kickoff!

The visiting team received and scored in eight plays. The extra point was good and the score was now 7 to 0 against John. The remainder of the quarter was nip and tuck but no scores were made.

The second quarter was just as bitterly fought but no scores were made.

The third quarter was a repetition of the second, but within 5 minutes of the last quarter, John's team scored to even the count at 7 to 7. With only five minutes left to play, John's opponents scored again but missed the extra point and the score was now 13 to 7.

With possession of the ball and only three minutes left to play, John's quarterback suddenly switched him from tackle to end so as to confuse the opponents and to likewise make John eligible for a pass. So, on the succeeding play, John was at end and the play was a pass to him. The ball was snapped and John raced down the field to receive the pass he expected. However, a fast charging defensive line fouled the play and threw the passer for a 15 yd. loss. John returned to the huddle and was instructed to go back to his tackle position. The following play was also a pass, and John in his tackle position, looked up and saw the pass
coming directly to him for an easy catch; so with little or no time to reflect on the situation, he caught it and ran for a touchdown.

The umpire immediately went to the referee and warned him that John had not been eligible to receive a pass on that particular play; the referee, however, was of the opinion that John was eligible, but neither could convince the other, so they decided to ask John if he were eligible.

There are three alternative answers John might have given:
1. Yes, I was eligible,
2. No, I was not eligible,
3. Refuse to answer or evade the issue.

To the questions:
a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3?
The jury upheld answer 2.
b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3?
The jury chose answer 2.
c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach John to give, 1, 2, or 3?
The entire jury supported answer 2.
Part II.

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. Nothing important was at stake in this particular game,
2. John's team was already leading by thirty (30) points when this play happened,
3. The crowd was only three or four thousand strong;

answer the following questions.

a. Under these changed circumstances, which answer do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury was in complete favor of answer 2.

b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury answered by preferring answer 2.

c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach John to give, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?
The jury decided unanimously that it would teach alternative 2.

II.

Here follows a comparison of the subjects' answers with the jury's judgment. The answers of the subjects were judged correct if they coincided with the unanimous or majority judgment of the jury.
Story A.

Part I.

This is the story of the dual match in collegiate fencing in which the captain of team "B" had the following two alternatives:

1. He could have resumed the bout and proceeded to try to defeat the captain of team "A".
2. He could have confessed as he did and thereby relinquish all hopes of winning.

To the questions:

a. Of the alternatives above, which would you have chosen, 1 or 2;
11 of the subjects chose #1, while 39 chose #2, representing 78% accuracy in the subjects' choices. To the writer this 78% accuracy seems rather low and seems to indicate that 22% of the subjects chose values that are not socially sound.

b. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a student of yours to choose, 1 or 2;
4 of the subjects chose #1, while 46 subjects chose #2, representing 92% accuracy in the subjects' choices.

c. Was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch;
48 of the subjects said Yes while 2 of the subjects said No. This represents a 96% agreement with the jury's decision.
Part II.

To the questions:

a. Which alternative of Part I above would you have chosen, 1, or 2;

20 subjects chose #1 whereas 30 subjects chose #2, showing 60% accuracy when compared with the jury's majority\(^2\) opinion. This low percentage of accuracy is another indication that the values chosen by subjects for themselves are not always socially sound.

b. If you were coach, which alternative of Part I above would you teach a student of yours to choose, 1, or 2;

13 subjects preferred #1 and 37 preferred #2 which accounts for 74% agreement with the jury's majority preference. This percentage of concurrence is rather low, but it does indicate that what the subjects would teach is much higher than what they would actually do.

c. Was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch;

41 subjects said Yes while only 9 said No. This made for 82% concurrence with the jury's decision.

---

Story B.
Part I.

This is the story of the hectic interclass hockey contest in which Johnny accidentally scored a goal with his foot instead of with his stick. Everyone else thought Johnny had

\(^2\) The word "majority" will be used to denote a jury judgment that was not unanimous.
scored with his stick and so the score was allowed. Johnny felt that it was wrong, however, but was undecided as to what to do. He had the following three alternatives:

1. Confess after the game as he did,
2. Confess to the referee during the game,
3. Keep quiet about the incident.

To the questions:

a. Which of the alternatives above should Johnny have chosen, 1, 2, or 3; 7 subjects chose #1, forty-one (41) chose #2, and 2 chose #3. This revealed that 82% of the subjects were correct in their judgments.

b. Which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3; 6 subjects preferred #1, thirty-five (35) chose #2, and 9 picked #3, showing that 70% of the subjects agreed with the jury's judgment. Likewise, it shows that the values chosen by the subjects for themselves are less socially sound than those chosen in question "a" above.

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach your players to choose, 1, 2, or 3; 3 subjects chose #1, forty-one (41) chose #2, and 6 subjects chose #3. This made for 82% agreement with the opinion of the jury.
Part II.

To the questions:

a. Should Johnny have confessed;

42 subjects said Yes while only 8 said No. This showed 84% agreement with the jury's preference.

(1) If so, During or After the game;

of the 42 subjects who said Yes, 38 preferred During and 4 chose After the game. This shows that of the 42 Yes answers, approximately 88% were in favor of confessing During the game, while the other 12% favored confessing After.

b. What would you have done;

36 chose to confess During, 3 subjects preferred to confess After, and 11 would Not Confess. The jury's choice was to Confess During, which shows that 72% of the subjects were correct in their decisions.

c. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to do;

42 subjects would teach students to Confess During the game, 1 subject would teach his students to Confess After the game, and 7 subjects would teach their students to Not Confess. Such an analysis shows that 84% of the subjects would teach as the jury judged best.

Story C.

Part I.

This is the story of the track meet in which three
friends competed against one another; each was a sprinter. Two of the friends were from the same school but the third was from a different school. The sprinters from the same school jumped the gun twice and were disqualified, but their friend from the other school interceded and got permission for them to run again.

To the questions:

1. Was Vince's act justifiable; 22 subjects said Yes, whereas 28 subjects said No. The jury had unanimously chosen No, which shows that 44% of the subjects were incorrect in their decisions. This high percentage of inaccuracy shows that there are wide differences of opinion among the subjects concerning values of this sort.

2. Was Vince's act Necessary or Unnecessary; 49 subjects said Unnecessary and only 1 said Necessary. This revealed 98% of the subjects to be correct.

3. Should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor; 15 subjects said Yes and 35 said No, making for 70% inaccuracy when compared with the jury's judgment. This represents the highest percentage of disagreement with the jury's judgment in any phase of the study. It indicates that to the majority of the subjects, it is not a socially sound value to accept that type of favor under such conditions.
Part II.

To the questions:

a. Was Vince's act justifiable;
16 subjects said Yes and 34 said No, showing 68% agreement with the jury's choice which was the same in both Part I and Part II. It should be noted that for the subjects there is a decrease of 6 Yes answers due to the situation changes in Part II.

b. Was Vince's act Necessary or Unnecessary;
48 subjects said Unnecessary and 2 chose Necessary. This shows 96% agreement with the jury's decision, but a drop of 2% due to situation changes in Part II. The agreement was 98% in Part I above.

c. Should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor;
16 subjects said Yes and 34 decided No, showing 32% of the subjects to be wrong in their answers. There is a 2% increase in Yes choices in this part due to situation changes.

Story D.

Part I.

This is the story of the second meeting of the three friends. The two from the same school are the only ones running this time because the third friend has graduated. He is at the meet, however, to cheer his school on to victory. He becomes alarmed when he sees that his school might be defeated if his friend (Jack) wins the next race; so he furtively approaches Jack and asks him to throw the
To the questions:

1. Was Vince justified in making such a request on the basis of friendship; all of the subjects chose No, making for 100% agreement with the jury's judgment. It seems from this unanimous agreement that there is no conflict in social values (among the jury and subjects) relative to friendship requests of this type.

2. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded; 1 subject chose to Comply and 49 to Not Comply, showing only 2% of the subjects as incorrect in their choices.

3. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond; 1 subject would teach his players to Comply and 49 subjects would teach their players to Not Comply. This latter group of subjects represents 98% agreement with the jury's decision.

Part II.

To the questions:

a. Was Vince justified in making such a request; 3 subjects said Yes and 47 answered No. Due to the changed circumstances in Part II, this represents a 6% drop from unanimity in the No choices as was noted in Part I above. Likewise it shows 94% of the subjects as accurate in their
choices.

b. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded;
49 subjects responded by choosing to Not Comply and 1 subject chose to Comply. The choice of this 98% of the subjects was upheld by the jury's decision.

c. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond;
49 subjects chose to teach their players to Not Comply, but 1 subject chose to teach his players to Comply. This 1 subject represents only a 2% fallacy in social values, when compared with the judgment of the jury.

Story E.

Part I.

This is the story of Jim who caught his teammate Fred smoking before the championship basketball game. The question was whether he should have reported the incident after Fred had asked him not to do so.

To the questions:

1. Should Jim have reported the incident;
17 subjects answered Yes and 33 answered No. These 17 subjects showed 34% of the total to be incorrect. This is a very high percentage of inaccuracy and indicates to the writer that incidents of this kind should be very delicately handled when teaching.
a. To whom, the Captain or the Coach; of these 17 subjects who said the incident should have been reported, 9 said Jim should have reported the incident to the team Captain and 8 said Jim should have reported to the Coach. This seems to show, that of those subjects who believed the incident should have been reported, there is a wide difference of opinion among them. Approximately half favored the Coach and the other half favored the Captain.

2. Should Jim have reproached Fred and not reported the incident;

24 subjects said No and 26 said Yes. This represents a 52% disagreement with the jury's majority decision. The jury had voted 3 to 1 in favor of No. This shows for the second time a majority against that of the jury, and seems to imply that in incidents of this sort, the subjects believed it better to try and settle the matter oneself rather than either report or ignore it.

3. Should Jim have ignored the incident;

13 subjects said Yes whereas 37 subjects said No, making for 74% concurrence with the jury's majority judgment.

4. What would you have done;

12 subjects would have Reported it, 27 subjects would have Reproached Fred and not reported it, and 11 subjects would have Ignored the incident. This represents only 22% agreement with the jury's decision. The jury had voted 3 to 1 in favor of ignoring the incident. Again the majority opinion (54%) was in favor of Reproaching Fred. Twenty-four
percent of the subjects chose to report the incident.

5. Was Fred justified in asking Jim to not report it;
10 subjects responded Yes while 40 subjects responded No, showing 80% of the subjects' choices of values to be correct.

6. If you were coach, would you teach your players to report incidents of this kind;
10 subjects said Yes and 40 subjects said No. These 40 subjects represented 80% concurrence with the jury's choice of value.

Part II.

To the questions:

a. Should Jim have reported the incident;
19 subjects said Yes and 31 subjects said No, making for only 62% concurrence with the jury's decision. This concurrence is very low as is the case with most subject responses to this particular alternative.

(1) To whom, the Captain or the Coach;
of the 19 subjects who said Yes, 12 preferred reporting it to the Captain and 7 to the Coach. Under these changed circumstances, the difference between preference for the Coach and for the Captain is much larger than in Part I above where the difference was only one.

b. Should Jim have ignored the incident;
12 subjects said Yes and 38 said No. This makes for 76% accuracy in the subjects' choices, based on the jury's
decision. It is significant to note that in Part I above, the jury's decision was 3 to 1 in favor of Not Reporting the incident. However, in Part II due to the changed circumstances, the jury's decision was 3 to 1 in favor of Ignoring the incident.

c. Should Jim have Reproached Fred and not reported the incident;

28 subjects (56%) were correct in their choice of No, whereas 22 subjects (44%) were incorrect in their choice of Yes. This was also a question in which the jury split its decision 3 to 1 in favor of No, possibly foretelling the high percentage of incorrect choices noted above.

d. Had you been in Jim's place, what would you have done;

13 subjects would have Reported the incident, 25 would have Reproached Fred and not reported it, and 12 would have Ignored the incident. The jury had split 3 to 1 in favor of ignoring the incident; the one (1) jury member favored Reproaching Fred. The subjects' answers show only 24% of them to be correct according to the jury's majority judgment. It shows 50% of the subjects in favor of the opinion of the minority member of the jury, and it shows 26% of the subjects in favor of the remaining alternative.

Part III.

To the question:

a. If you were coach, would you teach the team
captain to report such incidents;
18 subjects said Yes and 32 said No. The jury had unanimously agreed, No; therefore, 64% of the subjects were correct in their answers. It is surprising that there should be such a wide difference of opinion (percentage of inaccuracy) on a matter of this sort.

Story F.
Part I.

This is the story of Eddie who was an excellent tennis player. He had been chosen to represent his state in a tri-state meet to be held at his hometown. On the night before the meet, Eddie was approached by two strange men and offered $50 to allow himself to be defeated.

There are three alternatives Eddie might have chosen:
1. Accept the bribe and ignore the incident,
2. Reject the bribe and report the incident,
3. Reject the bribe and ignore the incident.

To the questions:

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which of the alternatives do you believe Eddie should have chosen, 1, 2, or 3;
43 subjects chose #2 and 7 chose #3. This indicated 86% of the subjects' answers were correct.

b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative
would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3;
43 subjects chose alternative 2 and 7 chose alternative 3. Thus, only 14% of the subjects were incorrect in their choices.

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3;
45 subjects chose to teach alternative 2 and 5 subjects chose to teach alternative 3. These latter 5 subjects represent 10% inaccuracy in the subjects' total choices.

Part II.

To the questions:

a. Which alternative should Eddie have chosen, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above;
44 of the subjects chose alternative 2 and 6 chose alternative 3. Such a ratio of choices makes for 88% accuracy in the subjects' judgments.

b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3;
40 subjects would have chosen alternative 2, nine (9) would have chosen alternative 3, and 1 would have chosen alternative 1. These 40 subjects who chose alternative 2 show 80% of the subjects' choices to be correct.

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3;
47 of the subjects preferred to teach alternative 2 and 3 preferred to teach alternative 3. This shows only 6% of
the subjects to be incorrect in their choices.

Story G.

Part I.

This is the story of Bob who was sent in the game as a substitute during the finals of the state high school basketball championship. Because of his excitement at getting a chance to play, he forgot to report to the scorer. When the officials asked him about it, he realized that he had not reported.

There are three alternative responses that Bob might have chosen:
1. Yes, I reported to the scorer,
2. No, I did not report to the scorer,
3. Refuse to answer or evade the issue.

To the questions:

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3;
7 subjects chose answer #1, and 43 chose answer #2. Judged by the jury's decision, these 7 subjects (14%) are incorrect in their choices.

b. Had you been in Bob's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3;
8 subjects chose answer #1, three (3) chose answer #3, and
39 chose answer #2. Judged by the jury's decision, 78% of the subjects were correct in their choices. Again this low percentage is evidence that what the subject would do himself is the area in which values chosen are least socially sound.

c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach a player of yours to give, 1, 2, or 3?

5 subjects chose answer #1 and 45 chose answer #2. These 45 subjects represent 90% accuracy in the subjects' choices.

Part II.

To the questions:

a. Under these altered circumstances, which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?

3 subjects chose answer #1, while 45 chose answer #2, and 2 chose answer #3. According to the jury's judgment, 90% of the subjects' answers were correct.

b. Had you been in Bob's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?

4 subjects chose answer #1, whereas 44 chose answer #2, and 2 chose answer #3. Answer #2 was the jury's choice and shows 88% of the subjects to be correct.

c. If you were the coach, which answer would you teach Bob to give, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above?

3 subjects would teach answer #1, and 46 would teach answer #2. Only 1 subject would teach answer #3. These 46 subjects
show 92\% of the subjects' choices to be correct.

---

**Story H.**

**Part I.**

This is the story of the football game in which John (a tackle) caught a pass and ran for a touchdown. He was playing tackle when he caught the pass. When questioned by the officials, he was undecided as to what his response should be.

There are three alternative answers John might have given:

1. Yes, I was eligible,
2. No, I was not eligible,
3. Refuse to answer or evade the issue.

To the questions:

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3;

8 subjects chose answer #1, four (4) chose answer #3, and 38 chose answer #2. The jury's choice was answer #2, showing 76\% of the subjects to be correct in their choice. This percentage is considerably low for a choice made for a player. Previously the low choices have been made by the subjects for themselves.

b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would
you have given, 1, 2, or 3;
7 subjects would have given answer #1, thirty-two (32)
would have given answer #2, and 11 would have given answer
#3. When compared with the jury's judgment, this 64% of
the subjects were correct. This is another example of the
low correlation between the values chosen by the subjects
for themselves and the sound values set up by the jury.

c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach
John to give, 1, 2, or 3;
4 subjects would teach John to give answer #1, forty-three
(43) would teach answer #2, and 3 would teach answer #3.
This indicated that 86% of the subjects were correct in
their choice.

Part II.

To the questions:

a. Under these changed circumstances, which answer
do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above;
2 subjects chose answer #1, forty-five chose answer #2 and
3 chose answer #3. The 5 subjects who did not choose answer
#2 represent 10% whose answers were incorrect.

b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would
you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above;
2 subjects chose answer #1, forty-three chose answer #2,
and 5 chose answer #3. Such choices were only 14% incorrect,
when compared with the jury's choice.
c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach John to give, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above; 2 subjects chose answer #1, forty-six chose answer #2, and 2 chose answer #3. These choices of answer #2, represent 92% accuracy in the subjects' choices.
CHAPTER IV

Results and Conclusions

A detailed analysis of the jury's judgment and the subjects' answers reveals the following results of the study. The conclusions drawn are specifically related to this study and must be considered in this manner.

Result:

In each story, the subject had to make a choice for the player, a choice for himself if he were in the same situation, and a choice as to what he (the subject) would do if he were coach. In the total Parts I of each problem list, there were six chances for the subject to choose the same response for the player in the story, as he (the subject) would choose for himself. For the 50 subjects there were a total of 300 chances. Of these 300 possible chances, there were 51 choices made in which the subject did not respond in the same way that he believed the player should have responded.

Conclusion:

Values chosen by subjects for themselves are not always identical with what subjects believe others should do in the same type situations.

Result:

Likewise, there were 7 chances for the subject to
choose the same response for himself as he would teach, if he were the coach. For the 50 subjects, there were 350 chances for the subjects' values and the values for which they would teach, to coincide. However, of these 350 possible chances, there were 53 instances in which the subjects' choice and the value he would teach were not identical.

Conclusion:

What a subject would do himself is not always identical with what he would teach, if he were the coach. Significantly though, in 87% of the cases, what the subjects would teach was what the jury had judged to be a sound social value. What the subjects believed players should do was, in 77% of the cases, the same as what the jury had decided. However, in only 71% of the cases, were the values chosen by the subjects for themselves identical with those established as sound by the jury.

Result:

Further, there were 6 chances for the subjects to choose the same responses for the players in the stories as they (the subjects) would teach, if coach. For the subjects, there were 300 chances to make the players' values and the coaching values coincide. However, in 30 instances the values did not coincide.

Conclusion:

For this study, it is seen that in one-tenth of the
cases, what one believes others should do and what one would teach others to do, are not the same. The highest percentage of accuracy in the subjects' choices was in the values they would teach, if they were the coaches. For educational purposes, this is significant in that it shows a very good chance of having those values taught which are judged socially sound by a jury of competent persons.

Result:

In the total Parts II of each questionnaire, there were 6 chances for a subject to choose the same response for a player (under the changed circumstances), as for himself. For the 50 subjects, there were a total of 300 possible identical "subject-player" choices. Of these total possible choices, 31 were not identical. Thus, in approximately one-tenth of the cases, the values chosen for the players by the subjects were different from those chosen by the subjects for themselves.

Conclusion:

Since the total possible "subject-player" choices in Parts I and II are the same (300), it is significant that when the circumstances are altered¹ (as in Part II of each story), the number of unlike "subject-player" values is decreased by 20.

¹ The provocations are removed, except in Stories B and E.
Result:

Likewise, there were 6 chances in the Part II of each questionnaire for the subject to choose the value for himself which would be identical with the values he would teach, if he were the coach. For the 50 subjects, there were a possible 300 chances to choose identical values. However, in 27 of the choices, the values chosen were not identical.

Conclusion:

In the Part I, there were a possible 350 identical "subject-coach" choices, but there were 53 instances of unlike choices made. In the Part II, there are approximately 14% less chances to choose identical "subject-coach" values, but the number of like choices made is increased by 50%. It appears then, that the absence of provocations makes for an increase in the choice of identical "subject-coach" values.

Result:

Likewise, in the Part II there were 5 chances for the subjects to choose identical values for the players as for themselves, if they were the coaches. For the 50 subjects, there were a total of 250 choices. In only 15 of these instances were unlike values chosen. These 250 choices were only one-sixth less than the total possible in the Part I, but the unlike values chosen in the Part II is decreased by 50%.
Conclusion:

A decrease in provocative stimuli makes for a decrease in the conflict of values.

Result:

There were 8 chances in each questionnaire for the subjects to make the same choices in Part II of each story as in Part I. Thus, for the 50 subjects, there were 400 possible chances. Of these 50 subjects, there were 32 who did not choose the same values in each part of the story. These 32 subjects made 82 different choices in Part II from those made in Part I. This shows that of the 400 possible choices, approximately 20% of them were unlike. Since 32 subjects made the 82 different choices, the average unlike choices per subject is 2.5.

The jury had 8 chances to make identical choices in both parts of each story. In two stories (A and E), its choice was not the same. For the jury (considered as a whole), the different choices made are two (2).

Eighteen subjects answered both parts of each story the same.

Conclusion:

The average difference in choice of the subjects (2.5) when compared with that of the jury (2.0), shows only

---

2 The jury is considered as a whole, because its final judgment represents the sum of four different judgments.
a 0.5 difference between the two. Such a minor difference shows a correlation of .80 which is usually considered high. The 18 subjects whose choices were identical in both parts of each story, can be considered to uphold values that are absolute; whereas the remaining 32 subjects can be considered to uphold values that are relative to the situation.

Result:

The 82 conflicts in values noted above, grouped themselves in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>No. of Conflicts</th>
<th>Approximate % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:

The most provocative situation type is that

represented by Stories A and B. Situation types represented by Stories G and H and by Stories E and F are second, and the type represented by Stories C and D are least provocative. Although no subject made a choice in Part II of Story D that was different from the choice in Part I, it is significant that only one subject out of 50 chose to Comply with the request in both parts.

Result:

Part III of Story E revealed 18 subjects in favor of teaching the team captain to report incidents of smoking by teammates. Thirty-two subjects did not consider reporting such incidents, a sound social value. The jury unanimously upheld the decision of these 32 subjects.

Conclusion:

According to the judgment of the jury and the opinion of 64% of the subjects, it is not good practice for coaches to teach their captains to report teammates who are caught smoking.

Result:

Although Stories G and H involve the same ethical principles and judgments; i.e., whether the player would tell the truth, lie, or evade the issue, there were 15 subjects who did not make the same choices in both stories.

Conclusion:

It is conceivable that the type of game being played,
and the subject's interest in such a game, likewise influence his decision. A subject who loves football might tell a lie, if it will make him victorious; whereas, in basketball, he might tell the truth in the same type of situation since the outcome of the game doesn't mean so much to him.

Result:

In cases where there was a split decision by the jury, there was also a higher percentage of inaccuracy in the subjects' answers.

Conclusion:

When a jury of competent persons cannot unanimously decide which of several values is socially most sound, such indecision is a good indicator that there will be wide variation in the subjects' answers.
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APPENDIX
A STUDY OF ETHICS IN SPORT
by
Marion M. Curry

Here follow some situations involving judgment and behavior in athletics. You are to read the story (Part I), and on the basis of the facts presented therein, please answer the questions at the end of the part.

In Part II of the story the situation will be changed somewhat; and on the basis of the changed situation, please answer the questions that follow the part.

Story A
Part I

During a dual match in collegiate fencing, the teams were evenly matched and the scoring close. In fact the score was tied when the final bout between the opposing team captains took place. A victory by either would decide the entire match in his school's favor.

The bout began with each captain confident of victory. However, after several expert offensive maneuvers, the captain of team "A" thought he made a touch and therefore stepped back for the referee's decision. The referee and judges halted the bout and closely inspected the uniform of the captain of team "B", but could find no evidence of a touch having been made; immediately they ordered the bout resumed.

Instead of resuming the bout, the captain of team "B" stepped up to the referee, saluted, and said, "Sir, the touch was here" (indicating the spot and the evidence).

Because of the confession, the entire match including this bout was awarded to team "A".

There are two alternative responses to the situation which the captain of team "B" might have chosen.

1. He could have resumed the bout and proceeded to try to defeat the captain of team "A".
2. He could have confessed as he did and thereby relinquish all hopes of winning.

Questions:
a. Of the alternatives above, which would you have chosen, 1, or 2?
b. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a student of yours to choose, 1, or 2? (underline).
c. Was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch? Yes___; No___.

---

1 All names herein used are fictitious.
Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:
1. this was not the deciding bout
2. the captain of team "A" had not indicated that he believed that he had made a touch,
answer the following questions,
a. which alternative of Part I above would you have chosen, 1 or 2? (underline).
b. If you were coach, which alternative of Part I above would you teach a student of yours to choose, 1 or 2? (underline).
c. was the captain of team "B" justified in confessing the touch? Yes__, No__.

Story B
Part I

During a hectic interclass hockey contest, Johnny accidentally scored a goal with his foot instead of with his stick. The coach (who was refereeing) and all the players thought Johnny had scored with his stick, and so the score was allowed. Johnny alone knew his score had been illegal. This thought worried Johnny very much, for he believed that it was wrong. Nevertheless, he made no mention of the fact until after the class period was over. Then he called the coach aside and confessed that the goal he had scored was illegal.

There are three alternative responses to the situation which Johnny might have chosen:
1. confess after the game as he did,
2. confess to the referee during the game,
3. keep quiet about the incident.

a. Which of these alternatives should Johnny have chosen, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
b. Which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach your players to choose, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).

Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:
1. this particular match was an interscholastic contest,
2. Johnny was team captain,
3. the goal Johnny had illegally scored was the winning goal,
answer the following questions;
a. Should Johnny have confessed? Yes__; No__. (check)
(1) If so, DURING or AFTER the game (underline).

b. What would you have done,
   (1) confess during, confess after, not confess? (underline).

c. If you were the coach, how would you teach a player of yours to do,
   (1) confess during, confess after, not confess? (underline).

Story C

Part I

Jack, Bob, and Vince were great sprinters and had been close friends all through college. Jack and Bob went to the same school, but Vince to a different school. Each year they looked forward to track season and a chance to compete against each other. When they raced against each other, however, their rivalry was intense and each gave his all to defeat the other two.

This year Vince was a senior and today's race his last against his friends. He intended for it to be a good one. They smiled at each other, each beaming confidence, as they and the other sprinters took their marks for the 100 yd. dash.

The starter called, "On your marks; get set", but Bob and Jack jumped the gun (a false start) so the sprinters were called back for a new start. "On your marks; get set" the starter called, but again Jack and Bob jumped the gun, and were, according to the rules, disqualified.

Vince, however, interceded immediately; and by pleading with the official, the other sprinters, and even by threatening not to run, he got permission for Jack and Bob to remain in the race and try again.

Questions:

1. Was Vince's act justifiable? Yes____; No____ (check).
2. Was Vince's act necessary or unnecessary? (underline).
3. Should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor? Yes____; No____ (check).

Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,
1. Jack and Bob were not Vince's personal friends, but on the contrary, were unfriendly,
2. Vince was not a senior and this was not his last race;
answer the following questions,
a. was Vince's act justifiable? Yes____; No____ (check).
b. was Vince's act NECESSARY or UNNECESSARY? (underline).
c. should Jack and Bob have accepted this favor? Yes___; No__ (check).

Story D
Part I

The following year when Jack and Bob competed against Vince's school in a dual meet, Vince was on hand as a spectator. The meet was very close and it appeared that the winner of the 100 yd. dash would undoubtedly clinch the meet for his school. Vince realized that Jack would most likely win, and he didn't want his school to be defeated; so, on the basis of friendship, Vince furtively approached Jack and urged him to throw the race.

Questions:

1. Was Vince justified in making such a request on the basis of friendship? Yes___; No__ (check).
2. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded?
   a. comply with the request___; not comply with the request___ (check).
3. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond?
   a. comply___; not comply___ (check).

Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. the meet did not depend on this one race
2. Jack and Vince were not close friends, but on the contrary, were unfriendly;
answer the following questions,

a. was Vince justified in making such a request? Yes___; No__ (check).
b. If you had been similarly approached, how would you have responded?
   (1) comply with the request___; not comply___ (check).
c. If you were coach, how would you teach a player of yours to respond?
   (1) comply with the request___; not comply___ (check).
Story E
Part I

Jim was a second string guard on his college basketball team. All season he had kept the training rules faithfully and as a result was in excellent condition. One of the severest of the training rules was that there should be no smoking at any time. A player caught smoking was immediately dismissed from the team.

So far, the season had been a success with 16 wins and only 4 defeats. Tonight's game, if won, would insure the conference championship.

On his way to the gymnasium to get dressed for this all important game, Jim was delayed in a traffic jam so he took a short cut and entered the gymnasium from the rear to save time. As he was bounding up the steps to the locker room, he noticed Fred (the first string guard) crouched beneath the steps and smoking. Fred noticed that Jim had seen him, so he beckoned Jim over and asked him not to report the incident.

Questions:

1. Should Jim have reported the incident? Yes__; No__. (check).
   a. To whom, the team captain___ or the coach___? (check).

2. Should Jim have reproached Fred and not reported the incident? Yes__; No__. (check).

3. Should Jim have ignored the incident? Yes__; No__. (check).

4. What would you have done, reported it__; reproached Fred and not reported it__; ignored it__? (check).

5. Was Fred justified in asking Jim not to report it? Yes__; No__. (check).

6. If you were coach, would you teach your players to report incidents of this kind? Yes__; No__. (check).

Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,
1. Tonight's game was not a championship one,
2. Fred did not ask Jim not to report the incident,
answer the following questions:

a. Should Jim have reported in incident? Yes__; No__. (check).
   (I) To whom, the captain__ or the coach___? (check).

b. Should Jim have ignored the incident? Yes__; No__. (check).

c. Should Jim have reproached Fred and not reported the incident? Yes__; No__. (check).
d. Had you been in Jim's place, what would you have done; reported it; reproached Fred and not reported it; ignored it? (check).

Part III

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been:
1. Jim was team captain, answer the following question,
a. If you were coach, would you teach the team captain to report such incidents? Yes; No (check).

Story F
Part I

In Eddie's hometown, tennis was the outstanding sport, and being on the high school tennis team was a major achievement for any boy. Eddie was fortunate in being team captain and #1 in singles. His ability as a tennis player was known throughout his hometown and the rest of the state. This year he had been chosen to represent his state in a tri-state meet to take place within a week at Eddie's high school.

Eddie's hometown was aglow with activity due to the tremendous influx of strangers and spectators from all over the state to witness this tennis spectacle. The intentions of some of these visitors were questionable, however, for, on the night before the meet, Eddie was approached by two strange men who offered to pay him $50 to allow himself to be defeated.

There are three alternative responses Eddie might have chosen:
1. Accept the bribe and ignore the incident,
2. Reject the bribe and report the incident,
3. Reject the bribe and ignore the incident.

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which of the alternatives do you believe Eddie should have chosen, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).

b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).

c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,
1. Eddie had been offered $500 instead of $50,
2. Eddie's life had been threatened if he refused to comply,
answer the following questions;
   a. Which alternative should Eddie have chosen, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline)
   b. Had you been in Eddie's place, which alternative would you have chosen, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).
   c. If you were coach, which alternative would you teach a player of yours to choose, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).

Story G
Part I

During the finals of the state high school basketball championship, Bob was suddenly sent in the game as a substitute. Because of his excitement at getting a chance to play, the heat of the game, and the closeness of the score (31 to 30 in his favor and only 2 minutes to go), Bob forgot to report to the scorer, but he did report to the referee. The scorer for Bob's team thought he saw Bob indicate that he was substituting, so he made the entry in the book. At the first play after the substitution, the scorer for the opponents sounded his horn to indicate an infraction of the rules. He insisted that Bob had not officially reported. The scorer for Bob's team insisted that Bob had reported to him. After much arguing with neither scorer able to convince the other, and with the referee unable to settle the matter, they decided to ask Bob if he had reported. Bob realized that he hadn't.

There are three alternative answers Bob might have given:
1. Yes, I reported to the scorer,
2. No, I did not report to the scorer,
3. Refuse to answer, or evade the issue.

   a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
   b. Had you been in Bob's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
   c. If you were the coach, which answer would you teach a player of yours to give, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been,

1. Bob's team was leading by ten (10) points and there were twelve (12) minutes left to play,
2. The game was not the state finals, but just a game of much less importance,

answer the following questions;

a. under these altered circumstances which answer do you believe Bob was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 or Part I above? (underline).

b. had you been in Bob's place, which would you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).

c. If you were the coach, which answer would you teach Bob to give, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).

Story H

Part I

John was a senior and a first string tackle on his college varsity football team. Today's game was to be his last and the chance for which he had been waiting to avenge last year's humiliating defeat at the hands of today's opponents (his school's bitterest rival). All season he had pointed and prepared for this game. His coach and teammates were set and ready, the student body was frantic for action, and the fans were pouring into the stadium by the thousands. The loudspeaker had already announced 83,000 in the stands and still more were coming. As he lined up for the kickoff, John thought of these things and how it would please him to defeat this team just as badly as he had been beaten by them last year.

The kickoff!

The visiting team received and scored in eight plays. The extra point was good and the score was now 7 to 0 against John. The remainder of the quarter was nip and tuck but no scores were made.

The second quarter was just as bitterly fought but neither team scored.

The third quarter was a repetition of the second, but within 5 minutes of the last quarter, John's team scored to even the count at 7 to 7. With only five minutes left to play, John's opponents scored again but missed the extra point and the score was now 13 to 7.

With possession of the ball and only 3 minutes left to play, John's quarterback suddenly switched him from tackle to end so as to confuse the opponents and to likewise make John eligible for a pass. So, on the succeeding play, John was at end and the pass was to come to him. The ball was snapped and John raced down the field to receive the pass he expected. However, a fast charging defensive line fouled the
play and threw the passer for a 15 yd. loss. John returned to the huddle and was instructed to go back to his tackle position. The following play was also a pass, and John in his tackle position, looked up and saw the pass coming directly to him for an easy catch; so with little or no time to reflect on the situation, he caught it and ran for a touchdown.

The umpire immediately went to the referee and warned him that John had not been eligible to receive a pass on that particular play; the referee, however, was of the opinion that John was eligible, but neither could convince the other, so they decided to ask John if he were eligible.

There are three alternative answers John might have given:
1. Yes, I was eligible,
2. No, I was not eligible,
3. Refuse to answer or evade the issue.

a. Under the circumstances as described above, which answer do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).
c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach John to give, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).

Part II

If, instead of the foregoing, the situation had been;
1. Nothing of importance was at stake in this particular game,
2. John's team was already leading by thirty (30) points when this play happened,
3. The crowd was only 3 or 4 thousand strong,
answer the following questions.

a. Under these changed circumstances, which answer do you believe John was justified in giving, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).
b. Had you been in John's place, which answer would you have given, 1, 2, or 3 of Part I above? (underline).
c. If you were coach, which answer would you teach John to give, 1, 2, or 3? (underline).