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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A perennial problem exists in society, the determination of ethical behavior. This problem extends into the area of sports as is demonstrated by examples of booing crowds, coaches who argue with umpires, and players who deliberately foul.

Behavior in sports can and perhaps should be judged within the context of the society in which it exists. The unsportsmanlike acts may thus be uncovered and used for understanding what standards of conduct exist.

The ability to discriminate in order to determine good and bad sports conduct or sportsmanship must be developed. This process needs to become a part of physical education, and education and the experiences or situations which allow practice in discrimination must be provided. "Education must organize experiences within which the student may have a critically discriminating experience."

Choice offers opportunity for discrimination and formulation of values.

Cultures that have some degree of freedom live by the rules of the game, by the rule of sportsmanship. The term sportsmanship has become synonymous with civic responsibility.

Sportsmanship has become synonymous with ethical behavior. The word sportsmanship has been taken from the field of play and applied to all walks of life. Yet, what does it mean? Is there such a thing as a quality of sportsmanship? Can it be defined, taught, and applied in a democratic culture? Does sportsmanship find its base in moral standards and principles?

Jost has defined sportsmanship as "that quality of honor that deserves always to be courteous, fair, and respectful, and it is interpreted in the conduct of players, spectators, coaches, and school authorities." ¹

Webster's Dictionary defines sportsmanship as "conduct becoming to a sportsman, involving honest rivalry and graceful acceptance of results." ³

Oberteuffer says: "There is no such thing as a general quality of sportsmanship. There are sportsmanlike acts - and many of them put together and done by the same person will likely give him the reputation of being a 'sportsman' or 'sportsmanlike.'" ⁴

A quality of honor, individual conduct involving graceful acceptance of results, and sportsmanlike acts determine society's view of individual behavior. The behavior of

---

²Taylor Dodson, "Attaining and Maintaining Good Sportsmanship," School Activities XXIII (November, 1951), 84.
³Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 5th ed.
individuals is judged and the judgment does not end on the field of play but reaches into everyday situations. If there is no "general quality of sportsmanship" the "sportsmanlike acts" must be analyzed and defined to determine whether these acts are truly ethical and have their foundations in standards and principles.

The educational systems and those persons involved in the systems share the responsibility of defining ethical behavior; of guiding and educating for moral and spiritual values, and of transmitting what is known about ethical values to their students.  

The teacher's contribution is one of taking advantage of opportunities inherent and present in school situations, of establishing values in terms of consequences, of agreeing upon behavior, of generalizing about behavior, and of formulating a philosophy. Once formulated and classified, a teacher's actions must be guided by his beliefs, by example, and by his teachings.

Basically the school's task begins with determining what is good, what is bad, what is right, and what is wrong. Otherwise nothing may be transmitted to future citizens, no standards can be formulated, no principles followed, and

---


no behavior controlled. Sportsmanlike acts must be defined as good or bad, especially if sportamanship is accepted as a term synonymous with ethical behavior.

The problem of determining what is good and what is right begins with life itself, and the possibility of turning to this source for information of standards has been discussed and a method must be evolved. A method called the Critical Incident Technique, devised by Flanagan, suggested the basis of this study for determining standards as guides to ethical behavior, specifically in the sports world.

The need for the establishment of standards of conduct and agreement among educators on these standards provides the first major step in setting guides for ethical behavior.

Statement of the Problem

Believing that the consequence and effects of a participant's conduct in sports and athletics can be judged good or bad, right or wrong, it is the purpose of this study to judge conduct in the area of sports. Having judged the conduct and determined what is right, the judgment should serve as a guide to uncovering standards of ethical behavior.

More specifically, it is the aim of this study to collect incidents or situations involving conduct, deemed

---

7 Oberteuffer, op. cit., p. 190.
ethical or unethical by the contributors of the incidents. The situations are to then be treated in such a way as to determine what a consensus would hold to be acceptable behaviors in each situation. Such a consensus would be formulated from the opinions of experienced persons in whom the investigator would have reason to have considerable confidence. Further insight into the problem might be supplied by comparing the consensus concerning right or good behavior of experts or mature individuals with the opinions of supposedly less mature individuals such as students.

**Purpose of the Study**

The type of study to be undertaken is a form of social research which will undoubtedly result in the raising of new questions and perhaps the reformulation of old questions. This type of study is exploratory in nature. It should be realized that while exploratory studies do not always attain definite results they may nevertheless uncover more significant problems for more precise investigation.

The purpose of the exploratory study is to ascertain whether interpreters can agree upon the suitability of specified behaviors in given situations. "Since existing situations may provide the only possibility of collecting evidences related to the hypothesis," that sports

---

participants' behaviors can be judged and their behavior measured for its ethical value through the consensus of experienced persons, the writer conducted an "experience survey" for the purpose of devising a test instrument. Such an instrument might be used to determine what is ethical behavior in sports.

Steps in the Study

Before the instrument was devised, it was necessary to collect sports situations. These incidents could be used as the foundation for the questions which were to be asked.

Collecting situations.—To collect these incidents, persons connected with sports were interviewed. These respondents were chosen "in terms of their likelihood of offering insightful contributions, in other words a selected—not a representative—sample of people working in the area was called for."12

Members of the men's and women's physical education departments at The Ohio State University who had considerable experience in the field were interviewed.

Forty-two people were selected for these interviews. Selection was based upon maturity of age and experience in athletics and sport.

The initial contact for interviews was made by telephone. Preparation for the interview consisted of a brief

12 Ibid., p. 37.
statement of the purpose of the interview and background of the study being conducted.

At the time of the interview the investigator recorded all incidents of good or bad sportsmanship related by the person interviewed. Suggestions by those interviewed concerning what was good or right behavior for each situation were noted.

Two hundred and sixty-two situations were collected in this manner. The writer continued the interviewing process until situation examples for all of the so-called "popular" sports had been collected.

Several situations or incidents were added to the collection from other sources. Three incidents came from newspapers and magazines. Four incidents were taken from a collection published in Oberteuffer's Physical Education.\(^{13}\)

Each situation was rewritten and in the process some similarity was noted between incidents; these were eliminated. If, however, similar behavior was noted in a situation in one sport as compared with another sport, these situations were kept in the collection with the anticipation that a type of behavior considered unethical in one sport might be acceptable in another sport.

Devising a test instrument. It was decided to devise a multiple choice type of instrument. Starting with the

\(^{13}\) Oberteuffer, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 96-102.
situations collected by the interview method, and with the accompanying opinions about what was good or bad behavior in each situation, the writer devised choices of behavior for each situation.

The choices devised offered alternative answers in terms of each situation. The alternatives offered ranged from stressful to unstressful. The choices were multiple, from three to eight, and ethical and unethical selections or good and bad answers were included.

Many sports situations offer more than one right behavior choice. It seemed possible that if a person were offered many choices and that these alternative choices involved a range of behavior from ethical to unethical, stressful to unstressful, or good and bad, the answer chosen might truly represent opinion of what is good and right if such an answer is specifically requested.

Certain difficulties must be noted in the devising of a multiple choice instrument. Difficulties were encountered in duplication of choices and in the wording of the choices so that bias might be eliminated. A biased statement would cause a respondent to express one in his answer. This writer tried to anticipate this difficulty by devising numerous choices suggested by the incident and avoiding solving the situation by previously selecting what was believed to be the right answer.
Some of the previously collected incidents did not lend themselves to a multiple choice situation. These were eliminated. Others were eliminated when it was impossible to devise more than three alternative choices. In addition some incidents were found to suggest as many as ten or eleven choices. These were eliminated because of the confusion they might cause the respondent.

The average number of alternative choices for each incident was five. The range in number of choices for the situations retained as part of the test instrument was from three to eight.

The investigator also tried to avoid the grouping of what he felt to be the right answers at either end of the choice listings.

It was anticipated that some of the multiple choice test items might be harder to answer than others. Some mistakes in the structure of the test items were also felt to be present. The wording, clarity of meaning, presence of duplicate choices, and the presence of biased or obvious choices needed correction or deletion. With this in mind a preliminary test form of the instrument was prepared and administered.

Preliminary Test

The purpose of the preliminary test was to see whether it was possible for individuals to pick a right answer; to find some of the test construction errors; to determine the
length of time it would take to complete such a test; and to rank the difficulty of situations according to the trouble encountered in selecting the right or good choice.

The preliminary test was given to twenty-eight graduate students and teachers in physical education at The Ohio State University. Willingness to cooperate was the main criterion of selection, but this group was limited to those men and women who were teaching or had had at least two years' teaching experience.

The instruction sheet requested the preliminary jury to make suggestions and corrections about wording and clarity of meaning of the situations and choices. If situations and choices seemed to be duplicated or if other choices should be included, the respondents were asked to so indicate. This jury rated the difficulty of selecting a choice for each situation by using a scale of one through five. Rating a situation "one" meant the choice of right behavior was easy; "three" was average; and "five" was difficult. Each respondent also noted the time involved in going straight through the test and choosing what he believed to be the right response to each situation.

Final Jury's Test Forms

Following the suggestions and corrections offered by the members of the preliminary jury, the multiple choice test was rewritten.
Some of the situations that involved a rule of a game were found to be lacking in clarity or rule explanation. For example, a situation in which some confusion over a baseball rule was discovered was submitted to the preliminary jury as follows:

The groundskeepers have sprinkled lime on home-plate to mark it more clearly. A runner slides into home-plate. The catcher, by sitting down on home-plate, blocks the runner. The umpire calls the runner safe but the catcher stands up and shows the umpire the imprint of home-plate on the seat of his pants. The catcher maintains the runner was out since he couldn't possibly touch home while he was blocking the plate in such fashion.

The following statement was added to help the final jury make its decision.

Blocking bases frequently occurs and is commonly accepted as good play although it is against the rules.

Some of the choices had to be deleted and others rewritten as a result of duplication or confusing wording. In addition the preliminary jury felt that some situations were similar to others, therefore these were deleted.

The average amount of time involved in completing the multiple choice test was three hours. In order to shorten the time, guided by the preliminary jury's suggestions, the number of situations was reduced still further.

In the preliminary form the situations were arranged or grouped by sports. This basic arrangement was retained but within each sport grouping the incidents were rearranged according to the classification by the preliminary jury.
The order of arrangement was hard, easy, and average. Half of the hard-to-answer situations were placed in an "A" form and the other half in a "B" form of the multiple choice test. The same was done for the "easy" situations, whereas all average situations were included in both A and B forms of the instrument. The purpose of this classification of the situations was to provide some method of arranging the questions within the test form.

The total number of situations retained numbered 204, with 103 situations placed in form A and 101 situations in form B.

If all of the jurors answered all of the situations and choices the time needed for such a task would seem to discourage thoughtful selections. Therefore the incidents and choices were divided into two forms, A and B.

Selection of final jury.—A final jury was chosen for the purpose of determining the right or good behavior from the choices in each of the multiple choice situations. The jury membership was limited to mature individuals. These persons, in the opinion of this investigator, had fully developed their sense of judgment through experience as far as ethical behavior was concerned. The selection of the membership of this body was empirically determined. Representatives from educational or background areas in philosophy, philosophy of education, psychology, education, physical education, the ministry, and sociology were requested to
serve on this jury. Two persons from each of these areas were asked to serve. Two jury members came from universities other than The Ohio State University. One of the ministers was a resident of Columbus, Ohio, and a second minister was connected with this university's student campus affairs. All other jury members were from the previously mentioned educational areas at The Ohio State University. Seven of the twenty jurors were physical educators. Four of the twenty were women.

A sample form of the contact letter and a copy of the post card, indicating willingness to serve as a jury member, may be found in the Appendix. Immediately following these forms in the Appendix is the letter of instruction accompanying the multiple choice test forms.

Half of the twenty jurors were requested to answer test form A, the other half test form B. One juror requested both forms of the instrument and inadvertently answered test form B instead of form A. The total number of jurors answering test form A was nine, although eleven answered form B.

The jurors' responses, on which there was 100 per cent return, were compiled, tabulated, and totaled. The jury's responses were totaled for each choice and for each situation or sport incident. It should be noted that some jurors, although requested to pick one answer, chose extra responses. These extra replies were also tabulated.
Inasmuch as the anonymity of the jurors' replies was guaranteed, tabulation of individual replies was coded. These coded results are not displayed for the reason just mentioned.

Comparison of jury and student responses.—Informal expressions of opinion by individual jurors indicated the time involved in answering the test forms ranged from two hours to eleven and one-half hours.

Anticipating difficulty in obtaining student opinions if the task of answering the test remained time-consuming, it was decided to reduce further the number of multiple choice test items.

Preparation of Student Test Forms

Seventy items were deleted upon the following basis: of (1) elimination of the duplicate "average" situations included in the jury's test forms; (2) further deletion of some similar situations; (3) elimination of some situations which some jurors felt to be confusing; and (4) deletion of some situations by sports when a particular sport such as football or basketball, possessed a preponderance of incidents as compared with the other sports.

Still further reduction in the number of situations was accomplished by dividing the number of situations remaining into two groups. The groups were kept nearly equal from the standpoint of numbers. The two forms were kept
somewhat similar through the empirical judgment of this investigator. The two sets of multiple choice situations and choices were designated Student Form A and Student Form B.

The situation arrangement by sports and organization by degree of difficulty (hard, easy, average) in answering was retained wherever possible in the student test forms. It should be noted that as a result of the elimination of some situations the "difficulty" arrangement was impossible to maintain throughout, still retaining the sports classification.

Believing that the choices which the students might select would differ from those of the jury because of differences in variation of cultural background of student and jurymen, the student answers could also vary according to age, year in college, sex, athletic experience, and major field in college (physical education major or not). A data sheet, displayed in the Appendix, was developed to elicit such information from the student respondents.

The two Student Test Forms, A and B, were mimeographed on different colors of paper. The different colors were for the purpose of facilitating tabulation. A letter of instruction for filling out the test prefaced each form, and the data sheet followed the test form. A sample letter of instruction may be found in the Appendix.
Selection of Student Respondents

A small empirical sample of Ohio State University students was invited to respond to the multiple choice test. Student representation from all classes; Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior, was made in order to provide a range in age. Men and women in as nearly as possible equal numbers and, as far as possible, physical education majors and non-majors were included in the sample. Two hundred tests, one hundred of form A and one hundred of form B, were prepared and distributed through the help of the men's Panhellenic Fraternity Council, instructors in major classes in the men's and women's physical education departments, and service class programs, and student assistants in women's dormitories and housing units.

The method of contact for distribution and collection of these test forms was made by this investigator with the persons representing the previously mentioned groups. The writer, by personal contact, by letter, and visitation to the Fraternity President's Council succeeded in obtaining one hundred and fifty-seven replies of the two hundred test forms prepared for distribution.

Eighty-two students answered test form A and seventy-five students responded on form B. These replies represented approximately a 78 per cent return.

The data on the student test forms were coded and tabulated by International Business Machine. Further
information on this process may be found in Chapter III of this study.

Display of tests, situations, and choices.—In Chapter III, Treatment of Data, some situations and choices are reproduced. These test items are those taken from the student test forms A and B and were used in comparing jury and students' choices. Those situations which were not used in this chapter are displayed in the Appendix.

In addition, all of the situations used in the jury's test forms A and B and not used in the student forms are displayed in this section. By reference to the key, as indicated in the Appendix, the reader may determine the use of the situations thus listed.
CHAPTER II

SEARCH FOR STANDARDS

The problem of determining what is man's reasoned judgment or natural sense of what is right and good may be solved by a decision representing an opinion of the majority. Whether this majority opinion should be the sole basis of determining standards or guides to acceptable conduct is one side of an issue which has existed since man first examined his moral life and moral sense.

Once man undertook the process of examination of his moral life and sense, many points of view and ethical systems developed. Different moral views and ethical systems seem, basically, the result of conflicts. These conflicts stem from desires, the desires of individuals and the desires of groups. Individuals' desires seem to be in direct opposition to the aspect of consideration for others. The "others," in this sense, represent the group and its wishes.

Methods in the Search

Two methods of determining good, bad, right, or wrong result in the formulation of standards. One method, called naturalistic, bases the choice of good or right upon actual situations present in life. A person when confronted with a situation reaches out and makes a decision.¹ Man takes

something as it is and tries to discover why by studying its relation to other things. 2 Once having reached a decision, man has created a standard by virtue of the fact that he has used his prerogative of choice within the realm of his experience.

The second method involves a search for a situation which matches a previously chosen standard. The individual, uninfluenced by situations occurring about him and in isolation, thinks through ethical problems and formulates an ideal standard. He then takes this standard and turns to the world of practical affairs seeking to find situations which prove his ideal standard will work. Once having found a situation which matches this ideal he has made a step in the direction of determining what is right or good. This normative or critical method is considered by some as another way to formulate standards, rules, or models. 3

Whatever the method used for selecting standards, the source or root of the standards is found in a principle.

Principle Defined

A principle is a fundamental truth, a comprehensive law or doctrine from which other principles are derived or

---


3 Ibid., p. 414.
upon which others are founded. A principle may also be a fundamental assumption.\textsuperscript{4}

The search for standards finds its roots in principles. The fundamental truth about standards of conduct, once established and once clarified, forms the basis of systematic study. Systematic study results in ethics and ethical systems.

Ethics Defined

"Ethics is the science that deals with conduct insofar as the term is considered right or wrong, good or bad. A single term for conduct so considered is 'moral conduct,' or the 'moral life.'\textsuperscript{5} Or, "...ethics aims to give a systematic account of our judgments about conduct insofar as these estimate it from the standpoint of right or wrong, good or bad."\textsuperscript{6}

James Seth in interpreting Aristotle's view, said, "We may say that ethics is the investigation of the final end or purpose of human life."\textsuperscript{7} It has also been said that ethics deals with what man should desire and should avoid as an individual and as a member of society. What man ought or ought not do is duty and the power to attain an end and accomplish duty is virtue.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., p. 1.
\textsuperscript{7}James Seth, A Study of Ethical Principles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898), p. 12.
\textsuperscript{8}Spencer, op. cit., p. 469.
Simplifying the above, one may say that this is the study of good or bad or the study of right and wrong. With this simplified definition in mind two problems must be recognized. What does good or right mean? Once the meaning of good or right has been clarified, how does one go about developing this concept into a scheme of values and duties?

These two problems exist no matter what method of inquiry is used; whether one searches for a definition of good in real life situations; or whether one formulates an ideal of good and right by matching an ideal to the situation.

**Historical Developments in the Search for Standards**

History reveals that man's moral sense has gone through a process of evolution and growth. Paralleling this growth was the evolution and growth of ethics and ethical systems. If one is to understand and explore the growth of ethics and ethical systems one must understand and explore the growth of man's moral sense.

Certain factors become apparent and should be kept in mind in developing an understanding of ethics and in helping one solve the problems of what is good and how to do or be good. Ethical systems propose solutions to these problems yet the proposals conflict one with the other. Therefore, we find many solutions to these age-old problems. Which solutions should we accept and which should we reject? Which ethical system leads us to a solution and which ones do not?
Man's Moral Growth and Group Morality

In the evolution of man's moral sense we uncover facts which reveal the reasons for primitive man's moral actions. The first recognizable form of morality may be called "group morality." 9

Tribes, families, kinship groups were the unifying and ruling force in the lives of primitive peoples. Forced to find safety in numbers, or because of the enjoyment and security which groups provided, these early peoples adopted common customs and laws. The laws, rules, or customs can't be looked upon today as truly moral nor could they provide the basis of ethical judgment in today's society. Nevertheless these primitives sewed the seeds of morality. 10

Kinship groups.—The kinship group, with one common ancestor, tied the group together. The children reversed the elders and whether they disagreed or not with the duties imposed by these elders, they complied out of fear or from necessity of survival. In the undeveloped wilderness of the past, the individual submerged his desires to the group. "Kinship or family groups became industrial and economic units then political bodies." 11

9 Dewey and Tufts, op. cit., p. 17.
10 Ibid., pp. 17-21.
11 Ibid., p. 24.
Totem groups.—Fear and necessity fostered formation of other groups. Primitive worship of primitive forces demonstrated by animism and religious needs resulted in totem groups. These groups broke over and beyond the family ties incorporating many families into the group. Preserved were ancestral ties, along with primitive laws and customs. Because smaller units were developed into larger units as man makes social progress. Man's moral sense was also expanding because more laws, habits, and rules were being incorporated into the larger social unit.

Customary morality.—The rituals and taboos imposed by the necessity of group unity can be said to be habits. Group judgment recognized rituals and taboos. Rituals and taboos became moral standards. But this morality must be labeled customary morality because the right of the individual was submerged. His rights and desires were smothered by the weight of numbers. These standards imposed by the group were not entirely reasonable nor did they completely represent the feelings of all members of the group. These standards were more habitual or customary than truly moral. Complete morality is reached only when the individual recognizes the right or chooses the good freely, devotes himself heartily to its fulfillment, and seeks a progressive, social

\[12\]
Ibid., pp. 53-72.
development in which every member of society shall share.\textsuperscript{13}

The individual finds himself in conflict with the group.

Individual morality conflicted with group morality. The pressures of authority made it difficult for progress and change or the reformation and reconstruction of habits or customs.\textsuperscript{14} The emergence of this conflict was inevitable. The rights of individuals and groups clashed and resulted in change as illustrated by the moral development of Hebrews and Greeks.

**Hebrew Moral Development**

The Hebrews' concept of right and good was based upon the ideal of righteousness.\textsuperscript{15} Turning to the Old Testament of the Bible the primary ethical principle of these people was obedience, obedience to the will of God. Historical events, such as the tribe's escape from bondage in Egypt, success in living as nomads, and finally, finding a new home in Palestine led to the formulation of this principle.\textsuperscript{16} Divine intervention became the basis of their lives. The "code of the Covenant" in the Book of Exodus\textsuperscript{17} strengthened their level of morality. Justice and kindness became moral

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 73.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 74.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 95.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 4.
concepts, and yet this tribal morality submerged the individual and made him subservient to the group. "Nevertheless, it provided the foundation of social responsibility and concern for the weak and poor upon which the higher ethical ideals of later periods could be erected."

Kindness, compassion, and faithfulness replaced sacrifices and offerings, and a universal insight into man's moral responsibility developed as a result of the emergence of the prophets in Hebrew history. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and an unknown prophet changed the tribal outlook to a more personal and universal outlook. Individual freedom exemplified by personal religion was proposed by Jeremiah. The "second Isaiah" or unknown prophet advanced the idea that the Hebrew religion, monotheism, represented by one god, could be extended to the Gentiles or other peoples.

The Hebrew moral growth evolved further as the result of their development of law. Three of their most important law codes according to Thomas were the "Code of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus." Prophetic principles of justice, mercy, fidelity to God are found in Deuteronomy. Release from debts and bondage plus relief from oppression and care for the widow are examples of moral laws dealt with in this code. The code of Leviticus stated ethical laws, such

18 Ibid., p. 5.
19 Ibid., pp. 6-10.
20 Ibid., p. 12.
as love thy neighbor as thyself, acceptance of strangers, and impartiality to poor and great alike.  

Greek Moral Development

As Hebrew morality grew, this growth illustrated how customary morality could change into truly ethical precepts. Greek moral development provides further insight into moral growth. Measure and harmony became the Greek ideal of moral development. Wisdom and insight of the individual became the foundation stone.

Realizing that existing customs and institutions conflicted with individual development and evolving intelligence, the old religious gods and social standards were challenged. Custom was put in a bad light and challenged the Greeks to find a true meaning of good. Custom and institutions attacked the rights of individuals. "Convention," representing custom, conflicted with personal desires or "nature." The problem resolved into individual versus social interests, or immediate satisfaction versus an ideal standard which might be higher or more permanent.  

Another ethical principle was also evolving. "No legislation or conventional code ought to stand in the way of free association of genius and power." As Otto has put it,

---

21 Ibid., pp. 12-14.
23 Ibid., pp. 121-122.
historically man warred against man in order to put his ideas of right in operation, thereby suppressing others' ideas of right. The strong, the intelligent, and the forceful personalities of the Greeks evoked change but raised further problems in the search for good and right. Could the meaning of good be found in society or could it be found in isolation, or through individuals in isolation from the world affairs? 

The Hebrews' codes of laws, their principle of righteousness, and their emphasis upon kindness, justice, compassion, etc., submerged individual desire. The Greek moral development, beginning at the level which the Hebrews achieved, allowed the individual's idea of moral conduct to emerge. This was possible because of the recognition of rights of individuals and through the emergence or emphasis upon reason and wisdom. Ideals of good and right developed through individual insight not because of customs, habits, or tribal codes.

**Christian Moral Development**

Contributing to man's moral development was the rise of Christianity. The moral philosophers of the period of Jesus's time, Jesus and his disciples, believed and taught the principle of love. This meant love of God and love of 


neighbor. The Golden Rule became the axiom to live by. Here one finds the individual being recognized as worthy of love and God as the transcendental source of the meaning of good and right. Love of self, love of neighbor, and love of God were the true right and good.

The Church then became the interpreter of the divine source of moral law. This moral law was based upon the ten commandments derived from Hebrew origins.

Medieval and Modern Moral Development

The modern period of moral development was rooted in tribal morality, Greek ideal morality, Christian morality, German and Celtic plus Roman standards.

Following the Greek period, war-like peoples, such as the Germans and Celts injected their tribal codes. Medieval church codes, which required stultification of individual desire, fostered asceticism, humility, and withdrawal were added. As Dewey and Tufts have said, "two sets of standards existed, one set by the tribal code and the instinct of a war-like people; the other set by a church which required renunciation while it asserted control."

---

26 Thomas, op. cit., p. 42.
27 Dewey and Tufts, op. cit., p. 219.
28 Ibid., p. 220.
29 Ibid., pp. 147-148.
To summarize the moral changes occurring in the medieval period, the true meaning of good came to be family power, material wealth, artistic triumphs, and truly religious or secular life. Human authority came into power as sovereign states were formed, as civil liberty grew, and as political democracy emerged.\(^{30}\)

Instead of blind faith in church or God, gods and goddesses, and mythical figures shrouded in the mystery of the past, reason asserted itself by doubting and challenging transcendental concepts. The worth of the individual appeared in all lines of thought and endeavor. Charity was replaced by social justice as the chief virtue in this changing picture of what is truly good.\(^{31}\)

"All men are equal before God, why should one man assume to command another because of birth?" became the moral principle echoed by Milton, Locke, Rousseau, and Jefferson.\(^{32}\) This principle was expressed as natural, the "law of nature," or "natural rights" and its relation to the Greek evolution of moral development can be seen.\(^{33}\)

**Moral Development in the United States**

In the United States social morality is a summary of factors. Influenced by Hebrew, Greek, and Medieval periods

\(^{30}\text{Ibid., p. 148.}\)
\(^{31}\text{Ibid., p. 148.}\)
\(^{32}\text{Ibid., p. 152.}\)
\(^{33}\text{Ibid., pp. 152-153.}\)
of history, the colonists brought with them a heritage of moral standards. Awaiting the settlers was a new land of opportunity and the possibility of emergence of individual freedom and fulfillment of desire necessitating further change.

New factors entered this picture in a new land. Laws based upon previous knowledge were written, re-written, and created. Scientific studies of groups, sociological advancement, pointed to further need and resulted in further modification.

The government itself instituted changes. Literary efforts of the day uncovered injustices and molded public opinion toward new horizons. Lincoln, Jefferson, and Washington led the people down these paths of change.34

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America expresses the political, social and moral change when it states:

We the People of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.35


Man at last had the opportunity of free choice, of shaping his own destiny, and of choosing right and good, all based upon a shifting kaleidoscope of principles, standards, and ethical systems fraught with conflict and struggle through the age of primitive man; Greek, Roman, and Medieval achievements; and the renaissance of scientific achievement. Individual and social morality had emerged and were attempting to merge.

Group morality, customary morality, tribal morality, law, political bodies, challenge of convention and the emergence of reason with the resultant emphasis on individual worth were important factors in man's moral development.

A clear picture of this changing process can't be accomplished without giving attention to man's efforts to find the true meaning of right and good as illustrated by the emergence of major ethical systems. Individual and social growth inspired systematic study by learned, thoughtful men. Certain influential ethical systems have contributed to man's moral development.

Ethical Systems and Moral Development

To classify, divide in groups, and select major ethical systems which have played important roles in man's moral development inevitably results in the exclusion of some important systems. With this risk in mind this writer has, for the sake of clarity, divided the ethical systems into
three general classifications following those proposed by Albert Hofstadter of Columbia University. 36

The classifications are teleological systems, deontological systems, and mixed systems. Included in each classification are found major ethical systems which guided the writer in her search for standards of good and right.

**Teleological Systems**

Teleological ethical systems, in establishing the meaning of right and good and creating a scheme of values, emphasize that an act which is done is important as far as consequences are concerned. They are not concerned from the standpoint of motive but in actual or intended effect. The consequences of an act become the criteria of good. As long as the outcome of man's behavior is good then man has acted in a truly moral fashion. 37

Included in this teleological classification are Hedonism, Universalistic Hedonism, and Utilitarianism. These ethical systems emphasized pleasure.

Pleasure is the sole intrinsic good and pain is evil. To lead a good life one must seek happiness and once having achieved happiness man succeeds in leading a good life. 38

"Good is happiness, and happiness of the greatest number."

37 Ibid., p. 1.
38 Ibid., p. 1.
The demands for individual satisfaction and for social distribution of goods is voiced in this system.39

Aristippus and Epicurus emphasized in the ethical system of Eogistic Hedonism that self was the all important determining factor as to pleasure or pain.40

Bentham's Quantitative Theory advanced the idea that "happiness could be calculated by intensity, duration, probability, promptitude, fecundity, purity, and social extent of pleasure or pain."41 He created a yardstick or measure of pleasure or pain to aid in determining the degree of goodness or rightness of an act as far as consequences are concerned.

John S. Mill also accepted the thought of pleasure as good but further developed this idea called today the Qualitative Theory. He proposed that humans were capable of higher pleasures than lower animals and that pleasures differed in quality as well as in quantity.42

Deontological Systems

Deontological ethical systems purport to emphasize that right or good is synonymous with law, duty, obligation and virtue. The consequences of an act are not important.

40 Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 1.
41 Ibid., p. 1.
42 Ibid., p. 1.
The motive of an act is all important. The fulfillment of a law, a duty, an obligation regardless of the consequences becomes the only good.\(^4^3\) Deontological systems seem to take a completely opposite stand in the search for the meaning of good from the teleological systems.

Chief representative of the deontological point of view is Emmanuel Kants' ethical theory of Formalism. "Freedom, power and authority of reason, human dignity, supreme value of character, and the significance of society in which every man is at once sovereign and subject"\(^4^4\) are major points of emphasis.

The moral command intrinsic in this point of view is that "all men are duty bound to tell the truth." Or, "if you wish to profit, then be honest (honesty is the best policy). Be honest because it is right, regardless of profit or loss."\(^4^5\) The emphasis of the law of duty is universal and necessary. This law is called the "Supreme Categorical Imperative." Man must obey moral law because it is law and act in such a way that he can will the principle of action to be universal law.\(^4^6\)

**Mixed Ethical Systems**

The separation, following the classification of ethical systems into deontological and teleological systems, is

---

\(^{4^3}\) Dewey and Tufts, *op. cit.*, p. 169.


\(^{4^6}\) Ibid., p. 2.
not simple. The difficulty of separation becomes apparent when one realizes that teleological systems emphasize consequences or as Dewey and Tufts point out, the "outer" effects of man's actions, thoughts, and desires. Deontological systems emphasize the "inner" feelings, effects, thoughts, and desires as the important consequences. "Inner" means in a sense man's attitude; outer means outcome.47

The difficulty of separation of inner and outer, attitude and outcome, seems unsurmountable. The point where attitude separates clearly from the outcome of individual action cannot be located. The reversal of the separation of outcome from attitude is just as difficult. Realization of this difficulty resulted in the development of mixed ethical systems. These systems mix the deontological and teleological points of view of what is good or bad.

Hedonism.—Hedonism, with its emphasis on pleasure, builds a case for man as essentially a sentient being. This opposes the theory of the Epicurians, the Utilitarians, and Kant's Formalism which hold that man is exclusively a rational being; and that man's good is not feeling (sentient) but a rational good. The one theory finds in feeling (inner), and the other in reason (outer), the deeper and truer self.48 "Hedonism can not long avoid the reference to

---

48 Seth, op. cit., pp. 80-81.
reason,\textsuperscript{49} and the Utilitarians or its agreeing proponents can't ignore the senses. The result is a compromise or merging of supposedly opposite views. An example of this merger is the ethical theory proposed by Plato, that of Eudaemonism.\textsuperscript{50}

**Eudaemonism.**—Eudaemonism, later modified and perpetuated by Aristotle, states that man's function is reason or man's function is activity of the soul in accordance with reason. Or as Dewey and Tufts have stated "an orderly and harmonious development of impulses under the guidance and control of reason."\textsuperscript{51} "The full development of man's capacities culminating in a rational and harmonious life" was Aristotle's view of good.\textsuperscript{52}

**Stoicism.**—Stoicism is another example of an attempt to mix the two points of view; teleological and deontological; inner and outer; attitude and outcome; or feeling and reason. The stoics said that man's happiness depended upon his following the laws of nature. He could challenge the natural laws through his ability to agree with these laws or deny them. But, since man is a part of nature, he would be happier to accept its laws and to control his desires and emotions absolutely.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 81
\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., p. 82.
\textsuperscript{51}Dewey and Tufts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., p. 134.
The control of desire and emotion represents the "inner" part of man and nature, with its laws, the "outer." The emphasis on nature (outer) places the secret of good in this realm but recognized human nature too as a source of good (inner).  

Pragmatic Naturalistic Humanism.—Pragmatic Naturalistic Humanism also seeks to resolve the differences of the teleological and deontological points of view. This ethical theory proposes that man is able to judge the effectiveness of proposed conduct, his moral ideas, standards, and principles only when he has tried out and found them to be of help in resolving difficulties.

Man is an animal who adapts and adjusts to life by means of intelligence and creativeness influenced by tradition and experience. The recognition of the "inner" side of man is represented by proposing that man is an intelligent, rational being who is able to adapt and adjust, under the modifications of tradition and experience. The outer or outcome part of this theory is represented by man's ability to try out his ideas, to adapt and change his world, and the ability to judge, as the result of experience, whether his conduct is good or bad. But, in any case, "inner" and "outer" lose their traditional meaning in these views.

---

53 Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 2.
54 Ibid., p. 2.
Religion and ethics.—Moral philosophers and theologians of the church also attempted the "fusion of elements of inner and outer control."^55 Divine revelation and divine assistance was the true source of moral law and of the true meaning of good. Man is to rely upon the authority of the church, as the church is the interpreter and controlling force of divine law.

The divine revelations which reveal the meaning of good seems to represent the "inner" side of this view. The consequences, outer, or outcome side of this point of view is represented by church authority. The ultimate source of the true meaning of good or right is supernatural or transcendent.

Ethical Principles

The difficulty of concise classification is apparent in the previous presentation of examples of major ethical systems. The difficulty of separating sentient and rational; inner and outer; and attitude and content theories results in overlapping and entanglement.

It is not the purpose of this portion of the study to resolve ethical disagreements or to choose an ethical system. It's purpose, rather is to show some of the reasons for disagreement and some of the opposing points of view as to the meaning of good or right.

Each ethical system has evolved in relationship to certain fundamental assumptions or principles which have appeared. It is possible to relate these principles directly to ethical theories. It seems more appropriate, however, to summarize and synthesize some principles. Such a process seems more practical when one realizes the wealth of principles that have been stated.

The moral development of man; the methods needed to determine good or right; and the ethical theories that have developed with their proposals for the meaning of right and good can not contribute to the search for standards unless some of the main principles of good and right are examined.

Right for Right's Sake

Things are done under the sense of their rightness and the higher the feeling of rightness, the higher is the moral quality of the act that has been done. This principle, stated more concisely, is "right for right's sake." Otto says this principle places the emphasis upon three desires of the spirit: moral, intellectual, and aesthetic. Man's "spirit" wishes to "do what is right for the sake of doing right, to know the truth for the sake of knowing the truth, and the desire for beauty."

---

57 Ibid., p. 59.
58 Ibid., p. 59.
Principle of Love

"The fundamental principle of the Christian ethic is love of God and love of neighbor." 59 This principle has been construed to mean love of self by some early and medieval Christian thinkers. St. Augustine has been quoted as having said, "true love of self requires love of God as the Highest Good of the self and that he should love himself 'for the sake of God.'" The Golden Rule, "As you wish that men would do to you, do so to them" seems to favor this view. 61

The Christian ethic and the principle of right for right's sake turn the search for the meaning of good to a supernatural or transcendental realm. Morality becomes a pattern of things as they should be. 62 The world of value is not to be found in this world but must be searched for above the material or natural world of man's existence.

Turning back to the interpretation of the ethical systems in which man's moral sense develops as a result of the sense of rightness of an act or as the result of the consequences, the principle of right for right's sake takes on still further meaning. The clue to its meaning rests in the fact that "things are done under the sense of their rightness." 63 The interpretation of sense seems to direct

59 Thomas, op. cit., p. 42.
60 Ibid., p. 55.
61 Ibid., p. 55.
63 Ibid., p. 57.
one's thoughts to inner feelings. What man feels within himself to be right is right. Regardless of the consequences of an act and as long as one knows within himself that he is right this principle can become operative as a guide to moral action.

Reason, intelligence, and contemplation by the individual are important measures in deciding good. The consequences of an act are not as important as the sense or spirit in which the act is executed. Unsubstantial, bodiless, disembodied, or subjective as this principle may seem because consequences are apparently not considered, it is nevertheless a basis of assumption by some for formulation of standards of good and right. Yet, as Otto notes, it gives power to those who are in a position to claim to know the right.

**Might is Right**

With the development of a dominant culture and the absorption of other cultures into one came the inevitable suppression of smaller groups' ideals and standards. Conquering by force and might, the victorious group's standards were superimposed upon the losers. Acceptance by the minority of the majority group's values draws attention to another principle, "might makes right." In this sense "might makes some people's ideas of right overshadow the lesser peoples' concept of right."

---

64 Ibid., p. 80.
65 Ibid., p. 82.
In still another sense the principle of might makes right may mean that it is impossible for a definition of good to survive unless might is present. Unless groups of individuals agree upon a standard thus balancing ideals against each other, no standard of right or good can be formulated.

The word might in this principle can be further interpreted. If might means forces which cooperate in bringing about a moral outlook, "the might is indeed responsible for the moral ideals a people may from time to time espouse." The conflict of one's ideals or the warfare of ideals results in choice. This can take place within the individual. This is not enough since, however, an individual may seek approval of others of his chosen standard. By enlisting the aid of others who have agreed with his concept of good, he spreads his standards. The spread of an individual's meaning of good depends upon others or might in this sense. Historically, might has been the factor which has accounted for the survival of certain moral standards and meanings of right and good.

There seems to be something wrong with a principle which seems to give free play to might. Suppression of one individual's concept and acceptance of another's through

---

66 Ibid., p. 82.
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sheer weight of numbers by public opinion, by ruling powers or by any other force, seems to go against individual right. It balances the scale in favor of the group out of proportion to individual freedom. "Tentative rules are mutually agreed upon, and victory according to these rules determines who wins. Where 'might' interferes with this arrangement we call it unclean sport. There is no absolute legal code, yet the most powerful of the contestants does not instruct the judge and jury and compel a decision." Actually, right, to refer to Otto again, shows who is strong, not who is right.

Right by Agreement

"Substitute settlement by conciliation for settlement by coercion" seems necessary and may result in the rejection of the principle of might makes right. The substitution of another principle, "right by agreement," is an attempt to bring together individual desire and group desire. Conflicting ideals of individuals can be adjusted by agreement and avoid the danger of closing one's mind to standards proposed by another. The interaction of individual and group desire, individual against individual, and group against group hinge upon the principle of agreement in determining right and good.

69 Ibid., p. 100.
70 Ibid., p. 101.
71 Ibid., p. 107.
Disagreement as to the method of determining right and good may be resolved by putting this principle into operation.

Those who place faith in the proposal that the true source of good and right rests in a transcendental realm may find good by agreement. Agreement among those who turn to this source should result in formulation of standards.

Conversely, those who believe that standards for good and right are found in the world of nature (practical word) can gain acceptance from those of similar inclinations.

If the two groups, those who turn to transcendental sources of good and those who look to the practical world for the true meaning good, put this principle of agreement in operation. Standards of good and right can be ascertained. It must be admitted, however, that those who accept or try to put the principle of right by agreement into practice must abandon support of other principles. Those who believe in right for right's sake must abandon their position as will those who support might as right.

It seems probable that individual desire and group desires can also be resolved through this principle. Acceptance within groups and the bridging of differences between groups may be attained by using agreement and conciliation. We can let desires fight it out, we can appeal to external authority, or we can come to some basis of agreement. These are the choices left to us.

---
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The moral man is one who can resolve conflicts of wants and desires by adjudication. He instigates a program whereby he sets his goals and disciplines himself to reach that goal. His wants come first, but he disciplines these wants, and through discipline he begins to live a moral life. Soon he also includes the wants of others in his life program and becomes, as a result of this inclusion, more moral. Added to this he becomes aware of the "morality in vogue" and what has been established as good in his environment. Within himself and with others he resolves, the conflicts of his own wants, others' wants, and the demands of the standards of his environment. He reaches agreement therefore establishing standards of good and right.

Other Principles

William H. Kilpatrick concerned himself with the basic conflict of the individual's idea of good as opposed to the group's idea. Two ethical principles which he proposes illustrate this:

1. Each person is to be treated always as an end and never merely as means. In this ethical respect all men are to stay equal.
2. Conversely, each person is under moral obligation so to act as negatively, not to hurt the good life of others and positively, to foster the good life for all.

---

73 Ibid., pp. 118-128.
In Kilpatrick's third principle we seem to find support of Otto's third principle, right by agreement, when he states:

3. The more honestly and carefully study is carried on by different individuals and groups, the more likely will they reach like results. What is good study is itself to be determined by other study. We begin where we are and examine the results of our study so as to improve our methods of study.  

In support of this principle we find this statement, "every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after."  

The difficulty in selecting, accepting, and rejecting principles may hinge upon whether these principles are peremptory or imperative; whether they are pure, non-independent, or intrinsic; or whether they are categorical and unconditional. Our intelligence and reason tend to reject absolutes and may support two more principles:

4. The free play of intelligence stands as our final resource to tell us what to do - intelligence playing freely upon experience in any and all of its content, including the use of intelligence itself.  

5. We know no absolute principles; that is, none which now stand properly above criticism or which may not conceivably be modified, perhaps in intent, perhaps in application, as new conditions arise.  

---
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The effort to run life on the basis of ethics and intelligence is supported in Mr. Kilpatrick's principles. He adds one more basic, his sixth principle:

6. ...democracy follows as the effort to run society on the combined basis of the good life and ethics, as these are managed cooperatively by the members themselves.78

Applying Principle

In stating or applying any philosophic principle great difficulty is encountered. Each principle may admit exceptions. On the edges there seem to be questions and exceptions. If we stick to the central theme of the principle perhaps we can avoid entanglements and so better apply or reject the principle.

For example, the sixth commandment of the Bible states "Thou shalt not kill." In our country this may mean sparing human lives. In India this means all living creatures. To follow this principle we should eliminate capital punishment and refrain from killing in wars. Each country interprets the principle in its own fashion. Each new situation that arises, such as the exigencies of war, causes a principle to be re-interpreted. Re-interpretation and variation of application cause us to lose the central theme and turn to fringes of meaning. Thus we lose the central theme of the principle or the commandment.79

78 Ibid., p. 54.
79 Ibid., pp. 53-54.
Keeping in mind the danger in losing the true meaning of a principle, it may be interesting to apply some of the principles mentioned in this chapter. Application of these principles to the choices selected by the jurors for certain situations reveals the difficulties involved in such a process.

Admittedly the motives of the jurors were not recorded as they made choices. Whether the jurors made conscious use of principles in making their selections is in question. It is conceivable that the rejection of some choices and the selection of a specific choice was consciously or unconsciously based upon some ethical principle.

In situation number one of Form A, approximately 88.8 per cent of the jurors selected choice (c). What principle, if any was in operation as these jurors made such a choice?

The situation and the choices offered are stated as follows:

In a badminton game played without officials, the players were supposed to call their own "wood shots." These shots occur whenever the edge of the frame of the racket hits the shuttlecock instead of the strings. Such a "wood shot" causes the player to lose a point or the serve. Player A fails to call his "wood shots" but his opponent, Player B, calls his own "wood shots" and realizes that A is not calling his.

_____a. Player A should ignore B's actions.

_____b. Player B should quit calling his, since A is failing to do so.
Player B should inform A that he knows of his error and ask him to call his own "wood shots."

B should call A's attention to his failure to call the "wood shots" and refuse to play any further.

B should stop the game and refuse to play anymore.

The juror may have been applying Kilpatrick's principle number two, "each person is under moral obligation so to act as negatively, not to hurt the good life of others and, positively, to foster the good life of all."

Positively player B felt his opponents actions were wrong and entering into the spirit of what he felt to be wrong tried to point out to Player A his error, perhaps hoping that this player might change his ways. Negatively, player A must be wrong since he was failing to call his "wood shots."

One might also apply Otto's second principle, might is right. In this case player B is seeking to express his judgment of A's behavior in order to influence or bring about change. Player B's knowledge of rightness rests in the knowledge that A is breaking a rule. The rules of the game of badminton are the result of group or majority thinking and approval. The rules may represent might and player B is representing might, in the absence of authority, as an umpire or official.

---
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Principle number three as expressed by Otto, right by agreement, may also apply to the jury's choice. B believes A's actions are wrong and he tries to get A to examine his behavior and to agree to change his ways by accepting the rule of the game. Instead of coercion he appeals to reason and intelligence which supports Otto's third principle. A juror may have applied Kilpatrick's fourth principle: "(4) The free play of intelligence stands as our final resource to tell us what to do - intelligence playing freely upon experience in any and all of its content, including the use of intelligence itself."^83 Player B is appealing to A's intelligence and reason. A must know that wood shots should be called and B is calling his attention to this fact. For the sake of the game and its rules A and B are trying to resolve disagreement in a rational manner.

Another situation may also serve as an example as to the manner in which a juror may have applied an ethical principle in making his choice. In the jury's test form A, situation number eleven, 65 per cent selected choice (c).

The situation is stated below:

During the fourth quarter of a basketball game one team has only four players left, due to disqualification of the others by fouls. This team is losing the game. The coach of the opponents requests the referee to permit the losing team to use one of the players fouled out. The official was within the rules in not allowing the other team to use a disqualified player.

^82 Ibid., p. 107.
^83 Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 54.
a. The winning coach was doing the sporting thing in making the request. The official should have allowed it under the circumstances.

b. The coach's request makes the losing team appear weak by seeming to say they can win even if the losers have all their players in the game.

c. The coach should not request this since his opponents lost their players according to the rules of the game.

d. The winning coach should also play with only four players, rather than make his request.

e. The coach should not ask an official to change a rule under any circumstance.

The motives of the coach in the situation will never be known. His action was to request that his opponents be allowed to use disqualified players. Judging upon the basis of his actions, the jurors disagree with the coach. Their disagreement may have been with the fact that the coach was flaunting a rule of the game and asking the authority (umpire) to change a rule.

"Might makes right"\(^4\) may be one principle which could apply. Objection to the challenge of authority represented by the rules and the umpire may make some reject this action. Might in this case is the rule of the game. We have no right to set aside might, authority, or law. The individual must accept this idea of right or good for the sake of the game and others.

\(^4\) Otto, op. cit., p. 80.
We may apply Kilpatrick's second principle "each person is under moral obligation to act, negatively, not to hurt the good life of others and positively, to foster the good life for all." The umpire cannot treat one player differently from another, nor set aside a rule that helps to control the game for others. "The good life for all" is to play basketball according to the rules. To allow the coach to set aside a rule would result in harming the game. Setting aside rules may lead a player into flaunting of rules, to lose faith in rules of other games, and thus the game would be lost to others.

In Conclusion

Perhaps the jurors did not use ethical principles in making choices. Possibly one principle was used over and over in making a choice in each of the many situations. It is likely that many principles were used, one principle at one time and some other at another time.

One fact seems to be apparent, each juror made his choice within the realm of his experience. If his experience included contact with the principles mentioned, it is possible that he used these principles in making choices and this possibility must be proved or disproved by further investigation.

---

Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 54.
The search for standards of behavior in sport is continued in the next chapter. The treatment of the data, collected by the naturalistic method mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, is undertaken.

Jurors were confronted with situations and asked to make choices. Because they made choices they expressed a preference for certain consequences in human relationships rather than for others. Thus, they confronted a moral problem and reflected a view of morality. "Moral rules can therefore only be those regulations which justify themselves experimentally to be serviceable in securing the end."86 The end this writer seeks is a rule or model which can guide our behavior in the world of sport.

---

86 Otto, _op. cit._, p. 129.
CHAPTER III

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Treatment of the juror's responses.—The procedures followed in this study were stated in Chapter I. Before any conclusions, analyses, or results could be determined treatment of the data was necessary.

Tabulation and compilation of the juror's responses was the first step. The number of jurors picking choices (a), (b), (c), (d) etc., situation by situation, were numerically summarized.

It was found, during the tabulation process, that in some situations the jurors chose more than one answer although specifically requested to select one response. Some jurors picked one extra choice and some picked two or more choices. In addition, some jurors failed to select even one response. The extra choices were summarized and noted.

The writer noted each individual juror's replies, separated on a basis of occupation. The individual records are not displayed in this study since the jurors had been guaranteed anonymity.

Calculation Per Cent Agreement by the Jury

The second step was to calculate the per cent agreement of the jurors on each of the two separate forms, form A and form B.
On form A, a per cent value of 11.1 was given each juror's choice in each situation. This figure was arrived at on the basis of nine jurors' replies. The nine jurors' total replies were valued at 100 per cent.

On form B, each juror's reply was valued at 9.09 per cent. This was based upon eleven jurors' replies representing 100 per cent.

It should be noted that one juror had requested copies of both forms of the situations. This juror had been asked to answer form A but instead answered form B. Consequently, instead of ten jurors answering form A and ten answering form B, nine answered the B form and eleven the A.

**Per Cent Value of Extra Choices**

In order to deal with the extra choices or lack of choices made by some of the jury members, it was empirically determined that each reply, extra or not, would be valued at the same percentage figure as the single replies.

For example, form B, situation number 28, some of the jurors made two extra choices. When each juror's choice was given the value of 9.09 per cent the total, including the two extra choices, of all of the jury's votes came to 118.2 per cent.

In form A, situation number 11, one extra choice by a juror was made. The extra response was given a value of 11.1 per cent as were all other replies. The total of 111.2 per cent represented all of the replies.
The means that the valuing of all of the choices, including the extra choices, at the same percentage figure may be justified upon the following basis:

1. Some jurors may have found it impossible to choose just one answer.

2. Since the instrument was in an experimental form all duplicate choices may not have been eliminated.

3. Within the scope of the choices offered for a given situation two correct or "right" answers may exist.

In Chapter I it may be noted that the situations were arranged in a definite order, that of hard, easy, and average. Since all 20 of the jurors answered the average situations, the per cent value of each juror's response on these situations was calculated as 5.

For example, situation 1 on Form A and situation number 2 on Form B were the same and were answered by all 20 jurors. The total per cent possible for situation number 1, Form A, was 45. The total per cent possible for any one choice on any one situation on form B was 55.

Extra choices made by jurors were given 5 per cent value. As a result, the total per cent replies in some situations exceeded 100. When total per cents are lower than 100, this indicates that some juror failed to select an answer.
Treatment of the data.—In the procedures followed in this study it should be recalled that the student A and B forms contained a smaller number of situations than the forms submitted to the jury. The reason for the reduction was based upon the exigencies of time.

It was found that some jury members spent from 5 to 11 hours selecting choices to each situation. Anticipating that students might not answer such a lengthy and time-consuming questionnaire, some situations were eliminated.

The basis for elimination of the situations for the student forms follows: Some situations that seemed similar in nature were deleted. Some situations seemed confusing to the jurors and these were crossed out. Finally, certain sports, such as basketball, had more situations than others. Therefore, certain ones of these were deleted.

The situations thus eliminated may be determined by referring to pages 357 through 371 in the Appendix. In this section of the Appendix those situations which were eliminated are reproduced. Also, in this same section, are listed all of the situations in which no majority per cent agreement was reached by jury or student groups.

Machine Tabulation of Data

With the cooperation of Mr. Omar Goode and the use of the facilities of the Bureau of Business Research of The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, the data submitted
by the students, plus their responses to the situations, were coded in order to use the Key Punch System of tabulation by International Business Machine.

A coded number for each questionnaire was established. The series of numbers differed for forms A and B. A number was assigned for each answer given by the student.

The data or information sheet at the end of the forms was also coded. A digit was assigned for the age, the sex, and the athletic experience of the student respondents. The code system is not displayed.

After development of the code, the numbers were transferred to each student questionnaire form. All data were then key-punched on the IBM key punch cards, Number 733727.

**Student Platform Classification**

The cards were tabulated by the I.B.M. machine on the basis of three platforms or divisions of the student group. The first two platforms or divisions were those of Athletes and Non-Athletes. An athlete is generally defined by physical educators as one who has received a letter in a sport. This definition applied effectively to the men students and was used in determining or dividing the men students into Athletes and Non-Athletes.

Women athletes, under the present sports systems in schools and colleges, are seldom awarded letters for membership on a single team. Recognition of their achievements is
commonly made by awarding points for that membership. A pre- 
determined point total for participation in many sports and 
many teams results in a letter award rather than a letter 
for one single team sport.

In view of this fact, an arbitrary classification or 
definition of women athletes was used. Any woman who had 
participated as a member of three teams while in school or 
college was classified as an athlete. This empirically 
determined definition gave a better balance, numerically 
speaking, of the women students who replied. The women 
students were thus divided into Athletes and Non-Athletes.

One hundred and fifty-seven students answered the 
two student forms of the questionnaire. The 52 students who 
answered form A were classified as Athletes and Non-Athletes 
on the previously stated basis. Forty of these students 
were found to be Athletes, 30 were labeled Non-Athletes, and 
2 students were unclassified, since they failed to indicate 
whether they had received letters in sports. The unclassi- 
fied students' replies were not calculated in per cent 
agreement totals as may be noted later in this chapter.
Forty-five students answering Form B of the student question- 
aire were classified as Athletes. Thirty men and 30 women 
students were classified as Non-Athletes on this same form.

The second platform of comparison used in treatment 
of the data by International Business Machine was sex.  
Forty-one females and 41 males answered Form A. Forty men 
and 35 women replied to Form B.
Further data from the information sheet on the student forms provided a basis for the third platform of comparison. This platform was composed of students who majored in physical education and those who did not. One student failed to indicate his status on this basis. Therefore, of those who answered form A, 44 were classified as Physical Education Majors and 38 as Non-Physical Education Majors. On Form B, 36 students were majors in physical education; 38 were not.

**Calculation of Per Cent Agreement by the Students**

Since the jury's replies were based upon a 100 per cent total, the same total was applied to the student responses. In each of the three platforms for each of the student questionnaire forms the per cent agreement was determined in this fashion for each situation.

In Form A, the replies of Athletes were valued at 1.9 per cent each. The replies of Non-Athletes were valued at 3.3 per cent apiece.

Each Athlete's reply on form B was given the value of 2.2 per cent. The Non-Athlete's reply was valued at 3.3 per cent.

The second platform, composed of men and women students received the following per cent values.
On form A 41 women's answers were given a 2.4 per cent value for each of their replies. The 41 men received the same value on their choices.

On form B the women's replies, of which there were 35, were valued at 2.9 per cent each. The men's were calculated at 2.5 per cent inasmuch as 44 responded.

Majors and non-majors in Physical Education in platform three replying to form A were given the following value to their choices. Forty-four Physical Education majors' choices were valued at 2.3 per cent. The 38 non-majors' choices were valued at 2.6 per cent each.

On form B, platform three, 74 students replied. The 36 Physical Education majors' choices were valued at 2.8 per cent, whereas the 38 non-majors' replies were given a value of 2.6 per cent apiece.

The students' replies, by platforms were totaled by IBM for Forms A and B in order to determine per cent agreement or disagreement. Those situations which displayed a majority per cent agreement among students or jury are displayed in Table form of this chapter. The situations in which there was no majority per cent agreement are found in the Appendix.

A few extra choices were made by the students and accounted for those percentage totals which exceeded 100 per cent. The reverse was also true since some students failed to select a response in some situations. The extra choices
or lack of choices were treated in the same fashion as were the jurors' replies.

Basis of comparison between jury and students.—In order to compare the juror's choices with those of the students, some basis of comparison was needed. The basis, empirically determined, was majority per cent agreement.

The definition of majority agreement displays or explains the reason for such a comparison. Webster's dictionary defines majority as "a number greater than half of a given number."\(^1\) With majority per cent agreement as a basis, situations in which jury and students' replies agreed at 50 per cent or more might be considered significant as to what they deem to be right or good behavior.

The use of plurality as a basis of comparison was also considered. Webster defines plurality as a "state of being numerous."\(^2\) This criterion was rejected as being less significant than majority but such rejection is admittedly not completely defensible.

The tabulation of situations which show majority agreement of students and jurors follows. The situation in which there is some majority per cent agreement between jurors or student platforms replying to that situation is stated. The choices offered to the jury and students are

\(^1\) Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 5th ed.
\(^2\) Ibid.
also given. Following the situation and choices are certain
remarks deemed appropriate for each situation.

Following the situation and choices are tables.
These tables display the percentage totals for each choice
for each of the groups responding.

On each of the tables the first column shows majority
agreement. The key used follows:

Mj = Majority Agreement of the Jury.
Ma = Majority Agreement of Athletes.
Mna = Majority Agreement of Non-Athletes.
Mw = Majority Agreement of Women.
Mm = Majority Agreement of Men.
Mpe = Majority Agreement of Physical Education Majors.
Mnpe = Majority Agreement of Non-Physical Education Majors.
l. In a World Series baseball game one of the pitchers had a no-hit, no-run game up to the last batter. In the last half of the last inning, the batter at bat had a count of 3 balls and 2 strikes. As the pitcher delivered the ball, the umpire called "Strike three, you are out!" The batter objected violently but the game was over and the pitcher had won this no-hit, no-run game. Later, the batter told newspaper reporters that the third strike was wild and the umpire probably had called it a strike just to give the pitcher the glory of winning a no-hit World Series game. It was also known that the umpire in question was retiring and this was his last game.

**Choices:**

(a) Since winning a no-hit game in the World Series is almost unheard of, the umpire was justified in calling that last pitch a strike regardless of where the ball was. The batter's team would have lost anyway.

(b) Big league umpires are very good and they very seldom make mistakes. The batter was wrong and the umpire right.

(c) The batter should not have protested the umpire's decision in the first place, much less go on to announce later that the call was wrong.

(d) It was all right for the batter to object to the third strike during the game but he should not have said anything later.

(e) It is possible the umpire was wrong but since he was retiring and the pitcher had done so well, he was justified in calling any kind of pitch, "Strike three."

**Remarks:** (See Table 1)

Choice (c), chosen by the jury and the non-athletes, seems to affirm faith in officials as authority in the game and fails to condone the practice of arguing with officials as is customarily practiced by many in baseball.

Choice (c) displays 88.8 per cent or clear majority agreement between the jurors. Only one other choice, (d), was chosen by any of the jurors.

The only student group agreeing, majority wise, in this situation was the non-athlete group.
A plurality agreement may be noted in all other student platforms although no clear majority is indicated by the percentage figures.

The male students split their percentage agreement between choices (c) and (d).

Physical education major students tended to choose choice (c) and (d) in nearly equal numbers.

The jury and student groups did not choose choice (a).

2. A spectator at a basketball game sees that an opponent is about to shoot a free throw. He stamps, whistles, and tries to distract the player.

Choices:

(a) If other spectators were trying to bother the player, you would also.

(b) Unless the officials stop you, you would try to bother the player.

(c) You would bother the player only if the score was close.

(d) You would not try to bother the player.

(e) If you were the only spectator trying to bother the player, you would stop.

Remarks: (See Table 2)

The opinion of jurors and students seems to condemn the present practice of bothering players who are taking free throws.

A clear per cent majority agreement between the jury and student groups is displayed on choice (d).

The jury was in complete agreement on choice (d).

The students did not completely agree on any one choice.

Greatest per cent agreement among student groups on choice (d) was shown by the Physical Education majors.

The lowest per cent agreement on choice (d) was shown by the non-physical education major group.
TABLE 1

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Agreement</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Agreement</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mna, Mw, Um</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. A baseball team that was losing a game, realizes that an opposing player was called safe at first on a trapped fly ball. The catcher of this team argues that the ball was not trapped but legally caught. The argument continues and the catcher calls the umpire names. The umpire finally evicts the catcher from the game.

**Choices:**

(a) No player, regardless of the team or side he is on, should argue with an official.

(b) The catcher should not argue. He should expect the person who trapped the ball or some other teammate to do this.

(c) It would be all right for a player or catcher to argue as long as he feels the umpire is wrong and he is right.

(d) He was justified in arguing with the umpire since this is customary in baseball, but he should not call him names.

(f) A player is justified in occasionally losing his temper to the extent of name-calling, if he feels he is right and the umpire wrong.

**Remarks:** (See Table 3)

The jury didn't reach a majority agreement but tended to choose, by plurality, choice (a). The jury apparently felt that players shouldn't dispute authority. The students clearly agree, with the exception of the non-physical education majors, that choice (a) indicates one shouldn't dispute the officials' decision. It is possible that the catcher's extreme behavior influenced the students' choice.

This situation, displaying the jury's lack of agreement as far as majority is concerned, is unusual. The majority of the incidents of this study in which the jury agrees outnumber those situations in which students reach majority agreement and the jury does not. In this student form A, situations 3, 4, 9, 16, 21, 50, 51, 42, and 65 are representative of this type of disagreement with the jury and agreement among students.

4. A baseball player complained about an interference penalty when he had not seen the play at all but merely wanted to save his team a penalty. The player who interfered openly admitted he had been wrong later on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) The player should argue if he had seen the play.

(b) If the player was certain the umpire was wrong then he is justified in arguing.

(c) This player's actions were all right, since it is customary to argue with baseball umpires.

(d) The player was wrong to argue. Players should not argue under any circumstances.

(e) It was useless for the player to argue since baseball umpires very seldom change their decisions.

Remarks: (See Table 4)

The Physical Education majors were the only group able to agree majority-wise on a choice. Their agreement seems to mean that arguing with an umpire in baseball is wrong. Speculation as to why the jury and other student groups could not agree may be the result of the custom of players to argue with officials.

The jury tended to uphold the right to argue when one notes a plurality agreement on choice (a). The jury seems to feel that the right to argue with authority is justified if the player knew what he was talking about or had seen the play.

The non-physical education majors tend to agree in plurality with the jurors' plurality choice.

All other student groups tended to agree with the physical education majors' choice in plurality.

No group, jury or student, selected (c).

All groups distributed choices over four of the possible five alternates.

6. In a championship Little League Baseball game, the score was tied. In the final inning, with the last team at bat and a runner on third base, the following incident occurred.

The third base coach, an adult, called to the rival team's pitcher and asked to see the ball. The young pitcher threw the ball to the coach, whereupon the coach stepped aside and let the ball go by. The runner on third base saw
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mde</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ball rolling away and ran home scoring the winning run. There is nothing in the rules which states that such action is against the rules.

**Choices:**

(a) The umpire should make the runner go back to third base even though he did not break a rule.

(b) The umpire should make the runner go back to third base, and speak to the adult about such tactics.

(c) The pitcher should have been smart enough not to do such a thing, therefore, what happened was all right.

(d) This is a perfectly good baseball maneuver and the adult coach was justified in using it.

(e) Such action is all right for older baseball players, but not to use on Little League players.

**Remarks:** (See Table 5)

The students seem to disagree with the actions that occurred. It is interesting to note that the students feel the official should handle the situation while the jurors place the blame on an individual player and seem to approve the tactic.

The juror's majority choice, choice (c), displays 50 per cent agreement.

Forty per cent of the jury chose choice (b).

No student group agreed in majority with the jury on choice (c).

Three student groups composed of athletes, non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors displayed a majority agreement on choice (b), the second highest choice chosen by the jury. Plurality was shown for choice (b) by the other student groups.

Four student groups, the athletes, men, physical education majors, and non-majors had some students choosing all of the choices. The other student groups had some students choosing four of the five choices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mnpe, Mn, Mw, Mj, Ma, Mn, Mpe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>95.3 92.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In little league baseball competition the coaches of some of the teams have been known to tell their players to participate in the "Stamp Act." The Stamp Act means that the players are to try to stamp on the umpire's feet whenever they can get close to the umpire. The stamping is a means of protesting an umpire's decision. Whenever a disputed decision occurs the coach calls out "Stamp Act" and the players carry out the plan.

**Choices:**

(a) Rather than argue, the players have an effective means of protesting the umpire's decision when they use the "Stamp Act."

(b) The coach has no business telling his players to do such a thing.

(c) The players should carry out the Stamp Act since the coach says this is a good maneuver.

(d) This action is all right to use as long as the players do not really hurt the umpire by stamping on him.

(e) This action is all right as long as the umpire knows why the players are doing the "Stamp Act." It's all part of the game.

**Remarks:** (See Table 6)

The example and advice given by coaches to players can definitely influence their behavior. The students and jurors clearly agree that this coach was quite wrong in this situation.

A clear per cent majority agreement is shown between the jury and all student groups on choice (b) of this situation.

No juror chose any other choice than (b).

Some students from every group chose some other choice than (b). The other choices were (a), (c), and (e). No student group made more than three choices.

The highest per cent agreement of the student groups with the jury was made by the athletes and the physical education majors student groups.
### TABLE 6

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mna, Mw.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwpe</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. Second baseman, according to the rules of the game, must step on or tag second base before throwing to first base in making a double play. The runner who runs to second base from first base is put out in this manner and if the baseman's throw reaches first base before the batter arrives, the batter is out and thus a double play (or two outs) is made. Some big-league second basemen have been known to deliberately pretend to touch or tag second base and throw to first base. This enables them to get more double plays.

Choices:

(a) Since it is the umpire's job to tell whether or not the second baseman touches the base before he throws, it is all right for the baseman to pretend to touch to cut down on his time if he can get away with it.

(b) The second baseman is breaking the rules and should not do this.

(c) This maneuver does not always help the baseman to get a double play so he might as well try it.

(d) This is all right for big league players to use, but school or minor league players should not use it.

Remarks: (See Table 7)

The students and jurors support rules, thus condemning the actions of the second baseman. Responsibility is placed in the hands of individuals not authority as represented by the umpires.

A clear majority agreement amongst the members of the jury is shown for choice (b). The only other choice chosen by a juror was choice (a).

Four of the six student groups agreed with jury's choice (b) in majority per cent. These groups were the athletes, men, women, and physical education majors.

The non-athletes and non-physical education majors did not display majority per cent agreement with the jury's choice.

All student groups showed a plurality of choice on choice (a).

No group questioned chose choice (e).

Some members of four student groups, the non-athletes, women, men, and non-majors chose four choices.
### TABLE 7

**PER CENT COMPARISON: ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Ma, Mw, Mn, Mpe</td>
<td>(a) 32.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 64.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) 2.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) 2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. A baseball player trapped a fly ball between the ground and his glove in what appeared to be a spectacular catch. Such action is called "trapping" and is against the rules. The player wasn't sure the umpire saw him.

**Choices:**

(a) The player should have immediately confessed that he illegally trapped the ball.

(b) The player should wait for the umpire's decision and abide by it.

(c) If the umpire ruled his catch illegal, he should disagree on the grounds that he felt that the umpire could not see the play.

(d) If the umpire asks him if he trapped the ball he should say he did.

**Remarks:** (See Table 8)

The jury failed to agree in majority per cent but tended to choose choice (a). In opposition to the jury, two student groups were able to agree upon choice (b). The students seem to feel that official's decisions in baseball should remain unquestioned. The other student groups tended to agree in plurality with this selection.

The jury seems to want to place the responsibility for a decision upon the player rather than the umpire or authority. Some of the athletes in fairly large per cent agree with the jury on this choice. Other jurors may be resorting to authority by choosing (b).

Three student groups made choices from all four possibilities. The jury, non-athletes, women, men and physical education majors confined their choices to three of the four possibilities.

10. In a baseball game, the coach instructs the batter to bunt in order to give his teammate a chance to advance from first to second base. Instead of bunting, the batter takes a full swing at the ball. He misses the ball but his teammate runs safely to second. The coach tells the batter he should have followed instructions but the batter says it does not matter since the runner arrived at second base safely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) The coach was justified in objecting to the batter not following instructions.

(b) The batter was correct in trying to hit, rather than bunt, if he felt he might be able to hit the ball.

(c) The batter was displaying poor teamwork in not following instructions.

(d) Coaches can make mistakes in giving bunting instructions so if the batter saw his chance to get a hit he should have tried.

(e) Since the runner arrived safely at second base the coach should not have said anything.

Remarks: (See Table 9)

The choice of (a) and (c) by students and jurors may indicate that teamwork is thought to be essential and that the coaches have a right to expect loyalty and cooperation from players.

A slight majority agreement of 55 per cent is displayed by the jury for choice (a). Fifty per cent of the jury chose (c).

Two student groups agreed in majority with the jury. These groups were the men and physical education majors.

The non-athletes had a majority per cent agreement on choice (c) but did not agree with the jury's majority selection.

The athletes, non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors showed a plurality agreement with the jury's majority choice.

Plurality agreement was also displayed with the jury's second highest per cent choice by the athletes, women, men, physical education majors, and non-physical education majors.

Greater diversification of choice was displayed by the women since some chose (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 1, Mpe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 1, Mpe</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. In a high school state championship basketball tournament, one team lost by one point on a free throw. The coach of the losing team violently protested the foul. When the defeated team returned home the coach freely protested and criticized the foul in front of students, teachers, and townspeople.

**Choices:**

(a) The coach was justified in his actions if he genuinely disagreed with the official's decision.

(b) The coach should not have protested the foul at home, and after the game, but only at the time the foul was called.

(c) The coach should have protested in front of his players at the time of the foul, not in front of others and after the game.

(d) The coach should not have protested against the foul under any circumstances.

**Remarks:** (See Table 10)

Two groups, jurors and non-athletes, seem to approve of a coach disputing an official's decision under this situation's circumstances. Where and when this disagreement takes place is important.

Only one group of students believed a coach shouldn't dispute authority.

A majority agreement was reached by the jury on choice (b). Other choices chosen by the minority of the jurors were (c) and (d).

The only student group agreeing in per cent majority with the jury was the non-athletes.

The physical education student group displayed a majority per cent agreement for choice (d), thus disagreeing with the jury's choice.

The athletes showed a plurality in favor of choice (d) as did the women student group.

Plurality agreement with the jury's choice was displayed by the non-physical education major group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi, Ma, Mw, Km, Mpe</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pitcher on a baseball team has pitched a no-hit game up to the last inning. With two batters out, the third batter hits a ground ball to the second baseman. The second baseman momentarily fumbles the ball and the runner is safe at first base. The scorer credits the runner as safe on a hit, not on an error. The scorers make these decisions and according to the rules are supposed to do so.

Choices:

(a) The scorer is not correct and the umpire should make him change the record.

(b) Since the pitcher might have been credited with a no-hit game except for the scorer's decision, the scorer's record should be changed.

(c) The scorer's decision should stand since he is the authority on such matters.

(d) The important thing is that the player was not put out. The scorer's decision should not be disputed. Individual records are not as important as the team's play or efforts.

(e) The pitcher should persuade the second baseman to confess his error and thus influence the scorer's decision.

(f) The second baseman should confess his error to the scorer in hopes that the scorer will change his decision.

Remarks:  (See Table 11)

Disputing authority, represented by the scorer, is not recognized as good practice. Individual records seem unimportant, at least in terms of this situation.

The jury demonstrates a clear per cent majority agreement for choice (c). Some jurors chose selection (a), (d), (e), and (f).

Four student groups agreed in per cent majority with the jury's choice. These groups were the athletes, women, men, and physical education majors.

The other student groups, non-athletes and non-majors, agreed in plurality but not majority with the jury's choice (c).

Three student groups had students who chose all choices. These groups were the non-athletes and non-physical education majors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2, Mne</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Team A and team B are tied in the final quarter of a basketball game. A player on team B is awarded a free throw. As he steps up to shoot the referee notices that the net on the basket is caught on the rim. The referee takes the ball, flips it through the basket and frees the net. The scorekeeper looks up, sees the ball go through, and gives team B's point. Actually, the official, not the team B player shot the goal.

The game continues and team B wins by one point. The officials sign the score book but team A's score book says the game is tied. Spectators for team A says that the officials were wrong. Team B supporters disagree.

Choices:

(a) The case should have been appealed to a higher authority and the game replayed.

(b) Since the referee must depend on the scorekeeper and could not remember the situation, he had no choice but to sign the book and consider the game finished.

(c) The referee and scorekeeper should not be allowed to officiate or score any more games.

(d) Team B should have noticed that the score was incorrect and should offer to replay the game.

(e) Overtime play would have solved the situation and should have been allowed.

(f) Team B should have realized they had won illegally and the game should have been tied. They should have offered to play an overtime period.

Remarks: (See Table 12)

The jury seems to have no difficulty in agreeing that the responsibility for winning or losing by fair or unfair means rests with the teams themselves. The students tend to agree with the jury but also seem to want to place some responsibility for this mix-up in the hands of the officials.

The jury reached a clear cut majority per cent agreement on choice (f). A few jurors chose (a) and some selected choice (d) and (e).

The student groups didn't agree in per cent majority with the jury nor could they agree on any one choice. A plurality or tendency to agree with the jury's choice was demonstrated by all student groups with the women showing the highest plurality.
**TABLE 12**

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. An official in a basketball game called an out-of-bounds ball in favor of one team. As the official started to award the ball the crowd yelled so hard he thought he might have called the play incorrectly. He asked the player whom he thought touched the ball last whether he had or not. The boy said he had touched the ball.

Choices:

(a) The official should have stuck to his decision regardless of the crowd's yelling.

(b) The official did the correct thing in asking the player.

(c) The official should not display uncertainty by asking the player.

(d) The official, by asking the player, showed he was not a good official.

(e) The official, by asking the player, showed he let the crowd's feeling influence his decision.

Remarks: (See Table 13)

The only student group not reaching a majority agreement on choice (a) was the non-athletes. The jury also failed to reach a majority agreement.

The students may be indicating that an official should ignore the crowd or they may feel that since the official is the authority he need not pay attention to outside influences.

The jury tended to choose (b) which seems to indicate that the official, authority, can be questioned or that when in doubt the best thing may be to change or reconsider a decision.

None of the groups chose (d) and all groups distributed choices over four possibilities.

17. A basketball team is going to play another team whose scorer is suspected to have failed to keep the game's records fairly.

The visiting team hear that their opponents' scorer failed to charge fouls to the proper players and credited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mnpe, Mn, Mw, Mm, Mpe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fouls of a star player to substitutes or lesser players in order to avoid the disqualification of the "star."

Officials have been unaware of the scorer's errors. The visiting team's players do not want to acknowledge their own fouls by raising their hands because they think the scorer will be purposefully inaccurate.

**Choices:**

(a) The coach should refuse to let his team play the opponent's team unless they change the scorer.

(b) The team should report the matter to the officials so the officials can check closely on the score book.

(c) The coach should tell his players to raise their hands, should report the matter to the officials, and should insist on a different scorer.

(d) The coach should tell his players not to raise their hands and force the officials to investigate the scoring when they discover why his players are not claiming their fouls.

(e) The coach should instruct his scorer to check on the other scorer. If the scorer makes a mistake then he should notify the officials and let them handle the matter.

**Remarks:** (See Table 14)

Apparently the jurors believe that the coach has a responsibility in preparing for anticipated difficulties. Supposedly legal steps should be taken by using a scorer and appealing to the officials for a decision. The jurors may believe that to anticipate trouble is wrong and the coach should wait for proof before acting.

Some students seem to want to do something before the game gets under way. Other students tend to agree with the jury.

The jury showed majority agreement on choice (e). The only other choice chosen by the jury was (b).

No student group agreed in per cent majority with the jury.

A plurality of agreement of the student groups agreed with the jury's majority choice.
Plurality agreement of student groups was also found with the jury's second choice, choice (b).

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

Choices:

(a) Players should use such plays. The coaches are clever to direct their players in such fashion.

(b) Players who disagree with this type of play may learn them if their coach so directs but should not use such plays.

(c) Players and coaches should agree to teach or use these plays.

(d) Players should refuse to play for coaches who insist they use such plays.

(e) The players should tell their coaches they don't approve of such plays but use them if he insists.

(f) Rules should be devised to outlaw such plays.

(g) Officials, players, and coaches should agree not to use such plays.

Remarks: (See Table 15)

Only the jury seems to condemn plays which cause fouls. It is possible that students, perhaps closer to the game from the standpoint of playing, in an era where this practice occurs tend to go along with what is customary. This may account for their inability to reach a decisive choice.

A clear cut majority agreement is displayed on choice (g) by the jury. Other choices selected in minority numbers by the jury were (a), (c), and (f).

No student group agreed majority-wise with the jury. A plurality of agreement with choice (g) was displayed by all student groups. The highest plurality demonstrated was by the women and physical education majors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three student groups, athletes, men, and physical education majors, had some members choosing choices (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g). The other student groups chose six of the seven available choices.

20. The crowd booed their basketball coach when he removed a player from the game. The crowd showed the coach, by their actions, that they wanted the player back in the game. After the game, the coach announced to the papers that he was justified in removing the player from the game since it was for the player's own protection.

Choices:

(a) The crowd has a right to disagree with the coach.

(b) The crowd should leave the decisions to the coach and refrain from criticizing.

(c) The crowd has a right to disagree but should not boo.

(d) The crowd was right in disagreeing and booing.

(e) The coach knows more about the game then the crowd so the crowd should realize this and stop their criticisms.

(f) The crowd's action is not unusual, and is unimportant in its effect on players or coaches.

Remarks: (See Table 16)

Some students tend to agree with the jury. The jury seems to feel that the coach should make decisions without the spectators' interference. The inability of students to agree with the jury may indicate they agree with a practice that seems to be a part of a present custom.

The jury shows a clear cut majority per cent agreement on choice (b). Some jurors chose choices (a), (d), and (e).

No student group agreed with the jury as far as a majority per cent is concerned. A plurality with the jury's choice is shown by student groups of non-athletes, women, and physical education majors.

The athletes show a plurality agreement on choice (d).

The non-physical education majors display a plurality agreement on choice (e).

Two groups, women and non-physical education majors, had some students choosing all choices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 15
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS
### Table 16

**Per Cent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. In a basketball game, the coach observed one of his player's stepping on the foot of an opponent while at the free throw line. The coach later asked the player why he did such a thing. The player said he was trying to prevent his opponent from jumping.

**Choices:**

(a) The coach should have let the matter drop since this is a pretty good thing to do.

(b) The play was clever but should not have been so obvious that his coach saw him.

(c) The coach should not say anything to the player but wait for officials to catch him.

(d) The coach should tell the officials what his player is doing so that they can catch him.

(e) The coach was right to ask the player and since the player was honest in his reply, the coach should warn him not to do such a thing again.

(f) The coach should have removed the player from the game.

**Remarks:** (See Table 17)

Opposite displays of opinion between jury and students were shown on this situation. The students agreed on choice (e), perhaps indicating the right of the coach to question a player, recognizing the player's true reply, and giving him another chance.

The jury favored more drastic action by tending to pick, plurality-wise, choice (d). The coach seems to be duty bound to inform the authority to mete out discipline. The jury may feel the players' actions are apparent, wrong, and more drastic action was needed.

Some jurors tended to agree with the students.

Two student groups distributed choices over all six selections. The non-athletes confined their choices to three possibilities while the women, physical education, and non-physical education majors chose from four possibilities.

22. A spectacular basketball official dramatized every decision with actions which clearly explained his calls to the crowd. The crowd, as a whole, accepted his decisions without booing and yelling. Some coaches feel this type of officiating is good, especially for its effect on the crowd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mn, Mw, Mm,</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mmp</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) A good official should not find it necessary to appeal to the crowd with dramatic gestures.

(b) An official should not find it necessary to appeal to the crowd, since the spectators' feelings are not important.

(c) An official who dramatizes his calls may tend to take the game away from the players.

(d) Dramatic gestures make the official seem to be ridiculous. He is there to see that the rules of the game are followed, nothing more.

(e) The coaches, who feel this kind of officiating is good, are correct.

Remarks: (See Table 18)

The jurors' choice indicates officials need not be dramatic nor do they need to resort to crowd appeal.

Three student groups had members who chose one of all of the possible choices.

The jury agreed in majority with choice (a). A plurality of jurors chose choice (e). Some jurors selected (c) and (d).

No student group agreed in majority per cent with the jury.

The athletes agreed in majority per cent with choice (d), but not with the jury.

The non-physical education major student group had a majority agreement on choice (e).

A plurality of non-athletes agreed with choice (d) as did the women, men, and physical education majors on choice (e).

23. A basketball rule states that a captain of a team is the only player who may talk to an official, request time-out, or ask for permission to leave the court. Some players and coaches feel that if they constantly complain of being fouled when no foul occurred eventually they will gain an advantage by directing the attention of the officials to the opponents. It is possible this might work with some officials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mape</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) Complaining about actual fouls is all right but not non-existent fouls.
(b) This particular practice influences only a few officials, probably poor ones, therefore such action is all right.
(c) This is a good thing to do because it may help to determine which officials are good and which are not.
(d) This action is not in the spirit nor within the rules of the game and should not be practiced.
(e) Since this action is a violation of the rules, the officials should stop this practice and enforce the rule.

Remarks: (See Table 19)

The practice of complaining to officials about fouls was condemned by jurors and students by their majority agreement on choice (d). The non-physical education majors didn't reach a majority but indicated plurality agreement with the others.

The jurors chose selections from four of the five possibilities as did all of the students except the athletes and non-physical education majors. These two groups distributed selections over all of the possibilities.

The highest per cent agreement was displayed by the physical education majors. The lowest per cent majority was shown by the non-athletes.

24. A star forward on a basketball team is consistently out-scoring the opponents. He is guarded by a player considerably shorter than he. The shorter player discovers he can bother and sometimes prevent the star player from shooting if he holds onto his belt when he thinks the official does not see him.

Choices:

(a) This is a foul and the shorter player should be penalized by the official. If the official does not see him foul he might as well get away with it.
(b) The star forward should report this opponent's action to the official.
(c) The shorter guard should not take unfair advantage of his opponent even though his team is losing.
TABLE 19

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn, Mpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) This is a clever maneuver and an effective measure for guarding such a tall player.

(e) The star player should try to do something to the shorter guard in order to get even.

Remarks: (See Table 20)

Seventy per cent of the jurors and physical education majors showed a majority agreement on choice (c). They condemned the action of the guard who was deliberately fouling in spite of height disadvantage or discrepancy in score.

A slight tendency may be noted in the above results to choose selection (b) which may seem to indicate that players should report fouls to officials. Or it may be that appeal to authority is the best solution. Some women students and non-physical education majors supported, in plurality per cent, this choice.

A plurality voted for choice (c) in groups composed of athletes, non-athletes, women, and men.

The non-physical education group displayed plurality agreement on choice (b).

Three groups composed of athletes, men, and non-physical education majors distributed their answers among all five choices. The jury confined their selections to three possibilities.

25. You are a member of a bowling team. Your teammate steps over the foul line and since the electric eye is not working the foul is not noticed by your opponents or by your teammate. You, as a member of the bowling team should -

Choices:

(a) Tell your teammate that he fouled and leave it up to him whether to report the foul or not.

(b) Inform the scorekeeper of the foul.

(c) Ignore the foul since it is the responsibility of the owner of the bowling alley to keep the electric eye in working order.

(d) Do nothing about the foul.

(e) Tell your teammate that he fouled, wait to see if he reports it, and if he doesn't, report it yourself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1, Mpa</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 21)

Responsibility in bowling for fouls seems to rest directly in the hands of individuals. Teammates share responsibility for directing attention to fouls. All groups, either by majority or plurality per cent, indicate this view by their selection of choice (a).

The jury agreed majority-wise on choice (a). Other jurors selected choices (b) and (d).

Three student groups agreed in majority per cent with the jury on choice (a). These groups were the non-athletes, women and physical education majors.

The athletes, men, and non-physical education major student groups displayed a plurality agreement with choice (a) and the jury.

The athletes, women, men, physical education majors, and non-physical education majors tended to have a number of students choosing choice (e).

Four student groups' membership had some who chose all five choices. These groups were the athletes, women, men, and non-physical education majors.

26. One team is ready to bowl. The bowlers of this team get up and bowl whenever the pins are set. The other team deliberately stalls and waits around attempting to annoy their opponents. What would you do in this situation?

Choices:

(a) This would not bother you in bowling so it is all right for the other team to stall.

(b) You should not stall since there may be other people or teams waiting to bowl.

(c) This is a perfectly good bowling tactic to use.

(d) You don't mind if other teams stall but you would not wish your team to do so.

(e) You would tell the other team to stop stalling.

(f) This is poor sportsmanship and does not reflect the spirit of competition in any way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>M.1, Mna, Mw, Mpe</em></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 22)

Stalling in bowling is condemned in this selection by the agreement of jurors and four student groups. Keeping other teams waiting seems to be the motive or reason for condemning this practice by the plurality per cent agreement of the non-athletes. The reason for condemning this practice, as chosen by the majority, is not clear due to the need for interpretation of "spirit of competition."

The jury displayed majority per cent agreement on choice (f). A number of jurors chose (b) and some chose (d) and (e).

The athletes, women, men, and physical education majors agree majority-wise with the jury. A plurality agreement was reached by the two groups, namely the non-athletes and the non-physical education majors, on the same selection.

A high percentage of non-athletes and women chose choice (b).

Three groups of students chose (a) from six answers. These groups were the athletes, women, and non-physical education majors. The jury selected choices from four possibilities.

27. Some boxers have gained reputations as "dirty" fighters. These fighters have been known to hit the opponent when coming out of a clinch, to hit the opponent with their elbows, and on occasion to hit below the belt. They usually fight "dirty" until the official warns them. In the meantime, they hope that they have weakened their opponent. The fighters know they may lose points, the round, or the bout if they continue.

Choices:

(a) Such a fighter should be immediately penalized, rather than warned.

(b) This type of fighting is customary and should be expected.

(c) Repetition, in a series of fights, of this type of fighting should result in suspension.

(d) The opponents should fight back in the same fashion in order to weaken the "dirty" fighter.

(e) More officials, better rules, and stiffer penalties should be put into force to overcome this situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 23)

The jury and women students agreed that some type of stiffer penalty or enforcement is needed in this situation since choices (c) and (e) offer such possibilities. The other groups tended to agree with the need for stiffer penalties as shown by plurality agreements on (a), (c), and (e). Perhaps the choices in this situation offer too many similar solutions and may account for the lack of clear cut majority agreement.

Fifty per cent of the jury agreed with choice (e). The second highest per cent agreement was on choice (a). One juror chose (b) and four chose (c).

All student groups except one failed to reach a majority agreement on any choice and didn't agree with the jury. The women chose (c) displaying a 51.0 per cent agreement.

Plurality of agreement on choice (c) was displayed by the non-athletes and non-physical education majors.

The men's group displayed a plurality on choice (e), the same choice chosen by the jury.

The physical education majors divided their plurality opinions between choices (a) and (e) as did the athletes between choices (c) and (e).

26. In women's field hockey tournaments it is customary to select "all-star" teams. The coaches of the participating teams or designated persons, chosen by the teams, select the players. In one instance a "selector" who was coach or one of the teams succeeded in placing five or six of her own players on the chosen eleven. It seemed obvious to others attending the tournament that the coach showed favoritism and that other - more deserving players should have been chosen.

Choices:

(a) This selector may have believed her players were better, therefore her actions were justified.

(b) The system of selecting should be done by people not connected with the teams in any way, but who are familiar with the game.

(c) If it seemed the selector was unfair this person should not be allowed to select again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mw</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VJ</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Since each participating team is allowed a representative selector, the selection must have been fair. Attending persons should not disagree.

(e) Some different method of selection should be used so there would be no criticism.

Remarks: (See Table 24)

In order to avoid favoritism, criticism, and neglect the selection of deserving players, the jurors, men, and non-physical education majors favor a different selection system in this situation. Other groups tend to agree. These groups seem to be willing to condemn the coach's selections under the terms of the situation as it is stated.

Fifty-five per cent majority agreement was demonstrated by the jury on choice (b). Their second highest per cent agreement was on choice (d) with some jurors choosing (e).

The men and non-physical education groups agreed in majority per cent with the jury's choice. A plurality agreement was displayed by all other groups with this choice.

All student groups had some persons answering all of the choices.

The women's group had a fairly high plurality agreement on choice (d) as compared to the other student groups.

29. A field hockey player hit her opponent on the shins just as she was about to receive a pass from a teammate. The player who hit the opponent's shins intercepted the pass and went on to score. It is against the rules to hit a player with your stick but the official did not see the foul.

Choices:

(a) If the official did not see the foul the player need not confess she fouled.

(b) The player should not have broken a rule. She should have indicated she fouled.

(c) The opponent should wait for a chance to pay the player back and hit her in the shins.

(d) Not all officials see all the fouls which may occur. Nothing need be done. If the player should foul again in the same fashion, she will probably be caught.
### Table 24

Per Cent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. I., Mw., Nope</em></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) If the teammates of this player realized she fouled they should tell the officials.

Remarks:  (See Table 25)

The official was absolved of blame in not seeing the foul and the player's action was condemned. These facts are indicated by the majority and plurality per cent agreements reached on selections (b) and (d). More pronounced differences seem to be needed in the statement of these choices and may account for the divergence of opinion and lack of majority agreement.

The jury was the only group to reach a majority agreement. They selected choice (b). The rest of the jury divided their choices between choices (a) and (d).

All student groups agreed plurality-wise with the jury except the men's and non-physical education student groups. The men's group displayed plurality agreement on choice (d) with the non-physical education majors splitting their plurality between choices (b) and (d).

None of the groups selected choice (c).

All student groups divided their choices between selections (a), (b), (d), and (e).

30. In field hockey a player is permitted to hit the ball with her stick as hard as she wishes, as long as she does not hit the ball directly into an opponent. Sometimes a player hits when an opponent is very close. She hits the ball away and not at the opponent but in swinging the stick causes the opponent to duck or dodge to keep from being hit. This action is not illegal as long as the stick is not raised above the shoulders. Some players will not swing at the ball when an opponent is close but others concentrate on hitting the ball and expect the opponent to get out of the way of the stick.

Choices:

(a) Since there is no rule against this action, players are justified.

(b) Players who swing at the ball when an opponent is standing close to the stick should be penalized.

(c) If the players have not the nerve to play under such circumstances they should not participate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Players should be coached to use and exercise caution in avoiding this type of play. It is better to lose the ball than to endanger an opponent.

(e) The object of the game is to get the ball. The first player to reach the ball has the right to do what she wishes.

Remarks: (See Table 26)

Actions that have become customary and which endanger opponents are condemned by jurors and students. Rules of the game seem to be unnecessary nor does the object of the game affect their agreement on such procedures.

The jurors reached majority per cent agreement on choice (d). Only one juror chose any other choice and that was (c).

All the student groups, except the non-physical education majors, agreed in majority per cent with the jury's selection. This non-major group displayed plurality agreement with the jury.

All but two student groups, the non-athletes and the physical education majors, distributed their selections over all the choices. These two groups distributed their selections over four, rather than five.

31. A well-known golfer is competing in an important match. The spectators know this golfer is easily bothered by noise such as rattling papers, coughing, etc. In the finals this golfer meets the home course's professional. The spectator's sympathies are with the home-town player. At a critical point on the last hole one of the spectators coughs just as the well-known golfer puts. He misses his putt and the home-town golfer wins, much to the well-known golfer's chagrin.

Choices:

(a) The spectator was clever since he helped the favorite win.

(b) The spectator should muffle his cough, he should allow the home-town player a chance to win by skill not by unfair advantage.

(c) The well-known golfer should overcome this weakness. The more people bother him the sooner he can get over this habit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn, Mpe, Mj,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns, Npe, Mw</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) The well-known golfer should not object or feel badly since he knows he has this weakness.

Remarks: (See Table 27)

Regardless of the advantage, favoritism, or desire for an individual to succeed, this spectator's action was condemned by all groups.

The jury and student groups agree in majority per cent on choice (b).

Four student groups had some who chose one of all of the four available choices. These groups were the athletes, women, men and non-physical education majors.

The other two groups divided their choices among selections (b), (c), and (d).

The highest majority agreement by any one student group was made by the non-athletes. The second highest per cent agreement was made by the men. The third highest by women, physical education majors, and non-physical education majors.

The lowest per cent agreement was displayed by the athletes.

32. In field hockey, opponents may guard but not closely enough to make body contact. If a player should push or contact his opponent a foul may be called. It is called if the person who is pushed or impeded cannot get to the ball. It is not called if, in spite of the pushing, the player still gets the ball. Officials watch the players involved with the ball but cannot watch others at the same time. Some players have been known to intentionally push, crowd, and harass their opponents whenever the ball is on the other side of the field.

Choices:

(a) There should be enough officials or a designated official to watch for the pushing when it occurs in another part of the field.

(b) As long as the foul is called because of inability to get the ball, the rest of the pushing can be ignored.

(c) The opponents should retaliate in order to get even with the pusher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mmpe, Mj, Mm, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Players who participate in this practice will eventually be caught fouling a player who is trying for the ball.

(e) This is poor practice. Players who do this concentrate too much on pushing and neglect good play.

Remarks: (See Table 28)

Complete majority agreement by all groups places the responsibility for fouls on individuals rather than the officials or authority in this situation.

Majority agreement is displayed by the jury and all student groups on choice (e). The second highest choice, percentage-wise, made by the jury was choice (a).

The highest per cent agreement with the jury's choice was made by the athletes and physical education major groups. The men's student group was second highest, the non-physical education group slightly lower than the women's score for the third highest choice, and the non-athletes the lowest per cent.

All groups tended to distribute choices between three selections except the men and non-physical education majors who selected from four possibilities.

35. A coach of a college football team taught the end player to use his knee on the head of the opposing backfield player. He was to use this whenever the opponent was trying to prevent the end tackling the kicker. After the end had used this maneuver several times the opposing blocker would become afraid of the end and let him by. The end player could never bring himself to follow his coach's instructions.

It is possible that players' knees can come in contact with an opponent's head during blocks, tackles, or evasive action; however, if this is done deliberately the player could be penalized.

(a) Such an action in football is unnecessary. The coach who advised, and the player who would execute such action were wrong.

(b) This action would be all right as long as the blocker is not injured.

(c) The end player was right not to follow his coach's instructions.

(d) The end player should follow his coach's instructions even though he felt the instructions were wrong.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) This is a perfectly good maneuver to use in football. The coach was right in advising it and the player wrong not to do it.

Remarks: (See Table 29)

By virtue of all groups agreeing on choice (a) the coach was condemned for his advice. This action was deemed unnecessary, without qualification, as to the dangers involved or to the proposed necessity of a player following his coach's instructions.

Majority per cent agreement was found between the jury and all the student groups on choice (a). The jury made only one other choice, choice (c).

The highest per cent agreement with the jury was made by the physical education major student group. The second highest was made by the men. The non-athletes were third highest, the athletes were fourth, the women fifth, and the non-physical education majors the lowest.

The athletes, women, and men's groups distributed their selections over all of the five choices. The non-athletes and non-physical education majors selected from only three choices, choices (a), (b), and (c). The women made choices from (a), (b), (c), and (d).

36. An outstanding All-American football player was known for his rough, tough play. When he started to tackle or block an opponent he never stopped even though the opponents might have handed the ball or they were obviously out of the play. When asked why he played this way he expressed the opinion that once he started for a player he could not stop. If he stopped suddenly he might injure himself.

Choices:

(a) Little regard for opponents made him an outstanding player. Those who play football should expect such action from opponents.

(b) The All-American was right to avoid injury to himself.

(c) The All-American should be penalized for such roughness especially when the person tackled or blocked was not involved in the play.

(d) To play roughly is bad enough, but to out-and-out admit it was because he was protecting himself, is even worse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) This play is not a true All-American. Good players would consider their opponent's safety as well as personal safety. He should be able to stop.

Remarks: (See Table 30)

Complete majority agreement may be noted on the choices in this situation. The jurors believe the All-American has no right to avoid injury to himself if it may affect the safety of others. The students agreed and felt his conduct was wrong.

The jury agreed majority-wise on choice (e). Some of the jurors chose (c) and (d) and one juror chose (a).

All of the student groups agreed in majority per cent with the jury.

Distribution of choices among all five possibilities is displayed by the men and non-physical education major groups. Two others, athletes and women, distributed choices over four possibilities.

The physical education majors selected only two choices, choice (c) and (e).

38. Before face masks on football helmets were legalized by the rules, a team might wear them if the other team consented. Team A was playing team B. Team B's coach had consented to allow team A to wear masks. At half time the score was 21 to 0 in favor of team A. Team B's coach protested the masks. Team B's coach heckled the officials all through the second half.

Choices:

(a) Team B's coach had a right to protest since his team was losing.

(b) Team B's coach had no right to protest since he had already consented to team A wearing masks.

(c) The coach was correct in protesting but not heckling the officials during the second half.

(d) The officials should have allowed team B's protest and had team A remove the masks the second half.

(e) Team B should have put on masks to even their chances, rather than protest team A's wearing them.
### TABLE 30

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Mpe, Mnpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mj, Mpe, Mnpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm
Remarks: (See Table 31)

The jurors and students in agreeing on choice (b) condemned the coach's actions in this situation. No allowance was made for his actions from the standpoint of score, the right to change his mind, or the coach's right to protest. These groups uphold the authority of the rules and the officials.

All groups, jury and students, reached a majority percent agreement on choice (b). The jury was unanimous in its choice.

The physical education majors displayed the highest percent among student groups. The athletes were second and the women and men following in that order. The lowest agreement, percentage-wise, was shown by the non-athletes and the non-physical education majors.

Five of the six student groups distributed their choices over four possibilities. The men distributed their choices over five.

39. A coach of a football team in the pre-game huddle was known to have his players pray for their opponents and themselves to remain free from injury. He then ended the prayer and told the team to "Give 'Em Hell!"

Choices:

(a) The prayer was appropriate but not the final remark.
(b) The prayer was inappropriate as well as the coach's final statement.
(c) The coach's actions are satisfactory.
(d) The coach should confine his remarks to instructions for playing the game and encourage them but not use a prayer, nor "hell."

Remarks: (See Table 32)

In this situation the jurors agreed that prayers are inappropriate and disagree with the coach's actions. Two student groups agreed that prayers are appropriate but objected to the coach's final remark. Disagreement may be due to age differences between groups. The younger group may have become accustomed to the use of prayers on the playing fields, having been brought up in an era where this practice is commonly followed.
TABLE 31

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Kpe, Knpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No student majority per cent agreement was reached with the jury's majority choice, choice (d). The jurors tended to choose (b) as second choice and some selected (a). One juror selected (c).

A majority of the non-athletes and men students agreed percentage-wise on choice (a).

A plurality of the other groups disagreed with the jury's choice but tended to agree upon choice (a).

All groups, except the non-athletes, distributed their choices over all four selections.

The athletes, women, and physical education majors tended to have more students agreeing with choice (d), selected by the jury, than other student groups.

40. In a football game a team threw a long forward pass down the field to a player who caught it and ran on for a touchdown. The official threw a marker down on the field for a foul and chased the player down the field. The official asked the player, "Were you in the line of scrimmage on that play?" If the player answers "yes" he will be declared an ineligible pass receiver. If the player says "no" the touchdown will count. The player said "yes," the touchdown was nullified, and his team was penalized. Ordinarily the officials can tell who is playing in the line and who is not but it is possible to become confused.

Choices:

(a) The official has no right to ask the player where he played. As the official, he should know without asking.

(b) The official was admitting he was not sure by asking the player. It was the only thing he could do.

(c) The official should have consulted the other officials and made a decision without asking the player.

(d) If the official was not sure he should not ask the player, and should give the team the benefit of the doubt and allow the touchdown.

(e) The official should not ask but simply penalize since there was some doubt in his mind.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mja, Mm</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 33)

Jurors and students seem to feel that players should not be "put-on-the-spot" by officials as long as it is the officials' responsibility to enforce rules. The rule is not questioned but the officials are criticized. When the individual's responsibility is in doubt there seems to be an appeal to authority.

Five of the six student groups agreed in majority percent with the jury's choice, choice (c). The only other choice chosen by the jury was (b).

The student group, non-physical education majors, failed to reach a majority on choice (c) but did reach a plurality.

The second highest choice was (a), reached by athletes, men, and physical education majors.

All student groups, except the physical education majors, displayed greater diversity of choice by choosing all five choices.

The majors distributed their selections over four.

A football player had a chronically bad ankle. This fact had been publicized. During a game this player was playing with his ankle heavily taped. An opponent tackled this player and after the whistle blew obviously twisted this player's bad ankle. The injured player was removed from the game. A penalty was called on the tackler's team but the tackler remained in the ball game.

Choices:

(a) The player with the bad ankle should not have been in the game.

(b) The tackler was justified in twisting the opponent's ankle.

(c) The team which had the injured player should get back at the tackler later on in the game.

(d) The penalty against the tackler's team was all that was necessary under the circumstances.

(e) The officials, since they were aware of the situation, should have put the player out of the game.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 34)

The jury and students seem to have agreed that the officials should have penalized the tackler by removing him from the game. It may be noted that no one believed, at least as to majority opinion, that a player who might be injured should be kept out of the game. The responsibility was placed on the officials, not the coach who allowed the player to participate.

None of the groups condoned the tackler's right to twist his opponent's ankle.

The highest per cent student agreement was reached by the non-physical education majors. The second highest per cent agreement was made by the non-athletes. The least highest score was made by the physical education major student group.

The jury divided choices over three possibilities and the students over four.

42. During a football game, the quarterback of a college team was eligible to win recognition as the player who completed the most passes. The opposing team had a star passer who also was eligible for this honor. The quarterback felt his team could beat the others if he called running plays. He proceeded to call these and their team won. The opponent's passer won the record, since he continued to pass.

Choices:

(a) The quarterback should have passed enough to win the record even though his team might have lost.

(b) The quarterback's team or coach should have insisted he pass so that he could win the record.

(c) The quarterback did the right thing in not passing. He sacrificed his record for the sake of the team.

(d) The quarterback could have called enough pass plays to win the record just as long as his team won.

(e) He should call pass plays and running plays as needed to win the game.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw,</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mnpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 35)

Team games foster team spirit and individual rights must be submerged for the good of all. This seems to be the expression of opinion of the majority of students and jurors in this situation. The jurors further indicate, by selection of choice (e) and splitting their agreement, that players should concentrate on the game and winning rather than individual edification or glory.

The jury displayed a majority per cent agreement split between choices (c) and (e). No other selections were made by this group.

The students agreed with the jury's choice (c) in majority per cent. The next highest per cent plurality shown by the students agreed with the jury's other choice, selection (d).

Three student groups divided their choices over four of five answers. The non-athletes and women chose three and the physical education majors chose only two answers, (c) and (e), the same as the jury.

43. A young girl playing in her first golf tournament hits her ball into the shallow part of the creek. She starts to move the ball and take the penalty but her older, more experienced opponent says she can't do this and she must play the ball from where it lies. The younger player thinks the older player must be right since she is more experienced so she tries to play the ball from the spot in the creek. She adds several strokes to her score before realizing it is impossible to play. By this time she has taken too many strokes and is defeated.

Choices:

(a) The younger girl should know her rules well enough so that she would not have to accept her opponent's advice.

(b) The opponent taught the younger player a good lesson. Hereafter the younger player will know her rules.

(c) The younger girl, by listening to her opponent's advice, received what she deserved.

(d) The older player deliberately falsified the rules, and she was wrong to do such a thing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill, Hpe, Mnpe, Lj.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Hna, Mw</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since there was some disagreement she should send for the tournament official.

Remarks: (See Table 36)

The jury places the responsibility for all facets of this situation on the younger player. The young player should know the rules, participate only when familiar with the rules, and not rely on advice or invite her opponent to take advantage of her ignorance.

Three student groups tend to place the responsibility on the older player and condemn her falsification of the rules.

The jury agreed on choice (c). Their second highest choice, at 45 per cent, was choice (a). Some jurors chose (c) and one chose (b).

The athletes, men, and physical education majors agreed in plurality on choice (d). No other student group agreed majority-wise or plurality-wise with the jury.

Three groups, the non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors showed plurality agreement on choice (a), the jury's second highest choice. These groups tended to condemn the younger player thus, in a sense, agreeing with the jury.

Four student groups distributed their choices over all five. The athletes and physical education major student groups distributed their choices over four selections of the five possibilities.

44. Player A, while playing player B in a golf match, continually comments upon the difficulties of the hazards which player B confronts. In addition, player A discusses the difficulties player B will encounter in trying to play the ball from where it rests. This occurs throughout the golf match.

Choices:

(a) Player A is using clever psychology.

(b) Player B can profit from player A's tactics by learning to ignore the comments.

(c) Player A's comments should not bother good golfers, therefore his actions are unimportant.

(d) Player A is being discourteous to player B. Player A should refrain from making such comments.
TABLE 36
PERCENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) If player A wins he is beating player B by using unfair tactics.

Remarks: (See Table 37)

Players should refrain from trying to influence, in any fashion, their opponents' game. The jurors and students agree on this point thus indicating A's actions as reprehensible.

The jury and student groups agreed in majority percent on selection (d). The only other choice selected by any of the jury was (e).

The physical education majors displayed the highest percent agreement with the jury. Second highest agreement was reached by the women students. Third and fourth highest percent agreement was made by the non-athletes and athletes. Fifth highest agreement was made by the men students and the lowest percent, but still majority, was made by the non-physical education majors.

Five student groups distributed their choices over all five possible selections. The physical education majors were the only group which did not display such a range and confined their selections to three of the possible five.


45. Golfer A was about to put his ball into the hole on the 17th green. Golfer B sneezed just as Golfer A hit his ball. Golfer A's ball missed the hole and Golfer A took one more stroke to put the ball in. Golfer B, knowing he must have bothered Golfer A, deliberately missed his first putt.

Choices:

(a) Golfer A would appreciate Golfer B playing his best so that he can beat him through skill, not by Golfer B's charitable action.

(b) If Golfer B really wanted to remedy his mistake he should allow Golfer A to take his first putt over.

(c) Golfer B did the right thing since he had bothered Golfer A's first putt.

(d) Such things sometimes happen. Golfer B did not need to sacrifice his putt since Golfer A might inadvertently distract him later on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37
Per Cent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students
Remarks: (See Table 38)

The jury and students tended to agree that B should not have deliberately missed his putt. The jurors seem not to need to know whether B's actions were deliberate or otherwise and accepted a solution of allowing A to take his putt over again. Two student groups tended to agree while the other students may have believed B's action was accidental and that a sacrifice on his part wasn't necessary.

The choices on this selection offered compromise solutions which weren't very discriminating. The respondents weren't forced into making a clear cut choice.

The jury reached majority agreement on choice (b) of this situation. The next highest per cent choice selected by the jury, but not majority, was (d). Some jurors chose (a) and (c).

No student group displayed majority agreement in any one choice nor agreed with the jury's selection. The men's group tended to show plurality agreement with the jury on (b) as did the athletes.

Plurality agreement by the non-athletes and non-physical education major students was found for choice (d).

The women and physical education major students divided plurality agreement on choices (b) and (d).

Some respondents from four student groups, the athletes, non-athletes, women and non-physical education majors, chose all possible answers. The men and physical education students chose answers from three of the possible four selections.

46. A popular activity in gymnastic meets is the trampoline. The trampoline is constructed of tightly stretched canvas called the "bed." The "bed" is tied to a metal frame by springs and "shock" cords. According to the rules governing the gymnast's performance, he must perform on the "bed" never touching the floor, cords, or frame. This rule was designed to encourage safety of performance. Some coaches don't care for the rule because tall performers have a tendency to go through the shock cords while the shorter performers don't. These coaches feel the rule gives unfair advantage to shorter performers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Choices:

(a) The coaches who disagree with this rule are right since some performers, particularly short ones, gain an unfair advantage.

(b) Since safety is important, and even though tall performers may be handicapped, this rule is fair.

(c) No rule should give an advantage to any size, build, kind, or particular performer.

(d) If tall performers may go through the shock cords and be hurt, the coaches should use and train only short performers. They can not then object to such a rule.

(e) In trampoline competition, short and tall men should compete in separate divisions.

(f) If tall performers are at a disadvantage, it is all right since they have a decided advantage in other sports.

Remarks: (See Table 39)

Regardless of advantages or disadvantages to performers all groups agreed that the factor of safety was more important than individual success. It would seem that coaches who want to change the rule were losing sight of a more important fact, safety for all.

All student groups reached a majority per cent agreement with the jury's choice, choice (b). Some jurors selected (c) and (e) and one juror chose (f).

The men and physical education majors had the highest majority per cent agreement. The athletes and non-athletes were second and third highest. The non-physical education majors and women were fourth highest in total per cent agreement.

None of the students chose selection (f). Some members of the three student groups made choices from five of six possibilities.

The non-physical education majors distributed their choices over only three selections.

47. In tumbling events performers are allowed only two minutes in which to complete a routine. When the performers had only 30 seconds time remaining, the officials used to call out a warning. The coaches would coach the performers throughout the performance in order to tell him how much time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
he had left and to coach him so he would finish on time. This coaching was considered illegal and unfair. A rule was finally passed which resulted in calling out the time every 30 seconds rather than just at the end.

Choices:

(a) By putting a rule that replaces the coaching action they are recognizing unfair coaching as being all right.
(b) by putting in this rule the coaches are forced to cease the unfair practice. This is a good device to use.
(c) The coaches should not have made it necessary for a rule change to be used.
(d) If the officials had stopped the coaching when the old rule was in force, the new rule would not have had to be made.
(e) The old rule prohibiting coaching from the side lines should be strengthened rather than putting in a new and different rule.
(f) The action of the coaches indicates the need for another rule.
(g) The rule change is good providing it was changed as a result of a real need and not as a result of the coaches' actions.

Remarks: (See Table 40)

The possibility of change or need for rules' changes may be illustrated by this situation. Coaching the performers had become common practice and the majority must have felt the change was necessary. On the one hand an example of ignoring authority is illustrated. On the other hand the majority believe authority, the rules, must be challenged on occasion. It was interesting to note that the majority failed to condemn the coaches for breaking a rule.

The jury chose (g) as to majority per cent. A few jurors selected (a) or (b) instead.

The athletes, women, and physical education majors chose (g) for majority per cent. The other student groups agreed with the jury in plurality, not majority.

Some athletes, men, women, and non-athlete majors chose six of the seven possible selections. The non-physical education majors distributed choices over all seven possibilities. The other student groups confined their choices to five possibilities.
**TABLE 40**

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Juror</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M1, M3, M5, M7, M9  | (g)    |       | 77.7     | 55.1         | 40.0  | 55.9| 43.7                      | 51.0                         | 39.5
49. A rider in a horse show is putting his horse through various maneuvers and "gaits" required in that particular event. For example, the rider rides the horse through walk, trot, and canter with the judge estimating the skill with which the rider controls the horse and puts the horse through his paces. Another rider, in the same event, tries to crowd, shove, push, and annoy the first rider whenever the judge is not looking. If the judge sees the second rider doing these things, he can disqualify him, but unfortunately he does not. The first rider does not know what to do. If you were the first rider, what would you do?

**Choices:**

(a) Crowd the other rider before he can crowd you.

(b) Report the opposing rider's actions to the officials in charge of the horse show.

(c) Ask the opposing rider to stop crowding and tell him that if he does not you will report him to the officials.

(d) Ask the other rider to stop and threaten to crowd him if he does not stop his actions.

(e) Wait until the show is over and then report the opponent's actions to the horse show officials after telling the opponent you are going to do this.

(f) Simply ignore the opposing rider and pretend that nothing is happening.

**Remarks:** (See Table 41)

The tendency to try to make an opponent change his actions rather than tell on him may be illustrated by the majority agreement of four of the seven groups. Several groups tended to more direct action by appeal to the officials. It would be interesting to know what would happen if the rider's appeal were rejected and what he would do next. What would the respondents choose as a choice if the appeal failed? This was impossible to determine due to the type of choices offered.

The jury agreed on choice (c) at a majority of only 50 per cent. Their second highest and only other selection was (b).

The athletes, men, and non-physical education majors were the only student groups showing a majority per cent agreement and agreeing with the jury's choice (c).
The women and physical education majors agreed in plurality with the jury's choice. The non-athletes didn't agree with choice (c) but showed plurality agreement on choice (b).

The Women and non-athletes distributed choices over all six possibilities. The other groups distributed their selections over five possibilities. The athletes confined their choices to four selections and showed the highest percent majority agreement, even higher than that of the jury.

50. Two halfbacks, members of the same soccer team, work out a play whereby they can "sandwich" an opponent between them by running into him. This device looks accidental but oftentimes results in hurting the opponent. Even though the opponent is not hurt he is put out of the evolving play.

Choices:

(a) Since this play may result in the opponent being hurt the halfbacks should not use it.

(b) The opponent can use the same type of play and should.

(c) This is good, the object of the game includes blocking opponents.

(c) Two against one is not fair. If only one player blocked, injury might be avoided.

(e) This is all a part of soccer. Players should expect such plays.

(f) Players should not use such plays.

Remarks: (See Table 42)

Safety of others was the deciding factor in the selection of answers by four of the seven groups. The other groups tended to agree. Choice (f), also chosen by many, clearly condemned the players who use such plays. One can only speculate as to whether the safety factor was most important or whether the player's actions, excluding safety, was important in the minds of respondents.

The jury did not agree in majority per cent. Their plurality of agreement indicates they favored choice (f). The next highest per cent agreement was choice (a). One juror chose (d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 41
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS
The student groups composed of athletes, non-athletes, men, and physical education majors chose (a) thus disagreeing with the jury. A plurality agreement was indicated by women and non-physical education major students for choice (a).

Three groups distributed choices over all six possibilities.

The men, non-athletes and physical education majors distributed their selections over five choices, five choices and four choices respectively.

51. Although most colleges have rules against players receiving financial aid from any source other than designated athletic scholarships, players have been known to accept gifts of $20.00 to $30.00, clothes, cars, etc.

**Choices:**

(a) The players who accept extra money are wrong and should be penalized.

(b) If people choose to give players extra money, the players have a right to accept it.

(c) The rules which prohibit players from receiving extra money are unrealistic in this day and age. Players should be allowed to receive extras.

(d) Other students in other areas of endeavor are allowed to accept monetary gifts, loans, and so forth. Athletes should be allowed to do the same.

(e) The persons who tempt and give players the extra money should be penalized, not the players.

(f) Penalties should be imposed on those who give money as well as those who receive it.

**Remarks:** (See Table 43)

A tendency by the jury, plus majority agreement by two student groups, favored penalties for both givers and receivers of money. Other groups tended to agree with this solution to the situation. It was interesting to note that the players weren't completely condemned but that the blame should be shared.
### TABLE 42

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mna, Mpe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A contrast between athletes and non-athletes may be noted. The athletes indicated they favored penalties only by plurality. The non-athletes clearly indicated they favored penalties by majority vote. Perhaps athletes, who have been faced with personal decisions of this type, could not vote to penalizing actions they may have already practiced.

The jurors showed no majority agreement but indicated a plurality for choice (f). All other choices were chosen by some of the jury except for choice (b).

The student groups of non-athletes and non-physical education majors agreed by majority per cent with choice (f). All other groups displayed plurality agreement for the same selections.

All student groups distributed choices over all six possible selections.

52. During a college Sports Day swimming meet one of the swimmers in a breast stroke race made an illegal turn. Realizing this, he stopped in the middle of the pool and did not finish. His teammates kept calling to him to finish, not knowing why he stopped.

Choices:

(a) The swimmer was right to stop when he knew he had made a mistake.

(b) The swimmer should have finished the race and reported his illegal turn.

(c) The swimmer should have finished since the officials might not have seen his illegal turn.

(d) The swimmer might have simply thought he made an illegal turn therefore it was his duty to try to finish.

Remarks: (See Table 44)

Majority agreement, by those who reached it, indicated the swimmer shouldn't quit and should tell on himself. All other groups tended to agree with this solution. A few seemed to place responsibility for decisions in the hands of authority, as indicated by those who chose (d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The jury did not agree in majority per cent with any one choice. In plurality they chose choice (b) with choice (d) as their second highest choice. Some jurors chose (a) and (c).

The athletes, women, and physical education majors reached majority agreement on choice (b). All other student groups agree in plurality with this selection with the exception of the men students who chose (d).

Three student groups distributed selections over four possibilities while the non-athletes, men, and physical education majors confined their answers to three possibilities.

53. Many times in swimming meets the judges find it difficult to determine who won a race especially if two or three of the racers finish almost at the same time. These judges confer before announcing their decision. Sometimes a swimming coach rushes to the edge of the pool and congratulates his swimmer, just after he finishes, trying to influence the judges into thinking his swimmer has won.

**Choices:**

(a) The coach's action is fair if it helps his swimmer to win.

(b) Judges are as fair as possible, therefore, the coach's action probably would not influence them.

(c) This coach's action is unfair and should be stopped.

(d) It is possible the coach really thinks his swimmer won. His action might be perfectly all right.

(e) A rule should be instituted preventing anyone from coming close to swimmers until after the judges' decision.

**Remarks:** (See Table 45)

The jury agreed to condemn such action. No student group could agree in majority. Some students chose (b), perhaps by reason of faith in the infallibility of authority. Some chose (e), again illustrating need for a rule and thus also condemning the coaches' actions. Choices (a) and (d) were perhaps too similar to be discriminatory.
### Table 44

**Per Cent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mw, Mpe</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty per cent of the jury chose choice (c). The next highest per cent of agreement was on choice (b) followed by (e). Two jurors chose (d).

No student group agree in majority per cent with the jury's selection. There was also no agreement, plurality-wise, with the jury.

Plurality of agreement by student groups composed of non-athletes and non-physical education majors favored choice (b). The women and physical education majors favored choice (e) and the athletes split their plurality between choices (b) and (e).

The non-athletes and non-majors distributed choices over all five selections while the other groups favored four of the possible five answers.

During a championship relay swimming event, the race was very close. Whoever won this event would win the meet and the championship. As the last swimmer on team A dived, it was obvious to all that he dived before his teammate had reached the end of the pool. The inspector watching obviously saw him but after the race was over he disappeared. The referee said that team A should be disqualified but since the inspector had not reported the infraction, team A was declared the winner. All of the officials and team coaches met after the meet to decide what to do. They decided they would look at the movies of the race but team A's coach refused. According to the swimming meet rules, the referee can decide and make a ruling on points of disagreement.

Choices:

(a) Team A's coach should not have refused to view the movies of the race.

(b) The coach was right in refusing. The inspector or referee should have made a ruling since they were the officials in charge.

(c) The coach was right to refuse. The meet's officials should have located the inspector before reaching a decision.

(d) The coaches of the teams should not have met after the meet. The decision as to who won should be in the hands of the officials. If the coach refused the movies on these grounds, he was justified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) Since the referee had obviously seen the incident, he should have disqualified team A. The coach was right to refuse to see the movies.

(f) Since the referee had obviously seen the incident, he should have disqualified team A. The coach was wrong to refuse to see the movies.

Remarks: (See Table 46)

The choice chosen by majority agreement by the jury was (f). They condemned authority, the authority being the referee. By choosing choice (f) they also disagreed with the coach's actions. The opinion the jury and students seem to be expressing is that people in authority must be able to solve such situations and can if they take their responsibility seriously and support the rules regardless of extenuating circumstances.

The jury agreed 88 per cent on choice (f). The only other choices favored by any of the jury were (a) and (e).

The men and non-physical education major students failed to agree in majority per cent with the jury's selection but all other student groups did. The highest per cent agreement was displayed by the physical education majors and the lowest per cent majority was made by the non-athletes.

The non-physical education majors and men students showed plurality agreement with the jury.

All student groups distributed their choices over all of the six available selections.

55. A well-known swimming coach is known to corner an opposing team's swimmer and talk to him. In the course of the conversation this coach will tell the swimmer he has not a chance to win. The coach believes this is using good psychology.

Choices:

(a) This is using clever psychology.

(b) This type of action probably doesn't bother the swimmer to any extent so it is all right to use.

(c) This is unfair advantage of the swimmer. The coach should not try such a thing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) The other team's coach should do the same thing to one of their swimmers.

Remarks: (See Table 47)

Regardless of the coach's motives his action was clearly condemned by the majority agreement of jury and students.

The jurors and student divisions agreed in majority per cent with choice (c). The only other choice favored by a juryman was (b). One student from the non-athlete group also chose (b) with all other members of this division agreeing as to choice (c).

The second highest per cent agreement, other than that achieved by the non-athletes, was made by the physical education majors, closely followed by the women. The fourth highest per cent agreement was made by the men, then the athletes, and finally by the non-physical education majors.

None of the jurors or students chose choice (d). The men and non-athletes confined their selections to two of the four possibilities. All other groups distributed their choices over three of the four selections.

56. A tennis player is getting ready to play in a tennis match. While he is getting out his racket, putting on his tennis shoes, and warming up, he complains about not feeling too well. He continues, commenting that he knows he can not play his best today. His comments seem to the spectators that he is trying to establish an alibi in case he should lose. He is defeated and after the match point out that he just wasn't playing his best today.

Choices:

(a) Alibiing is a poor thing to do.

(b) If he genuinely felt bad, he has a right to mention the fact before or after the game.

(c) His remarks may be misunderstood by spectators as an alibi.

(d) Since such actions seem to the spectators like alibiing, the tennis player should not say such things.

(e) If the tennis player really felt bad he should not play. If he feels well enough to play he should keep still.
### TABLE 47

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw,</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn, Mpe, Mnpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f) Making the remarks after the game, not before, is all right.

(g) Making the remarks before the game, not after, is all right.

Remarks: (See Table 48)

Jurors and students clearly agreed that verbalized excuses by tennis players were poor devices to use. No one seemed to like a player who made excuses for losing.

The jury and students agreed in majority per cent on choice (e). Other jurors chose (a), one chose (b); two chose (c) and two chose (d) and one other chose (g).

The highest per cent agreement was made by the students of the women and physical education groups. The next highest per cent agreement was made by the non-athletes followed by the athletes, and then the non-physical education majors. The lowest per cent agreement by students was made by the men.

The athletes distributed their choices over six selections. The non-athletes, women, and men over four choices, and the physical education and non-physical education students varied their choices over five of the possible six selections.

57. A winning 100-yard dash man had succeeded in persuading the officials to allow two of his opponents to start even with him in a race. These opponents had been penalized, according to the rules of that time, two yards for false starts. The two men, who had their penalties changed, had placed second and third. The winning runner asked his rivals who had placed, to help him win the coming relay race. Although the other racers were not on his team, they could help by holding back and not running as fast as they could. If these men cooperated with the winner's request, the winner's team would win the track meet. It is against the rules to do such a thing but it is difficult to determine whether a runner is running his best or not.

Choices:

(a) The winner was justified in asking but the other men should refuse.

(b) The other two runners owe it to the winner to help him win since he had helped them before.
## TABLE 48

### PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm, Mpe, Mppe</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) The winner had no right to ask his opponents to help him win.

(d) Since the winner's request made the difference between winning and losing the track meet, the opponents should refuse.

(e) The opponents should refuse since they would be breaking a rule. They did not break a rule in the 100-yard dash since the official had allowed the penalty to be changed.

Remarks: (See Table 49)

Those jurors and students who agreed in majority and plurality on choice (c) place the blame on the winner who made the request. Others who chose (e) accepted a solution by indicating what the opponents should have done, thus also condemning the winner's action. The two choices, (c) and (e), were similar in nature and may account for lack of majority agreement by some of the student groups.

The jury reached complete agreement on choice (c). The non-athletes and women students agreed with choice (c) in majority per cent.

The men students displayed a majority agreement with choice (e).

In plurality per cent the non-physical education majors agreed with the jury's choice.

The athletes and physical education majors distributed choices over all five possibilities. The non-athletes, men and non-physical education majors confined their choices to three possibilities.

58. Player A is playing Player B in a tennis match. Player A beats player B in the first set, 6 games to 1. He continually stops to tie his shoes, wipe his face every few minutes, and move slowly into position for each play. Player B discovers that these actions upset player A. He continues these maneuvers and beats player A in the second and third sets, winning the match.

Choices:

(a) Player B is clever to use these tactics since they helped him win.
|| Majority Agreement | Choice | Jury | Athletes | Non-Athletes | Women | Men | Physical Education Majors | Non-Physical Education Majors |
|---------------------|--------|------|----------|-------------|-------|-----|----------------------------|----------------------------|
|                     |        |      |          |             |       |     |                            |                            |
|                     | (a)    |      | 1.9      | 2.4         |       |     |                            |                            |
|                     | (b)    |      | 1.9      | 2.4         |       |     |                            |                            |
| M1, M2, Mw         | (c)    |      | 99.9     | 41.8        | 56.6  | 51.0| 43.7                       | 40.9                       |
|                     | (d)    |      | 3.8      | 10.0        | 9.7   | 2.4 | 5.8                        | 5.3                        |
| Mw                 | (e)    |      | 47.5     | 30.0        | 29.2  | 53.5| 43.1                       | 39.5  |
(b) Player A should use the same tactics against player B.
(c) Player B should not take unfair advantage of player A.
(d) Since player A could use the same tactics as player B, player B was right to use them.
(e) Player A, if he were a good player, would not let player B’s tactics bother him.

Remarks: (See Table 50)

All groups agreed, by majority or plurality, that B’s actions were unfair. No other alternatives were clearly chosen. Other choices might have revealed what the jury and students would have done as players in the same situation, if they had been included.

The jurors and all of the student groups, except the non-physical education majors, agreed majority-wise on choice (c) of this situation. The only other choice favored by any of the jurors was (e).

The non-physical education majors showed plurality agreement on choice (c).

The highest per cent agreement among the student groups was made by the physical education majors. The men and women were second with a total of 58.3 per cent each. Third highest was the athlete group and the non-athletes were fourth.

Four student groups distributed choices over all five of the possibilities. The non-athletes and physical education major students confined their choices to four of the five selections.

59. In a dual swimming meet a racer beat his opponent in the breast stroke race by 12 lengths. Whereupon the winner climbed from the pool, hurriedly grabbed a towel to wrap around his neck, and stood casually waiting for his opponent to finish. There is nothing in the rules which makes this action illegal, although it is customary for winners to stay in the water until all contestants have finished a race.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mj, Ma, Mne, Mw</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent comparison answers by jurors and students.
Choices:

(a) The action described is satisfactory.

(b) Since this action was not against the rules, it is all right.

(c) This procedure made the loser look bad. The winner should not have done it.

(d) There should be a rule which penalizes a swimmer who does such a thing.

Remarks: (See Table 51)

The swimmer's action was clearly frowned upon by jury and students since all indicated a majority agreement for choice (c). Responsibility for good conduct was directly placed upon the individual.

The jury was unanimous in their choice.

The men students displayed the highest per cent agreement. The non-athletes and physical education majors were second highest. The athletes were third. The non-physical education majors were fourth. The women were last.

All student groups had some members who picked choices from all of the four possibilities.

61. In a mile race at Madison Square Garden the finish of the race was very close. The judges awarded the trophy to one racer and then discovered that photographs of the finish showed another racer winning. The judges did not reverse their decision since photographs are not considered "official."

Choices:

(a) The officials were obviously wrong and should have reversed their decision.

(b) The officials were correct in their decision since photographs are not official.

(c) The officials should have compromised by declaring the race a tie.

(d) The officials should have had the race re-run.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 52)

The jury expected officials to show fairness by the ability to change a decision when they were wrong. This fact may be indicated by their choice of selection (a). The students who reached majority agreement and some who agreed in plurality seem to want to follow the "letter-of-the-law" and agreed with what the officials had done. Ability to change and admit one may be wrong is in apposition with authority and existing rules.

The jury agreed in majority per cent on choice (a). The only other choice made by this group was (b).

No student group agreed majority-wise with the jury. Neither was there any indication of plurality agreement.

The athletes and men showed a majority agreement on choice (b). The other student groups tended to show a plurality per cent for this choice.

All student groups, except the men, distributed their choices over all four possibilities. The men's group chose from three selections.

63. In the Princeton Invitational Track Meet of 1939, a World Record holder was invited to run against American leading runners. During the race the record holder was beaten. Afterwards he claimed a racer had fouled him and caused him to break his stride. A great deal of ill will and unfavorable comment resulted when the protest was made public. Racers should accept officials' decisions but it is customary to question them when one is in doubt.

Choices:

(a) The record holder, since he had been beaten, should not have complained of a foul.

(b) The record holder was justified in his complaint since he felt he was fouled. The unfavorable comments were not his fault.

(c) The officials of the race could stop the comments if they had kept quiet about the protest.

(d) The officials, racers, reporters, etc., should not complain of the record holder's protest. He has a right to protest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mn</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) The record holder should not protest since there are officials who watch for fouls. If they did not see any or say there were any, that should settle the matter. 

Remarks: (See Table 53) 

Half of the student groups plus the jury disagreed majority-wise with the runner's action when they chose selection (e). This choice may indicate that the officials, who are given responsibility for rules enforcement, should be supported and unquestioned. 

The jury agreed in majority per cent on choice (e). Some jurors chose (b) and two chose (d). One juror chose (a). 

The non-athletes, men, and physical education majors agreed in majority per cent with the jury's choice, choice (e). 

All other student groups tended to agree in plurality per cent with the jury. 

The non-athletes made choices from four of five possible selections while all other groups chose from all five. 

64. A 165 lb. national champion intercollegiate wrestler was put into an event with a heavier opponent. The reason the smaller man was used against the heavier was that his team did not have a good wrestler to enter in the heavier weight class and his team needed someone for this event. As this unequal match proceeded the crowd went wild because the heavier wrestler was beating a national champion. The coach of the heavier wrestler stopped the match and announced to the crowd the situation so that the national champion would not be discredited. 

Choices: 

(a) The coach's explanation to the crowd was a fine thing to do. 

(b) The coach's explanation should have been unnecessary if the national champion had been allowed to wrestle someone his own size. 

(c) The national champion should be willing to wrestle heavier men because he could do better against heavier opponents than less experienced or skilled wrestlers.
TABLE 53

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e, m, Mr, Mpe</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) The good of the team is all-important. The smaller wrestler should be willing to accept the crowd's criticisms since he is only trying to help his team. The coach doesn't need to explain to the crowd.

(e) The coach's explanation to the crowd draws unfair attention to the national champion wrestler. The less said about the matter, the better the handicapped wrestler might feel.

(f) The coach or team should not enter an event in which there is no qualified participant.

Remarks: (See Table 54)

Plurality and majority agreement by all respondents on choice (f) seemed to indicate that the coach was wrong to put the wrestler in a position to be outclassed or beaten. It was interesting to note or to infer that the good of the team didn't enter into the choices of these groups. Their sympathy was with the individual, the wrestler.

Some respondents chose (a) perhaps indicating the good of the team was important and approving the coach's action.

The jury agreed percentage and majority-wise on selection (f). Their second highest per cent choice was (a) with some choosing (d).

The women were the only student group agreeing in majority per cent with the jury. All other student groups tended to agree with the jury's choice, choice (f), by plurality.

Three student groups chose from five of the six possibilities. The other three, athletes, non-athletes, and women made selections from all six possibilities.

65. If a wrestler uses an illegal hold and hurts his opponent, the match is awarded to the victim. If an illegal hold is used and the opponent is not hurt, the opponent is awarded two points. During a wrestling match wrestler A used an illegal hold on wrestler B. The official awarded two points to wrestler B, but wrestler B's coach comes out and tells wrestler B he is hurt. Wrestler B insists he is all right but the coach says, "no - you are hurt." The referee had to award the match to the "hurt" wrestler B.
TABLE 54

PER CENT COMPARISON: ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M1, Mw
Choices:

(a) Since wrestler A used an illegal hold, wrestler B was right in pretending to be hurt and to take his coach's advice.

(b) Wrestler B had no right to play "hurt" even though his coach told him to.

(c) The referee should have been able to judge whether wrestler B was "hurt" or not. He should not have given the match to wrestler B.

(d) The coach had no right to influence his wrestler B. His wrestler was put on-the-spot as was the official.

Remarks: (See Table 55)

The athletes, men, and physical education majors agreed majority-wise that the coach was wrong in his actions. The official was absolved of blame as was the wrestler who evidently had to follow the coach's instructions.

The jury divided its plurality agreement between choice (b) and (d). Their opinion seems to condemn the wrestler as well as the coach.

The non-athletes and women seem to tend to blame the official for being influenced although this was by plurality agreement on choice (c).

Four student groups distributed choices over five possible answers while the non-athletes and physical education major students chose from four. The jury chose from three possibilities.

66. Sportswriters have been known to label teams that have been defeated "stumble-bums," "humpty-dumpties," etc. This makes good reading for the followers of the winning team.

Choices:

(a) The sportswriters are entitled to express their opinion.

(b) The sportswriters should stick to the facts and refrain from giving opposing teams such "labels."
### Table 55

**Per Cent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mm, Mpe</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) It is all right to label teams but not after they have been defeated.

(d) Labeling is making fun of a defeated team and is bad practice.

(e) If "labeling" defeated teams interests the readers, such practice is all right.

Remarks: (See Table 56)

Name-calling and labeling teams in such fashion, as stated in the situation, was disapproved by the majority of jurors and students.

Many jurors and students chose (d) which also condemned this practice. The two choices were not sufficiently discriminatory and may account for lack of majority agreement by some of the groups.

The jury agreed in majority on choice (b). Some jurors chose (d) and one chose (a).

The athletes, women, and physical education majors agreed with the jury's choice. All other student groups failed to reach a majority but indicated a plurality agreement.

Four student groups made selections from four of the five choices. The non-athletes chose answers from three possibilities and the men students chose from all five possibilities.

67. One wrestler is clearly better than an opponent. When the good wrestler gets on top of the poor wrestler, the poor wrestler tries to curl up and crawl in a corner of the mat. The good wrestler grabs him by the seat of the pants and neck, turns him around, and sits on top. The crowd loves it. The good wrestler is within the rules and even sits on the opponent, crosses his arms and when his opponent tries to move, he slaps him down.

Choices:

(a) The good wrestler makes his opponent appear ridiculous. He should not do such things in spite of the crowd's support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi, Ma, Mw, Mpe</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) This is good entertainment. The poor wrestler should expect this if he is out-classed.

(c) The good wrestler cannot help it if he is better than his opponent. As long as he is within the rules, such actions are satisfactory.

(d) There should be wrestling rules which prevent such actions.

Remarks: (See Table 57)

One choice, selection (d), offers a solution in rules which condemns this wrestler's actions. The other choice, (a), chosen by the majority of four student groups also condemns this wrestler. More groups might have reached agreement if these two choices had not been essentially the same.

The jury failed to reach a majority agreement. A plurality per cent agreement is indicated for choice (d). Their second highest choice favored (b), with (a) third, and (c) the last.

The students agreed on choice (a), as to majority per cent, except for the women and non-physical education majors. These latter two groups tended to agree with the other students in plurality per cent.

All student groups, except the non-athletes, divided their answers over all four possibilities.
TABLE 57

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mps, Ma, Npa, Im</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. An archery tournament official is watching to see if any arrows strike the target, yet fail to stick. If such happens, he awards points for this type of "hit." One of the contestant's arrows rebounds from the target but the official fails to see it and therefore fails to award any points. The archer asks the official about this error.

**Choices:**

(a) Since the official did not see the rebounding arrow, his decision stands.

(b) The official should admit his error when it is pointed out and should award a score.

(c) The official should ignore the archer's questions since the archer has no right to question the official.

(d) The archer should not have questioned the official.

**Remarks:** (See Table 58)

The jury divided its plurality agreement between choices (a) and (b) while the student groups agreed upon choice (a) in majority per cent. The jurors and students placed their faith in the authority represented by the official. In so doing these groups condemned the archer's action. Archers should not, under the circumstances, question the official.

One juror inferred the archer shouldn't question the official by choosing selection (d). This choice, if reworded or excluded, might have resulted in a majority decision on choices (a) or (b).

The highest per cent agreement by students was reached by the physical education majors closely followed by the athletes and men. The women were fourth. The non-physical education majors were fifth. The non-athletes were sixth in order of total majority per cent agreement.

Two student groups distributed selections over all four possibilities while the athletes and physical education majors selected from three. The women confined their choices to two choices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hpe, Mnpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mn</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In a badminton game played without officials, the players were supposed to call their own "wood shots." These shots occur whenever the edge of the frame of the racket hits the shuttlecock instead of the strings. So a "wood shot" causes the player to lose a point or the serve. Player A fails to call his "wood shots" but his opponent, player B, calls his own "wood shots" and realizes that player A is not calling his.

Choices:

(a) Player B should ignore player A's actions.

(b) Player B should quit calling his since player A is failing to do so.

(c) Player B should inform player A that he knows of his error and ask him to call his own "wood shots."

(d) Player B should call player A's attention to his failure to call the "wood shots" and refuse to play any further.

(e) Player B should stop the game and refuse to play anymore.

Remarks: (See Table 59)

In the absence of officials the jury and students agreed that the proper action for the player was to appeal to A to call his own mistakes. These groups seemed to give player A the benefit of the doubt rather than condemning him by choosing one of the other alternatives.

All groups agreed in clear cut majority per cent with choice (b). The jurors chose from three possibilities.

The athletes, non-athletes, and men students distributed their choices over three possibilities. The non-physical education majors picked from four of the five possible selections while the women confined their choices to two and had the highest per cent agreement of any group.

3. Baseball rules state that runners are out if they are touched by a ball held securely in a fielder's hand or hands. If the ball is juggled or dropped the runner would be safe since the ball is not held securely. The rules also state that it is illegal to knock the ball from a fielder's hand or hands.
TABLE 59

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a World Series game in 1951 a player intentionally kicked the ball out of the shortstop's glove while sliding into second base. The umpire called the runner safe.

**Choices:**

(a) The player was entitled to try to kick the ball out of the shortstop's glove since this was an important game.

(b) The sliding player should not have knocked the ball out of the opponent's glove.

(c) It is customary to do such things in baseball, therefore the runner's action was justified.

(d) This action was against the rules; therefore, the player should be penalized either by the umpire reversing his decision or by the opponent's protesting the game.

(e) The umpire's decision should not be questioned since his is an authority. His decision should stand.

**Remarks:** (See Table 60)

The sliding player's act of kicking the ball from his opponent's glove was censored by the majority agreement of the jury. By selecting this choice, choice (d), the jurors inferred the umpire was wrong and should change his decision. They also upheld the rule regardless of extenuating circumstances. Two student groups tended, by plurality agreement but not majority, to agree with the jury.

The non-athletes, women, men, and physical education majors displayed plurality agreement with choice (e). They upheld the umpire's authority regardless of circumstances or rules. Respect for authority may be commendable but disagreement with the jury indicated that the students didn't feel the umpire should reverse his decision or that he could be wrong.

All groups distributed their choices over four of the five possibilities except for the jury which selected from five.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a baseball game a base-runner was forced to run from first to second base when the batter hit the ball toward second. The base-runner was easily put out but he deliberately crashed into the second baseman who was trying to throw to first base, and who was not in the runner's way. It is common practice for runners to try to prevent basemen from throwing - by running into them. Although this is against the rules it is difficult for umpires to tell whether the runners are deliberately or accidentally knocking the basemen down.

**Choices:**

(a) Customary or not, the base-runner should have avoided the second baseman.

(b) The base-runner was doing what is common by running into the baseman in order to prevent another out.

(c) The base-runner runs the risk of being called out by the umpire. If he can get away with it, he might as well try.

(d) Since this is against the rules the base-runner was wrong in his actions.

(e) The base-runner should get in the way of the second baseman rather than knock him down.

(f) Basemen expect this type of action from base-runners, so it was a risk; he should expect such things to happen, and try to avoid the runner.

**Remarks:** (See Table 61)

The base-runner should not have broken a rule. This was the majority opinion of the jury as indicated by their selection of choice (d). Only one student group tended to support the jury's choice. This group was composed of women students. The non-athletes divided their plurality agreement with this choice and choice (f).

All other student groups tended to agree in plurality per cent with choice (f). Regardless of rules infractions, the students seemed to indicate approval of actions that have become customary and part of the game.

Three groups made selections from all of the six possibilities. The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors confined their selections to five. The jurors limited their votes to four of the six possible selections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. In baseball, a "spit ball" is a ball which has been wet by saliva and thrown by a pitcher. Such a pitched ball is very difficult for a batter to hit. The "spit ball" is illegal according to the rules.

A famous big league pitcher confessed, some years after his retirement, that he used to throw "spit balls" and related how he had been able to conceal it from others. The story was printed in a well-known sports magazine.

Choices:

(a) The pitcher was clever in concealing his pitch from opponents, umpires, etc. Therefore, he was justified in telling his story and having it published.

(b) The sports magazine was wrong in reporting the story since this may lead their readers to believe that such actions are good.

(c) Printing such a story reveals the true facts and lets the readers know how the pitcher had fooled the opposition and officials.

(d) Printing this story helps players and officials to uncover other pitchers who may be using the "spit ball" illegally.

(e) If the pitcher had told his story to the magazine - to confess that he had been wrong, then the magazine was justified in publishing it.

Remarks: (See Table 62)

It was interesting to note that the jury was unable to reach majority agreement. Plurality agreement was shown for choice (e). Some of the students groups clearly agreed upon a different selection.

Other situations in this questionnaire form illustrated agreement among students but disagreement between jurors. The numbers of these situations were 5, 12, 50, 56, 58, 60, and 63.

The students agreed and tended to agree by plurality and majority that the magazine was justified in printing a story if its motive was to correct the situation.

The jury didn't seem to care about such a motive of future help but tended to agree in plurality that the best motive was for the pitcher to admit his mistake.
Both the jurors and students, by their selections, seemed to condemn the pitcher's actions. In this sense there was agreement. Similarity of choices was also indicated.

The jury, women, and non-athletes distributed their choices over three possibilities. The athletes and men selected from five possibilities while the other groups chose from four of the five possible selections.

7. A player on a baseball team hits the ball and runs for first base. As he approaches first base, he throws up his arms, trying to bother the first baseman so he will drop his teammate's incoming throw. There is nothing in the rules which states this is illegal.

**Choices:**

(a) The first baseman should complain to the umpire that the runner was bothering him regardless of whether he is safe or not.

(b) If the baseman drops the ball or if the runner is called safe, he should complain about the runner's actions.

(c) The baseman should say nothing regardless of whether the runner was out or safe, or whether or not he bothered him.

(d) If the runner is declared out, the baseman should not complain.

(e) The first baseman should wait until this runner is at first and then try to bother him.

**Remarks:** (See Table 63)

The jurors favored reporting the runner's actions to the umpire for his decision. The students seemed to avoid "complaining" or perhaps avoided putting the baseman in a poor position by appealing to authority. All groups, in a sense, condemned the base-runner's action and supported the rule of the game.

Clear majority per cent agreement was reached by the jury on choice (a). A plurality tended to select (c) thus some of the jurors agreed with the student majority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mne, Mne, Mw, Wpe</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All student groups agreed majority-wise on selection (c). The highest per cent agreement was achieved by the women, followed by the non-athletes. The third highest agreement was reached by the athletes closely followed by the physical education majors. The lowest score on agreement was made by the non-physical education majors.

The jury and physical education majors made choices from two possibilities. The non-athletes and women selected from three possibilities while all other groups chose one selection from four of the five possible answers.

9. Team A and team B are playing a girl's basketball game. Team A's coach protests the official's decisions constantly. As the game progresses, team A is losing. Team A's coach stops the players and takes her team off the floor, refusing to play. Team B wins the game by default.

Choices:

(a) Team A's coach should not have removed the players from the floor.

(b) Team A's coach should not have stopped the game, much less objected to the official's decisions.

(c) If the officials were poor, team A's coach was justified in such action.

(d) Even though the coach of team A wished the players to leave, the players should have continued to play.

(e) Team B should offer to replay the game with different officials.

(f) The decision should stand and team A should be banned from other league games.

Remarks: (See Table 64)

Only the jury and men students reached majority agreement on selection (a). By their agreement they seemed to censor this coach's actions and her removal of the players from the game.

The athletes and physical education majors tended to agree in plurality per cent with the above groups. The non-athletes divided their opinions between choices (a), (b), and (f) while the women split their plurality per cent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mj</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreement between selections (b) and (f). Those groups and individuals tending to select (b) condemned this coach. Selection (f), favored by some, offered a solution to the situation and thus censored this coach.

Two groups selected answers from all six possibilities. Three groups chose from five of the six choices. The men students selected from four while the jury confined their answers to three of the four possibilities.

11. The groundskeepers have sprinkled lime on home-plate to mark it more clearly. A runner slides into home-plate. The catcher, by sitting on home-plate, blocks the runner. The umpire calls the runner safe, but the catcher stands up and shows the umpire the imprint of home-plate on the seat of his pants. The catcher maintains the runner was out since he could not possibly touch home while he was sitting on home-plate in such fashion.

Blocking bases frequently occurs and is commonly accepted as good play although it is against the rules.

Choices:

(a) The catcher should object strenuously since he has unquestionable evidence that the runner could not have touched home-plate.

(b) If the umpire does not change his decision, the catcher should appeal to the other umpire or officials.

(c) You should accept the umpire's decision since he is the authority in the game.

(d) You should accept the decision but argue anyhow to let the umpire know how you feel.

(e) You should not block home-plate, so accept the umpire's decision.

(f) Since blocking the base is customary in baseball and the runner must have been out, the umpire should change his decision.

Remarks: (See Table 65)

The non-athletes and women agreed in majority with the jury's majority per cent selection, choice (e). The catcher's actions were deemed wrong regardless of extenuating
TABLE 64

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1, Km</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
circumstances. The non-physical education majors tended to agree in plurality per cent.

The athletes, men, and physical education major students condemned the catcher's actions and seemed to feel that arguing with the official was wrong from the standpoint of questioning authority. This possibility was suggested by plurality agreement of these groups upon choice (c).

Three groups distributed choices over all of the six selections. The women students and physical education majors selected from five possibilities while the non-athletes chose from only four. The jury divided their answers over three of the six possible selections.

12. In most baseball or softball games it is customary for the players to "chatter" or talk constantly to encourage their teammates or discourage the opponents. A catcher annoyingly and constantly tries to get the opposing batters to swing at bad balls.

**Choices:**

(a) As the catcher you might do this occasionally but not too often.

(b) As the catcher you would feel that this is the wrong thing to do and so you would not do it.

(c) Since this is a way of bothering the batter and is done fairly frequently in these games you, as catcher, would feel free to do this.

(d) "Chattering" is all right, but you would not attempt to get the batter to swing at bad balls.

**Remarks:** (See Table 66)

The jury was unable to reach majority agreement, however the athletes, men, and non-physical education students did agree upon choice (c). They were supported in plurality, not majority, agreement by the non-athletes. Their choice, selection (c), accepted the customary practice of the catcher's "chattering" to teammates or opposition.

The jurors and women tended to agree with the above but further qualified their selection of proper behavior by dividing their votes between (c) and (d). They recognized "chattering" as part of the game but condemned the practice
TABLE 65

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e, e, e, e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of bothering the batter. The physical education majors could not reach a decision in either plurality or majority and tended to perhaps compromise by selecting choice (a). This choice may have indicated that the catcher may follow this practice occasionally.

All groups except the jury, distributed answers over all four possible selections.

13. In a baseball game, the first base coach constantly tries to distract the first baseman of the opposite team by talking, waving his arms, and so forth when the first base coach's team has a runner on first base. As long as the coach stays in the coach's box along the first base line he is within the rules.

**Choices:**

(a) The baseman should complain to the umpire about the coach's actions.

(b) The baseman should ignore the coach's actions since this is all part of the game.

(c) The first baseman should try to heckle the base runners of this coach's team in order to get even.

(d) The baseman should complain to his team manager and let him handle the situation.

(e) The first baseman should tell this coach just exactly what he thinks of such actions.

**Remarks:** (See Table 67)

Jurors and students completely agreed in majority percent on choice (b). In making this selection they didn't clearly condemn the coach since they accepted his actions as part of the game. The player must, evidently, learn to put up with such practices.

The non-athletes attained the highest percent agreement closely followed by the non-physical education majors. The women, men, physical education majors, and athletes followed, in that order, in numerical value of their percent agreement.
### TABLE 66

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

197
Four groups chose four of the five possibilities. The non-athletes confined their selections to two possibilities and the women and non-physical education majors chose from three possible answers. None of the groups chose selection (c).

Near the end of a high school basketball game, the Red team is ahead and proceeds to pass the ball back and forth without shooting. This is called "freezing" the ball, and there is nothing in the rules against such action. The opposing team, Blue, finds it difficult to get the ball without committing a foul. Blue team could get the ball by deliberately fouling - as they might recover the ball on the rebound after the Red team's free throw.

**Choices:**

(a) The Blue team should foul in order to have a chance to get the ball after the free throw.

(b) The Red team is playing unfairly. The object of the game is to score not to just pass the ball back and forth.

(c) The Blue team should appeal to the officials that the Red team is stalling.

(d) Since this type of play is within the rules they should try to intercept without fouling.

(e) "Freezing" the ball shows the Red team must resort to this action because they are not good enough to keep the Blue team from winning any other way.

(f) "Freezing" the ball is not in the spirit of the game and a rule should be put in to penalize teams who use such a tactic.

**Remarks:** (See Table 68)

All student groups, except the non-physical education majors, showed majority per cent agreement with the jury on choice (d). This choice might be interpreted as approval of freezing the ball as long as such practice is within the rules. Further, the opinion of these groups condemns the practice of fouling to gain possession of the ball.

The non-majors agreed with the other groups choice, as far as plurality per cent was concerned, but it was interesting to note the fairly large per cent who chose
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lm, Lipe, Mmpe,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Ma, Mma, Mw</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selection (a). Those who selected this answer favored the fouling practice to gain the ball.

Five groups, including the jury, distributed choices over four of the six possibilities. The non-athletes chose from four and the women distributed their selection over five of the six possible answers.

15. In basketball the spectators and players often attempt to put pressure on the officials by booing, talking, and yelling. This is a way of pressuring the officials into becoming aware that the players and spectators expect them to give the close decisions to their team.

**Choices:**

(a) This is perfectly all right.

(b) This is customarily done and is a good way of putting his officials "on their toes."

(c) It is all right to yell and talk but not to boo.

(d) The spectators should assume that the officials try to be fair, therefore, they should refrain from such action.

(e) Such action probably does no good whatsoever so this is useless.

**Remarks:** (See Table 69)

Putting pressure on officials in basketball by booing, talking, and yelling is condemned from the standpoint that officials are trying to call a game fairly. This was the opinion of the jury, athletes, and non-athletes. All other student groups supported this choice, choice (d), by indicating plurality agreement, except the men students. The men students selected, by plurality, answer (b).

The men, by choosing (b), indicated a tendency to approve the spectators' actions to keep the officials alert.

Four groups selected answers from four of the five possible selections. The athletes, non-athletes, and non-physical education majors made their choices from all of the five possibilities.
TABLE 68
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Agreement</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1, M2, M3</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Certain basketball teams are coached to set up plays which cause the opponents to foul. Some players and coaches believe this is clever basketball since the opponents may foul out of the game and their team may gain extra points by scoring on the free throws.

Choices:

(a) Players should use such plays. The coaches are clever to direct their players in such fashion.

(b) Players who disagree with this type of play may learn them if their coach so directs but should not use such plays.

(c) Players and coaches should agree to teach or use these plays.

(d) Players should refuse to play for coaches who insist they use such plays.

(e) The players should tell their coaches they do not approve of such plays but use them if he insists.

(f) Rules should be devised to outlaw such plays.

(g) Officials, players, and coaches should agree not to use such plays.

Remarks: (See Table 70)

A majority agreement was reached by the jury for choice (g). The total per cent was high, perhaps due to the extra choices made by some jurors, as previously noted in this study in Chapter III.

Three student groups tended to agree with jury in plurality but none of the students agreed as to majority per cent.

The jury felt that plays which cause fouls should be eliminated from basketball. Perhaps, since this has become a custom, the students found it difficult to agree with the jury. This may be indicated by the plurality agreement of the men and non-physical education majors on choice (a). This choice approves such practices.

A variety of distribution of choices may be noted perhaps due to the number of answers offered to the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. At a particular field house where basketball games are played, the coach and substitutes for each team are seated underneath the basket, one team at one end of the floor and the other team at the other end.

Team A and Team B are playing when suddenly the play comes down under team A's basket. Team A's coach stands up, leans over the shoulder of the official who is standing under the basket and points to a foul which he thinks the official should call.

Choices:

(a) Team A's coach was correct in pointing out the foul to the official, only if the official missed the foul.

(b) Team A's coach should not have pointed out the foul because the official would probably call it anyhow.

(c) Team A's coach was wrong. He should let the officials do their job without interference, reminder, or attempts to influence their decisions.

(d) Team A's coach was doing his job as a good coach. His action serves as a reminder and keeps the officials alert.

(e) The coach's actions are justified since it is customarily part of his job to show the officials what they should call and what they are missing.

Remarks: (See Table 71)

The coach's action in this situation, in trying to point out to the officials a particular foul, was condemned by jurors' and students' majority per cent opinion. Whether a coach's actions could be interpreted as incorrect at any time he attempts to influence officials would be speculative unless the respondents were questioned specifically on such a point.

The jurors displayed the highest majority per cent agreement. The physical education majors had the highest total per cent majority of the students, closely followed by the women students. The athletes, non-athletes, and men followed in that order as to total per cent agreement. The non-physical education majors showed the lowest total majority per cent.
The jurors distributed choices over three possible answers as did the physical education majors. The athletes and women confined their choices to four possible selections while the rest of the student platforms selected from all five possibilities.

19. During a basketball tournament, teams A and B are playing. A team A player is fouled by a team B player. The official starts to award the free throw to the team A player who was fouled. Another player on team A who was more expert at free throws and who was in the game, tries to take his teammate's foul shot. The official stops him since this is against the rules of the game. The rule states that a player who is fouled should take his own free throw unless he is physically unable to do so.

Choices:

(a) The second team A player was justified in trying to take the free throw.

(b) The first team A player should not have allowed the second player to try to take the free throw.

(c) Team A was wrong in trying to use another player on the free throw. There should be some penalty for team A's action.

(d) The basketball rule which states that a person fouled must take the free throw should be changed. The team awarded a free throw should have a choice as to which player should take the foul shot.

(e) Team B should protest A's attempt to substitute the free thrower and team A should be penalized.

Remarks: (See Table 72)

Although the jurors were the only group to agree in majority per cent on an answer to this situation, all of the student groups displayed a tendency to agree with the jury or picked a choice which condemned player A's action.

The athletes, men, and physical education majors demonstrated the above in selecting choice (b) by plurality agreement. The women, non-physical education majors, with a split decision by the non-athletes, indicated plurality agreement for choice (c). Those groups which favored choice (c) not only condemned player A's actions but favored a penalty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mpe, Mpe, Ml, Ma, Ma, Kw</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The jury and physical education majors divided their votes over three possibilities and all of the other groups chose their answer from four of the five selections. No one favored choice (d).

20. In basketball the spectators and players often attempt to put pressure on the officials by booing, talking, and yelling. This is a way of pressuring the officials into becoming aware that the players and spectators expect them to give the close decisions to their teams.

Choices:

(a) This is perfectly all right.

(b) This is customarily done and is a good way of putting the officials "on their toes."

(c) It is all right to yell and talk but not to boo.

(d) The spectators should assume that the officials try to be fair, therefore, they should refrain from such action.

(e) Such action probably does no good whatsoever so this is useless.

Remarks: (See Table 73)

The jury, athletes, and women agreed in majority per cent upon selection (d). All other student groups tended to agree, as indicated by plurality per cent, with this same choice.

It should be noted that an error in construction of the questionnaire resulted in a repetition of this situation. This situation and choices were the same as number fifteen on this student form.

The results on situation fifteen favored the same choice but the non-athletes who agreed, majority-wise, on that selection failed to on this. The women reached a majority decision on this situation although they could not on situation fifteen.

There was no attempt to establish reliability by duplicating these test items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 73
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. At a particular field house where basketball games are played, the coach and substitutes for each team are seated underneath the basket, one team at one end of the floor and the other team at the other end.

Team A and team B are playing when suddenly the play comes down under team A's basket. Team A's coach stands up, leans over the shoulder of the official who is standing under the basket and points to a foul which he thinks the official should call.

**Choices:**

(a) Team A's coach was correct in pointing out the foul to the official, only if the official missed the foul.

(b) Team A's coach should not have pointed out the foul because the official would probably call it anyhow.

(c) Team A's coach was wrong. He should let the officials do their job without interference, reminder, or attempts to influence their decisions.

(d) Team A's coach was doing his job as a good coach. His action serves as a reminder and keeps the officials alert.

(e) The coach's actions are justified since it is customarily part of his job to show the officials what they should call and what they are missing.

**Remarks:** (See Table 74)

It should be noted that this situation was the same as number seventeen on Student Form B, this form. The results were similar as to the choice chosen by jury and students.

This situation displayed majority agreement for selection (c). All groups clearly censored the coach's actions in reminding, interfering, and attempting to influence officials. The jury was in complete accord. A few extra choices made by jurors resulted in some believing that such action is customary as in choice (e) or that the coach has a right to do such a thing if the official missed the foul.

The highest agreement among the student groups was reached by the physical education majors. The lowest percent agreement was made by the non-physical education majors.

The jury, non-athletes, women, and physical education majors distributed choices over three of the five possibilities while the other groups chose from four of the five selections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. A basketball player, noted for his temper and complaints to the officials, was disqualified on fouls. The spectators noticed that he was smiling, talking, and shaking hands with the officials before leaving the game. A spectator asked him after the game what he had said to the officials. He said he had smilingly told the officials they were the worst officials he had ever seen.

Choices:

(a) The player should not have shown signs of temper in the first place.
(b) He should have shown his true feelings when talking to the officials instead of putting on an act.
(c) He should not have said anything to the officials.
(d) The least the player could have done was wait until after the game before addressing the officials.
(e) The player's actions were satisfactory; he felt he was justified in his actions.

Remarks: (See Table 75)

The jury and students, by virtue of their majority per cent agreement on choice (c), condemned this player's action and indicated he should not have said anything to the officials. Respect for authority was indicated and signs of temper are not approved.

The men displayed the highest agreement. The lowest per cent agreement was reached by the women.

It was interesting to note that no student group selected answer (b).

The athletes, men, and physical education major students distributed their choices over three of five selections. The other student groups chose from four and the jury from all five possibilities.

24. A basketball player on team A was known to have the habit of grabbing an opponent's belt whenever that opponent was trying to go after a loose ball. This action slowed the opponent down just enough to allow the team A player to get the ball. This action is against the rules. As the coach of team A's opponents, what would you do?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) If you were the coach of the opponents and saw this happening, you would report it to the officials.

(b) If you were the coach of the team whose player is being fouled, you would do nothing and wait for the officials to catch the opponent.

(c) As the coach of the opponents you would wait and if the opponent continued this then you would tell the officials.

(d) As the opponent’s coach, you should tell your player to hold the team A player’s belt.

(e) As the opponent’s coach you should tell team A’s coach that you are aware of his player’s actions, and if he does not stop, you will report him to the officials.

Remarks: (See Table 76)

The jury appealed to authority, represented by the officials, by agreement on selection (a). The athletes and physical education majors tended to agree with the jurors but no student group reached majority agreement.

The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors tended to favor choice (e) by plurality agreement. This choice indicated respect for authority but placed the responsibility of correction of the player’s action in the hands of the coach.

The men students divided their plurality agreement between choice (e) and (c) thus tending to indicate a "wait and see what happened" attitude, then appeal to authority.

The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors spread their choices over all five answers while all other groups chose from four of the five possible selections.

25. During the last 30 seconds of a tied basketball game between two college teams, the players scrambled for a loose ball near team A’s foul line. This resulted in a tie ball. After the official called "tie ball," team B requested time out and the official placed the ball on the foul line. After the time out, the official picked up the ball and awarded it to team A for a free throw, forgetting
### TABLE 76

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was a tie ball. Team A's captain told the official he was wrong and the official accepted his word.

**Choices:**

(a) The official was correct in accepting team A's captain's word.

(b) Team B should have corrected the official since they were being unfairly penalized.

(c) The official should have continued with the free throw regardless of objections since he is in charge of the game.

(d) Team A's captain should not have objected to the decision, he should have let team B's captain object.

(e) Neither of the team's captains should attempt to change the official's decision. They should let the official discover his own mistake.

**Remarks:** (See Table 77)

The necessity of admitting one is wrong and the ability to change a decision seemed to be the motives behind the choice selected majority-wise by jurors and students. Authority should be ready to change, back down, or reverse its position upon occasion. This was indicated by the selection of answer (a) in this situation.

The athletes reached the highest majority per cent agreement and the non-athletes the lowest.

The jurors and men students chose three of five possible answers. The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors distributed choices over all possibilities while the other two groups selected four possibilities.

27. Two rival teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on one of these teams' home court. During this game, the visiting team's star player was consistently booed whenever he missed a basket, pass, rebound, or maneuver. In the return game on the other team's court, the home crowd took revenge by booing all the players on the opposition. They were retaliating for what the other team's home crowd had done to their star.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mm</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Choices:**

(a) Booing is a good device to use to rattle a player. If this could help the home team in the first game, such action is all right.

(b) "Getting back" at the other team during the return game was justifiable under the circumstances.

(c) Even though the star player had been booed the other team's crowd should not have paid them back.

(d) Booing individual players does more good than booing the whole team. In the second game, the spectators should have singled out one player.

(e) Players should learn to play under difficult situations. Having the crowd boo them helps them to ignore future experiences of the same nature.

**Remarks:** (See Table 78)

The crowd was condemned for "paying back" and booing the rival team's players even though it was a matter of "paying back." The jury and student groups chose selection (c) indicating this fact.

No group selected choice (d) which favored booing the rival team's star.

The physical education majors reached the highest percent agreement next to the jury's choice. The lowest percent attained was made by the non-physical education majors.

The physical education majors confined their choices to two selections while the non-majors distributed choices over four. All other groups chose answers from three of the five possibilities.

28. A star player is a leading scorer in his basketball league and has a chance to be selected All American. His team is not very good and they would not win the league championship. The star player shoots at every opportunity and refuses to pass to his teammates. The coach backs him up and tells the team to pass to the star so he can shoot.

**Choices:**

(a) Since the team is not too good, recognition for one player is better than none. This is good procedure.
### TABLE 73

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) The coach should not ask nor should the star expect the team to always let him shoot. Basketball is supposedly a team game.

(c) The star player should not do all of the shooting and even if his coach advises his teammates to pass to him he should refuse to try to obtain all the glory.

(d) Since the coach has put the stamp of approval on this action, the star player has no other choice but to oblige.

Remarks: (See Table 79)

The athletes and women could not reach majority per cent agreement on choice (b) but did reach a plurality agreement. In doing so they favored the majority choice of the jury and other student groups. Individual glory was frowned upon in a team game such as basketball and a coach should not expect the team to let the star shoot.

The jury had 95 per cent agreement closely followed by the men and non-athletes with 88.4 per cent and 83.3 per cent respectively. The lowest majority per cent was indicated by the physical education majors.

All groups, except the jury which distributed their choices over two possibilities, selected from all four possibilities.

30. In league bowling one person will score approximately half the time then a member of the opposite team scores the rest. This amounts to keeping score for about one and one-half games. A bowler notices that the game being scored by the opponents is being scored incorrectly and in favor of the opponents.

Choices:

(a) The bowler should call the matter to the attention of the opponents.

(b) The bowler should ignore the situation.

(c) The bowler should wait until it is their team's chance to score and change the score of his own team.

(d) The bowler should wait until his team is scoring and change the opponent's score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Mi, Mna, Mm</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) After the bowler calls the mistakes to the attention of the other team he should ask for a new scorer.

(f) If the error is pointed out and not corrected, the team should refuse to bowl.

Remarks: (See Table 80)

The jury and students agreed in majority or plurality per cent with choice (a). The non-athletes and non-physical education majors did not attain majority per cent but did achieve plurality agreement.

The choice agreed upon indicated bowlers should and have the right to call attention to scoring mistakes even though the scoring was done by the opponents. No other action was deemed necessary.

The physical education majors reached the highest majority per cent agreement and the men the lowest.

The jurors, athletes, women, and physical education majors distributed their selections over three of the six possibilities. The other three groups distributed choices over all of the six possible answers.

31. Some boxers have gained reputations as "dirty" fighters. These fighters have been known to hit the opponent when coming out of a clinch, to hit the opponent with their elbows, and on occasion, to hit below the belt. They usually fight "dirty" until the official warns them. In the meantime, they hope they have weakened their opponent. The fighters know they may lose points, the round, or the bout if they continue.

Choices:

(a) Such a fighter should be immediately penalized, rather than warned.

(b) This type of fighting is customary and should be expected.

(c) Repetition, in a series of fights, of this type of fighting should result in suspension.

(d) The opponents should fight back in the same fashion in order to weaken the "dirty" fighter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mj, Ma, Kw, Mn</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) More officials, better rules, and stiffer penalties should be put into force to overcome this situation.

Remarks: (See Table 81)

It should be noted that this situation was the same as number twenty-seven on Student Form A. The students answering twenty-seven on Form A reached similar results, however, those answering failed to reach majority opinion except for the women students.

The jury condemned the type of fighting described in the situation and selected a solution by appeal to authority through rules and officiating. This was demonstrated by the majority per cent agreement of the jury on choice (e).

The athletes and men students were the only student groups reaching majority per cent agreement. They chose choice (e) thus disagreeing with the jury as to choice but not in principle. Choice (c) inferred condemnation of this type of boxing and proposed suspension of fighters after repeated violation. These groups are also appealing to authority.

It is fairly evident that choices (c) and (e) are similar.

The physical education majors tended to agree in plurality with choice (c) while non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors agreed in plurality with the jury's selection.

A plurality of jurors favored immediate censure of the fighters by voting for choice (a).

The athletes and men students distributed choices over three of the five possibilities. The jurors distributed their answers over four while all other student platforms ranged answers over all five of the selections.

32. A fencer consistently makes comments, shouts, or stamps his feet as he attacks his opponent. This seems to upset his opponent, but the first fencer is not breaking the rules of the sport.

Choices:

(a) This is perfectly all right if the fencer is not breaking any rules.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mn</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) If the fencer can't beat his opponent without doing such a thing, it is all right to try.

(c) If this is the only way this fencer can win, he is not really a good fencer, and should not do such a thing.

(d) The coach or officials should advise the fencer to stop this action.

(e) The opponent should tell the other fencer what he thinks of such action.

(f) Shouting, stamping, etc., are not in the "spirit" of fencing. Fencers should not do these things.

Remarks: (See Table 82)

Only the jury was able to reach a majority per cent agreement. They chose selection (f) which indicated the fencer, in this situation, was wrong in his actions regardless of the existence or absence of a rule. Authority was not appealed to nor sought in this choice.

The non-athletes, women, and physical education majors tended to agree with the jury through plurality per cent agreement. However, the athletes, men, and non-physical education majors tended to agree by plurality per cent with selection (a). Their choice seemed to indicate refuge in rules and appeal to authority for condemnation or approval of the fencer's actions. As long as a rule doesn't exist a fencer could carry out such procedures.

All groups chose five of six possible selections. The student groups did not choose selection (e).

33. Some consider it a good field hockey tactic for the defending backfield player to hit the ball deliberately over the end line so that an onrushing forward player can not score. There is a penalty for such action but it is not severe enough to allow the fouled player much of a chance to score when the penalty is administered.

Choices:

(a) As long as some consider this action a part of good tactics, it is all right to do.

(b) Since there is a penalty for this action this covers the situation.
### Table 82

**Percent Comparison Answers by Jurors and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) The penalty should be made more severe so that players would not hit the ball deliberately over the end line.

(d) It is better to hit the ball over the end line than to allow the opponents a chance to score.

(e) The object of the game is to keep the ball on the field in order to score. Since the players are not doing this they are ruining the game.

Remarks: (See Table 83)

The only group to reach a majority per cent agreement was the men students. The jury and all other student platforms demonstrated plurality agreement. The choice these groups favored was (c).

By favoring this selection, the practice of hitting a ball deliberately out-of-bounds was frowned upon and authority was appealed to for purposes of controlling such actions.

All groups distributed choices over all of the five possible selections.

34. A field hockey team is being badly beaten by their opponents. They finally get into position to score and as one player drives the ball toward the goal, her teammate inadvertently lets the ball bounce off her foot into the goal. The umpire does not see the kicking foul and indicates the goal is good.

Choices:

(a) Since the team was behind, the goal may as well score.

(b) The player who kicked the ball should tell the official what she did.

(c) The teammates of the player who kicked the ball should tell the umpire.

(d) The team which is ahead should inform the official that the goal was illegal.

(e) Since the team scoring the goal was behind it is to their advantage to confess the foul so that the opponents will think more of them even though they are not playing too well.

(f) The official's decision should stand.
## TABLE 83

PERCENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The jurors, physical education majors, and women students reached majority per cent agreement on selection (b). All other student groups tended to agree plurality-wise on this same choice. The majority and plurality agreement on this choice seemed to indicate that the responsibility of admitting a foul rested with the individual. No extenuating circumstances altered this decision.

The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors selected from all of the six possibilities while all other groups confined their choices to five.

36. In a southern football conference game a star player injured his ankle. The coach needed this player back in the game. The player's ankle was taped and given a shot of novacaine. The player re-entered the game and his team won. It was later discovered that the injured player's ankle had been broken.

Choices:

(a) The player should know whether he is able to play or not. He could have prevented the coach's sending him back into the game.

(b) Since the player was able to go on playing and his team won, the coach was justified in putting him back in.

(c) The coach should not have put the player back in the game.

(d) It is possible that the coach did not realize how badly injured the ankle was, therefore, he was justified in allowing the player to re-enter the game after giving him medical care.

(e) The team physician should make the decision, not the coach.

(f) The coach must have known the player's ankle was badly injured since he had the ankle taped and given novacaine. He had no right to send the player back into the game.

Remarks: (See Table 84)

Three groups, composed of jurors, non-athletes, and women, agreed in majority per cent on choice (e). The other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students tended to agree in plurality per cent with this same answer.

The groups' agreement seemed to indicate the coach's actions were wrong and inferred that a player's health should not be endangered regardless of the need for winning a game.

It was interesting to note that the voters felt that the coach must have had an idea of the extent of the ankle injury and if any doubt existed he should depend upon the advice of a doctor. It might have been interesting to see the results if the situation stated there was no physician available for such a decision.

The physical education majors distributed their choices over all six possibilities while the jury confined theirs to three. All other groups confined their selections to five choices.

37. An outstanding All-American football player was known for his rough, tough play. When he started to tackle or block an opponent he never stopped even though the opponents might have handed the ball or they were obviously out of the play. When asked why he played this way he expressed the opinion that once he started for a player he could not stop. If he stopped suddenly he might injure himself.

Choices:

(a) Little regard for opponents made him an outstanding player. Those who play football should expect such action from opponents.

(b) The All-American was right to avoid injury to himself.

(c) The All-American should be penalized for such roughness especially when the person tackled or blocked was not involved in the play.

(d) To play roughly is bad enough, but to out and out admit it was because he was protecting himself, is even worse.

(e) This player is not a true All-American. Good players should consider their opponent's safety as well as personal safety. He should be able to stop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mj, Mma, Mw (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 86)

This situation displayed complete majority per cent agreement between jurors and students. They selected choice (e). Their selection indicated that All-American football players should not play in such a manner and should consider other players' safety as well as his own.

The same situation was used on Student Form A. (See Number 36, page 120). These groups also agreed with the jury's choice on this questionnaire form.

The highest per cent agreement among student groups was achieved by the women students. The lowest agreement was made by physical education majors.

The non-athletes, women, and non-physical education majors distributed their answers over all of the five choices. The jurors, athletes, and men confined their choices to four of the five possibilities with the physical education majors answering on only three selections.

36. During a professional football game the fans booed because they thought a penalty for pass interference should have been called. Team B started to call their signals but could not hear, so waved their arms for quiet. The fans kept on booing; the officials asked team A's coach to ask the crowd, over the public address system, to quiet down but the crowd continued. Team B still called for quiet, and finally the officials penalized team A five yards for the fans' actions. This upset the crowd more and they continued booing. Before the crowd stopped, team A was penalized a total of 20 yards for the fans' conduct. The officials can call penalties on the crowd but don't very often.

Choices:

(a) The officials should not penalize team A for the crowd's action.

(b) The officials were justified in calling the fouls on team A because team B could not hear to call their signals.

(c) Team A's coach tried to stop the crowd. His team should not be penalized especially since they tried to quiet the fans.
TABLE 86

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) The officials should not have penalized team A. Team B could have pretended they could not hear the signals.

(e) The officials had no other choice but to try to control the crowd.

Remarks: (See Table 87)

The non-physical education majors reached a majority per cent agreement with the jurors' majority selection, choice (e). No other student group achieved majority agreement but all indicated a plurality per cent agreement for this same answer.

By this choice, the voters approved the officials' actions and disagreed with the crowd's behavior. Regardless of hurting a participating team's chances, or any other extenuating circumstance, the officials were forced into action. Approval of their action was offered by those questioned in this study.

No group chose choice (d). Choice (d) shifted some of the blame for the crowd's actions to the opponents.

All groups, except the jury, divided their answers among four of the five possibilities. The jury chose only two answers.

39. Football players are not allowed to move beyond the line of scrimmage until the ball has been snapped. Some coaches coach their teams and players to attempt to charge across the line of scrimmage a fraction of a second before the ball is snapped. This gives them an advantage over the defense since they outcharge them. The officials have difficulty in seeing this and the team may get away with this more times than they are caught.

Choices:

(a) The coach and players are clever to be able to do this without being seen by the officials.

(b) If the officials can't tell whether the team is wrong, players have the right to try.

(c) Since the object of the game is to outcharge the opponents, any way they can do it is legal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) This is against the rules so the players and coach are wrong to try to get away with such actions.

(e) The opponents can do the same thing if they wish, therefore, teams are justified to try.

Remarks: (See Table 88)

The practice of coaching players to break a rule was condemned by jury and students through their majority percent agreement on choice (d). The challenging of authority, represented by rules and officials, was frowned upon regardless of any other factors.

The jury reached complete agreement, with the physical education majors reaching the highest percent agreement as compared to other student groups. The lowest percent agreement was reached by the non-physical education majors.

The athletes, men, and physical education majors distributed their answers over four of the five possibilities. The non-athletes and non-physical education majors chose from all five. The women students confined their answers to three choices.

41. A senior in college football discovered his team needed a tackle. Although he had been an outstanding end in previous years and he knew he could not play this position quite as well, he voluntarily changed to tackle. His coach was pleased to have him play in this position.

Choices:

(a) The coach should not have sacrificed this player's talents in an unfamiliar position.

(b) Since the player volunteered to change positions the coach was justified in switching him.

(c) If the team really needed a tackle more than end, the position switch was justified.

(d) If the player had not been a senior, it would be all right to change his position. As senior he would not be able to play football again at this college.

(e) The player should not have volunteered to change positions. He knew he would have to learn all over again and he already was a good player.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mw, Mn</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 89)

The player's decision to change positions for the good of the team, regardless of endangering his personal glory and achievement, was commended by the jury, athletes, men, and non-physical education majors. This fact was indicated by these groups' majority per cent agreement in selecting choice (c).

The physical education majors agreed, majority-wise, upon selection (b). Their choice indicated no censorship of the coach in allowing a player to change as long as the player volunteered.

The other student groups tended to agree in plurality per cent with the jury's choice.

No group selected answer (d) and all student groups distributed their selections over four of the five possibilities. The jury confined their choices to only two selections.

42. A football team's linesman gathers hands full of grass or dirt to throw into the opposing line's faces. This enables them to break through the opponent's line freeing their backs to make long runs and score touchdowns.

Choices:

(a) It is the official's fault for failing to penalize the players for such actions.

(b) As long as the officials can't see the linesmen do this they might as well try it.

(c) Such action is unfair to the opponents. They should complain to the officials.

(d) The opponents should throw dirt or grass at this team when they get the chance in order to pay them back.

(e) The other team has equal opportunity to try the same thing, therefore, this team is justified in their actions.

(f) The linesmen's actions are unfair and not in the spirit of the game.
Remarks: (See Table 90)

The jury and physical education majors reached majority per cent agreement on choice (f). All other groups, except the non-physical education major students, agreed in plurality per cent with the jury.

The agreement with the jury indicated that the linesman's actions were unfair. The non-major students went further, as indicated by their votes for choice (c), in indicating appeal to authority.

None of the groups chose selection (d). The jury divided its selections over three possibilities as did the men students. All of the other groups, except the athletes and physical education majors, selected five of the six possibilities.

43. A football coach tells his boys how, when he played in college, he was told to stiff-arm the opposing star in order to put him out of the game. He laughingly tells of his success in achieving this assignment.

Choices:

(a) To injure an opponent deliberately is wrong. By laughingly telling his players what he had done, the coach is setting a bad example.

(b) Putting opponents out of the game is clever. By telling them how he had achieved this, he showed his boys how they could do it.

(c) Since the coach had been taught to do this, he must think such actions are part of football therefore he was justified in setting such an example.

(d) Regardless of how he told the story, it was setting a bad example.

Remarks: (See Table 91)

The men students were the only group unable to agree in majority per cent with the jury's choice, choice (a). All other student groups reached such agreement.

The agreement indicated censure of the coach for telling of his actions. The men students tended to agree but split their agreement between this choice and answer (d).
TABLE 89
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, K, L, Ka, LM</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 90
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choice (d) also condemned the coach and censored his actions for setting a poor example. Choices (a) and (d) were similar, perhaps accounting for the lack of majority percent agreement among the men students.

The non-athletes, men, and non-physical education majors chose answers from all of the four possibilities. The women confined their selections to three answers while the other groups divided choices between two of the four possibilities.

44. During a football game an ineligible pass receiver catches a long touchdown pass and scores. The officials fail to determine that the player was ineligible. The score is allowed to stand.

**Choices:**

(a) The ineligible receiver should have confessed he was ineligible.

(b) Since the officials did not see the error the player was justified in keeping his eligibility secret.

(c) The coach or teammates of the ineligible pass receiver should tell the officials about the error.

(d) The players or coach of the opposing team should let the officials know they had made a mistake.

(e) Since the officials did not see the error nothing should be done.

**Remarks:** (See Table 92)

Only the physical education majors reached majority percent agreement with the jury's majority choice (a). All other groups displayed a plurality agreement for this answer except the non-physical education majors.

The majority choice, answer (a), placed the responsibility for rules infractions upon individual players when the rules were broken or the officials failed to see the situation. The dissenting group placed the responsibility on the opponents' coach, possibly alleviating the individual player from such responsibility.

All student groups, except the physical education majors, who selected four of five answers, chose from all five possibilities. The jury selected answers from three possibilities.
TABLE 91
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mmpe, Mj, Mm, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Agreement</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In informal golf matches when there are no officials to watch each competing player, some players fail to count all the strokes they take. This gives them better scores and sometimes they end up winning the match.

Choices:

(a) As long as there is no one to check on the players they might as well score the way they wish.

(b) The player who fails to count his strokes is actually harming his golf game. He never knows how well or how badly he is really playing.

(c) Since this occurs in informal matches it doesn't matter whether players count their strokes or not.

(d) This type of player may never be a good golfer nor win important matches. In important matches there are officials to check on players' scores and this practice would be uncovered.

(e) Since there are no officials, players should be extra careful in scoring correctly and should call fouls against themselves.

(f) This type of play is unfair and should not be tolerated.

Remarks: (See Table 93)

The jury agreed, by majority per cent, on choice (e). No student group reached majority per cent agreement and the men students were the only group tending to display plurality agreement with the jury's choice. All other student groups tended to pick, as indicated by plurality per cent agreement, selection (b).

The jury's majority choice and the students plurality selection indicated that a golfer who failed to count his strokes in the absence of authority was wrong. Choice (e) indicated that awareness of absence of authority placed more stress on a player to count his strokes then at other times. Choice (b) suggested the harm a player does to himself without reference to the breaking of rules or recognition of presence or absence of authority.

The jury and men divided their answers over four of six possible selections. All the other groups selected answers from five of the six possibilities. No group chose answer (c).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A rather good golfer constantly tries to improve his opponent's game. He constantly offers advice on every shot, tells the opponent what club to use, and so forth.

**Choices:**

(a) The good golfer gives the appearance of knowing all there is to know. This is annoying to his opponent.

(b) A good golfer should know that unasked-for advice may upset his opponent. He should refrain from this practice.

(c) Such advice may be helpful to these opponents.

(d) By constantly offering advice this player may cause his opponents to feel they play badly. His advice may prove to upset them rather than help.

**Remarks:** (See Table 94)

The jury, women students, and physical education major students demonstrated majority approval of choice (b). In doing so they indicated disapproval of golfers who give unasked for advice from the standpoint of the annoyance it might cause to an opponent.

Choice (d) was similar in nature to (b) and may account for the plurality agreement of the non-physical education majors and their failure to choose (d) or agree with the jury in majority fashion.

The athletes and men indicated plurality per cent agreement with the jury's selection.

The non-athletes and women selected answers from three of four possibilities. The jury chose two of the four while all other student platforms distributed their votes over all four possibilities.

During an intercollegiate women's golf tournament in which it is customary for all the golfers to stay throughout the tourney, one player who was accompanied by her mother leaves. This player leaves immediately after she is defeated in the first round of play. By leaving, she misses the chance to attend social functions and does not get to see the other contestants play. When questioned later, she had no pressing reason for leaving.
TABLE 94

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, L, Mw, Mpe</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) The social functions and watching the other players play are unimportant. They were correct in leaving.

(b) The girl should have stayed. She could profit by watching others play and participate in the social functions.

(c) Since the player was defeated there was no point in remaining at the tournament.

Remarks: (See Table 95)

The high majority per cent agreement achieved by all of the students with the jury's choice, selection (b), may be due in part to the small number of answers offered. Greater diversification of answers may have yielded more variation in the voting.

The agreed upon selection, answer (b), indicated the value to a woman golfer of participation in social functions, opportunity to watch other players, as well as staying to the end of tournaments even though she has been defeated.

The jury, women, and physical education majors confined their choice to two answers while some distribution over all three answers was made by the other student groups.

48. During gymnastic meets the gymnasts are scored by points on their performance in executing various stunts. Some coaches advise their gymnasts to ask the officials, after the meet is finished, what their scores were and why they received them. Other coaches disagree with this practice. There is nothing in the rules which prohibits a gymnast from asking for his score to be explained.

Choices:

(a) The coaches who agree with this practice are correct if they feel the gymnasts will learn as a result of mistakes.

(b) The coaches who advise gymnasts to do this are wrong since the gymnasts questions may influence officials' decisions in the future by forcing officials to explain scores.
### Table 95

**PERCENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km, Mpe, Mmpe,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1, Ma, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) As long as gymnasts ask for scores after the meet is over, this is sound. Asking during a meet may influence and put officials "on-the-spot" unnecessarily.

(d) Since officials are, as a whole, impartial, the gymnasts and coaches should simply check scores on score-sheets, not questions. Asking officials the "why" of scores is a form of questioning the official's ability.

(e) If the practice of gymnasts asking officials about scores is a sound one, it should not matter when they ask. They should be able to ask the officials during the meet, as well as after.

Remarks: (See Table 96)

Selection (a) was chosen in majority per cent by all student groups except by the jury. The jury failed to reach a majority but indicated plurality agreement with answer (c).

The students approved the gymnasts' actions if their motives, as instigated by the coaches, were for the purpose of learning. The jury tended to approve the coaches who support this practice, providing the gymnasts wait until after the meet is over, thus avoiding what might be termed undue influence.

Both choices agreed upon by majority or plurality per cent agreement approved of the practice of questioning officials about scores but each choice varied as to appropriateness of time of questioning or motive involved.

None of the jurors or students selected (b) and all groups distributed their choices over four of five possibilities.

49. Horse shows include events in which riders are judged on their ability and skill in riding. Other events involve judging the performance and appearance of the horse, not necessarily the skill of the rider, although a good rider can help a horse perform better. However, some horses perform well or poorly regardless of the skill of the rider.

During a horse show it became common knowledge that an outstanding horse, who was entered in an event where his performance was to be judged, was easily upset by loud whistles. A rival stable, wishing this horse to lose and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mype, Ma,</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina, n°, Mn</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their horse to win, stationed people around the outside of the ring. These people were to whistle loudly whenever the horse went by. The horse was upset, performed poorly, and lost the event. The rival stable's horse won.

**Choices:**

(a) The whistling was unfair. The favored horse should be allowed to perform without distraction.

(b) The judge should have allowed the favorite to win since he must be aware of the distracting influences.

(c) The losing horse's owners should complain to the judges so they could stop the people whistling.

(d) Since the favored horse's weakness was common knowledge, the rival stable's action was justified.

(e) If the horse was really good and deserved to win, it should not be distracted by such actions and deserved to lose.

**Remarks:** (See Table 97)

The men and non-physical education major students were the only groups that failed to reach majority per cent agreement with the jury's selection (a). These groups indicated a tendency to agree by a plurality per cent agreement.

Those who agreed disapproved of the rival stable's distracting actions. No extenuating circumstances, appeals to authority, or other factors were deemed important enough to change their decision.

The jury voted for extra choices as may be noted by totaling the per cent of the responses. The "extra" choices still indicate censure of the rival stables actions. Similarity of the choices may account for these results.

The jury and physical education majors confined their answers to three possibilities and the athletes to four. All other groups chose selections from all five possible answers.

50. A soccer player receives a chest high pass and taps the ball down to the ground with his hand. The referee does not see this foul. (Soccer players are allowed to play the ball with their feet, not their hands.) The soccer player goes on down the field with the ball.
### Table 97

**Percentage Comparison Answers by Juries and Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spe. Mj.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choices:

(a) The player should raise his hand to indicate to the referee that he fouled.

(b) It is the referee's responsibility to see these fouls. If he fails to see them the player need not confess he fouled.

(c) The opponents should tell the referee the player fouled.

(d) As long as the player can get away with this action it is all right to use.

(e) This action may have been accidental. If the player does this again, the opponents should complain to the officials.

Remarks: (See Table 98)

Plurality per cent agreement by the jury, non-athletes, men, and non-physical education majors was made for answer (a). The other student groups were able to reach a majority per cent agreement on this same selection.

The plurality and majority votes favored placing the responsibility for declaration of fouls upon the player who committed the foul. The player had this responsibility when the officials failed to see his infraction.

A slight tendency may be noted to select choices (b) and (e) by the fairly high per cents. These choices indicated that some feel players need not confess to fouls since it is the officials job to call him. Some believed that fouls are accidental and therefore players need not confess. Continued fouling without officials penalization means the opposition should complain.

All groups, except the physical education majors, distributed choices over four of possible answers. These major students confined selections to three answers.

51. A diver who was well-known for his skill, thought he might be defeated by a rival in a coming meet. He persuaded a friend to take pictures of his close rival with a flash bulb and camera. The friend flashed the camera and bulb in the rival's eyes at crucial points of his dives to distract him. There are rules covering such happenings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any diver bothered by the crowd's actions such as flash bulbs, noise, etc., may request a retrial of the dive. Even though the rival diver was given retrials, the consistent action of the photographer threw him off so often that he lost the meet.

**Choices:**

(a) The well-known diver was clever in using this action.

(b) The rival must have realized what was happening and should have refused to dive.

(c) The officials, since there is a rule, should have stopped all photography.

(d) The well-known diver had no right to do such a thing.

(e) Photographers should be barred from taking pictures in diving meets.

**Remarks:** (See Table 99)

All groups reached majority per cent agreement on answer (c).

The photographer's action was deemed wrong but the voters felt the officials should have realized this situation and stopped all photography. One photographer could cause all photographers to suffer, this fact might be inferred except none of the groups voted for (e) which clearly states this fact.

Choices (a) and (e) were not selected. The women and jurors confined selections to two choices and all other groups to three.

52. In sprint swimming races, the racers try to get away with the pistol shot. Some swimming coaches will try to get one of their poor swimmers to start too soon, causing the opposing team's swimmer to go too. This action is called a "false start." Three false starts and a swimmer is disqualified.

**Choices:**

(a) If good swimmers are not able to avoid false starts, the action by the poor swimmers is all right.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mmpe, Mj,</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mna, Mw, Mn</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Coaches should not try to get poor swimmers to influence good swimmers by false starts.

c) Good swimmers should be expert enough to avoid false starts. By having poor swimmers try these things the good swimmers will learn to avoid such influences.

d) Coaches are unfair to poor swimmers when they ask them to do this.

Remarks: (See Table 100)

The jury selected choice (b). All of the student platforms failed to reach majority agreement. Some of the student groups did favor the jury's selection as indicated by plurality per cent agreement. The exceptions to this were the athletes and non-physical education majors who tended to favor (c).

The majority and plurality per cent agreement indicated censorship of coaches who encourage swimmers to cause false starts. Those who tended to choose (c) seemed to feel expert swimmers should be able to profit by the poor swimmer's actions and therefore may approve this practice.

The jurors and students did not vote for answer (a) and all groups distributed their choices over four of the five possibilities.

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

Choices:

(a) The opponents of these swimmers should learn not to be upset by such actions.

(b) This is a clever trick to use.

(c) This is all right to try since it probably works only on poor swimmers.

(d) This is all right since the opponents are not good enough to control their starting.
## TABLE 100

**PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) The opponents will eventually catch on and would actually profit by having this trick used against them.

(f) These swimmers are taking unfair advantage of the opponents.

Remarks: (See Table 101)

The athletes, men, and non-physical education majors failed to reach majority per cent agreement with the jury's selection (f). All other student groups agreed with the jury. Plurality agreement, however, was reached by the athletes, men, and non-majors for this choice.

Swimmers who move slowly into position to throw opponents off are wrong in their actions. This fact seemed to be indicated by the majority and plurality agreement of the voters.

None of the groups chose answer (c). Three student groups chose four of the six answers. The non-athletes, women, and physical education majors chose three of the six possibilities. The jury chose only two answers.

Extra answers were made by the jury, as may be noted by totaling the per cent responses of this group.

54. In sprint swimming races, the racers try to get away with the pistol shot. Some swimming coaches will try to get one of their poor swimmers to start too soon, causing the opposing team's swimmer to go too. This action is called a "false start." Three false starts and a swimmer is disqualified.

Choices:

(a) If good swimmers are not able to avoid false starts, the action by the poor swimmers is all right.

(b) Coaches should not try to get poor swimmers to influence good swimmers by false starts.

(c) Good swimmers should be expert enough to avoid false starts. By having poor swimmers try these things the good swimmers will learn to avoid such influences.

(d) Coaches are unfair to poor swimmers when they ask them to do this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 102)

It should be noted that this situation was the same as number fifty-two on this form. A variation in plurality per cent agreement over that displayed on fifty-two was made.

The jury's agreed upon choice was chosen by a plurality vote by only the athletes. The non-athletes divided their plurality between (b) and (c). The other pluralities favored choice (c).

Confusion due to repetition of the situation may account for the variation of replies between these two situations and any conclusions drawn might, as a result, be erroneous.

55. During diving meets the diver is judged by several judges as to the form with which he executes a dive. After each dive the judges award the diver points according to his performance. Some diving coaches have been known to organize cheering sections. After each dive the cheering section applauds the diver's performance, thus attempting to influence the judges' decisions.

Choices:

(a) The coach is wrong to do such a thing.

(b) The judges should not allow applause until after their decision.

(c) The coach is all right in his actions since this enables the coach to find out whether or not the judges are impartial.

(d) This is a clever thing to do, the more it works, the better.

(e) This is all right since good diving judges would not be influenced by such actions.

Remarks: (See Table 103)

The coach's action in organizing cheering sections to influence diving judges was disapproved by the jury as indicated by their majority per cent agreement on answer (a).

The students, by majority or plurality per cent chose (e). The athletes, women, and non-physical education majors by their selection didn't approve the practice but preferred
### TABLE 102

PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(e) since it indicated faith in the ability of judges to ignore such influences. Plurality agreement by the other student groups also favored selection (e).

Evidently choices (a) and (e) were not sufficiently discriminating to encourage agreement between students and jury.

Four student groups made choices from all of the possible selections. The physical education majors chose four. The jury and athletes chose three of the five possibilities.

56. In a tennis game player A discovers that his opponent gets the sun in his eyes on any high hit ball. Player A continually lobbs the ball high into the air at every opportunity. The players change sides of the court on every odd-numbered game but player B doesn't lob the ball into the air when player A has the sunny side of the court. Player B loses the match to player A.

**Choices:**

(a) Player A was justified in his actions since player B also could have lobbed the ball.

(b) Player B should have done the same thing as player A.

(c) Since player B did not take advantage of the sun, player A should not have either.

(d) Player A was clever to use the sun to his advantage.

**Remarks:** (See Table 104)

Choices (a) and (c) were voted for by the jurors in equal numbers. The athletes, women, and physical education major students agreed upon selection (c). All other student groups tended to agree with this answer as indicated by plurality per cent agreement.

In choice (a) the player, who used the sun to his advantage, was not censured since his opponent had equal opportunity to do the same thing. In selection (c) the opponent should have used the sun to his advantage as long as the first player had. Both choices imply approval of using the sun as an advantage, with students agreeing by majority or plurality that players may and should follow this practice.
TABLE 103

PERCENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mw, Mmpe</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The answers appear to be discriminating but evidently were not, perhaps accounting for the jury's split decision.

Only the jurors confined selections to three possibilities. All other groups distributed choices over all of the four possibilities.

57. When a particular tennis player wins a match he turns and walks away from his opponent. He fails to comment or to tell the opponent how well he played. When questioned about this, he justifies his actions by saying that if he tells an opponent how well he played this makes the defeated opponent look better than he really is.

Choices:

(a) The winner is correct in his actions and comments.

(b) His opinion may be correct but it would not hurt to simply shake hands with the opponent.

(c) He should tell his opponent he played well regardless of how he really feels.

(d) Simply complimenting the opponent should not make the opponent feel he is very good. After all, he had just defeated him.

(e) The winner is wrong. He should compliment and favorably comment on his opponent's play.

Remarks: (See Table 105)

The winner of a tennis match is justified in thinking he would be wrong to compliment an opponent for fear of giving the defeated a false idea of his tennis playing. He should be "courteous" or "sporting" and shake hands. This fact was supported by majority agreement of the jury.

The women students' majority per cent agreement took an opposite point of view by choosing (e). All other student groups tended to agree with this choice as indicated by plurality vote. Selection (e) indicated tennis players should compliment and comment favorably to the defeated opponent regardless of the winner's feelings. This choice may be the result of custom rather than honest opinion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr., Mrs., Wife</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The jurors selected three of the possible five answers. The physical education majors selected four and all other student platforms distributed choices over all of the selections.

58. In an important tennis match the umpire calls "out" when a ball hits close to the baseline. The player on whose side the ball hits believes the ball was in. Rather than argue with the umpire, in the next play he deliberately hits his return in the net.

Choices:

(a) The player was wrong to hit the ball into the net. By doing so he doesn't give his opponent credit for being able to win his own points.

(b) The player did not need to hit the ball into the net. If the umpire made a mistake he will probably make more and his opponent may gain back the point he lost.

(c) The player shows more displeasure with the umpire by hitting the ball deliberately into the net than if he argued.

(d) The player was correct in giving his opponent a point since he had gained the score unfairly.

Remarks: (See Table 106)

Only the physical education majors were able to reach majority agreement on any one choice. They chose selection (a). The jury indicated plurality agreement for this choice as did the women and men students. These groups tended to condemn the practice of "evening" the score and assumed that an umpire was wrong. The challenge of authority may be inferred in this choice.

The non-athletes and non-physical education major students showed plurality agreement on choice (c). This choice was similar to (a) inasmuch it condemned players who indicate displeasure or challenge authority by hitting the ball into the net.

Lack of agreement may be due to the lack of ability to discriminate between choices (a) and (c).

The jury divided its plurality vote between (a) and (e). Choice (e) indicated approval of this player's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actions, thus supporting the challenging of authority and the right of individuals to do such a thing.

Only the jurors confined their choices to less than four possibilities.

59. A previously undefeated tennis player was finally beaten in a close match. After the match and whenever someone spoke to him he would say, "I really didn't play my best game."

Choices:

(a) He had to say something when addressed. This was a good remark.

(b) He was justified in making such a statement if he felt it to be true.

(c) This was a clever remark. It should influence his opponent's opinion of him so that he might beat him later.

(d) A good loser would never say such a thing.

(e) Since this was the first time he had been beaten he was justified in making such a statement.

Remarks: (See Table 107)

The remarks of the tennis player who lost were wrong, in the opinion of jurors and students, inasmuch as all of them agreed in majority per cent with choice (d). Further inference might be that this player's statements were the sign of a poor loser and indicate he is making excuses for a defeat he should have accepted.

The jurors had the highest per cent agreement. The athletes and women were next highest followed by the non-physical education majors, the men, the non-athletes, and finally by the physical education majors.

Four student groups picked four choices out of five. The non-athletes and non-physical education majors chose all five answers with the jurors confined their selections to three possibilities.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Agreement</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60. In the Olympic Games of 1932, which were held in Finland, an American was racing in the 5,000 meter event. He tried to pass a Finnish racer who crowded him. The American was forced to drop back and then tried to pass again but was blocked by the Finn. The Finnish racer won the race. The crowd booed but the American announcer urged the Americans to stop since they were guests. Blocking is illegal but difficult to detect.

**Choices:**

(a) The crowd should not have booed nor should the announcer have found it necessary to quiet them.

(b) The announcer was correct in urging the crowd to be quiet.

(c) Being "guests" has nothing to do with the unfairness with which the American was treated. The crowd was correct in showing their displeasure.

(d) The protesting of decisions is not the business of the spectators. The crowd was wrong and the announcer correct.

**Remarks:** (See Table 108)

After the results of this situation had been tabulated a comment was made that this situation was known to have occurred in Los Angeles at the Olympic Games. Such a situation occurring in America might have brought different results. It would have been interesting to propose the changed situation and compare the selections of students and jury.

A tendency to divide plurality per cent agreement between choices (b) and (c) was displayed by the jury. Two distinct views were represented by this split decision. One view favored the announcer's attempts at quieting the crowd, the other, choice (c), agreed the crowd had a right to voice its displeasure.

One student group, the women students, reached a majority decision for choice (d). This selection favored the opinion that the crowd was wrong and the announcer correct. In the sense that the announcer was correct this choice agreed with selection (b). Plurality per cent agreement of the other student groups also favored choice (d).

It may be noted that the total per cent of the answers made by the jury exceeded 100 per cent. Extra choices were made by individual jury men perhaps accounting for lack of majority agreement.
The jury chose answers from three of four choices while all students distributed choices over all of the four possible answers.

61. A well-known champion woman track star threw the javelin on a hard-surfaced field. The javelin hit the hard surface and bounced. The official placed a marker where the javelin first hit. The woman thrower walked up to the official and moved the marker to another spot, all the while gesturing and talking.

Choices:

(a) Since she is a champion thrower she probably knows more about her throws than the officials. She has a right to move the marker.

(b) The javelin thrower was wrong to move the marker. She should let the official make the decision.

(c) The official could have been wrong. The thrower may question the official but she should not move the marker.

(d) The thrower should have requested another throw since she disagreed with the official's decision.

Remarks: (See Table 109)

The jury reached majority per cent agreement on two choices by virtue of the fact that extra selections were made by some. The choices selected were (b) and (c).

The students agreed with selection (b), in majority per cent, with the exception of the non-physical education majors. However, this group indicated plurality agreement with choice (b).

Choice (b) censored the javelin thrower for moving the marker and thus challenging official authority. The second choice, selection (c) made by the jury, gave the javelin thrower the right to question authority but not to assume the official's role by moving the marker. Both choices indicated moving the markers was wrong and in this sense the answers weren't sufficiently discriminating. This fact perhaps accounted for the jury's split decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three student groups chose from all four possible answers. One student group, the physical education majors, divided their choices between the same selections made by the jury. The athletes and women students made three selections from the four possibilities.

62. Two runners on team B "box" their rival, team A's star runner. One runner runs in the lead on the inside lane while the other runner moves into the second lane just one-half stride behind. Team A's runner can avoid the box only by dropping back to third place or by pushing one of team B's runners thereby risking having a foul called on him. Team A's runner fouls a team B runner - the officials do not see the foul, and he wins the race. "Boxing" is very difficult to detect.

**Choices:**

(a) The team A runner should not have fouled the team B runner in order to win.

(b) The team A runner was justified in fouling since he was boxed.

(c) As long as the officials did not see the foul, team A's runner was justified in trying.

(d) The winning runner should confess his foul but also point out he was boxed.

**Remarks:** (See Table 110)

The jury agreed majority-wise that the team A runner who fouled was wrong in his actions. The athletes, men, and physical education majors tended to agree by virtue of plurality per cent agreement.

The non-athletes, non-physical education majors, and women students agreed majority-wise on choice (d). This choice placed the responsibility on the track man to report his foul and "explain" why he fouled. These groups also say the runner was wrong but chose an answer that further solved the problem.

In the sense that the runner was wrong to foul, all groups agreed through majority or plurality per cent. Choices (a) and (d) were not sufficiently discriminating in this respect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mpe, Mj.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The jury, non-athletes, and physical education majors distributed choices over three of the four possibilities. All other groups chose from all of the four answers.

63. In the last track meet of their high school careers two rival runners meet. One of the runners had beaten his rival consistently and expects to win. The rival opponent is disqualified for false starts. The better runner feels that he can beat his rival and would like to try so he persuades the officials to let the poor runner race saying he will not race unless they allow this opponent's re-entry. The officials agree and the confident runner wins.

According to the rules, once a runner has been disqualified, he cannot re-enter the race.

Choices:

(a) The confident runner had no right to do what he did since he was acting against the rules.

(b) The confident runner was correct in his actions.

(c) It was all right for the better racer to ask for his opponent's reinstatement but not to threaten he would not race.

(d) Since it was the confident runner's last race, he was justified in making the request.

(e) Since the winner succeeded in his plan, his actions were justified.

Remarks: (See Table 111)

The jury reached a plurality agreement and divided their per cent plurality agreement between choices (a) and (c).

The jury's selections showed disagreement. Choice (a) condemned the runner for disputing authority, represented by the rules, regardless of the circumstances. Choice (c) condoned the confident runner's request but qualified the approval by disagreement with this runner's unwillingness to race unless his request was fulfilled.

Four student groups reached majority per cent agreement on choice (a). The athletes, non-athletes, women, and physical education majors felt the confident runner was
## TABLE 110
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mw, Wna, Wnpe</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wrong to break rules and make the request. The other two student groups agreed in plurality per cent, but not majority, with selection (a).

The men students and non-physical education majors divided their choices among all five answers. The physical education majors confined their choices to two selections and the jurors to three. All other groups chose from four of the five possibilities.

64. You are a member of a volleyball team and during a game your opponents hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazes your fingers as it flies out-of-bounds. The referee does not notice that you touched the ball and declared it out-of-bounds. If you were this player what would you do?

Choices:

(a) Tell the referee you touched the ball without waiting to see if anyone noticed your touching it.

(b) Wait to see if your teammates notices your touching the ball. If they did not notice let the referee's decision stand.

(c) Since the referee did not notice your touching the ball and it is his job to make decisions, let his decision stand.

(d) Ask the opponents if they noticed whether you touched the ball. If they did not notice, do not report yourself to the referee.

(e) Since you discover that the opponent's noticed that you touched the ball you should report yourself to the referee.

Remarks: (See Table 112)

The jury and all student groups, except the men students, agreed by majority per cent with choice (a). The men students reached plurality per cent agreement on this same choice. The jury was unanimous in agreement on this selection.

Choice (a) indicated that volleyball players should confess their out-of-bounds rule infractions regardless of whether or not the officials were or were not aware of such action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Mna, Mw, Mpe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the students tended to pick selection (c) which indicated responsibility for rules enforcement was vested with the officials. This tendency was demonstrated by the athletes, men, and non-physical education majors.

Three student groups selected choices from all five possibilities. The athletes and men students chose from four of the five proffered answers. The physical education majors confined their choices to three of the five possibilities.

Approximately one-third of the jury were physical educators. The action of calling one's own fouls in volleyball has become customary. The physical educator jurymen would be aware of this fact. The high percentage agreement may have been the result.

65. In a national college volleyball tournament for men, the final game was being played. A team A player spiked and smashed the ball into team B's court. Team B missed the ball and lost what might have been the game's deciding point. Team A would have won except that the player who spiked the ball said he touched the net. Later team B won the game and the national tournament.

**Choices:**

(a) In such important tournaments the officials should decide who touched the net. The team A player should not have had to confess.

(b) The team A player who confessed did the proper thing.

(c) Team B should not have accepted the team A player's confession. By accepting team A's players' confession they are ignoring the officials who are in charge of the game.

(d) Team A should not accept their own player's confession. By doing so they are putting the officials of the game in a bad light since the officials should see and call such plays.

(e) Team A's player called his own foul and his team would have won except for his statement. Team B should have recognized this and allowed team A to gain a point.
TABLE 112
PER CENT COMPARISON ANSWERS BY JURORS AND STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Lj, Ma, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: (See Table 111)

The only student group which was unable to reach majority per cent agreement with the jury's majority choice was the women students. The selection agreed upon was choice (b). However, the women students reached plurality per cent agreement on answer (b).

These groups' majority choice indicated approval of the player who confessed his foul. Extenuating circumstances such as a national tournament, danger of losing, or responsibility of the officials did not effect their choice.

The highest majority per cent agreement was attained by the jury. The lowest majority per cent agreement was made by the men students.

The physical education majors made selections from three of the five possible answers. The jury chose only two answers. The men and non-physical education majors selected answers from all possibilities. All other groups chose from four possibilities.

It is customary to call one's fouls in volleyball. One-third of the jury were physical educators and knew this. Higher per cent agreement by the jury might have been achieved if more of the jurors had been physical educators.

66. A high school wrestler upon graduation, was offered several athletic scholarships to various schools. A coach of one of the schools that had offered him a scholarship told him not to accept a scholarship to another particular school. The young wrestler did, however, accept the scholarship to that school. During a wrestling meet between the school whose coach had advised him and the school the boy now attended, the coach told him, "You'll never beat my wrestler."

Choices:

(a) The coach used good psychology on the young wrestler at the meet and in his previous advice.

(b) The coach was unethical in advising the boy not to attend that school, much less saying anything to him later.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpe, Mnpe, Mj, Ma, Mna, Mm</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) The coach was justified in trying to get the boy to attend his own school by running down another school and when the boy did not take his advice he was justified to use psychology on him during the wrestling match.

(d) The coach was justified in trying to influence the boy's decision about choice of colleges but not in what he said at the wrestling meet.

Remarks: (See Table 114)

The jurors reached majority per cent agreement on choice (b) as did all the student platforms except the physical education majors. This group reached plurality per cent agreement on this choice.

It should be noted that not all of the non-agreeing group's members made a selection. This fact may be noted in the total per cent answering. The total answering was 50.2 per cent. The reason some of these physical education majors did not reply is not known.

The coach's actions in trying to influence the wrestler's choice of schools and, later, his chance to win a match was condemned as unethical by those who agreed on choice (b).

Only one juror felt this coach's action might have been fair, in any sense, as shown by choice (c).

Some jurymen favored selection (d) which indicated approval of a coach influencing the wrestler's choice of schools but not this man's chances of winning.

The highest majority per cent agreement was achieved by the non-athletes. The lowest was made by the jury.

The non-athletes, women, and physical education majors distributed their choices over two of the four possibilities. All of the other groups chose three of the four selections.

67. The timekeeper's whistle indicated the end of a wrestling match. The wrestlers continued even though the whistle had blown. During this over-time one of the wrestlers scored two points. The timekeeper informed the official that the two points had been scored after the match had ended. The coach of the team that had scored the two points, argued with the official. The official
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm, Mma, Mj,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr, Mna, Mw</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compromised, since he was not sure when the match ended and the two points were scored in a legal maneuver. The official gave the scoring team one point and the match was tied.

Choices:

(a) Since the two points were scored illegally, no points should have been given regardless of the situation.

(b) Since the two points were awarded the wrestler, the coach had a right to dispute with the official and gain a compromise.

(c) The coach should not dispute with the official since his wrestler's points were scored in an illegal overtime.

(d) The official had no right to compromise the situation. The two points scored were illegal and he should have accepted the timer's word.

(e) Since two points were scored as a result of the confusion over the timer's signal, the official should offer a compromise to soothe the coach who objected.

Remarks: (See Table 115)

The official's failure to accept the timekeeper's decision that the match was over was condemned by the jury. Further inference may be drawn that the points scored were illegal and the official should not compromise in spite of the appeals of the coach. These facts were stated in choice (d).

No student platform chose (d) but the non-athletes, women, and physical education majors reached majority percent agreement on choice (a). Choice (a) also indicated disapproval of the officials compromise decision. Authority, represented by the rules, should not be challenged.

Disagreement between jurors and athletes as to choice was a result of similarity of choices not lack of agreement upon the principle involved. This fact may be further supported in noting that the men students split their plurality percent agreement between choices (d) and (a). The jury also divided their choices between these two even though they reached majority percent agreement on answer (d).
The athletes and men students chose answers from all of the five possibilities. The physical education majors and non-physical education majors selected four of the five possibilities. The non-athletes and women chose three of the five available answers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Agreement</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mn, Mw, Npe</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SEARCH FOR STANDARDS

Introduction to the Chapter

Because of differing philosophical views, the search for standards of ethical conduct can become entangled. The attempts to define good and bad have been further clouded by certain historical developments. The development of clear cut principles, unchallenged statements of good, and unchallenged illustrations of facts which might guide individuals or groups in the search for standards of conduct, seems an insurmountable task.

In this study groups of individuals were confronted with numerous situations in which choices of conduct were stated. Each individual reached a decision as a result of his experience. The ability to make a decision was based on some individual idea of good and bad. One may challenge such choice and yet the wisdom of one individual added to the wisdom of many individuals carries weight in the sense that agreement points the way to resolving dilemma of choice.

Philosophical Method

Some may believe that true standards of good or right are impossible to state, define, or achieve. This reasoning may be based upon the difficulty of determining the source
of good and right. The difficulty may also rest in the fact that the true standards of good or right accepted may not be universal and if not universal, valueless.

This writer can't deny the existence of standards of good and right. These standards may be universal in character and transcendental in source. They may have been devised by theologians, philosophers, prophets, leaders of the past or present. They may not as yet have come into existence and are waiting for the process of verbalization by some thoughtful person.

The hedonistic idea of pleasure was a proposal of a standard as was the principle of "right for right's sake." Each of these standards and principles has been rejected by many. Rejection can either cause the search for standards to cease or it can become a challenge for further consideration. The latter course seems to be the only road open to those who show concern for the resolving of the problem of defining good and bad.

The naturalistic method of determining good and bad appeals as a practical step in the solution to such a search. The form of this study is based upon this method: the solving of real life situations by experienced persons through agreement on a choice of behavior. Achievement of agreement does

---

not necessarily guarantee the existence of a standard. However, achievement of agreement can be accepted as a step in the direction of formulation of a standard. Thus a practical step was taken toward composition of beliefs. Some change in belief may result through this practical approach and some may not. "That experience with individuals or with groups is a decisive factor in bringing about change in belief, whether this change is in the direction of what we may call 'good' or designate as 'bad'" remains in the realm of experience.

Philosophical Dilemma

Some individuals choose to deny experience as a source of standards. The denial may be based upon historical developments in which man made mistakes in moral judgment. Enslavement of peoples; wars which annihilated worthy persons and societies; and development of weapons with frightening consequences may make man wonder whether his practical approach to living is a farce. Denial of these mistakes may take the direction of appealing and searching for a better world. The better world means to some not of this time, this life, or this existence. Refuge in remote realms and the promise of a better life in the hereafter is a solution that some may accept.

---

When moral standards are found to be lacking in their practical applications they can be reformulated. Reformulation may result in standards which are unattainable or impractical in the light of reality. Or reformulation can result in experimentation and the resultant culling out of those standards which work and those which fail.

The alternative is not to repudiate moral standards, nor yet to justify these standards by having recourse to a transcendental realm, but to modify the pattern of living, whatever it may be, so as to secure constant widening participation. The continuity of experience is thus preserved and a principle for the guidance of conduct is provided.4

**Dualistic dilemma.**—Denial of a practical world and refuge in a transcendental world out of fear of the consequences of man's acts is one basis of the dilemma of the search for good.

Another explanation of avoidance of the practical world of experience is the philosophical point of view called dualism. This doctrine is composed of two kinds of "things" or "existences," matter and mind.5

Matter is real and tangible. It can be felt, dealt with, manipulated, and is easily recognizable. Mind is all of those things that are immaterial, such as pains and

---


frustrations which seem to be unrelated to matter. Mind in this sense is a separate substance in its own right. 6

Those who share this dualistic view can search in two places for the meaning of good or for standards and principles of good. They can search in the material world or they may examine an immaterial world of the mind. "The claim that there is 'some essential humanity' in us, which speaks with authority when there are decisions to be made, may be taken to mean that there is higher, overarching reality that speaks within us." 7

It seems unfortunate that scientific progress has become so exclusively associated with the material world, the world of matter. Further, it is equally unfortunate that the true standards of good have become associated, in the minds of many, with an immaterial world. The merging of these two points of view is necessary. Certainly scientific progress offers solutions to problems as do ideas, supposedly derived from out-of-this-world sources. The only recourse is to merge these opposites by turning to available source material.

The source of the material is available to us in society. Society's history, its changes, and its predicted future offer a solution to a moral dilemma whether the

6 Ibid., p. 20.
7 Ibid., p. 68.
dualistic view is supported or rejected. The source for solution of moral dilemmas seems to rest in the examination of the practical, social world of experience.

Cleavage in our culture.—"Our moral values are purely social in their origin and validity or else they derive their credentials from some different source." The difficulty of determining values can be a result of the philosophical dilemma posed by the dualistic point of view. The dualistic point of view causes cleavage or division of opinion as to philosophy and consequently standards or meaning of good.

The "cleavage in our culture" is apparent when one looks into the pages of history. Our country was founded by people who were deeply religious. These primarily Christian peoples escaped to a new land hoping to create a government free from ecclesiastical domination. The separation of church and state, religion and government, was attempted.

Transcendental principles of good and evil were part of the lives of these founding peoples. Yet difficulties were encountered in following standards of good that had been appropriate in the European countries but were untried in the new. Moreover, immigration to the new land brought

---

8 Burkhardt, op. cit., p. 11.
9 Ibid., p. 1.
other religious sects and groups of people, each group with its ideas of good. Some of these ideas and standards failed to mix; others were found to be compatible.

The new land challenged progress. Concern for establishing a new nation stimulated this progress to the extent that practical affairs superceded ideas formed through contemplation. The standards that worked overshadowed the standards voiced or inherited. Reconciliation of opposing views and of opposing standards took place as demonstrated by the creation of a constitution and of a democratic form of government. Biases were torn down. Open-mindedness was necessary and the recognition of many sources of right or good resulted.

**Individual and society.**—Contributing to the moral dilemma, to formation of government, and continuing progress necessary in a new nation were the demands of individuals and groups. Cleavage could result if individuality overshadowed the common interests and purposes of many. The reverse could also further the division or split in this culture. As Hullfish has said:

The individual is of paramount importance in the scheme of things. Individuality, freedom, love of liberty, the right to speak up and to be heard, the opportunity to get ahead in terms of one's ingenuity and energy are necessary to the progress and preservation of this democratic nation.10

---

10 Hullfish, *op. cit.*, p. 582.
On the other hand, the individual must recognize that his desires are not always the best for the group. He must submerge his actions and wishes when group action is needed. Desires and actions have moral consequences. In this search for the true meaning of good, what the individual wishes must, in many instances, be overshadowed by group desire. "Morality finds its fulfillment in the continuing extension of common interests and common purposes among men."^{11}

Our constant dilemma is this: our generous impulses promise to extend democracy in full measure to all, yet our more limited impulses deny and restrict.^{12}

Democracy represents a solution to the problem of the individual versus the group. Democracy must accept the standards and ideals of those whose idea of good and right are based upon transcendental principles, for example, by the recognition of religious sects. Democracy must also recognize the standards of good and right whose admitted source rests in the world of practical affairs.

Right by Agreement

The man who desires to live with others and to compete with others must have a program which helps him face the complexities of life. His impulses and desires are constantly competing with those of others. If man truly

---

^{12} Hullfish, *op. cit.*, p. 583.
wishes to be good and to do right he must adjust these com-
peting impulses and wants to the impulses and wants of
others. "A moral person is one who desires to satisfy the
desires of everyone." 13

Whose desires are to take precedence? The indi-
vidual's desires could come first. The group's wishes might
be best. At one time the individual's wants should come
first and at another time the group's. The means of adjust-
ing these conflicts must be found.

The means appears to be agreement. Agreement based
upon the use of man's intelligence. Agreement based upon
experience. Agreement based upon a moral heritage.

To act morally is to aim at such an adjustment of
conflicting ideals as will secure the greatest pro-
portionate satisfaction of the ideals involved, and to
act immorally, is to close one's heart to ideals
antagonistic to one's own when the two conflict.14

Intelligence as a means.—Each person resolves or
comes to an agreement with himself concerning the moral life
he must lead. The process which helps him reach this
decision is intelligence. By freely relying upon his intel-
ligence, weighing fact and fallacy, solutions to moral
problems appear.

Thinking about consequences, purposes, goals, and
awareness helps one exercise choice. Thoughtful choice

14 Ibid., p. 99.
becomes the means not only for individuals but for groups. Groups have desires, wants, goals, conflicts and cannot help but be aware of differences and similarities. Group intelligence plays its role in reaching agreement on the good and right of a moral life.

**Continuity of experience.**—Agreement through intelligence is a means to an end but another factor is also important, that of "continuity of experience."15 We have seen in Chapter II how custom and habit played an historical part in the development of moral values. Tribal customs became laws. Laws, based upon habits, ruled group life. In this sense history cannot be denied. History becomes synonymous with experience. The facts of the past affect the future, as noted earlier, "Every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after."16

Each individual from the day of birth undergoes changes which modify what already exists. The future quality of experiences becomes inescapably entangled with past experiences. As block on block is placed in a foundation, so experience is placed upon experience. The form of the foundation is for the purpose of creating a building.

The experiences of the individual, built one upon the other, add to the continuity and form of that individual. What he becomes morally is based upon the past. His "continuity of experience"\textsuperscript{17} shapes his standards of conduct, good or bad, for the present and for the future.

**Implications of the Principles of Right by Agreement and Continuity of Experience for Education**

Reliance upon past experiences modified by the present, the submergence of individual needs to group needs, protection of individual rights by law and legislation, and application of intelligence by groups and individuals are factors for democratic living. An educational system which is the product of a democracy must recognize these factors if it is to assist the students in formulating ideas of good. "Intimate or personal experience, not the formal work of the school, has been a crucial factor in the creation, and in the reconstruction, of the beliefs that they hold."\textsuperscript{18} Therefore "education must organize experiences within which the student may have a critically discriminating experience."\textsuperscript{19}

Education must assume the lead in solving conflicts between individuals and groups. It must control individual desire and at the same time preserve freedom. Hullfish has said:

\begin{itemize}
\item[17] Ibid., p. 26.
\item[18] Hullfish, *op. cit.*, p. 584.
\item[19] Ibid., p. 584.
\end{itemize}
What is at issue so far as education is concerned is that we create a total school atmosphere, in classroom and shop, in the halls and on the playing fields, within which our young people may get the feeling of associating with others on a level of genuine respect.  

**Implications for physical education.**—Physical education is an integral part of education. Its role becomes important in the providing of experiences (and continuity of experience) and in the formulation of standards of conduct. Perhaps no more unique than other phases of education and yet unique because of popular appeal and informality, physical education should organize its experiences to contribute to the growth of its pupils.

Organization of experiences is valueless unless the type or kind of experience which is best is first recognized. Essential then is agreement about the kind and type of experience necessary to moral growth. Agreement of standards of conduct must be reached by leaders in this educational area. The agreed upon standard must then be instilled into the student through the process of experience. Williams has said:

> It would appear,..., that physical education provides, through its sports and games, unique, educative opportunities in socialization, the setting up of standards and the formulation of attitudes.21

---


Several hundred situations collected in this study illustrated varying types of behavior in sport. As these incidents were collected it was noted that behavior of the participants in the situations was sometimes approved and sometimes disapproved. In addition, some of the situations suggested other behaviors which might be appropriate.

Factors of Agreement

If one believes in the factors of intelligent choice, the importance of breadth of experience, and agreement as a democratic process for solution to problems, a group of individuals might reach a solution as to the appropriate behavior in a given sports situation. Having reached agreement, the behavior thus chosen may be accepted as a guide to conduct.

The jurors' experience, in the opinion of the writer, can be relied upon. This experience factor gains weight when one realizes that each of the jurors is a mature individual possessing, by virtue of his experience, some insight into the problems of value. Each of the jurors has had to make choices within his own knowledge, based upon some judgment of good. Experience in making choices involves intelligent application of whatever principle or principles has been selected as operative within the realm of that jurors' experience.

The jury's majority decisions may be accepted by those of us in physical education as a guide to right behavior. Acceptance of their decisions is based upon the criteria of intelligence and experience.
Agreement is subject to change. The members of the jury reached their decisions independently. It is possible that the majority choices might change if these jurors were brought together and each attempted to influence the other's choice. This factor cannot be ignored and must be considered as a possibility.

Factors Influencing Disagreement

Lack of agreement about the right behavior is also significant. The study offered behavior choices some of which were inappropriate. The choices did not, in some instances, state some types of conduct that might have been possible. The custom in vogue might have fostered disagreement. Actual principles of right and good can be obscured by the awareness of a custom contrary to a principle.

In addition to the points just mentioned, the motives of the jurors were not known. Motives or outcomes, translated into purposes, can vary from individual juror to individual juror. Each juror's purpose, not always being the same as another's, could cause the selection of proper behavior to differ from the majority.

The factor of agreement tends to level differing purposes, (depending upon how the agreement is reached) demands choice from those available possibilities, and obscures custom as it might overshadow the application of a juror's concept of right and good. The individual's choice is represented in agreement. The group's wants are satisfied in
agreement. Experience is blended into agreement as is intelligent choice. Agreement mixes the parts and emerges as a whole. A standard is selected, from many standards, and this standard is practical, workable, and representative of the social structure from which it originates.

**Danger of accepting agreement.**—Admittedly there is a danger in accepting majority choice as the sole criterion for the selection of a standard of good.

Those jurors who disagreed with the majority are submerged by percentage figures. Their choices may be as significant as the others. Complete submergence of individual opinion may be wrong. Further experimentation might prove this assumption.

Every study has limitations. Anticipation of all the types of behavior within each given situation was impossible. Additional choices, as good or right as those stated and selected, may exist. Further study is necessary in order to develop this aspect and might account for the inability of a juror to agree with the majority.

The juror who selected the good and right behavior may have had a principle in mind as he made his choice. It would seem that such a principle is subject to change. Such a principle is not always absolute. Disagreement may rest upon the need for the creation of a new principle. If the disagreeing juror is given a chance to voice this principle,
the majority may be influenced and a change of opinion may result. The ends we try to achieve are agreed upon fairly easily. It is the means we employ which brings about disagreement. \(^{22}\) "There are some who are sure that the best-informed thought, and the best-motivated conduct, stand in some duplicating relationship to standards which reside beyond time and place and, thus, beyond man." \(^{23}\) Some believe that man is guided by absolute standards and some believe that man is "capable of generating the standards and ideals by which to guide...thought and conduct." \(^{24}\) This latter view is supported by the writer.

Every sports situation, when divorced from its surroundings and background and placed on a printed page, loses some of its meaning. The extenuating circumstances are not always known. Complete impartiality in reporting incidents can't be guaranteed since the bias of each reporter affects his account. A situation involving ethical behavior observed in its entirety and viewed at the time and place it occurs might suggest a different choice to the juror. Real life situations may not be truly judged unless experienced.

---


\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 259.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 259.
Interpretations in Conclusion

The beginning of the search for right and good in any mode or way of life starts with the recognition of need. The need may be based upon a conflict of ideas and values. The need may be based upon conflicting customs and practices. Once the need is determined some method for solving or meeting needs must be employed.

Some of us recognize certain practices in the sports world as wrong. "The attitude of deliberate violating rules to gain an advantage"\(^{25}\) is an example of a practice which some dread will become firmly implanted in our culture. Others recognize certain practices as good, such as "foregoing personal glory for the good of the team."\(^{26}\) Further, some believe that many of our rules in sports and games are outmoded and need changing.\(^{27}\)

Some believe that "character develops through contacts in school athletics"\(^{28}\) and this character is caught

---

25 John W. Bunn, "Smart Basketball or Poor Ethics?" *Journal of Physical Education of the Young Men's Christian Association*, LII (September and October, 1954), p. 5.


rather than taught. Some believe sportsmanship, synonymous with character building, can be taught.

Sportsmanship and character building can be taught or it can be caught. Some sports practices have become customary without thought to their value. Some are thought to be worth while and have been accepted as such. We can agree or disagree but there is a basis for agreement.

Agreement, resting in intelligent application of each individual's experience based opinion, can result in a definition of right or good. Add the individual opinions of many and the resulting definition gains force and influences more and more persons. Momentum is established in perpetuating the standard thus derived. Guides to behavior may now be pointed to by the educator. Students' experiences are organized around the standard or guide, and right or good are on their way to becoming an established part of the students' life. "We can usually agree in turn upon what constitutes good conduct in a particular situation." This opinion is shared by the writer and supports the purpose of this study.

Agreement as a principle is important but one more factor or agent must be recognized and added to the establishment of right and good conduct. That ingredient is

---


courage. It takes courage to submerge one's individual desires to those of the group. It takes courage to join, agree, and to see the other side of an issue.

Courage is also present when one chooses to disagree. Through disagreement one's personal convictions may sway others to acceptance of those convictions. This type of courage must also be kept and used. To search for right and good, to be convinced that the solution achieved is worth while, to lead others toward the same solution, takes courage.

Leadership is essential if right and good behavior is to be instilled in the thoughts and actions of the immature. Leadership involves action in the face of custom, habit, laws or rules, and existing practices. Leadership takes courage to act in the manner in which one believes is right. Leadership and courage in joining others in their conviction of right is the final goal in guiding others in the formulation of standards and in the achievement of a change of improper practice.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The aim of this study was to explore a method which might lead to the development of standards or guides to ethical behavior in sport.

The exploratory method was based upon an assumption that agreement of mature individuals upon a type of behavior in a given situation might be an indication of what is good or right.

A multiple choice test form was devised. A collection of situations taken from the field of play was made. For each of the situations, three to eight choices, based upon the terms of the situation, were contrived. These situations and choices were offered to a group of mature individuals, called a jury, for the purpose of gaining a consensus upon one choice for each situation. The choices of the jurors were to be based upon their ethical judgment of good or right.

Further exploration was undertaken by offering some of the situations and their choices to students. The students' choices were compared with those made by the jury. If any contrasts in agreement were discerned, the comparison
would be the result of older persons' opinions contrasted with opinions of younger persons or students.

The first two steps in the development of the test instrument in the order followed were the collection of the situations by interview of persons directly connected with sport and a survey of some of the literature in physical education for additional situations.

The development of a multiple choice test form with three to eight choices for each situation was the third step.

The fourth step entailed a preliminary trial of the test form for the primary purpose of clarifying meaning and of examining duplicate situations and choices.

A jury, composed of twenty mature individuals, was chosen. The majority of the jury were selected from the Ohio State University faculty. Two revised forms of the preliminary test were submitted to this jury. Approximately half of the situations and choices were placed in one test form and the other half in another form. Nearly half of this jury chose answers to the situations on one form. The rest of the jurors answered the second form.

Two additional test forms were devised for the younger group, the students. The number of situations was less than those given to the jury and the number of test items was divided in half. Half of the situations and choices were put in form A and half in form B. The smaller number of situations was deemed necessary because of the
amount of time involved in choosing an answer. The two student test forms were submitted to approximately one hundred and fifty students on The Ohio State University campus.

On the basis of the data collected from the students who answered the test forms, these individuals were grouped into platforms for comparison. The platforms were Athletes, Non-Athletes, Women, Men, Physical Education Majors, and Non-Physical Education Majors.

The jurors' and students' replies were totaled and translated into per cent figures. Per cent tables based upon majority agreement were made. These tables show agreement or disagreement between jury members, between student platforms and between jurors and students, situation by situation.

Each situation in which there was some majority per cent agreement between the groups surveyed was examined. Certain pertinent remarks were made for each of these situations. These remarks explore the structure of the multiple choice question, the percentage results, and the choices selected by the groups surveyed.

In order to clarify the meaning of ethics and to provide background material for the study, research in the literature concerning ethics and ethical principles was undertaken. This research was essentially philosophical in nature and enabled the writer to clarify his approach to the problem of determining right and good.
In this writer's opinion, this research emphasized the need for the recognition of certain existing standards and uncovered principles of ethics. One of these principles gave weight to the basic assumption prompting this study. This principle follows that agreement can be the basis of determining right or good behavior.

Conclusions

The study was frankly exploratory, the intention being to determine whether right or good behavior in sport can be determined and whether a multiple choice test form might be used to achieve such a goal.

Criticisms of method.—Certain weaknesses in the methods employed in devising the test were uncovered. One weakness was the method used in procuring the situations from athletics and sport.

The interviewing technique might have been more thoroughly standardized. Some of the individuals interviewed gave only examples of good sportsmanship. They balked at giving examples of poor sports' behavior.

In addition, some of the interviewees volunteered solutions to the elements of the situations, though others did not. The writer felt that she should have specifically requested a solution or eliminated this request. On the one hand, those who offered a solution aided the writer in devising multiple choices. On the other hand, by offering a
solution, a biased choice might have resulted, obscuring another choice that might well exist.

Numbers of Situations

A greater number of situations might have been collected. A larger number of situations might have suggested greater variation of choices thus eliciting different answers and results from the respondents.

More individuals might have been interviewed. It is possible that a greater number of persons interviewed would result in the collection of a greater variety of situations. Variety in situations might add to variety of choice, suggesting more possibilities of right or good behavior and wrong or bad behavior.

Confining the situation collection to one geographical area and selecting only a few from literary sources may have limited the numbers, types, and kinds. This limitation may curtail possible choices and the resulting indication of good and right conduct.

The decision of the writer to limit the situations to the so-called "popular" sports is not completely defensible. Popular sports may vary from one geographical area to another. Popular sports may also vary from one given period of time to another. As a consequence, it is possible that what the jury selects today as right may be different or meaningless tomorrow.
Criticisms of the Test Forms

Although a preliminary test form was undertaken and revisions made, some faults still remained. These faults were uncovered as the study progressed.

Through expression of opinion of the jury it was found that some jurors felt a more detailed explanation of the situation was needed. In some cases the wording of the situation was criticized.

The rules of the games represented in the situations were not always clearly understood. This fact was noted as a result of some of the juror's written comments on their test copies.

Although great effort was made to avoid duplication of choices, the analysis and tabulation of the results offered by the jurors and students indicated this was not completely accomplished. An example of this fact may be found in situation number 57 on form B of the student test. This situation is found in Chapter III of this study.

It is possible that different choices, which were not offered to the testees, exist and might have been offered for their judgment. A need for standardization in the number of choices offered for each situation was noted. For example, when only three choices are offered to the respondents it may be too easy for them to reach agreement.

Some of the situations did not lend themselves to the establishment of more than three choices. Elimination of such situations might result in a better test form.
Elimination of Situations from Student Test Forms

The decision to delete some situations from the student forms because of the time factor and to divide the number of situations in half creating two test forms cannot be completely defended. It is quite possible that some situations that were stressful and which involved choices which might have indicated different ethical concepts were deleted.

Although it was not intended, some situations were duplicated on the student test forms A and B. In analyzing the results of the responses to these situations different percentage figures were uncovered. The reason for such variance is not known.

Informal expression of opinions of jurors and students indicated the test was time-consuming.

Selection of jurors and students.—The selection of jurors was fairly representative. The age and background were considered adequate. However, it is possible that other jurors with different backgrounds might give contrasting opinions.

In addition, the lack of or the possession of athletic experience of the jurors was not considered. Lack of familiarity with the rules has been previously mentioned. Therefore, this variable, if controlled, might change the picture of the results.

The development of a valid and reliable multiple choice test was not within the scope of this study.
Consequently, the size of the student group tested was small and experimental in nature. A different sized group and different types of students might yield different results.

Geographical area, upper classmen as opposed to under-classmen, socioeconomic groupings and other variables need to be more thoroughly controlled to statistically validate and standardize this test.

Difficulties were encountered in securing numbers of students to answer the test forms. As a consequence, a greater variety of students (by background) might have been secured.

For example, the junior and senior men, who were not physical education majors, were taken from fraternity membership. The socioeconomic variable was, in this instance, uncontrolled.

The age variable was uncontrolled other than the limitation of selection of students by year in school.

Different platforms of comparison and divisions of the student groups might have yielded different results. Age, sex, major in college, and athletic experience are only a few divisions that might be used.

The definition of athlete as applied to the men was different than that applied to the women. This means of classification, if changed, might cause a variation in responses.
Treatment of the data.—The percentage comparison between jurors and students limits the conclusions of this study. Other statistical measures might be used and might yield different results.

Definite conclusions can't be reached unless different statistical analysis is applied.

Further work on the test forms is needed. In spite of the limitations imposed by the structure of the experimental test form and in spite of the limits imposed by the comparison method used, the following points are noted.

Jury Agreement

Of the 13/4 situations and choices submitted to the students, in 94 of these, the jury reached a majority per cent agreement (50 per cent or more) on one choice.

In six situations, the jurors reached 100 per cent agreement or complete agreement upon one choice.

On form A of the student test form, the jury reached agreement upon a choice in 47 of the 67 situations. The same was true for form B since 47 situations' choices were agreed upon majority-wise by the jury out of the 67 situations offered in this form.

Student Agreement

The test forms A and B, submitted to the students, were a result of dividing the numbers situations in half to reduce the time involved in answering. Since no attempt was
made to make the two test forms equal other than by numbers of situations, the student results for the two forms are grouped together. In this sense 82 students answered from A and 75 answered the B test form. This fact should be kept in mind in examining the following figures.

Of the 90 situations in which the jury reached majority agreement, the students agreed with the jury's choice in 69 situations. In 21 situations the students failed to agree with the jury.

The results of student agreement by platforms for both test forms is as follows:

1. The Athletes agreed with the jury's choice in $\frac{44}{90}$ situations of the 90.

2. The Non-Athletes agreed upon a choice in $\frac{44}{90}$ situations of the 90.

3. The Women agreed in $\frac{46}{90}$ of the 90 situations.

4. The Men agreed upon a choice in $\frac{41}{90}$ of the 90 situations in which the jury reached agreement.

5. The Physical Education Majors agreed upon a choice in $\frac{48}{90}$ of the 90 jury agreed upon situations.

6. The Non-Physical Education Majors agreed upon 33 of the 90 situations in which the jury had reached majority per cent agreement.

The highest number of situations in which any one student platform agreed with the jury was 48. The lowest number of situations agreed upon by a student platform was 33.
The Women and Physical Education Majors comprised the membership of the group attaining the highest score. The Non-Physical Education Majors made the lowest score.

**Student Agreement Without Jury Agreement**

In some of the situations in which the jurors failed to reach majority per cent agreement upon any one choice, the students succeeded. Of the 13 situations submitted to the students, 17 situations demonstrated this fact. Nine situations on the student test form A, and eight situations in student test form B demonstrate this.

In the 17 situations in which the students failed to agree with the jury but were able to agree on another choice, the student platforms varied in choice selections by majority per cent agreement.

1. The Athletes agreed upon a choice in 10 situations of the 17 in which the jury could not reach majority per cent agreement.

2. Non-Athletes agreed upon a choice in 11 situations of the 17 situations in which the jury could not reach a majority per cent agreement.

3. The Women students agreed upon a choice in 11 situations of these 17.

4. The Men agreed in 8 of the 17 situations.

5. The Physical Education Major student platform reached agreement in 13 situations of the 17.
6. The Non-Physical Education Majors selected a choice in 7 situations of the 17.

**Agreement Patterns**

Certain patterns developed according to the kinds of choices made by jury and students. These patterns were a result of the examination of the remarks which follow the situations stated in Chapter III. Certain practices were favored and some condemned.

In the list below these practices, favored or condemned by the groups surveyed in the study, are stated. Explanations are offered and the situations in which the majority choice results of jury or student platforms support the practice are listed.

1. The jury and students tend to support authority as represented by the rules of games and officials. They condemn those persons whose actions refute such authority.

   This type of pattern of choice is illustrated in situations 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 14, 16, 23, and 63 in student form A. Also, situations 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, 19, 23, 24, 38, and 61 in student form B, support the above.

   Explanation for the development of such a pattern may be due to the respect for authority which is instilled in children by example,
teachings, and parental influence throughout individuals' lives.

2. Actions of spectators, which are meant to distract or influence the players and officials, are condemned. In form A, situations 2, 20, and 31 illustrate this point as do situations 15, 27, and 60 in form B.

   Jurors and students seem to be aware of the unfairness of some types of spectator behavior, perhaps due to recent condemnation of such actions through statements made by those concerned with the conduct of sports.

3. The coach sets an example for players and spectators. His actions and practices can have a detrimental influence. Detrimental practices are condemned by the jury and students in situations 7, 6, 21, 28, 35, 38, 39, 53, 55, and 65 in form A and in 9, 17, 22, 43, 52, and 66 in student test form B.

   The majority of the jury are leaders in educational circles. They are undoubtedly aware of the influence which their leadership may exert on youth. The students may also be aware of the examples set by the coaches, officials, and teachers with which they come in contact. This may explain the pattern developed by the majority choices of jury and students in the above list of situations.
4. In some cases rules need to be changed and authority, as represented by the officials of games, should be challenged. Situations 27, 47, 61 in form A and numbers 3, 31, 48, and 67 in form B illustrate this statement.

A democratic nation, such as ours, supports the rights of an individual to disagree and to demand change. Such a right is expressed by the development of this pattern.

5. Team or individual players should report their rules' violations or infractions when the officials fail to see such actions. On form A, situations 15, 25, 28, 32, and 52 are found to illustrate this point as do numbers 5, 25, 34, 44, 45, 50, 62, 64, and 65 on form B.

Individual rights and actions are recognized as important in our democratic society. This idea is instilled in many of us from childhood through maturity.

The ability to admit one can be wrong and to admit the wrong doing seems to be a part of our culture. The jury and students may have been imbued with this idea, thus the resulting pattern stated above.

6. Deliberate fouling in games and sports is considered unethical. Illustrations of situations in which such
practices are condemned by the jurors' and students' majority choices are found in numbers 18, 24, and 16 in form A and 3, 14, 33, 39, and 63 in form B.

It would seem that our society condemns intentional wrong doing. We are taught to respect rules and authority and to deliberately flaunt authority is wrong. This pattern supports the first pattern which was stated in this section.

7. Officials must enforce the rules and, if no rule exists, exert leadership in solving stressful situations.

In form A situations 7 and 54 illustrate the above as does situation 51 in form B.

Authority is again considered important by jury and students. Respect for authority, instilled since childhood, may be lost if the authority fails to exert leadership.

8. Supposedly strategic devices such as stalling, trying to make an opponent make a false start, and disconcerting remarks are considered unfair even though not covered by the rules. Situations 25, 44, 55, and 58 in form A and numbers 32, 42, 49, 53, and 55 in form B illustrate this pattern.

The idea of taking unfair advantage of another seems to have been instilled in us since childhood. Perhaps this thought was in the minds of the jury and
students as they selected the choices in the above situations. If there are no rules to cover "strategic" devices we had better not use such actions for fear of taking unfair advantage of opponents. This may be the explanation for this pattern.

9. Reporting an opponent's rule infraction to an authority is considered poor practice. Trying to get the opponent to report his infractions is commendable.

Situations 49 in form A and situations 2 and 30 in form B illustrate the above.

We aren't supposed to tell on the other person. This idea seems to have become part of our way of thinking and acting, perhaps explaining part of the above statement. To be able to admit one is wrong was previously mentioned as common or good practice, therefore, to be able to persuade an opponent to admit his wrong doing should contribute to his moral development.

Agreement conclusions.—In the chapter on the treatment of the data it should be recalled that some jurors selected one or more extra answers. Some jurors also failed to make even one choice in some situations.

On form A of the jury's test form extra answers were given in 24 of the 103 situations. On form B of the jury's test extra answers were given in 56 of the 101 situations.
In four of the 103 situations on the jury's test form A some jurors failed to make a choice. The same was true in 7 of the 101 situations in the jury's test form B.

These facts may be due to faulty wording of choices, similarity of choices, lack of knowledge concerning the sport, more than one right answer existing within the terms of the situation and choices, and the lack of inclusion of the proper choice.

The above reasons may also relate to the inability of the students to agree on a given choice in some situations.

The ability to agree does give some indication, however, of what should be the right behavior. The choice of the right behavior is indicated within the limits of the jury's experience and the limits of each situation.

The right behavior agreed upon by the jury does not guarantee that a person involved in such a situation would act in such a manner. It does give some indication as to what a person in such a situation should do.

The students' idea of good coincided with the jury in well over half of the situations (66 2/3 per cent) in which the jury reached majority per cent agreement. This may indicate that students tend to have some concept of ethical behavior if (1) the jury's opinions are acceptable (2) if the test instrument indicates ethical behavior (3) if majority per cent agreement is a valid measure and (4) if the limits of the size and type of groups sampled are accepted.
The reverse can also be true. The students' failure to agree with the jury's choices may also indicate lack of ethical judgment under the same limitations stated in the previous paragraph.

There seems to be some indication that Women students, and Physical Education major students, who were questioned, displayed more ethical judgment than the other student platforms. The value of this point is dependent upon the test form, acceptance of jury opinion, validity of majority per cent as a measure and the kind and size of the student group surveyed.

It is essentially speculative whether the other student groups displayed less ethical judgment although this fact may be indicated.

The ability of the jurors and students to agree on some choices in some situations seems to indicate that right or good behavior can be determined. In a limited sense this has been accomplished.

The situations in which the jurors reached agreement upon a choice can serve as a guide to what is good or right in similar instances. Those persons concerned with ethical behavior could use these situations and choices for their own edification or for the guidance of students.

It is encouraging to the writer to note the many instances in which the students agreed with the jury. Some knowledge of good and right is evidenced by the opinion of these students.
These situations provide a choice in which one must look at alternatives that follow and then make a choice. The choices made by the jurors reflect the confusion shown by individuals who are faced with alternatives. Further thoughtful and reflective thinking seems to be needed to uncover the rules and standards, definitions of fairness, and honesty in the sports world. The jurors' and students' selections show that answers and choices must be made after one has looked at consequences. These persons must choose to satisfy the maximum of interests by agreement.

In the opinion of the writer this type of test could and should be developed further for the purpose of testing knowledge of ethical behavior.

The situations collected in the study indicate a need for more attention to the problem of ethical behavior in sport. The conduct of players, coaches, spectators, officials, and others in these situations prove this fact. Changes in practice, in rules, and customs are indicated if ethical behavior is considered a necessary part of athletics, and sport.

Implications for further study.—This writer believes that this type of test offers possibilities for validation and standardization in providing a knowledge test of ethical behavior in sport.
The principles which the jury followed in making their choices of good and right behavior might be uncovered. Such principles would be of inestimable value to those concerned with ethical behavior.

If principles and standards of ethical behavior are uncovered, some method or means should be developed to guarantee their application in the field of play. A study which relates these two aspects, knowledge as it carries over into practice, would be of major interest. Methods need to be developed that would instill principles and standards of ethical conduct in the lives of the students.
### APPENDIX A

#### STUDENT FORM A

**TABLE 116**

**FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 5 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 117**

**FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 12 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 120
FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 33 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 121
FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 34 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 122

**FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 48 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 123

**FORM A - SITUATION NUMBER 60 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B

#### STUDENT FORM B

#### TABLE 125

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 6 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 126

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 8 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 127
Form B - Situation Number 10 in which no majority per cent agreement was reached by jury or students.

Table 128
Form B - Situation Number 18 in which no majority per cent agreement was reached by jury or students.
### TABLE 1.9

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 21 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1.90

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 26 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 151

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 29 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 132

**FORM B - SITUATION NUMBER 35 IN WHICH NO MAJORITY PER CENT AGREEMENT WAS REACHED BY JURY OR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Jury</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Physical Education Majors</th>
<th>Non-Physical Education Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Physical Education Majors</td>
<td>Non-Physical Education Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 133: Form B - Situation Number 40 in which no majority per cent agreement was reached by jury or students.
APPENDIX C

Situations and choices offered to jurors and students in which neither group was able to reach majority per cent agreement.

Key SFA - Situation used in Student Form A of Multiple Choice Test.

SFB - Situation used in Student Form B of Multiple Choice Test.

JFA - Situation offered to Jurors answering Form A of Jury's Multiple Choice Test Form.

JFB - Situation offered to Jurors answering Form B of Jury's Multiple Choice Test Form.

Situations and choices taken from Student Test Form A in which neither jurors nor students reached majority per cent agreement.

5. A professional baseball player loafed in from second base on an inside-the-park home-run by a man who followed him. (This home-run had been hit in such fashion that the opponents could still field the ball and try to throw the ball to put the batter out.) Both runners arrived on the third base line at the same time. The play was not on the first man but on the second. The first man, however, timed his action just right so as to slide into the catcher and knock him down. He then laid on him while the relay throw flew clear into the stands and the second runner came home safely.

___a. This action is all right in professional baseball, but not necessarily in other kinds of competition.

___b. The first runner should have hurried so that this situation would not have occurred.

___c. If the catcher was in the way, the first runner, even if he loafed along, had a right to knock him down.
d. Even if the first runner loafed along and knocked the catcher down because he was in the way, the first runner should not have laid on the catcher.

e. This type of action was entirely unnecessary and no player should do such a thing.

12. During a tied championship basketball game and in the final two minutes left to play, team A fouls team B. The team B player steps up to take the free throw. Just as he starts to shoot, the crowd at one end of the floor behind a glass backboard, jumps up and down to try to bother the shooter. The shooter misses. The official does not know whether the crowd is really for team A or not since this is a tournament crowd composed of many teams' followers and the game is being played on a neutral court. The official tried to calm the fans but could not. He consults with the tournament manager who puts extra police among fans to quiet them. The official gives the player who missed the free throw a substitute throw. The team B player received a bonus shot but the fans bother him again. The official gives team B a substitute throw for the bonus throw that he feels the player missed because of the crowd's actions. The official has jurisdiction over unusual circumstances and may use his discretion in calling fouls on the crowd. There is nothing in the rules that allows the official to give substitute free throws as a result of the crowd's behavior.

a. The official was right in all of his actions.

b. The official was wrong in penalizing team A for the crowd's actions.

c. The substitute throw for the first free throw was enough, the second substitute throw for the bonus shot was too much.

d. The official should have kept trying to calm the crowd rather than award substitute free throws.

e. The tournament manager should have calmed the crowd or removed them rather than forcing officials to award substitute free throws.

f. Team A's coach and players should protest the game. The officials were wrong in awarding substitute free throws for things they could not control.
19. In many men's basketball leagues the officials are hired one year in advance - by a written and signed contract. Sometimes an official will referee several games in one year and he is asked to sign a contract for the coming year, which he does. Before the next year's games this official referees a game which displeases the school. This school then informs the referee he is to cancel the coming year's contracts. If the official thinks this is unfair he may appeal to the league officials. The usual result is that the official is paid for the games he contracted to do, but does not actually officiate them.

a. The school is justified in the cancellation if they don't like the official's ability.

b. The school should not be allowed to cancel any part of the contract.

c. The Athletic Commission should force the school to use, as well as to pay, the official.

d. The official should not appeal his contract cancellation. He should not want to officiate where he is not wanted.

e. The contract system, as stated, is faulty. The written agreements allow the school, the Athletic Commission, and the official no protection nor leeway.

f. The usual practice as stated above should be followed.

33. If a foul is committed in field hockey, such as kicking the ball instead of hitting it with the stick, the officials "hold the whistle" to see if the player who kicked the ball retrieves it or whether an opponent gets the ball. If the opponent gets the ball a foul is not called. If the "kicker" gets the ball, the foul is called.

Some coaches tell their players to stop if they foul and raise their hands. Other coaches tell their players not to stop. When "playing to the whistle" and the opponents get the ball, the official does not have to stop the game to administer a penalty. Sometimes "playing to the whistle" enables the player to retrieve the ball after kicking and the official fails to see the foul.
As long as the officials are supposed to "hold the whistle" players might as well "play to the whistle."

The coaches who tell their players to stop and indicate they have fouled are correct.

Since there is disagreement as to what to do, the "holding of the whistle" should be eliminated.

Players who do not raise their hands when they foul may begin to think they are getting away with the breaking of rules.

There should be mutual agreement on the point before the game starts since either way to play is all right.

During a football game team A was considerably ahead of team B in score. Team B committed a foul which the official ignored. The coach of team A protested on the grounds that in the previous play his team had been called for the same violation. While the protest was being made, the official let the clock run instead of stopping it, thereby ending the game. The official should have stopped the clock but he wanted to end the game soon since it was so one-sided.

The officials were correct in ignoring the violation and letting the clock run.

The official should not have let the clock run but should have endorsed the violation.

The officials by their actions put the losing team in a bad light by calling attention to their weak play.

The officials should have stopped the clock and administered the penalty for the violation.

Since the violation had been ignored it was too late, but the clock should have been stopped.

It is customary in most gymnastic meets to use an announcer who keeps the spectators informed of the scoring in the meet. One particular college's announcer always announces the scores of all the meets and the number of times his college has beaten the present visiting team. The coach of the visiting team objected to these announcements.
a. The coach was correct in objecting since calling attention to his school's defeats may give his team feelings of inferiority causing it to perform poorly.

b. Such announcing is perfectly logical and fair. Facts should never bother, help, or hinder either team.

c. The home team, whose announcer followed this practice, should have stopped the announcer. The visiting coach had reason to object and the home team should have realized this.

d. The coach, by objecting, calls unfair attention to the announcer's practice. The home team or the announcer may not have had any idea of trying to influence the visiting team's performance.

e. This style of announcing is unfair and should be eliminated.

f. It would be courteous not to announce the results if the previous records were overwhelming in favor of the home team.

60. In a city recreation tennis tournament committee does not provide officials for the matches except the final and semi-finals. One player believes that an opponent who beat him does not call the questionable balls near boundary lines fairly. He watches the opponent in other matches and talks to this player's opponents and they agree that they feel he is cheating. They complain to the tournament committee about this player.

a. They should have told the player how they felt. If he continued his actions they should then report him to the tournament committee.

b. They should not have reported the player since if this player reaches the semi-finals, his cheating will be discovered by the officials.

c. They were correct in the action they took.

d. They should not have complained since they could possibly be mistaken.

e. Since this was a recreation tournament, the loser stirred up too much fuss about something that was unimportant.
The defeated player was wrong in going to others. If he was sure he should talk to the player and if the player continues this practice, he then should go to the committee.

The opponents should go individually to the player and tell him what they think.

Two rival teams, A and B, were playing a volleyball game. Team A was winning. The scorers and timers were friends and supporters of team B. With two minutes left to play and the score very close, team A asked for someone from their team to be present at the score table. In the final seconds the timer dropped the stopwatch, fumbled in picking it up, and during the time the watch was picked up, team B scored the winning point. The time on the watch indicated the game ended sometime while the watch was on the floor.

Team A should protest the game and final score.

Team B should offer to play an overtime with score tied, replay the game, or some similar action.

It is possible the timer dropped the watch unintentionally and time did not expire. The score should stand.

The decision as to the timer's action should be left up to the referee.

Since it may be impossible to tell whether the point was scored before or after the game ended, the score should stand.

Since it may be impossible to know whether the game ended before the point was scored, the point should be replayed.

The referee should call a tie game and order an overtime.
Situations and Choices taken from Student Test

Form B in which neither jurors nor students reached majority per cent agreement.

6. During a closely fought basketball game in Madison Square Garden, both teams were pushing and shoving. The spectators were screaming and yelling. Suddenly a player on team A shoved a team B player on a lay-up shot, and sent him sprawling at the feet of the crowd. A teammate of the team A player who shoved the team B player came running and shook his fist at the team B player lying on the floor. A spectator starts kicking the team B player. The official calls a foul on team A for shoving but does not call a foul on the fan who kicked the team B player. The official could have called a foul on the spectator according to the rules.

___a. The official had no other choice than to call a foul on the team A player who shoved.

___b. The official should have called a foul on the spectator, as well as on the team A player.

___c. The official should have called two fouls on team A; one foul for the shoving, and one foul for the player shaking his fist at the team B player, and remove the spectator.

___d. The officials should have stopped the game; called a foul on team A for shoving; called a foul on the team A player who shook his fist; called a foul on the spectator and had the spectator removed from the building.

___e. The officials called the correct foul but should have had the spectator removed from the building.

___f. The officials should have calmed or quieted the crowd long before the incident occurred.

8. During the fourth quarter of a basketball game one team has only four players left, due to disqualification of the others by fouls. This team is losing the game. The coach of the opponents requests the referee to permit the losing team to use one of the
players fouled out. The official was within the rules in not allowing the other team to use a disqualified player.

**a.** The winning coach was doing the sporting thing in making the request. The official should have allowed it under the circumstances.

**b.** The coach's request makes the losing team appear weak by seeming to say they can win even if the losers have all their players in the game.

**c.** The coach should not request this since his opponents lost their players according to the rules of the game.

**d.** The winning coach should also play with only four players, rather than make his request.

**e.** The coach should not ask an official to change a rule under any circumstances.

10. Two softball teams are playing in a state softball tournament. The manager of team A discovers that team B, the opponents, are playing with an ineligible player. If the ineligibility is reported to the tournament officials, team B will be disqualified and team A will win. The players of team A also know this and tell their manager not to report the ineligibility.

**a.** The manager should not report the ineligibility.

**b.** The ineligibility should not be reported since this is the job of the tournament officials.

**c.** Team B's manager should be told that others are aware that he is playing with an ineligible player and he should make a decision.

**d.** Team B's manager should be informed that others know of the ineligibility and then team B should be reported to the tournament officials.

**e.** The manager should report the ineligible player in spite of his team's objections.
18. In an intramural basketball tournament the rules governing the play allow a short-handed team to borrow players from another team, providing the opponents agree to the substitution. Team A borrows two players and fails to ask their opponents' permission on one of the two players. Team A and team B play with team A winning due to the efforts of team A's borrowed and unapproved player. Team B discovers, after the game is over, that team A played with an unapproved player and protest the game to the intramural tournament officials. The tournament officials are unable to determine whether team A deliberately failed to ask team B's permission to approve the player.

a. The score should stand since team B could have protested before they knew the final outcome.

b. The game should be re-played since the rules of the tournament have been violated.

c. The score should not stand. Team A should lose the game by disqualification for violating the rules.

d. The score should stand and team B should be informed that they should not protest.

e. Since the violation occurred before the game started, team B should win by default.

21. A member of a department of physical education whose school's basketball team is playing a game with a rival school, is not the coach of the team but is a basketball official. The rival team asks her to officiate this game as their official. Girl's basketball rules legally allow her to officiate since she is not the coach and, therefore, is not officially connected with the teams which are to play.

a. She should officiate the game since she can be impartial.

b. She should not officiate the game since it is too difficult to be impartial.

c. She should not officiate since she may feel she may be criticized by her own school if they should fail to win.
d. She should not officiate since in a sense she is connected with the school even though the rules state it is legal.

e. She should not officiate since the rival team may criticize her if they don't win.

f. Since a qualified official is efficient and impartial, she should officiate.

g. She should not officiate even though she feels she can be impartial.

A highly trained woman physical education teacher took her basketball team to a game at another college. During the game, she consulted with a man coach. This man urged her to protest the official's decisions, which she proceeded to do.

a. If the official's decisions were poor the woman and man coach were justified in their actions.

b. The woman should not have relied on someone else's advice.

c. Regardless of the advice the woman should not have protested the official's decisions.

d. The coach had no business influencing the regular coach's decisions, especially advising her to protest the umpire's decisions.

e. The woman coach displayed lack of knowledge, confidence, and judgment in using another's advice and protesting officials' decisions.

West Santee, a famous track star, was ruled ineligible by the Amateur Athletic Union for receiving excessive expense money. They ruled he was a professional rather than an amateur but, the American Bowling Congress holds national championships without reference to amateur or professional status. It is well-known that many bowlers win and accept prize money in tournaments and receive expense money.
a. The American Bowling Congress should follow the principles of amateurism as established by the Amateur Athletic Union.

b. Bowling is not like track and field or other athletic events; therefore, amateurism or professionalism is not an issue.

c. Since it is hard to determine just what is an amateur or professional these days, the Amateur Athletic Union should change its standards.

d. Money as a basis for awards is poor practice. The Bowling Congress should remove the money angle from its awards.

A series of plays in football in which the ball is concealed by the quarterback who then thrusts the ball into any one of the three backfield player's stomachs, is called the "belly series." Officials find it difficult to follow the ball and sometime call plays "dead" when actually another player may have the ball and is still running. Such a thing happened when an official blew his whistle thinking the player with the ball had been tackled when actually another player ran on for a touchdown. The official's call canceled the touchdown. The official could not allow the touchdown since by blowing his whistle the players stopped, thus allowing the opposing player to score.

a. Confusing plays like the "belly series" should be ruled illegal to protect both the teams and the officials.

b. The touchdown should have been counted regardless of the whistle being blown too soon.

c. The game should be replayed with different officials.

d. Since the player running with the ball did not stop when the whistle blew, the touchdown should not count.

e. Since the official made a mistake the play should be re-run, not necessarily with the "belly" play, but the ball remaining on the same spot.

f. The official's decision should stand.

g. The touchdown should not count but the next play should start approximately from the spot where the runner was when the whistle sounded.
During the third period of a football game a halfback came running down the side line with the ball. Just as the runner passed in front of his own coach and bench, the coach noticed the player stepped on the side line. The officials did not see him and the player went on to score a touchdown. The team that scored the illegal touchdown lost.

_ a. Since the team lost the coach should not confess his player scored illegally.

_ b. The coach should have immediately informed the officials that his player had gone out-of-bounds.

_ c. The coach should not tell the officials that his player was out-of-bounds since it is the official's job to see such things.

_ d. If the team scoring the illegal touchdown had won, then the coach should confess that their touchdown was illegal.

_ e. The coach should let the officials run the game.
SITUATIONS ELIMINATED FROM THE JURY'S MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST FORM, FORM A

The following list of situations are those eliminated during the construction of the Student Multiple Choice Test forms. The jury did pick a choice for each of these situations but the students did not since these questions were not offered for their judgment nor for comparison purposes.

Those situations which were in the Jury's Test Form A are indicated by the letter "A." Those situations and choices which were in the Jury Test Form B are marked "B." The numbers of the following situations are the same as they were in the jury's test forms.

It should also be noted that the situations that had been classified "easy" by the preliminary jury were repeated in both the jury's test forms. These duplicate situations were eliminated in the student test forms in order to reduce the numbers of situations.

30. A basketball player, noted for his temper and complaints to the officials, was disqualified on fouls. The spectators noticed that he was smiling, talking, and shaking hands with the officials before leaving the game. A spectator asked him after the game what he had said to the officials. He said he had smilingly told the officials they were the worst officials he had ever seen.

   a. The player should not have shown signs of temper in the first place.
b. He should have shown his true feelings when talking to the officials instead of putting on an act.

c. He should not have said anything to the officials.

d. The least the player could have done was wait until after the game before addressing the officials.

e. The player's actions were satisfactory; he felt he was justified in his actions.

31. A basketball player on team A was known to have the habit of grabbing an opponent's belt whenever that opponent was trying to go after a loose ball. This action slowed the opponent down just enough to allow the team A player to get the ball. This action is against the rules. As the coach of team A's opponents, what would you do?

a. If you were the coach of the opponents and saw this happening, you would report it to the officials.

b. If you were the coach of the team whose player is being fouled, you would do nothing and wait for the officials to catch the opponent.

c. As the coach of the opponents you would wait and if the opponent continued this then you would tell the officials.

d. As the opponent's coach, you should tell your player to hold the team A player's belt.

e. As the opponent's coach you should tell team A's coach that you are aware of his player's actions, and if he does not stop, you will report him to the officials.

34. During the last 30 seconds of a tied basketball game between two college teams, the players scrambled for a loose ball near team A's foul line. This resulted in a tie ball. After the official called "tie ball," team B requested time out and the official placed the ball on the foul line. After the time out, the official picked up the ball and awarded it to team A for a free throw, forgetting it was a tie ball. Team A's captain told the official he was wrong and the official accepted his word.
a. The official was correct in accepting team A's captain's word.

b. Team B should have corrected the official since they were being unfairly penalized.

c. The official should have continued with the free throw regardless of objections since he is in charge of the game.

d. Team A's captain should not have objected to the decision; he should have let team B's captain object.

e. Neither of the team's captains should attempt to change the official's decision. They should let the official discover his own mistake.

Two rival teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on one of these team's home court. During this game, the visiting team's star player was consistently booed whenever he missed a basket, pass, rebound, or maneuver. In the return game on the other team's court, the home crowd took revenge by booing all the players on the opposition. They were retaliating for what the other team's home crowd had done to their star.

a. Booing is a good device to use to rattle a player. If this could help the home team in the first game, such action is all right.

b. "Getting back" at the other team during the return game was justifiable under the circumstances.

c. Even though the star player had been booed the other team's crowd should not have paid them back.

d. Booing individual players does more good than booing the whole team. In the second game, the spectators should have singled out one player.

e. Players should learn to play under difficult situations. Having the crowd boo them helps them to ignore future experiences of the same nature.
A star player is a leading scorer in his basketball league and has a chance to be selected All American. His team is not very good and they would not win the league championship. The star player shoots at every opportunity and refuses to pass to his teammates. The coach backs him up and tells the team to pass to the star so he can shoot.

a. Since the team is not too good, recognition for one player is better than none. This is good procedure.

b. The coach should not ask nor should the star expect the team to always let him shoot. Basketball is supposedly a team game.

c. The star player should not do all of the shooting and even if his coach advises his teammates to pass to him he should refuse to try to obtain all the glory.

d. Since the coach has put the stamp of approval on this action, the star player has no other choice but to oblige.

In the Olympics the coach of the winning Figure Skater is congratulated by the runner-up's coach. He is heard to say, "Congratulations." The winning coach replies, "It was a tough fight." The runner-up's coach, who still has hopes his skater will beat the winner in future competition, says, "It will continue to be a tough fight."

a. The runner-up's coach used good psychology in making the final statement.

b. The runner-up's coach should not have made the final statement.

c. Coaches should avoid comments after competitive events therefore hard feelings won't result.

d. The winner's coach should not have said anything to the losing coach. Since he did, he deserved the final remark.

e. The statement made by the coaches would probably have little effect. What the runner-up's coach said was unimportant.

f. The comments were appropriate regardless of the effect.
Outstanding athletes, playing for schools and college, have been known to receive gifts of clothing, watches, and so forth. These gifts are given by admirers who are not officially connected with the school. Conference rules prohibit such gifts when given by officials of the schools or colleges. When players are questioned as to whether they have received such gifts, they deny receiving them since they were given "unofficially."

(a) If the gifts come from those people unofficially connected with the school the players should not be questioned.

(b) Since they are outstanding players they have the right to accept gifts from outsiders without question.

(c) Outsiders should not give players gifts since conference investigations may uncover official connections which the players may not have realized.

(d) There is no difference between outsiders and officials when it comes to giving "extras" to players. The conference should completely outlaw such practice.

(e) If other students are free to receive gifts from unofficial persons, athletes should be allowed to receive such things without fear of investigations.

In a six-man-invitational 100-yard dash, there were three racers who probably would not win and three others who might. At the start, two of the favored had false starts twice in succession and according to the rules of these days, they were penalized two yards. The remaining favorite was not penalized but he requested that the starter allow them to start even with him. The officials allowed the penalized racers to start even with the runner who had requested it. The race was run and the unpenalized favorite won. The other, formerly penalized favored racers, placed second and third.

(a) The unpenalized favorite was correct in his request to the officials.

(b) The unpenalized racer should not have requested the officials to break a rule.
The unpenalized favorite, by requesting such a thing, eliminated the possibility of any of the unfavored runners winning.

The favored winner put the other favored two in a difficult position. By requesting a rule change, they were forced to take unfair advantage of the other opponents.

Many teams in track events will place a good runner and a poor runner in the same race. The poor runner is to run fast to try to get the opponents to follow and expend their energy while his teammate, the good runner, hangs back, saves his energy, and goes on to win.

This tactic is fair since it is not against the rules. This is a good tactic to use; if the other runners are not smart enough to save their energy, they deserve to lose.

The poor runner has no right to be in the race, much less to try to make the other runners lose.

The good runner should win on his own skill, not depend on help from a teammate.

All teams entering races have the opportunity to use the same tactic. If one team wishes to do this, the other team could too.

A good runner should be able to set his own pace, therefore, this action should not be used.

Runners in long distance races in track events must learn to pace themselves or conserve energy. It is against the rules to run along the outside of the track and pace a teammate when one is not entered in a race. A famous runner was "pacing" his team's runners in other races in the back stretch of the track. The referee and commissioner of the track meet told him not to. This famous runner argued with them.

The famous runner was trying to help his teammates and since he was probably more skilled than they, was simply trying to be helpful.
b. Since this action is a violation of the rules, the famous runner was wrong and should have been penalized.

c. The officials probably did not want to penalize a famous runner, or his team and were right to tell him to stop. Since he argued, then he should have been penalized.

d. It is worse for a famous runner to do these things than it is for others. Being well-known, he sets a bad example for himself and his team.

97. A well-known champion discus thrower fouls by going out of the circle while making a good throw. The official does not see the foul, even though the crowd does. The discus thrower throws again, fouls, and this time the official sees it. The thrower argued with the official, pulled up the markers on the field from previous throws, and demanded that he be given a chance to take all of his throws again. The judges allowed the discus thrower to take his last throw over again.

a. The officials did the correct thing.

b. The officials should not have allowed the thrower to repeat any throw.

c. The discus thrower was correct in arguing with the officials but not in tearing up the markers.

d. The officials should have allowed the thrower to take all of his throws again as long as they allowed him to repeat the last throw.

e. The officials were correct in penalizing, but as a result of the thrower's pulling up the markers should have disqualified him.

SITUATIONS ELIMINATED FROM THE JURY TEST FORM B

IN PREPARATION OF STUDENT TEST FORMS

7. A baseball player complained about an interference penalty when he had not seen the play at all but merely wanted to save his team a penalty. The player who interfered openly admitted he had been wrong later on.
16. a. The player should argue only if he had seen the play.
   b. If the player was certain the umpire was wrong then he is justified in arguing.
   c. This player's actions were all right since it is customary to argue with baseball umpires.
   d. The player was wrong to argue. Players should not argue under any circumstances.
   e. It was useless for the player to argue since baseball umpires very seldom change their decisions.

17. A player in a basketball game stole the ball on a dribble from an opponent. He started down the floor and while passing another opponent, the opponent struck him on the cheek. The crowd gasped but the officials did not see the play. The coach took the opponent, who hit the player, out of the game.

   a. The coach should have left the player in the game. By taking him out he indicated the player was doing something wrong when he may have done this impulsively and unintentionally.
   b. The coach should have left the player in the game. By doing so the player would have to face the consequences of the actions of the opponents and the crowd.
   c. The coach did the correct thing by taking the player out. He thus avoided any retaliation by crowd or opponents.
   d. The coach's action was correct thus showing his player that he would not tolerate such action.
   e. The coach should have called for time and scolded his player, left him in the game, and given the player a chance to prove that he did not do that sort of thing very often.

20. A player on a basketball team breaks a training rule just before the championship game, by smoking. He is one of the most valuable players on the team. The coach discovers the player is breaking training.
a. The coach should not allow this player to play in the championship game.

b. Since the coach wishes to win the championship and needs this player he should warn him not to smoke again, and allow him to play.

c. The coach should reveal to the other team members what has happened and let the other players vote whether to suspend him or allow him to play.

d. The coach could cross the no-smoking rule off the list of training rules allowing all players to have the same privilege as the original player. This would allow the coach to use this player in the coming game.

e. The coach should ignore the player's action and allow him to play.

23. During several basketball games team A discovered that some players on the opponent's team would attempt to assume responsibility for fouls charged to their star players. A less skillful player would raise his hand to indicate he had fouled when actually the foul should be credited to another "star" player of that team. Team A decided they would not play this team again. However, a few years later they do play this team and one of the "lesser" players pulls the same trick, whereupon the coach of team A told him that was why they had not played them for such a long time.

a. Team A should have complained to officials about the procedure used by the opponents, rather than stop playing them.

b. Team A was justified in not playing this team and telling the single opponent the reason.

c. Team A should have quit playing this team and told them why. They should not have waited two years and told only one player.

d. Team A should have warned the opponents that they were aware of what they were doing as soon as they realized the situation. Then if they continued this practice, they should stop playing them.

e. The opponents were justified in trying to take credit for fouls that their "star" players made.
25. A basketball official has a contract to do a basketball game for $15.00 at school A. School X offers him $50.00 to do a game on the same date. The official tells school A he cannot officiate the game and asks a friend of his to substitute for him. He proceeds to officiate school X's game for $50.00. If his action is discovered, he will be suspended.

__a. Any official is wrong to do this. Suspension is the only solution.  
__b. A standard fee for all games would eliminate this practice.  
__c. The official is justified in getting as much as he can for games he officiates.  
__d. As long as school A's game is officiated by a substitute, the first official has a right to do school X's game.  
__e. School X should not offer to pay more for officials than school A.  
__f. The official should fulfill the original contract and the obligation.

27. A substitute in a basketball game is told by his coach to enter the game. He is also told to deliberately foul the opponent's high scorer, if and when he thinks the high scorer is about to shoot. The coach believes it is better to give the opponent a chance to miss a free throw or two, and thus prevent the higher score.

__a. The substitute should refuse to enter the game under such conditions and tell the coach why.  
__b. The substitute should enter the game but fail to deliberately foul the high scorer.  
__c. The player should enter the game and carry out the coach's instructions.  
__d. The substitute should enter the game in order to get a chance to play and pretend to try to foul.  
__e. The substitute should refuse to enter the game but refrain from telling the coach why since he doesn't like to disagree.
In many boxing matches it may be noticed that one or the other of the opponents receives a cut or bloody nose. The other boxer will immediately and deliberately try to hit the cut or punch the injured nose.

a. To do such a thing is taking unfair advantage of an opponent.

b. This is a perfectly good tactic to use in boxing.

c. There should be a scoring system to take points away from boxers who hit injured parts of an opponent.

d. Whenever cuts or visible wounds are made, the match should be stopped.

e. There should be some way of determining whether a boxer is doing such a thing deliberately and points, rounds, or match should be taken from that boxer.

During a Figure Skating championship, a skater was defeated by his rival. When the judge's results were announced the winner left without commenting favorably upon his defeated opponent's performance. In another tournament the positions were reversed, the other skater won, and he went out of his way to comment favorably to the loser on his performance. A great deal of publicity and criticism was made about the rival's failure to say anything when he defeated the skater in the first tournament.

a. The winner should not feel it necessary to comment on the loser's performance.

b. The loser, who won later, should not comment favorably either.

c. The first winner should have favorably commented on his opponent's performance.

d. The second winner should not have favorably commented on the loser's performance. By doing so he calls attention to the discourtesy of the first winner.

e. The publicity given to the first winner's failure was unnecessary and trivial.
According to football rules, time is taken when a player is injured so he may be removed from the game. During a very close game and in the final few seconds of play a player fell to the ground "faking" an injury. The clock was stopped, the player removed, and his team had time for one more play in which they scored a touchdown to tie the game.

___ a. As long as the rules permit such actions, the team was clever to use this to their advantage.

___ b. Faking injuries is taking unfair advantage of the opponents and the rule.

___ c. The rule should be changed so players cannot fake injuries.

___ d. Other teams may do the same thing so this team was justified.

___ e. The officials should have prevented the team from doing this.

In west coast conference football an outstanding university football coach was fired, whereupon this coach revealed irregularities, as far as conference rules were concerned, practiced by his former university and other west coast conference teams. In the resulting investigation players and conference teams were penalized.

___ a. If he was going to reveal the irregularities, the coach should have revealed them while he still held his job rather than after he was fired.

___ b. He was right to expose the situation regardless of whether or not he still held his job.

___ c. Other persons in the university may have prevented his revealing irregularities before he lost his job. If this were true he had to wait to reveal the facts until after he was fired.

___ d. The coach should have kept quiet about the irregularities. He had no right to reveal them.

___ e. He may have felt the conference irregularities were unimportant at first, and later realized their implications. If this were true he had a right to reveal the facts after he lost his job.
f. He should not have revealed irregularities since the resulting investigation uncovered situations in schools other than the one had been connected with.

59. In a football game a linesman loses his temper and strikes an opponent who has been roughing him. The officials do not see it, but his coach does.

a. The coach should take the player out of the game and tell the linesman and officials why.

b. The coach should let the player go on since his actions were justified.

c. The loss of temper might not occur again so the coach should let the player remain in the game.

d. The coach should take the player out for fear the opponent might retaliate.

e. The coach should tell the officials what happened so the opponent will stop roughing his linesman.

f. The coach should warn his player that he is not to do such a thing again.

g. The coach should simply take his player out of the game.

61. Visiting football teams, at certain universities, use the same passageway from the dressing room as does the home team. Since the visiting team has less players, the home team waits for the visiting team to reach the passageway before they crowd out. They push, shove, and jostle the visitors. One visiting team's coach, realizing this, put his biggest players as guards and shoved the home team out of the way.

a. The visitors should wait until the home team is out of the passageway before leaving in order to avoid trouble.

b. The coach was smart to protect his team and show the home team they would not stand for such things.

c. The home team is the host to all visitors and should allow the opposing teams freedom in passage to the field.

d. Such tactics by either team is unpardonable.
68. Some golfers will push their ball into a better spot or even bend over and place the ball to their advantage. According to the rules, this is illegal and if this is done in a tournament the player is penalized.

   a. Players, by improving the lie of the ball, are handicapping themselves since they will never learn to hit the ball from bad spots.

   b. As long as no one sees them move the ball they might as well move it.

   c. If they can't do it in tournaments they should not do it at any time.

   d. As long as it is not tournament play they might as well improve their chances of getting off a good shot.

   e. If players agree before the match that such tactics are optional, it should be a matter of choice.

76. In some intercollegiate conferences the eligibility of players for participation in football, basketball, baseball, soccer, etc., is regulated by rigid rules. These rules cover whether he has played for money, whether he has maintained grades, if he is transferring from college to college with a satisfactory academic status, etc. In addition, each player is required to sign a statement saying he has never broken these rules. Some players have been known to falsify this statement. The falsification of this record has been at times encouraged by coaches who want a particular player to play for his college.

   a. Some of these rules are unrealistic in this day and age.

   b. Coaches are justified in encouraging players to falsify records since some of these rules seem unrealistic.

   c. Since the conference requires compliance with these rules, players should not falsify records even though their coaches encourage them to do so.

   d. The coaches have no right to encourage players to falsify these records.

   e. Since some coaches encourage them, players may falsify these records.
78. Player A, in kicking the ball in a soccer game, misses the ball and kicks his opponent, player B, in the shins. A few minutes later player A again kicks player B. This time player B loses his temper and kicks player A back, not even trying for the ball - though the ball is close.

a. The penalty on player B was correct.
b. Player B should not have been penalized since player A had already kicked him twice.
c. Player A should have been penalized. If he had, player B would not have had to kick back.
d. Player A should have admitted he was wrong and asked the officials to penalize him, not player B.
e. Player B should have explained to the officials why he had kicked player A so the officials would understand his actions.
f. Player B should complain to the officials and tell them why he kicked player A and persuade them to penalize player A.

79. A diver who had been considered good enough to make the Olympic team found at the end of the Olympic trials, that he had been beaten. Three other divers had placed ahead of him. The third place winner offered to give up his place to the diver who had been beaten. On the final re-check of the score it was found that the diver who had been eliminated was eligible for third place. The third-place diver was eliminated.

a. The action of the third-place diver was admirable in offering to give up his place on the team.
b. The third-place diver should not have offered to give up his place to one who had been beaten.
c. If the diver who had been eliminated found he had won, after a re-check, he should offer to give up his place.
d. Since an error in scoring occurred, it was proper that the original third-place diver was eliminated.
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF INSTRUCTION TO JUROR ACCOMPANYING
MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST FORM

Dear Mr. Michins:

A study is being made in the Department of Physical Education at The Ohio State University on the appropriateness of responses which can be made to critical and actual situations in sport and athletic contests. We know that these responses in the actual play situation vary tremendously, both among the spectators and among the competitors. We also know that to establish standard and universally acceptable responses is virtually impossible, because of the tremendous variations in social and ethical background which are brought to the incident by the person making the response.

Nevertheless, we seek to discover now near a picked jury of educators, philosophers, ministers, and others can come to agreement as to the appropriateness of response.

You have indicated your willingness to participate in the study. We are, therefore, asking you to return the attached material for purposes of giving us your judgment as to which is the "right," or "good," or "most socially and ethically acceptable" response. We are asking you to do this for each of the sport situations presented to you.

In the event you are unfamiliar with the sport involved, or the character of the incident described, we would ask you either to make a general judgment out of your experiences, or pass the incident by without marking it.

We estimate that this task will require between one and two hours of your time, and we are deeply grateful to you for your participation.

When you have finished with the task, would you please be so good as to return the material in the enclosed envelope? We would hope to have this part of the study completed by April 31.

Yours very truly,

Betty G. Hartman
Department of Physical Education
The Ohio State University
I will be glad to read the situations and make a judgment as to the proper behavior.

I am sorry but I will be unable to assist in this study.

Signed
Dr. Delbert Oberteuffer  
Department of Physical Education  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus 10, Ohio  

Dear Dr. Oberteuffer:  

Some recent research in the field of physical education has been directed toward motives and responses in the area of behavior of both competitors and spectators in sport and athletic contests. We are noting a wide variation, not only in responses to provocative incidents, but in the acceptability of responses. There seems to be some variation, perhaps engendered by differences in our conception of acceptable values, among those who might be in a position to establish acceptable behavior.

In order to explore where these variations and similarities are, we have collected some 100 real and critical incidents taken from the field of play. We would like very much to have a jury of educators, philosophers, and religionists help us determine what acceptable behavior would be in each of these incidents.

We would like very much to invite you to participate in the study. If you would be willing to do so, the time it will take you to make your contribution will approximate 90 minutes. The task assigned to you would be to choose from three to five alternatives, the behavior which you think would be closer to acceptability in our predominantly democratic culture.

If it is possible for you to make this contribution to the study, would you be so good as to return the enclosed postcard indicating whether or not you will be able to comply. If you agree to do this, we will forward the material to you.

Very truly yours,

Betty G. Hartman  
Instructor of Physical Education

Delbert Oberteuffer  
Adviser to the study
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APPENDIX H

INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS ANSWERING MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST

Instructions for Filling Out the Attached Questionnaire:

On the following pages you will find statements of situations taken from sport and athletic events. There are from three to eight choices of behavior listed for each of the situations.

Will you please pick one choice for each of the situations by placing a check mark in the blank in front of your choice. Pick the one behavior that seems to you to be the "right" or "good" response in each instance.

In some situations you may not be able to pick just one choice. In such an instance you may pick more than one but avoid this if at all possible.

After completing all of the situations please be sure to fill out the final information page as fully as possible.

May I say I am extremely grateful for your cooperation in this study. When you have finished please return the form to the person or persons who presented it to you. If by chance you cannot do this please return the form to me. Thank you again.

Betty G. Hartman
Rm. 207, Pomerene Hall
Women's Physical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio
APPENDIX I

DATA SHEET FILLED OUT BY STUDENTS ANSWERING THE MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST

Instructions: Please answer this last page by filling in the blanks or using Yes or No according to the questions.

1. Age ___________ Sex ___________ Year in College __________

2. Have you ever competed as a member of a team or group in a sports event? ___________ If so, in what sports? ___________

3. Have you ever won a letter or numeral in high school? ___________
   If so, in what sport or sports? ___________

4. Did you ever win a letter or numeral in college? ___________
   If so, in what sports? ___________

5. Are you a major in Physical Education? ___________

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Betty G. Hartman
Rm. 207, Pomerene Hall
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio
Dear Dr. Kelly:

Thank you for filling out and returning the questionnaire on ethical behavior in sports.

We realize the task was not easy in making a judgment as to "right" or "good" behavior as each of the situations presented difficulties both from the standpoint of time and from the standpoint of determining a response.

Thank you again and if you are interested in the results we shall send you a summary of the jury's responses upon your request.

Sincerely yours,

Betty G. Hartman
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