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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

This dissertation explores the socialization process to deviant subcultural identities. More precisely, the objective is to understand the social processes behind what will later be defined as positive deviance. This endeavor takes place through the study of the subcultures of weight lifters and runners.

The study of subcultures has been a pervasive theme in sociology for quite some time. Over twenty years ago, J. Milton Yinger, in his much referenced article "Contraculture and Subculture," could accurately say, "In recent years there has been widespread and fruitful employment of the concept of subculture in sociological and anthropological research."^1

Through the 1960's, subcultural themes inundated sociology, particularly studies of deviant subcultures.2 Therefore it is no surprise to find the term being widely used. Subculture has become a basic concept, as evidenced by its inclusion for discussion in almost all general sociology texts.

In understanding our complex and diversified society, the concept of subculture may be as fundamental to sociology
as the more traditional concepts of role, class, and norm. Yet despite the pervasive application of the concept of sub-culture, there are some serious problems in how it is used.

The first problem is neglect of sport subculture(s). The prominence of sport subcultures in American society heightens the seriousness of this criticism. One author has noted the neglect has been so great, consistent, and long that he was compelled to say, "The study of sport subcultures is one of the most promising areas of sociology."

Second, the sociological study of subcultures does not consist of a progressive body of knowledge; there is little continuity in theory, model building, or research goals. David O. Arnold is one of the few scholars to give explicit recognition to this problem. His assessment is that the concept of subculture

... is a tool not yet well used.... It is as if the accelerated use of the concept has caught us unawares. We examine Mexican-American subcultures, middleclass subcultures, or subcultures of organized crime as if they were wholly unrelated to earlier ideas developed in studies of other subcultures. As a consequence, subcultures research has not been as cumulative as it might have been.

The subfield has not built upon classic formulations in theory and research as have other areas of sociology.

In *The Sociology of Subcultures*, published in 1970, Arnold offers the most comprehensive endeavor to systematize and provide a direction to subcultural studies. Although
a sound beginning, this work has not led to any decisive developments, by Arnold or others, over the last decade. As a result, the assessment of subcultural studies has not changed much from that of 1970.

Given the two problems discussed above, it is no surprise to find that the sociological study of sport subcultures is practically nonexistent and certainly inconclusive in results. This is especially true in the case of socialization into subcultures of sport.

This inadequacy of sociological research is particularly glaring for the subcultures of weight lifting and running. Information is lacking to develop a full-fledged deductive model for hypothesis testing. Therefore, this study must be exploratory and inductive. However, an often referenced "model" of socialization, proposed by Howard S. Becker during the 1950s, does provide a theoretical beginning for this dissertation.

THE BECKER MODEL AND THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Outsiders, by Howard S. Becker, has become a renowned study of lasting influence in the sociology of deviant behavior. This work led the way in introducing two major innovations for the sociology of deviance. First, Becker highlighted a new concept of deviance in which the emphasis is society's labeling people as deviants. Second, Becker conducted some of the first and most thorough investigations on the progressive process by which people are drawn
into deviant careers or life styles.

Becker's second innovation has major implications for this study. Becker recognizes that deviance, as a life style, is not generally a quick social passage. Rather, he continually demonstrates that permanent involvement in deviant behavior requires a progressive and enduring process of socialization. Socialization of this nature requires continuous association with deviant peers. The process encourages, if not necessitates, subcultural formation among deviants.

In his discussion of "Becoming a Marijuana User", Becker provides one of the most exacting yet parsimonious accounts of how socialization into deviant subcultures might occur. The end product of Becker's endeavors is a five stage model of socialization to deviant identities.

As a result of its explicitness, economy, and seemingly generalizable character, the Becker model holds considerable promise as a guide to further research. Therefore, the Becker model is the focus of and guide to the present research on socialization into the subcultures of weight lifting and running. Unfortunately, other than tacit use of the Becker model within the sociology of deviance, little theoretical specification or empirical testing of the model has occurred since its introduction.

In focusing on the Becker model, the purpose of this dissertation becomes threefold. First, the Becker model
will be theoretically clarified and specified. Through this process, the model will be more readily open to empirical testing.

Second, the study extends the Becker model. Does the explanatory power of the model extend to the phenomenon of positive deviance?

The third objective is to empirically test the model, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in the specific context of the subcultures of weight lifting and running. This testing should prove crucial for assessing the future utility of the Becker model for understanding deviant subcultural behavior.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There are any number of ways of judging the significance of a study, and the criteria applied often varies from reader to reader and discipline to discipline. As a piece of sociological research, however, three fundamental criteria of significance for sociology will be discussed. These criteria are: 1) high social significance, 2) exploration of basic sociological concepts, and 3) the building upon past theory and research in the discipline.

The criteria of high social significance refers to a type of behavior having a growing amount of expression and prominence in our society. With growth, the behavior takes on social meaningfulness and becomes a social force within
our society. Sport happens to be one of these behaviors of high social significance. A number of scholars have indicated the increasing pervasiveness and social meaningfulness of sport in our society. With this general growth in sport, there has been a dramatic increase in active participation (vs. passive participation) in sports over the last several decades. Much of this active participation is subcultural in form. Running and weight lifting represent two of the more prominent examples of contemporary subcultures of sport.

However, this increasing pervasiveness and prominence of sport has not provoked growth in the sociological investigation of sport. As noted earlier, this neglect is true for the study of sport subcultures and particularly in regard to socialization into sport subcultures. The present study on weight lifters and runners is significant in that it is one step toward overcoming this neglect.

This study is also significant in that it further explores three of sociology's most fundamental concepts and their relationship to each other. These basic concepts are socialization, deviance, and subculture. The study of runners and weight lifters will expand sociological knowledge of these concepts and the social processes they include. These objectives will be met through presenting and testing a model of socialization to deviant subcultural identities. Hence, the research issues and strategies to
be employed in this study are well rooted in the intellectual concerns and heritage of the general discipline of sociology.

The final, and most important point to be raised on the issue of sociological significance, is the explicit relationship this study has with earlier theory and research in sociology. This study will attempt to refine and extend the Becker model of "Becoming a Marihuana User."\textsuperscript{15} More precisely, the goal is to assess and offer suggestions toward extending the Becker model to the social phenomenon of positive deviance. Weight lifting and running provide a new and promising testing ground for this endeavor. The following research offers an example toward the development of a coherent and cumulative body of knowledge for the specialty of subcultural behavior.

PLAN OF THE DISSERTATION

In addition to this introductory chapter, there are seven principle sections to this dissertation. These sections comprise chapters 2 through 8 and are outlined below.

Chapter 2 will provide an overview of the conceptualizations and definitions pertinent to the overall study. The goal will be to develop a conceptual base and analytical framework from which to view the Becker model and its usefulness for understanding the positive deviant behavior of weight lifters and runners.
In chapter 3, the logic of the Becker model will be presented. Through a description of each stage of the model, Becker's theory of socialization to deviant identities will become clear. Chapter 3 will conclude with a discussion of the need to refine and simplify the Becker five stage model to a three stage model.

The fourth chapter will be on methods. The basic objectives of this chapter are to indicate the procedures in selecting subjects, surveying subjects, and data manipulation (tabulation, storage, and statistical analysis). Rationales for choices of method, as well as a general discussion of limitations of method will be presented.

The fundamental purpose of chapter 5 will be to provide a descriptive and qualitative account of the socialization model for weight lifting and running. As the stages of the model are described within the social context of weight lifting and running, the chapter will characterize the social meaning of these subcultural worlds.

The objective of chapter 6 will be to quantitatively measure and statistically test the hypothesized stages by which participants of this study become socialized into their respective subcultures of sport. Factor analysis will furnish a statistical model to empirically test the existence of distinct stages of socialization. Guttman analysis will determine if the stages can be sequentially ordered.
Chapter 7 will attempt to account for any unexpected differences that may arise between the two subject groups (weight lifters and runners) of this study. Of course, the most important issue will be whether or not there is any substantial variation in the ability of the socialization model to explain each of the sport subcultures.

The final chapter has two basic goals. First, a recapitulation of the research problem and findings of the dissertation will be given. Second, this chapter will provide suggestions for future research on subcultural behavior.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 1


6. See David O. Arnold (ed.), *The Sociology of Subcultures*, Berkeley: The Glendessary Press, 1970. A work comparable to Arnold's, in either the scope or explicitness of its goal to provide unity to the scattered body of subcultural studies, could not be found. Similar works but with more modest goals are also few in number. Apparently few sociologists have been interested in exploring the distinct meanings subculture may have as a sociological concept. For example, see Cressey,
"Foreword," p. iii; and Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," p. 625.


11. The only research found that explicitly attempted specification and testing of the Becker model was Terry Lundgren, "Yes, I Enjoy It: Maintaining Deviant Identities," Unpublished Manuscript, 1978. However, much writing from the symbolic interactionist perspective on deviance gives tacit support for the general theme of the Becker model. For example, see Earl Rubington and Martin S. Weinberg (eds.), *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, London: Macmillan, 1978; Frank R. Scarpitti and Paul T. McFarlane (eds.), *Deviance: Action, Reaction,


13. See Kando, Leisure and Popular Culture, pp. 265-312, for a concise review of the growth of sport and active participation in sport within American society.


CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Before empirical analysis of the Becker model for understanding weight lifting and running takes place, the study should first provide an analytical framework from which to view the Becker model. This takes place through discussing the basic concepts behind Becker's description of "Becoming a Marihuana User."\(^1\)

However, the discussion of basic concepts goes beyond explaining marihuana use. For each concept raised, the discussion is broadened to encompass the interests of this study. Through such a process, the Becker model is clarified and extended and its usefulness for understanding weight lifting and running is demonstrated.

The basic concepts discussed are expressive behavior, subcultural deviance, and socialization.

**EXPRESSIVE BEHAVIOR**

Although not explicitly noted by Becker, the unique aspect of his work, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*,\(^2\) is its focus on deviant behaviors which do not have utilitarian objectives. The presentation by Becker on "Becoming a Marihuana User"\(^3\) is a discussion and analysis
of expressive deviant behavior.

Many deviant behaviors are easily understood because utilitarian objectives provide the basis for enjoyment of the act. These utilitarian deviant behaviors are likely to be committed by single individuals (isolates) which makes social control nearly impossible, as in the case of naive check forgers.  

In contrast, expressive deviant behavior is usually difficult to understand because the basis for enjoyment is not immediately obvious. The Becker model offers a solution to this problem by focusing analysis on socialization to expressive enjoyment. Of course, this perspective suggests that expressive deviant behavior requires a subcultural context and group identification.

Although Becker does not specify the range of behavior for which his model is applicable, the above discussion does suggest the possibility of doing so. This study hypothesizes that the more expressive the deviant behavior the more useful the Becker model will be in explanation. Conversely, the Becker model will have little validity for understanding deviant behavior with explicit utilitarian objectives.

Expressive Nature of Sport

Scholars have attempted to increase clarity and precision in the definition of sport by considering the social
nature of sport and its roots in the expressive behavior of
play. This has been done in one of three ways: (1) by
emphasizing the carry-over of play aspects into sport situa-
tions, (2) by demonstrating the distinctive aspects of sport
as compared to play, and (3) by combining both of the above
procedures.

Edwards invokes the third procedure and develops one
of the most thorough conceptualizations of a continuum from
play to sports. The conceptual categories along the con-
tinuum are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Contest or Match</th>
<th>Game</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>-&gt;</td>
<td>Sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1  Continuum from Play to Sport

From this perspective what is unique about play is
that it has no pre-established determinant of outcome. The
course and results of play cannot be known beforehand. They
emerge anew out of the process of each play act and have
no duration beyond the play act. There are no given esti-
mates of, strategies for, or procedures to outcomes in play.
Thus play may be defined as follows:

Any activity that is free, separate, uncer-
tain, unproductive, make-believe, governed
by rules, spontaneous, serious, and thereby
having no pre-established determinant of
outcome.
Although there are some important differences between recreation, contest or match, and game, they are also similar. They all focus on pre-established goals (although possibly problematic) and have established estimates of, strategies, and/or procedures for such desired outcomes. In short, they all have pre-established determinants of outcomes. Since recreation, contest or match, and game are similar in this respect, a simplification can occur by considering them all under one category: game. In game, the determinant of outcome can take many forms as indicated in the following definition:

Game is any form of playful activity in which the outcome is determined by established principles of physical skill, specified procedures, strategy, or chance. These may be invoked in combination or singly.

Finally there is the situation where the established determinant of outcome is physical prowess. This situation will be referred to as sport and will be defined as follows:

Sport is any form of game in which the outcome is determined by the demonstration of established acts of physical prowess.

Using the criterion of determinant of outcome in developing a continuum from play to sport clarifies the place of weight lifting and running. At the present stage of conceptualization, weight lifting and running, with their outcomes being determined by physical prowess, fall under
the concept of sport rather than play or game.

However, since outcomes in other areas of social life can be based on physical prowess (e.g., work), the conceptual presentation must be extended. Here the ideas of Loy, McPherson, and Kenyon, as presented in figure 2.2, prove to be very useful.12

Figure 2.2 presents sport as a subset of games and games as a subset of play. This half of the total sequence represents expressive or non-utilitarian activities. The other half of the sequence represents instrumental or utilitarian activities, with athletics being a subset of occupation and occupation being a subset of work.

![Expressive/Instrumental Continuum](image)

*This conceptualization is particularly useful for maintaining a distinction between sport and athletics. Sport and athletics both have physical prowess as their determinant*
of outcome. However, sport is unique by being within the realm of expressive outcomes: these are internal to or emerge out of the physical activity. In contrast, athletics is associated with instrumental outcomes which are external to the physical activity.

Of course, the two categories are not absolutely discrete in the empirical world. Yet, the analytical distinction is a worthy one for it clarifies the place of weight lifting and running among the diverse activities from play to work.

Instrumental or utilitarian activity and outcomes, at this point in the study, seem to be few for weight lifters and runners. Therefore, the earlier classification of these activities as sport (rather than athletics) is maintained. Analysis later in this study will determine the adequacy of this initial classification.

This latter conceptualization of a continuum from play to work (figure 2.2) has the advantage of not being inconsistent with the former continuum from play to sport (figure 2.1). The congruity between these two conceptualizations is schematically presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant of Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>play---games---sport----athletics---occupation---work</td>
<td>Instrumental/Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expressive/Non-utilitarian

Figure 2.3 Combining the Determinant of Outcome/Outcome Continuum with the Expressive/Instrumental Continuum
In figure 2.3, the play - game - sport sequence is a continuum of expressive activities with the determinant of outcome taking on increasing importance. Juxtaposed to this is the athletics - occupation - work sequence of instrumental activity. Here the outcome, as opposed to the determinant of outcome, becomes increasingly central to the activity. Presented in this fashion, the determinant of outcome/outcome conceptual framework is part of a more general expressive/instrumental continuum.

As a result of this congruity, the above conceptualization suggests the range of the Becker model's explanatory power. As an explanation of expressive deviant behavior, the Becker model ought to be valid for deviancy within the categories of play, games, and sport. In contrast, the utilitarianism of athletics, occupation, and work makes the explanation of deviant behavior under these social categories improbable via the Becker model.

Expressiveness vs. Organizational Level

Texts in the sociology of sport often suggest, at least implicitly, that increasing degrees of formal organization and competition overlap the continuum from play to sport. Operating under this assumption does not seem inappropriate for the majority of sociological studies on sport. This is particularly true if the term sport includes athletics, as many scholars have chosen to do.
However, caution is advised to those wishing to hastily and universally apply this assumption. Degrees of formal organization and competition may vary independently of the continuum from play to sport. For example, one can easily note that many games are as formally organized and competitive (if not more so) in comparison to sport and even athletic events. Similarly, the amount of formal organization and competition may vary considerably within any single category from play to athletics.

Eitzen and Sage provide a classification of sport organization differentiating among informal, organized, and corporate levels.  

The conceptualization of a corporate level of organization is particularly insightful for it indicates the major way in which movement from sport to the category of athletics occurs. At the corporate level, the organization of physical activity is predominantly based on economic and occupational criteria. With this corporate or bureaucratic rationalism, emphasis on outcomes and instrumental activity take precedent over concern for expressive activity.

Since the corporate level of organization falls under the category of athletics, Eitzen and Sage are left with only two levels of organization in sport. In considering Snyder and Spreitzer's discussion on this issue, an additional level between Eitzen and Sage's informal and organized levels is advisable. By taking the liberty of calling
the organized level the formal level, the following schema results:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Informal} \quad - \quad - \quad \text{Semiformal} \quad - \quad - \quad \text{Formal} \\
\text{Sport} \quad - \quad - \quad \text{Sport} \quad - \quad - \quad \text{Sport}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.4 Organization Within the Category of Sport

The levels of organization within sport can be briefly defined as follows:  

Informal sport - In this level of sport, the engagement and process of the activity is determined by the participants, not a regulatory body. Prerogative lies within the individual participant. Sport activities at this level tend to be work-up events, unscheduled, and momentary or ephemeral in nature.

Semiformal sport - What distinguishes this level from informal sport is that sport at the semi-formal level takes on a more scheduled and systematic nature. However, the engagement and process of the sport is still largely the prerogative of the individual participants, and not a regulatory process.

Formal sport - This level of sport has the additional characteristic of having a regulatory body which determines the engagement and process of the sport. The regulatory body "...exists primarily for the benefit of the players, working for fair competition, providing equipment, officials, scheduling rulings in disputed cases, and opportunities for persons to participate." Here an attempt is made by the organization to remain true to the concept of sport, even though there may be a highly formal structure to the regulatory process.
The subcultures of running and weight lifting are organized at the semiformal level. They are both highly scheduled and systematic activities as carried out by the subjects of this study. Yet, these clubs generally are not governed by any regulatory bodies. Occasionally, participants may come into contact with regulatory bodies through entering formal competition (such as the presence of the Amateur Athletics Union at many weight lifting meets). This contact is short in duration and does not affect the participants' sport behavior on a day to day basis. Besides, a number of serious participants of these sports never enter formal competition. Therefore, the semiformal level of organization is the most appropriate categorization for these sports.\(^{18}\)

Weight lifting and running were chosen for study partly because they are organized at the semiformal level. At higher levels of organization, one would expect external interests and instrumental goals to interfere and possibly destroy expressive behavior. As noted earlier, the Becker model loses its explanatory power in such a context.

On the other hand, a lower level of organization (informal level) is also inconsistent with the Becker model. Expressive deviant behavior requires a subcultural context and group identification as a basis to definitions of enjoyment. The ephemeral nature of the informal level of organization does not provide the substantive interactive
context for such a socialization process.

**Expressiveness vs. Competition**

As in the case of levels of organization, the assumption that competition increases as one moves from play to sport is questionable and difficult to establish. This problem is largely a result of numerous obstacles to a definitive classification and measurement of competition.

First, there is the difficulty of precisely defining the limits or boundaries of competition. Rather than being a definitive concept, competition is often interwoven with a variety of sociological concepts and processes such as: violence, aggression, conflict, coalition formation, reward allocation, prestige, etc.

Second, specification and measurement is substantially halted because competition cuts across social settings, is not limited to specific forms of expression, and is almost unlimited in regard to the social events in which it occurs.

Finally, many forms of competition are subtle and subjective in nature, thereby defying objective behavioral measures.

However, even if the assumption of increasing competition as one moves from play to sport is untrue, scholars still commonly hold that sport involves "the attempt to defeat an opponent."\(^\text{19}\) As such, all sport is by definition characterized by some degree of competition.
This conclusion raises a problem about the appropriateness of the Becker model for understanding the sports of weight lifting and running. Competition is the struggle or rivalry between two or more opposing sides for honor, supremacy, and/or an object.\(^\text{20}\) Competition, even if only moderate in intensity, would seem to work against a general condition of expressive behavior and subcultural cohesion. As noted earlier, expressive behavior and subcultural cohesion are integral to the Becker model.

This problem is overcome by changing the focus of attention, from classifying and measuring competition per se, to an understanding of the types of competitive relationships that are possible. This produces a number of possible competitive relationships for consideration.

1. competition between one individual and another
2. competition between one team and another
3. competition between an individual or a team and an animate object of nature
4. competition between an individual or a team and an inanimate object of nature
5. competition between an individual or a team and an ideal\(^\text{21}\)

If competitive relationships number 1 and, to a lesser extent, number 2 predominate in a sport, the less likely the sport will be characterized by expressive behavior and subcultural cohesion.\(^\text{22}\) This is simply because explicit competition tends to create a self-centered attitude amongst...
rivals.

However, the other competitive relationships create no interference with the development of expressive behavior and subcultural cohesion. They might encourage expressive behavior and subcultural cohesion for they provide a common adversary around which the group can unite. In any case, these latter competitive relationships are not incompatible with the Becker model.

Only a few of the competitive relationships listed have a possible bearing on the sports of weight lifting and running. Number 2 has no bearing for the subjects of this study are not organized into teams. The possibility of number 3 can be excluded as well; the subjects' sport activities are not related to animate objects of nature. The remaining relationships (1, 4, and 5) all have a possible bearing on the sports of weight lifting and running. Through this study the relative importance of these remaining relationships will be determined.

At present, this study tentatively suggests that relationships 4 and 5 are probably of more importance than relationship 1. The basis of this assumption is that competition between individuals is not a frequent event in running and weight lifting. However, this is said with caution for frequency may not be a good assessment of importance, and other related data needs to be explored. Future chapters provide insight into this matter.
SUBCULTURAL DEVIANCE

Becker characterizes the continued use of marihuana as dependent on subcultural perception and definitions of its use as enjoyable. The initial unpleasant or ambiguous sensations of marihuana use forms the basis of why an explanation, such as Becker's, is necessary.\textsuperscript{23} If marihuana use or any other activity is inherently pleasurable, a subcultural interactive context is not necessary for the activity to occur and continue to occur. More precisely stated, if the sensations produced by an activity are "naturally" pleasurable, there is no need for people to learn to enjoy the activity nor do they require social support to sustain the activity.\textsuperscript{24} Becker's model of socialization to enjoyment is not required for behavior characterized by such sensations.

The necessity of a subcultural interactive context for sustained involvement ought to decrease to the degree that the activity is societally sanctioned as enjoyable. If the general culture provides normative sanction of an activity as enjoyable, sustained involvement proceeds with little difficulty.

However, if cultural and institutional sanctions of enjoyment are lacking for an activity, continued involvement is likely to require a subcultural interactive context. Subcultures provide support and meaning to activities that go unrecognized by the larger society. Without subcultural recognition and support, such activities occur infrequently
or not at all. This is particularly the case when the general culture takes a non-neutral position and views the activity as deviant. The Becker model is most applicable within this social context.

Subculture and Sport

A vast amount of sociological research has an affinity with subcultural phenomena. Yet, little of this sociological writing explicitly analyzes and adequately defines the concept subculture.25

However, despite the paucity of analysis of meaning, a basic sociological theme does pervade the subfield of subcultural behavior. Namely, the notion of subculture as being "... a distinctive kind of 'world,' with its own customs, values, and social rules (or norms), its own myths, legends, and lore, its own rhetoric or argot, its own life style."26

Subcultures are common in our society. A review of research indicates that the rise of subcultures seems to be a matter of course. This has particularly been demonstrated through sociological investigation in the following areas:

1. the social structure of work - occupational subcultures
2. the social institutions of polity - political movements and subcultures
3. the social institution of religion - religious subcultures
4. the social structure of the legal system - criminal subcultures
In general, subcultures are considered to fall under three major types. These types are occupational, avocational, and deviant subcultures. Although infrequent to date, sport subcultures can be analyzed through this classification of subcultures.27

Occupational subcultures of sport emerge within professional athletics. In this case, sport is a career providing economic livelihood and a distinctive life style.

Avocational subcultures are essentially social groupings in which one pursues a central interest for fun or leisure. Many sports carried out in the name of leisure, recreation, hobby, or fitness fulfill this purpose for individuals in our society.

Deviant subcultures represent forms of social participation that are labeled by the dominant culture as being in violation of "standard" normative patterns. Violations such as cheating, gambling, hustling, drug use, and violence are among the most common to sport.

These sport subcultures are not mutually exclusive. For example, avocational participation may lead to occupational participation. Of particular importance for this dissertation is that deviant subcultures often overlap occupational and avocational subcultures. In other words, deviant social patterns can run through any sport subculture.
Deviance

This study assumes that deviance is a social process; that is, transpiring through symbolic interaction, entailing social evaluation of an individual or group, and the labeling others with negative symbols and instituting sanction. Deviance is not inherent in certain acts nor is it natural or unnatural. Rather it is socially created and symbolically mediated.

Rubington and Weinberg characterize the social process of labeling people deviant as involving three essential steps. The dominant group must engage in (1) social description, (2) social evaluation, and (3) social prescription before deviancy is established about an individual or group.

The process of description, evaluation, and prescription may occur in regard to several dimensions of an individual or group. One could be labeled deviant for either inappropriate behavior, attributes, or beliefs in comparison to societal norms.

The most common form of deviance discussed in the sociological literature is negative deviance. This is simply where an individual or group breaks or violates a norm. Here the deviancy is inconsistent with the theme or logic of a norm. The individual's or group's behavior, attributes, or beliefs are a blatant infraction of social rules.
However, there is also the possibility of positive deviance. Positive deviance is where the relationship to societal norms is not one of blatant violation but rather extension, intensification, or enhancement of social rules. In this case, the zealous pursuit or overcommitment to normative prescriptions is what earns the individual or group the label of deviant. The individual or group is essentially true to the normative standards but simply goes "too far" in that the plausible or actual results are judged inappropriate by the general culture.

Being in line but greatly exaggerating normative social participation has also been termed positive addiction. However, the term positive addiction has been used solely in reference to end results which are personally or individually beneficial. In this study the term positive deviance is preferred in order to focus attention on social process and structure rather than on individual well being. The term positive deviance is also chosen to avoid association with the biased assumption that end results are necessarily beneficial (socially or individually).

**Sport and Positive Deviance**

The discussion on subcultural deviance was necessary because few conceptual or analytical developments on deviant subcultures of sport have occurred within sociology. Most writings in the sociology of sport simply note that
deviant social participation in sport exists, that given
groups of subcultures can be identified as deviant, or that
certain acts in sport are of a deviant character. This
leads to very little conceptual specification as to the
forms of deviant social participation that may take place
in sport.

Although the term positive deviance is not used by
Lundgren, he is one scholar who has successfully applied a
similar conceptual framework to the sport of motorcycling. Other subcultures of sport that might fall under this con-
ceptual framework of subcultural and positive deviance are
the risky sports of mountain climbing, running rapids, hang
gliding, etc.

The objective of this study is to apply this conceptual
framework of subcultural deviance to a sample of weight
lifters and runners. First, as practiced by the subjects
of this study, these sports are considered to fall within
the classification of avocational subculture. Second, it is
felt at present that these sport subcultures are an example
of positive deviance. A great deal of the remainder of this
work is focused on assessing the logical and empirical plausi-
bility of these assumptions.

SOCIALIZATION

In Becker's study of marihuana use, the concept of
socialization occupies a central role in his analysis.
Therefore, it is no surprise that, of the concepts presented in this chapter, socialization is the one most explicitly discussed and analyzed by Becker. The product of Becker's discussion and analysis is a model of socialization to expressive deviant behavior.

With socialization so central to Becker's work, and since the Becker model provides the theoretical foundation to this study, Becker's contributions require a chapter of their own (see chapter 3). In preparation for such a discussion, the remainder of this chapter provides a more general review of the topic of socialization.

The Concept of Socialization

Socialization is a social process which pervades across diverse social contexts, and is manifested in an infinite variety of social acts. Hence, it is often seemingly easier to empirically recognize socialization than to adequately define the process.

In the most general sense, socialization is the process by which human beings learn to be social beings. Most research has focused on the process by which the human child becomes an adult social participant of the general society. Given this line of research, "... socialization may be defined for these purposes as an interactional process whereby a person acquires a social identity, learns appropriate role behavior, and in general conforms to expectations held by
members of the social systems to which he belongs or aspires to belong.35

In recent years researchers have not only focused on this broad form of socialization (from human beings to social beings) but have also focused on more restricted settings of socialization.36 There is an increasing recognition that the socialization process is a life long one. As a result greater attention is being given to various bounded occurrences of socialization that ensue at different stages of adult life.

Given this, contemporary research efforts have concentrated on forms of socialization and/or the nature of the social context in which it occurs. This research has analyzed such phenomena as occupational, political, religious, and deviant socialization.

In considering these trends in research, one might expect a substantial body of research and knowledge to have accumulated on the process of socialization within the social world of sport. The study of socialization seems particularly appropriate within subcultures of sport. Yet, a substantial body of research has not developed within this area.37

**Socialization and Sport**

However, such a conclusion should not be over stressed. Research in this area has managed to flush out rather
important distinctions and indicate vital directions for future research. Attention will now turn to several points germane to this study.

Recent literature on the topic of socialization and sport emphasizes the necessity of maintaining a distinction between socialization into sport and socialization via sport. Snyder suggests several dimensions of socialization whose variation affects whether role-specific (socialization into sport) or diffuse characteristics (socialization via sport) result from sport participation. He lists the dimensions of socialization as follows:

1. the degree of involvement in the activity by the participants
2. voluntary or involuntary selection and/or participation
3. instrumental or expressive socialization relationships
4. the prestige and power of the socializer
5. personal and social characteristics

This study analyzes, to various degrees, the impact of these dimensions on socialization into the sport subcultures of weight lifting and running. Considering the expressive/instrumental continuum outlined earlier, dimension 3 is of special interest to this study. Of course, these dimensions and the socialization process are of interest in respect to their consequences for those undergoing socialization. The major consequences of socialization into a sport
subculture are:

1. a new self concept (new image)
2. new social participation (new involvements)
3. new beliefs (new values)
4. new behavior and attributes (new accomplishments)

The description and analysis of these socialization consequences are basic to understanding the subcultures of weight lifting and running. How these socialization consequences are sustained requires the consideration of the related topic of social support structures.

Social Support Structures

Social support structures refer to patterns of interaction and understandings that provide social approval and legitimation to specific forms of social participation. Structure is used in reference to the constitution of social support as it is mediated through social interaction and the participation process itself. Therefore, social support is problematic and under negotiation.

In the study of socialization, particularly socialization into sport subcultures, it is advisable to note the distinction between external and internal social support structures. Sage suggests that external social support structures for sport emerge out of traditional socialization agencies such as: the family, community, mass media,
and other fundamental organizations and institutions of the general society. 41

On the other hand, internal social support structures originate out of the process of sport participation itself. In this situation, sport activity leads to the development of a subculture, with its own peculiar patterns of interactions and understandings that provide social approval and legitimation for specific forms of social participation. This study analyzes this latter process of internal social support.

CONCLUSION

This concludes the review of the literature. Unfortunately there was little presentation of past research on weight lifting and running. Specific research of direct relevance to the present consideration of running and weight lifting is notably absent within sociology. Therefore, it was necessary and more useful to bring attention to conceptualizations and definitions related to the study. This chapter helps to cultivate unity between sociology in general and sociology of sport in particular, and also promotes a more systematic presentation to the remainder of this study.

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide a conceptual foundation in which to locate the more specific interest of analyzing and testing the Becker model. A detailed
presentation of the Becker model is the topic of the next chapter.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 2


3. Becker, *Outsiders*, pp. 41-58. At the time of Becker's study, there was little societal or cultural question as to this deviant character of marihuana use. Of course, with the cultural standards of today such a characterization of marihuana use would be considerably more problematic. Therefore, the mention of Becker's study of marihuana use is done solely for the purpose of illustration and conceptual clarification of the present problem being studied. Becker's explanation of marihuana use is not necessarily applicable to present day use of the drug.

4. See Terry Lundgren, "Yes, I Enjoy It: Maintaining Deviant Identities," unpublished manuscript, 1978, p. 3. Most utilitarian deviance corresponds to this argument, but there are some exceptions. There are utilitarian deviant acts that require group endeavors (for example, organized crime). However, this has little bearing on the topic discussed here.


11. The determinant of outcome as a criterion for developing a continuum from play to sport is not new. This criterion underlies, at least implicitly, much of the scholarly literature on the conceptual placement of sport. As one of the most explicit examples, review Loy, McPherson and Kenyon, *Sport and Social Systems*, pp. 3-23.


16. These levels of organization are modified definitions given by Eitzen and Sage, *Sociology of American Sport*, pp. 16-19. The definitions were modified largely in light of a discussion by Snyder and Spreitzer, *Social Aspects of Sport*, pp. 20-22.


18. At present, this is an operating assumption of this dissertation. In future chapters additional information and analysis should shed light on this initial premise.


20. This definition is derived from a discussion of sport by Edwards, *Sociology of Sport*, pp. 57-58.


24. Lundgren, "Yes, I Enjoy It," p. 3, provides a similar conclusion.


31. In the rare instances where the concept positive deviance is used in sociological writings, it usually refers to functional effects of a deviant act for society, an organization, or a group. For example, see Frank R. Scarpitti and Paul T. McFarlane, "Introduction to Social Deviance," in Scarpitti and McFarlane, Deviance, pp. 9-10. This should not be confused with the use of the term in this study, where positive deviance could have serious negative impacts.


34. Lundgren, "Yes, I Enjoy It."

p. 258.


38. Sage, "Socialization and Sport"; Loy, McPherson and Kenyon, Sport and Social Systems; and Kenyon and McPherson, "Becoming Involved in Physical Activity."


40. Adapted and modified from Loy and Ingham, "Play, Games, and Sport," pp. 259-260.

CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL MODEL

INTRODUCTION

Becker's classic study on "Becoming a Marihuana User" presents a model explaining how people become involved, and how involvement is maintained, in deviant drug use. Becker establishes that marihuana use is a subcultural phenomenon requiring the learning by members (via socialization) of skills, values, and expectations necessary for enjoyment of, and identification with the deviant activity. In general then, marihuana users are not isolates, but engage in the activity with others. This occurs because the enjoyment of marihuana-produced sensations is neither inherent nor culturally universal. Enjoyment in this case must be learned. Becker observed:

Marihuana-produced sensations are not automatically or necessarily pleasurable. The taste for such experience is a socially acquired one, not different in kind from acquired tastes for oysters or dry martinis. The user feels dizzy, thirsty; his scalp tingles; he misjudges time and distances. Are these things pleasurable? He isn't sure. If he is to continue marihuana use, he must decide that they are.
A supportive subcultural context leads the individual to the conviction that marihuana-produced sensations are pleasurable. The final result of socialization into the subculture is that the activity becomes an integral part of the person's lifestyle and identity.  

THE BECKER MODEL

Becker develops a five stage model of socialization to marihuana usage. These are discussed in turn. First, one must learn the proper techniques for carrying out the activity. Unless the subject learns the techniques of smoking marihuana, the drug will not produce effects. If no effects are produced, the conception of the drug as a means to pleasure becomes impossible, and use will eventually discontinue.

In the second stage, the subjects must recognize the effects or symptoms as being a result of marihuana use. Unless users make a connection between effects and usage of the drug, they cannot experience being high. The failure to make such a connection leads subjects to feel that the drug, for whatever reason, has no effect on them, or possibly that pleasure from marihuana use is illusory. Either conclusion leads to discontinued use of marihuana.

The third step is acquiring the necessary concepts and symbols to intelligently express to oneself and others (generally other users) the various techniques, phases, and
sensations associated with marihuana use. Subjects develop expertise and become connoisseurs of marihuana usage. As a result, the subjects are able to communicate, and thereby demonstrate the experience of getting high. Acquiring such skills increases the ability of users to perceive the effects of the drug and enhances the meaning of experiencing the high. If these perceptions are not maintained, marihuana use ceases.

The fourth stage of the Becker model is the process by which the sensations of marihuana use become defined as pleasurable. Becker notes that "the effects of the drug, when first perceived, may be physically unpleasant or at least ambiguous..." In addition to the recognition of effects (stage 2) and the conceptual categories for expressing the experience (stage 3), the individual requires a supportive interactive context through which the initially unpleasant or ambiguous sensations of marihuana use becomes re-defined as enjoyable. This process occurs through association with more experienced users: "Enjoyment is introduced by the favorable definition of the experience that one acquires from others." However, maintaining this favorable definition of marihuana use is not a simple accomplishment or process, particularly if faced with societal disapproval.

The last stage of Becker's socialization model explores the process of continually answering "Yes" to the question
"Do you enjoy it?" or "Is it fun?". To maintain pleasurable perceptions and use of marihuana when faced with social disapproval and interference requires intensive participation in a supportive subcultural context.

To summarize, the origin and maintenance of marihuana use occurs in a subcultural and primary group context. Primary group interaction promotes an environment through which marihuana use is integrated into an individual's identity and life style. The subculture also provides the social support and interactive framework through which involvement is sustained in spite of negative societal sanctions and deviant identity.

MODEL EXTENSION

The question to raise now is whether or not the Becker model of marihuana use is applicable to other forms of behavior, and if so, what are the categories of behavior to which it applies? Chapter 2 offers aid in dealing with these questions through its discussion of the nature of enjoyment as a fundamental component for understanding the Becker model. A review and extension of this earlier discussion follows.

If an activity is inherently enjoyable or defined as enjoyable by the society at large, a supportive subcultural context (as in the Becker model) is not imperative for the activity to frequently occur. Therefore, in extending the
Becker model, the emphasis is on activities which produce sensations that are generally perceived as unenjoyable by the society at large. Since these activities lack societal sanctions of enjoyment, involvement in them requires sub-cultural socialization to enjoyment. This is the essential theme of Becker's discussion of marijuana usage, and therefore the Becker model offers a general explanation for all such "unenjoyable" activities.6

This extension of the model should be clarified in two ways. First, the application of the concept of enjoyable (or unenjoyable) is made in reference to cultural definitions and norms, which are not necessarily congruent with natural or objective references. For example, cigarette smoking, alcoholic drinks, and even some foods do not have an objective basis as enjoyable items. Based on objective measures, the negative effects of smoking and alcoholic drinks are substantial. Yet through cultural forces these behaviors have traditionally been accepted as enjoyable within American society.

Second, in addition to the evaluation of behavior, beliefs and attributes of an individual or group are also judged by society in respect to their enjoyable or unenjoyable consequences. Given this, there is no logical reason why the Becker model cannot be extended to include beliefs and attributes with its range of explanation.
In chapter 2, positive deviance was characterized as being logically in line with, but exaggerating and heightening normative social participation. In this case, deviancy results from extending, intensifying, or enhancing positively evaluated behaviors, attributes, and/or beliefs to such an extreme that they are judged inappropriate by the larger social world.

Becker's model of marihuana use (negative deviance) is quite amenable to the inclusion of positive deviance within its scope. Focusing on the concept of enjoyment provides understanding for both Becker's consideration of marihuana use and the present concern with positive deviance. As in Becker's characterization of marihuana use, positive deviance is behavior which is not inherently nor culturally perceived as enjoyable. Rather, the various forms of positive deviance are generally perceived as being so fanatical, physical or mentally unpleasant, and/or dangerous to one's overall health that they are not simply labeled deviant, but also as unpleasant or painful by the larger society.

Since positive deviance is not inherently enjoyable and lacks social support, Becker's model with its stages of socialization to enjoyment is fundamental for understanding the continued re-occurrence and maintenance of this type of behavior.

The discussion above presents the theoretical basis for extending Becker's model of marihuana use to the more general
phenomena of positive deviant behavior, beliefs, and attributes. With running and weight lifting being positive deviance, these sports provide an excellent social context for testing this theoretical extension of the Becker model. However, in its present form, the Becker model cannot be empirically tested for these sport subcultures.

MODIFICATION OF BECKER'S MODEL

In this section, the focus is on modifying Becker's model to the present research. Rather than a five stage model of socialization into deviant subcultures, a three stage model will be proposed. To augment the following presentation, the original five stage model and its reduction to a three stage model is diagrammed in Figure 3.1. The decision to collapse Becker's model results from two major issues that arise when relating the model to the present research situation. The two issues are particularly salient to survey design research, which is being employed here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Model</th>
<th>Reduced Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Effects</td>
<td>Sensations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Enjoyment</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 The Modification of the Becker Model of Socialization
The first issue to arise is that responses to the survey must convey the conceptual demarcations established between the stages. For the five stage model this seems unlikely for several reasons. On the one hand, it is seriously questionable whether the subjects are consciously aware of the conceptual distinctions and stages of socialization the researcher wishes to explore. The more complex five stage model requires fine distinctions between questions. If such exact and explicit distinctions are not perceived by the subjects, responses adequate for complete analysis will not occur.

Second, it must also be noted that although the five stages are conceptually distinct, they are not necessarily empirically distinct. This lack of empirical distinction is at least a partial explanation of the improbability of such distinctions being perceived by the subjects. However, the point to be made here is that there may not be an explicit increment or step whereby one passes from one specific stage of the socialization process to another. Therefore, it is not surprising to see several stages of the original theoretical model flowing across each other in the concrete world.

This lack of distinctiveness, whether in subjects' perceptions or empirically based, is most noticeable between the following stages of the five point model: stages two and three in one case, and stages four and five in the other.
For the first case, it is more appropriate to consider the stages as existing concurrently, rather than as distinctive stages in time. Other than analytically, the recognition of effects as a result of the activity (stage 2) cannot be completely separated from learning the appropriate categories for expressing the various aspects of the activity (stage 3).

On a logical basis, these two processes support and enhance each other. For example, experiencing the results of any behavior is severely limited unless the activity and its effect are perceived and linked by the individual. The individual otherwise has serious difficulty in providing intelligibility or meaning to what has happened, or even knowing that something has happened. The recognition of the effects of an activity is, to a large extent, due to the individual applying appropriate concepts and symbols to the situation. Acquiring the necessary symbolic categories increases the ability of the individual to perceive the effects and establishes meaningfulness to the experience. Therefore, it should be useful to collapse these two stages into one for the purposes of present research.

In considering stages four and five, a similar decision is quite appropriate. Like stages three and four of Becker's socialization model, the process of learning to define the effects of the activity as enjoyable (stage 4), and maintaining this positive identification with the
activity despite societal disapproval (stage 5) are empirically intertwined. The activities to be explained here are initially ambiguous or unpleasant, and therefore it is difficult to envision either of these stages occurring without the other. Enjoyment promotes identification and positive identification promotes definitions of enjoyment. This mutuality is further derived from the common underlying social mechanism of intensive participation in a supportive subcultural context.

Since the conceptual distinctions between these stages are difficult to operationalize, it is once again useful to collapse the two stages into one for the purposes of present research. This decision is strengthened by the study's focus on the supportive subcultural context which, corresponding to the Becker model, forms the basis of these processes.

Research manageability is also given consideration. A simplification of the socialization model to three basic stages makes the data gathering and analysis much more approachable and controllable for the researcher. It also aided the success of the mail survey design. A simplification of Becker's model promotes a short questionnaire and helps avoid the inclusion of questions that would have been overlapping, misunderstood, meaningless, or too complex from the subjects' standpoint. Both of these points are established principles of questionnaire design. 8
Applying the above rationales, Becker's original model is reduced to three basic stages of socialization as follows: (1) experience: there must be a minimal experience with and the learning of proper techniques for the activity; (2) sensation: the process of learning how to recognize and express sensations (effects) associated with the activity; and (3) enjoyment: learning to define the perceived sensations of the activity as enjoyable, even in the context of societal disapproval.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the Becker model, specified the model's applicability to positive deviance, and argued for a modification of the Becker model to meet the theoretical and practical constraints of this research endeavor. The discussion of these issues resulted in a three stage model of socialization to positive deviant identities.

The three stage model of socialization presented in this chapter is the theoretical model to be explored and assessed in the chapters ahead. First, this study wishes to determine if the three conceptual stages of minimal experience, sensation, and enjoyment can be empirically derived and isolated. Second, this study will attempt to establish whether or not the three stages can be sequentially ordered, as assumed in the model. Of course, weight lifting and running will provide the social setting within
which these objectives will be carried out.

The testing of the Becker model, as revised, cannot take place immediately. It is necessary to first specify the measurement of central variables, the nature and source of data, and the procedures of data analysis. Attention will now turn to the concrete issues of method.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 3


2. Becker, *Outsiders*, p. 53. At the time of Becker's study there was little societal or cultural question as to the deviant character of marihuana use. Of course with the cultural standards of today, such a characterization of marihuana use would be considerably more problematic. Therefore, this discussion of marihuana use is not necessarily applicable to the present. The discussion is for illustration of the theoretical model.


7. For the present discussion, the term empirical is used in the positive sense of the term; that is, as objective and quantifiable.
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CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY

SUBJECT POPULATION

Determining the exact population parameters of runners and weight lifters in the locality of this study would be exceedingly difficult. Explicit and accurate records on population size are not available for these two groups.

Sampling Procedures

This study therefore had no choice but to begin the sampling process in an exploratory fashion. By focusing attention on weight lifting and running clubs a purposive sample through a process of snowballing was drawn. The decision as to when the sampling terrain was adequately explored was a judgemental one.

Sampling Criteria. Sampling was considered complete on the basis of three criteria. First, it was arbitrarily decided that a sample size of 30 or more for each sport should be achieved. Initial knowledge of the sports indicated that at least this minimum number of subjects ought to be obtainable.
Second, the mere size of 30 also provides a minimum basis for data manipulation, analysis, and comparison. Any smaller sample size would restrict the ability to make comparisons and jeopardize the validity of conclusions, particularly statistical ones.

The last criteria was pragmatic. When new leads on the existence of other members of weight lifting and running clubs dwindled and/or proved unproductive, the sampling terrain was judged as adequately covered.

Clubs and Informants. Sampling began by contacting various clubs of weight lifters and runners. Two of these clubs (one weight lifting and one running) provided the population from which sampling was drawn.²

Sampling proceeded in a snowball fashion by establishing contact with and receiving aid from various key informants. Informants, in most cases, were relatively known within and esteemed sport participants of one of the subcultures. In a few instances, an informant was not so much a participant as simply a major associate or supporter of the participants of one of these sports. In either case, informants were an indispensable aid in sampling for they progressively provided knowledge of and contact with other weight lifters and runners.³ At various points along the way, names and/or mailing lists were obtained.
Administration of Questionnaires. The administering of the questionnaires proceeded in a schedule corresponding with the snowball process of receiving names and addresses. This procedure seemed most conducive to obtaining responses from the subjects. Once news of the study was circulated, immediate interest in the study and expectations of seeing the questionnaire were often high.

Questionnaires were predominantly self administered through the mail; although for approximately 50% of the total sample of weight lifters and several runners, questionnaires were personally delivered by the researcher. In the few instances with runners, this was the result of their requesting to see and fill out the questionnaire immediately. In desiring a high response rate and wishing not to alienate any promising subjects, these requests were not denied.

The direct and personal attention given to the large group of weight lifters was simply the result of a practical decision in the face of an unexpected opportunity. An informant could not provide names and addresses, but did provide an introduction for a personal appeal to a group of weight lifters. Given the opportunity of obtaining a reasonably large sample, this group could not be passed over.

Since social constraints did not permit immediate response to and return of the questionnaires, the weight lifters were provided the means to mail back their replies. In all situations where the questionnaire was personally
administered, names and addresses were solicited in the event that follow-up requests would be necessary.

Survey of Males. As a final point in the selection of the subjects, it was intended that they all be males. There was an initial misconception that either few females would be in these sports, or if participants, they would not be highly associated with their male counterparts. In actuality, females proved to be fully active participants (particularly in running) and, in several instances, were very encouraging and helpful contacts.

Although the present study is limited to males, females were included in the sampling procedure. One reason for doing so is simply the provision of data that may be analysed at a later date.

Furthermore, to concentrate solely on males might have alienated or insulted females, and justly so. Frustrating female allies could only have had undesirable consequences. The full negative impact of overlooking women could not be determined, but in this case, it certainly could be avoided.

Response Rate. The known male population of weight lifters and runners combined was 283. Of these, 101 were weight lifters and 182 were runners, far larger than the 30 originally desired. All the weight lifters were contacted. However, the study could not locate eight runners. These were deleted from the study, and the known population
was reduced to 174 runners. The number of returns for weight lifters and runners were 72 and 138 questionnaires respectively. This produced a return rate of 71% for weight lifters and 76% for runners (figures are rounded off to the nearest whole number). This is well within the range of acceptable percentages as practiced in the discipline. Although a high response rate may be useful for a number of reasons, the fundamental objective is to reduce the likelihood of response bias.

DATA GATHERING

Different methods of data collection can lead to a difference in the type or quality of information received, and possibly different conclusions. Therefore, it is important that the research method chosen corresponds to one's research questions and the objectives of the study.

Survey Questionnaire

The promising and competing methods for this study were observation (participant or non-participant), interview, and survey questionnaire. Each of these approaches have their particular advantages and weaknesses. The survey questionnaire was chosen primarily because it has generally been recognized "...to secure data at a minimum of time and expense." Given the goals of this study, the logical and substantive differences among these three
approaches was less important than the exigencies of obtaining the data.

The survey questionnaire was particularly advantageous in that it allowed for two important provisions. First, it permitted easy access to people who were difficult to locate for observations or interviews. Once addresses were obtained, mailing was intensively used. Second, the survey questionnaire provided time and privacy for more considered answers to a number of open-ended essay questions.

Openness of Approach. Each questionnaire included an introduction characterizing the nature of the study (see Appendix A). Subjects did not have knowledge of the methodological procedures, nor were they necessarily familiar with the sociological framework and significance of the study. Still, they were made aware of the issues being surveyed. The subjects were also provided an accurate, though general, statement on what the data would be used for.

Divisions of the Questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into four sections (see Appendix B). These sections are partly the result of practical divisions; practical in the sense of organizing questions in accordance with the form of response required. The development of the various sections and corresponding headings were also guided by the criteria of providing a meaningful and logical sequence of questions.
The "General Background Information" in section I of the questionnaire provides data on basic social background characteristics of the sport participants. These are age, race, education, college major, occupation, marital status, and degree and type of involvement in the sport. This information is used to delimit the sports of interest; that is the level of involvement and the social characteristics of participants. Select information from section I is also useful for control and specification of the socialization model.

Empirical recognition of stages of socialization, ordering the stages in a time sequence, and providing a comparison to the model rely on data from section I and II. "Views of the Sport" in section II (which concerns the affective aspects of participation) are particularly helpful in ascertaining the applicability of the model's second and third stages of socialization. Obviously, the questions of section II must provide data in the feelings, purpose, and meanings subjects assign to their sport.

The extent and nature of the subcultural processes and social support structures are explored largely through the "Biographical Information," (section IV) and data from "Progress through the Sport" (section III). Section III consists of questions on the degree of contact between participants of a given sport and their sources of knowledge about the sport. Section IV provides self descriptive
accounts to open-ended questions on various aspects of involvement and interpretation of the participants' sport.

**Pretesting.** The questionnaire was pretested on a few weight lifters and runners. The pretest took two basic forms: (1) administering the questionnaire to students in physical education courses emphasizing weight lifting or running, and (2) submitting the questionnaire to key informants for review and comment.

As a result of this pretesting, it became necessary to revise two of the questions for runners. Other than these two minor changes for purposes of clarity, the questionnaires for weight lifters and runners were kept identical for comparison purposes.

The first part of question 6 in section IV of the "Questionnaire for the Study of the Sport of Running" originally read "Do you get 'lost' in a workout?" Unfortunately in the pretest, runners occasionally responded to "lost" in a geographical sense. Therefore, the question was rephrased as follows: "Do you get 'lost' (sensuously, mentally, or spiritually, not geographically)?" Similarly, the original term of "overly developed" in question 8 of section IV proved to be confusing or uninterpretable to many runners. Hence, the new phrase of "overly fit" was used as a replacement. These changes eliminated the confusion on the part of the subjects while still remaining true to the intent of the researcher in asking the question.
Increasing Response Rate. After administering the questionnaire, a number of follow up procedures were employed to encourage responses. Given a period of between one and two weeks with no response, the following postcard message was mailed:

Date

Dear Runner,

This is a reminder that I have not received your questionnaire. Please help by returning it immediately! I need more responses to complete the study; it is only through your interest and aid that this survey can be successful.

Please disregard this note if you have already returned the questionnaire, and accept my sincere thanks.

Sincerely yours,
Keith Ewald
Phone # 291-2721

After another similar period with no response, a second questionnaire was mailed with the statement of the above postcard message attached. If within a week there was still no response, several attempts to contact the subject by phone were made (providing their phone number was listed by or available through the phone service). For both groups, well over 50% of the questionnaires were returned on the first trial. The mailing of the postcards substantially increased returns. However, efforts beyond the postcard were seldom successful.
**Time Frame.** For weight lifters, the process of administering the questionnaires began in January, 1978 and was concluded in July, 1978. Since runners were introduced late in the study, administering of questionnaires to them did not begin until October, 1978. The survey of runners was concluded by June, 1979.  

**COMPILATION OF DATA**

**Coding**

The coding of the data was a relatively simple and direct process. Many questions required an absolute figure in response and were directly coded as such. For Likert type questions, the normal coding procedure of assigning numbers based on increasing intensity of response was followed (codes 1-5 for section II and 1-3 for section III of the questionnaire). Dummy codes were used in most other instances.

The biographical questions were largely analyzed qualitatively. These questions were also content analyzed and appropriate codes were devised (see the code sheets in Appendix C for a more detailed presentation).

There was an attempt to code occupation sought, father's occupation, and mother's occupation using the Hatt-North Occupational Prestige Index. However, insufficient response or confusion over the questions led to the deletion of this information from analysis.
Computer Storage

Much of the data used in this study was placed on computer cards. This seemingly simple practice creates another issue of methods that has to be dealt with. "No matter how, or how carefully, the data have been transferred to cards, some errors are inevitable." Therefore, cleaning or eliminating errors is vital.

A number of cleaning procedures were used in this study. At select intervals, punched cards were directly compared for accuracy against original returns. Also, all punched cards were scanned for differences from the corresponding information on the data code sheets. A third procedure was the use of a card reader to obtain a card list for review. The SPSS computer package provided a fourth procedure for cleaning data through its list cases program. Finally the computer calculation of frequencies among the various categories of data was a means of verifying accurate data transfer to cards.

METHODOLOGICAL TECHNIQUES

In addition to general qualitative or purely descriptive forms of analysis, some particularly distinctive procedures or techniques of method were employed in parts of this study. They are given special attention below.
Content Analysis

Content analysis was used to aid in the description and summarization of the biographical information provided by the subjects. This allowed for presentation of the data in the form of frequency distributions. The actual process of content analysis was rather explicit and direct. It was more a matter of counting, rather than following the more traditional design of establishing themes or wholistic assessment and subjective intent. As a result, issues of validity and reliability that generally prove problematic for content analysis are greatly reduced.

Intersubjective reliability estimates for the content analysis were considered at one point in the study, but later abandoned. In addition to the above rationale, the following factors were considered: (1) content analysis serves a limited purpose in the study, (2) it is not the only nor central form of research, (3) it is checked against other data in the study, and (4) interpretation of reliability estimates may be problematic.

Factor Analysis

The study also applied factor analysis to parts of the data. Factor analysis was essential to determining whether or not stages of socialization could be empirically established or recognized for the sports of weight lifting and running. If distinct stages of socialization empirically
exist, factor analysis should generate separate dimensions as representations of each of the stages. The expectation was that the variables making up each dimension would correspond with the model of socialization.

Traditionally it has been argued that the choice and appropriateness of a statistical model ought to be based on the level of measurement obtained in data collection. From such a perspective, factor analysis should only be applied to data of interval or ratio level of measurement.

The traditional or classical perspective has been challenged theoretically and in practice. The debate goes on, and is by no means resolved.

The model of factor analysis corresponds closely to the goal of empirically isolating distinct stages of socialization. Hence, factor analysis was applied even though all the traditional assumptions of the statistical model were not met.

**Guttman Analysis**

A further concern of this study was whether or not the sequence of the stages of socialization in the model had any empirical validity. To test this, Guttman's scaling technique was used. The Guttman technique ideally requires that a favorable response to a later question is always preceded by favorable responses to all earlier questions. As employed in scaling, the Guttman pattern of responses is
sequential, irreversible, and unidimensional.\(^{17}\)

Here the mechanics of Guttman analysis remained the same, but the technique was used for a different purpose than scaling per se. The technique provided a statistical index to assess a sequential ordering of steps. Since stage one of the socialization process must theoretically occur before entering stage two, and stage two before arriving at stage three, the socialization model corresponds to the logic of the Guttman technique. Hence, when socialization stages were identified through factor analysis, the Guttman technique was used to statistically ascertain whether the stages were ordered, and if so, determine the nature of the ordering.

**Specification**

The study also engaged in a purely inductive strategy of specification. The intent was to determine whether or not any of the social background variables were applicable to the model. This was done by statistically controlling for select social background variables. In this way, the impact of specific variables were determined.

**LIMITATIONS OF METHOD**

At this point, a discussion of the issues that may, at least from the perspective of some sociologists, prove problematic for analysis and conclusions will be presented.
This is not to say that the issues preclude doing the study. Rather the perspective taken here is that all research has limitations and potential weaknesses.

Personal Contact

There was considerable personal contact (official and unofficial) with weight lifters in contrast with runners. As indicated earlier, official contact occurred with approximately 50% of the weight lifters during a personal appeal for their participation in the study. The purpose of unofficial or informal contact was largely oriented toward increasing sample size. Relatively frequent and friendly association with several weight lifters developed. Additionally, photographic work was done at several meets. This was done partially as a service to weight lifters (upon the request of one informant) and because of the photographic interests of the researcher.

Response Bias. The question of concern is whether or not the contact somehow biased responses. A number of points would suggest that the degree of association with weight lifters had a minimal impact on their responses.

First, a genial atmosphere was actively sought and encouraged by the researcher, while yet refraining from a normative commitment (positive or negative) on the sport. This atmosphere was supported by frequently stressing that the subjects were the experts on the sport. The researcher
deliberately encouraged the image of being a somewhat naive but motivated student.

Second, after a brief period the researcher became a natural and unobtrusive figure in the setting. The commitment of the subjects and the demands of their sports would not allow modification of behavior for very long. Subjects felt weight lifting was overlooked or misunderstood by others and welcomed the opportunity to express the meaning and purpose of their sport to the researcher.

Photography, as a third point of consideration, is not as intrusive as it might be in some other settings. Particularly at meets, it is not uncommon to have considerable photography taking place, and most weight lifters have come to consider it simply another aspect of their sport. For the sport, photography is a form of recognition and honor. If done respectfully and with consent, objection to photography is not an issue. Therefore, photography functioned as a way of obtaining first hand observation of the sport.

Finally, no requirement was made between answering the questionnaire and the development of relationships with the weight lifters. The two processes were independently initiated and consciously segregated from each other.
Nonprobability Sampling

Another limitation of the study is that it is not based on probability sampling. However, it would seem that the sample obtained does represent the total population of runners and weight lifters. Unfortunately there is no way of substantiating this claim. This would be a serious difficulty if there were a desire to provide statistical inference (based on probability samples) about the total population of runners and weight lifters. Without probability sampling, the risk of error in statistical inference is impossible to estimate.

However, the purpose of this study is not statistical inference, but analytical description and understanding. Furthermore, the qualitative and exploratory nature of this study makes probability sampling quite inappropriate. As Blalock states, "In exploratory studies, the main goal of which is to obtain valuable insights which may lead to testable hypotheses, probability sampling either may be too expensive or lead to fewer such insights."20

Issues of Time

Surveying and Time. A further limitation of the study is the effect of time. As indicated earlier, the survey of weight lifters and runners occurred during two separate time intervals. Also, the questionnaires were distributed,
filled out, and returned at various points over several months for each sport. The issue is whether or not some event or change took place that would substantially alter the nature of the responses.

The researcher took the precaution of constantly being on the lookout for any unexpected or unusual results, within and between the sport populations, that might be a product of a time related variable. Fortunately no seriously threatening differences appeared.

The researcher also took the measure of asking informants if any changes or unusual events in respect to their sports had occurred. This topic was approached indirectly and informally in discussions with them at various points across the study. Nothing unusual occurred.

**Cross-sectional Analysis.** A major assumption of this study is that the description and understanding of socialization into running and weight lifting can proceed with cross-sectional data (in this case, data collected at one time but on subjects at different levels or stages of experience in the sports). This short-cut procedure, as compared to longitudinal studies, has the difficulties of being more likely to miss important aspects of the developmental process. Unfortunately, longitudinal designs are usually precluded because of difficulties of time, costs, and manageability of the data collection and tabulation. Such is
the case with this study and therefore it proceeded with cross-sectional data.

**After Thoughts.** During analysis, it is not unusual for the researcher to wish s/he could go back and change some aspect of data collection. This desire is most likely to arise when applying a theoretical model to a new area of investigation. This study is no exception and some retrospective thoughts on how the data collection process could have been improved were not unexpected. The possible changes include some additions to or modifications of the questionnaire.

However, this problem is not so great as to jeopardize the essential goals and significance of the study. At most, there are but a few instances where it was necessary to either drop a specific datum or qualify some segment of the analysis. For example, it was necessary to exclude data on father's occupation, mother's occupation, and occupation sought by the subject from analysis. Fortunately, this data was not central to the overall study and where necessary education provided an adequate substitute.

Other instances of data deletion or qualified analysis will be presented as the study encounters them in the remaining chapters.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the reader with a description, clarification, and rationale for various methodological decisions of the study. Parts of this chapter raised obstacles or limitations of methods confronting the research study. The rational bases of how these obstacles and limitations were handled was also discussed.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 4


2. Three criteria were used in selecting clubs to survey: (1) clubs that were established for several years were preferred in order to assure a cross section of sport experience, (2) the clubs had to have a population size that was appropriate to the research, (3) in studying weight lifters and runners, this study requires a club from each sport to survey.


4. A few cases may be dropped from analysis at points for insufficient response to some part of the questionnaire.


8. The administering of questionnaires to runners took several more months because of considerable difficulty in obtaining membership information and their greater numbers.


12. For an understanding of the traditional uses as well as a more detailed account of content analysis, see Bernard Berelson, *Content Analysis in Communication Research*, New York: The Free Press, 1971.


21. For a discussion of these difficulties, see Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research*, pp. 63-70.
CHAPTER 5. DESCRIPTIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

PURPOSE

This chapter provides a descriptive and qualitative account of the socialization model for weight lifting and running (quantitative analysis will be given a separate chapter for discussion). Consistent with the model's stages of socialization, the following presentation explores the degree of experience, types of sensations, and the nature of enjoyment that are characteristic of these sports.

However, information in support of the operating assumption that weight lifting and running are subcultural and positive deviant activities will be presented first. This brief introduction will set the stage for the descriptive and qualitative account of the socialization model that follows. In carrying out these endeavors, this chapter is guided by the theory and conceptualizations of chapters 2 and 3.

SUBCULTURAL AND POSITIVE DEVIANT IDENTITIES

There can be no doubt that the weight lifters and runners of this study constitute a subculture. Just the
prodigious physical activity described in this chapter demonstrates that the subjects of this study are a group substantially out of the mainstream of the dominant society. This is commonly recognized and often admitted by the subcultures themselves. Literature written in support, and/or by someone of these subcultures, almost invariably begins with an acknowledgement of this fact and generally states it with some pride. For example, consider the following statement:

Leonard sensed in the sullenness of the crowd a conspiracy, a collective attempt to slow him down, an effort to stop his running. For isn't the runner, in a world that does not move, a strange and forbidding creature? Isn't he the foreigner in jogging shoes? Isn't he that flash of youthful lightening people want to forget, to hide from under a protective tree.

Although this passage is on running, the general theme is equally common in general literature on weight lifting.

Whether one selects such passages on running or weight lifting, one soon becomes struck by two prevailing factors. One of these, as already noted, is simply that these subcultures recognize themselves as different from the larger society. Ironically, on the other hand, they do not see the deviant nature of their activity or, at least, are reluctant to acknowledge it. Consider the following facts from this study.

A large percentage of the subjects felt, based on their experience, that people in general have false ideas on what
their sport is all about. Furthermore, a substantial number of participants stated that they often had people express negative attitudes toward their sport. Table 5.1 gives the exact responses for each sport on these two questions.

Table 5.1
Perception of Public Attitudes Toward Their Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters (Percent Agreeing)</th>
<th>Runners (Percent Agreeing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. People generally have false ideas about the sport?</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. People often express negative attitudes toward the sport?</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of these responses, one can safely say that subjects generally recognize their unique position in society. However, at the same time, they do not recognize these orientations by the general public as labeling and treating weight lifters and runners as deviant. The weight lifters and runners seldom indicated that people, in general, often treat them like deviants; just 11.1% and 8.1%, respectively. It is also true that, despite the negative experiences with the larger society, participants are seldom reluctant to tell people that they are seriously into running or weight lifting. Only 9.7% of the weight lifters and 5.2% of the runners voiced such reluctance.

These reactions in the face of frequent societal disapproval is explained by the fact of participants viewing
themselves as living up to society's positive evaluation of youthfulness, physical attractiveness, physical fitness, and health.

However, norms not only support certain characteristics but also define and limit them. The above traits are defined and limited in respect to: (1) degree or amount, (2) other normative constraints and priorities, and (3) the means by which they are attained. In short normative praise is conditional.

The time at which the sports of weight lifting and running come into conflict with the larger society is when they extend, intensify, or enhance the positively evaluated characteristics to the point of falling outside the conditional requirements. Weight lifters and runners tend to approach the ideals of youthfulness, physical attractiveness, physical fitness, and health in a zealous and purist fashion. It is not surprising then for runners and weight lifters to find nothing inappropriate in their behavior, attributes, and beliefs. After all their behavior is ultimately based on societal norms.

From the perspective of runners and weight lifters, if anyone is characterized as acting inappropriately it is the general public. At times, members of these sports express righteous condemnation toward society. For instance, a runner had this to say:
I think that people are threatened by a runner because:

(a) deep down I believe they know it is a valuable activity that they can't garner the energy or enthusiasm to do.

(b) seeing people run is a constant reminder to the non runner that he's not taking as good of care of himself as he should and I think he resents it.

EXPERIENCE

Workouts

Amount of Working Out. For both weight lifting and running, the success of the participants is based on acts of physical prowess. The sustainment of physical activity and demonstration of physical skill are considerable. For example, 94.1% of the runners worked out 3 or more times a week. The vast majority, 89.7%, of the runners also had workouts that lasted more than an hour. Frequency and length of workouts are quite similar for weight lifters; 98.6% worked out 3 or more days a week and all of the weight lifters had workouts of 1 hour or more. The two sports also correspond on the years of participation by members. The frequency of participation for two or more years in running and weight lifting was 79.4% and 87.5%, respectively.

However, a distinction in physical activity between the two sports becomes apparent as one looks at higher frequencies
and longer lengths of workouts. For example, 64.7% of the runners workout 5 or more days a week, as compared to only 37.5% of the weight lifters. On the other hand, 88.9% of the weight lifters had workouts averaging over 2 hours. Only 10.3% of the runners had workouts of such great length.

These variances may not indicate any "real" difference in the degree of skill or experience sustained by participants in each of these sports. A better explanation is that, at the higher levels of participation, the nature of each sport requires a different approach.

Running is a cardiovascular exercise that requires continuous exercise of the same parts of the body during a workout. In weight lifting, the same parts of the body are not continually exercise, but rather muscle groups are generally engaged in cycles of exercise and rest. More importantly, weight lifting is not a cardiovascular exercise. The central issue in weight lifting is building strength and/or body bulk. Therefore, the nature and type of activity in each sport leads one to expect differences between them in the frequency and length of workouts.

These differences do not alter the original conclusion. Clearly the data indicates a serious commitment to and demonstration of physical experience and skill by the participants in both weight lifting and running. (See table 5.2 for a detailed breakdown of the information provided thus far.)
Schedule of Workouts. In chapter 2, running and weight lifting were characterized as being semiformal sports. At this level of organization, sport has a relatively scheduled nature to it. Such prodigious activity, as described above, requires scheduling particularly if one is to carry out other expected or normal activities of life in this society. Therefore, participants of both sports generally establish explicit days, times, lengths, and rates of workouts. This not only helps participants to achieve their goals, but also reduces the frequency of conflict with other activities and social obligations in their lives.

Table 5.2
Indicators of Level of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters N=72</th>
<th>Runners N=136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complexity of Workouts. The practice of weight lifting and running can be systematic in ways other than scheduling. Participants often follow specific behavior patterns in carrying out their sports. These patterns may involve ritualized behavior before and after workouts, as well as specialized routines, techniques, and styles of doing the sport. Often of surprise to the naive is that there are numerous ways to run or lift weights. To the general society, both sports seem rather basic and simple. After all, cannot everyone run or lift something?

However, the serious practice of these sports leads to an entirely contrary view. The participants of running and weight lifting generally perceive a complexity to their sports that few other people in society comprehend. The pervasiveness of this type of participant viewpoint is clearly brought forth by answers to section IV of the questionnaire. This occurs even though these questions were not explicitly written to obtain a response to this issue.² For example, the following responses (several from each sport) were not uncommon:

By having a routine for time and distance of running, one will improve their endurance and strength. I started out slow, both in length of time and distance; also read about long distance running (heel-toe method) before really starting to run.

I am now just discovering many things about running. Before I would just go out and run, now I do different types of running
(speed, distance, etc.). I have just become more aware and educated.

It is a slow tedious process you must work through. Reading, learning from peers, and self experimentation is a time consuming process that is needed so you can find a routine that you believe in.

My knowledge was somewhat limited until I read "Pumping Iron." After I read this my knowledge expanded and I began to read everything I could get my hands on. I found an unbelievable change in my development when I went to a split routine and worked individual body parts, or a couple of them a day, instead of working every one of them in one workout.

Clearly running and weight lifting, as practiced by the subjects of this study, are not simply work-up events or ephemereal in nature. The sports require considerable experience and continuing development. The subjects of this study approach their sport on a very serious level; the engagement in running or weight lifting is a central and established ritual in their day to day lives.

Club Involvement. Although running and weight lifting clubs, such as in this study, seldom engage in a formal regulatory process, they do function to provide news, information, and promote the sharing of their sport among members. The clubs often do this through various forms of publications. They may provide newsletters to their members on various happenings in the sport or distribute flyers on upcoming events. In this manner, the clubs help promote
systematic involvement and subcultural unity among members within each of these sports.

**Competition**

Sport is commonly considered to involve "... the attempt to defeat an opponent." As such, sport is characterized by competition. Hence, the degree of experience in a sport may be partially measured by the extent and nature of competition.

The most basic question which comes to mind is what constitutes the opposing sides of the competitive struggle? In chapter 2, various possible competitive relationships were noted. Two of these possible competitive relationships were quickly ruled out for these sports. The present focus, therefore, becomes a search for the extent to which these two sports are based on individual competition with another person, an animate object of nature, or an ideal.

**Competition Between Individuals.** Frequency distributions, on the number of competitive meets entered and the number of awards won by participants, gives the initial impression that competition between individuals is a prominent feature of these two sports. This seems particularly true for runners where 91.2% of the participants stated that they had entered competitive meets. Furthermore, a relatively high percentage (39.7%) of the runners indicated that
they had won awards. Weight lifters reported a substantially lower number of individuals entering competitive meets (26.4%). On the other hand, the number of weight lifters winning awards was 22.2%.

Contextual information provides a more complete understanding of the meaning and implication of these figures. The differences between runners and weight lifters (frequencies of entering competitive meets) is largely due to the number and level of events open to the participants of each sport.

In the locality of this study, runners have numerous meets open to them over a year. These meets vary in distance and the level of runner development they are designed for. Within a short traveling distance by car, the number of meets available for runners increases rather dramatically. Opportunities for entering competitive events do not exist on this scale for weight lifters. In the locality of this study, there are only a few meets a year in weight lifting. More importantly, meets varying substantially in physical demands and level of competition do not exist for weight lifting. Running has numerous levels of competition whereas weight lifting essentially has only one.

The difference of 91.2% to 26.4% between the sports in entering competitive meets is not as dramatic and significant as the figures above imply. Differences in the orientation toward and emphasis placed on competition between
individuals within each sport cannot be inferred from these figures. Contextual data suggests that structural factors are the fundamental determinates of the differences between the two sports in entering competitive meets. Runners have a greater opportunity for competition between individuals, but this does not necessarily mean they have a greater commitment to it than weight lifters.

The figures given on the number of awards won should also be placed in proper context. In both sports, competitive struggle is broadly conceived. At any given meet, a number of participants are given recognition and winning is an experience of more than just one individual.

For running this is encouraged by establishing sex, distance, age, time, and other categories that are given separate recognition. Furthermore, there are 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and possibly more levels of recognition given within each of the more general categories. Running has, at times, taken this flexible attitude toward competition to the extreme of giving awards for simply finishing a given distance.

Weight lifting does not go to this extreme, and overall this sport does conceive competition more narrowly than running. But even here, it is unlikely that only one weight lifter will emerge as a winner. At weight lifting meets, competition occurs within a number of separate muscle groups (best chest, best arms, etc.), which decreases the chance of having only a single winner.
This presentation is not meant to imply that coming in first in a run, or being awarded best overall physique in weight lifting, is an unimportant aspect to the participants of these sports. In both sports, the achievement of being the overall best is highly admired, if not dreamed of and sought after by participants. Therefore, the information provided here has as its first goal to present an understanding of how these two sports can have such a high percentage of participants who have received awards. Second, the presentation indicates that there is a flexible attitude toward competition by weight lifters and runners through their de-emphasis of a single victor.

**Competitive Norms.** These points contrast sharply with the larger societal view. For example, compare the above presentation to the following conclusion on the nature of competition in American society.

> Each boy in a cub pack is given a small block of wood and four wheels that he is then to shape into a racing car. The race is held at a pack meeting with one boy eventually being the winner. The event is rarely questioned even though nearly all of the boys go home disappointed losers. Why is such a practice accepted--indeed publicized? The answer, simply, is that it is symbolic of the ways things are done, in virtually all aspects of American life.

American society's emphasis on competition and demand for a single victor is even more sharply brought out in
athletics or professional sports.

Measures are usually taken to ensure that one team (or individual) emerges victorious. The American people are generally dissatisfied with "ties" and draws." To circumvent this possibility, sporting contests climax in "sudden deaths"... and championship playoffs in almost every sport.

Though competition between individual exists within the sports of running and weight lifting, the examples above suggest that these sports do not correspond to the competitive values and norms of the larger society. This is particularly true when comparison between the sports of this study and athletics is drawn.

So far, the amount of competition between individuals seems substantial. Yet, competition between individuals in these sports does not follow the form normative to other areas of society. These seemingly incompatible findings increase the interest and importance of whether competition between individuals is strongly emphasized in the sports of weight lifting and running.

**Frequency of Competition.** Additional qualitative and contextual information suggests that this type of competition is not highly central to the sports. Even though frequencies of entering competitive meets and the number of awards won are impressive for both sports, the bulk of these sport activities do not occur within competitive settings. Engaging in competitive meets is a relatively minor and certainly
infrequent event, in comparison to the carrying out of these sports as they exist on a day to day basis. In short, competitive meets are more the exception than the norm.

Many of the sports most commonly known to this society, by definition and structure, immediately place individuals as opponents of each other. To engage in tennis, softball, basketball, and numerous other sports, even at the most informal level, instantly creates and encourages a competitive element. Of course, the intensity and handling of this competitive element within a group may vary. Yet, it is still no less the case that for many sports competition between individuals is inherent and structurally predetermined.

Running and weight lifting are two exceptions to this general rule. One could engage in running or weight lifting without coming into relationship with another individual as an opponent. These sports do not require one to face another weight lifter or runner as an opponent in order to play. As a result, both sports can occur separated and isolated from any pre-established form of competitive social relations. The form of group or social relations that do develop are not predetermined by the structure of weight lifting or running. Rather, the nature of social relations remains open for both of these sports. For an answer to this question, a review of subject response to several questionnaire items needs to be considered.
Within this vein of thought, it is noteworthy that for both sports participants did not automatically place themselves in a competitive stance toward others during workouts. Only 6.9% of the weight lifters and 3.7% of the runners consistently did so. A relatively high percentage in both sports said they sometimes competed with others during workouts. But what is truly interesting and quite surprising is the high percentage of runners and weight lifters who stated that they never competed with others during workouts: 52.2% and 38.9%, respectively (see table 5.3, for a summary of this data).

Table 5.3  
Competitive Stance Towards Others in Workouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the day to day practice of these sports, competition between individuals is not a prominent feature. Furthermore, subjects do not generally have winning in major competition as a future and essential goal. Of the runners surveyed, 82.3% did not consider winning in major competition as an ultimate goal. The results for weight lifters are not quite as striking, and weight lifters do seem to have a greater
tendency than runners towards the goal of winning in competition. Yet, to have 47.2% of the sample of weight lifters de-emphasizing winning as a fundamental goal is substantial. This figures takes on more importance with the realization that the remaining percentage of weight lifters do not all voice the complete opposite perspective. Rather, 22.2% of the weight lifters remained undecided (see table 5.4, for summary data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters %</th>
<th>Runners %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree or Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function of Competition Between Individuals. For both sports, the contrast of the above findings is resolved as follows: the extent of competition between individuals demonstrates a drive to continually develop greater skill. In this sense, competition between individuals is largely a way of measuring one's own development in the sport, rather than an emphasis on winning per se. As a result, this type of competition does not dominate the structuring of social relations among members in these sports.

Competition with Inanimate Objects. Another potential form of competition is where one's opponent is an inanimate
object of some kind. For runners the inanimate objects as opponents most often mentioned by subjects were time and distance. In the case of weight lifters, the most frequent candidate for an inanimate opponent was gravity, as represented by number of reps or poundage.

It is not unusual for the subjects of this study to mention, with joy, pride, and a great sense of accomplishment, their meeting or surpassing inanimate goals. The following are good representations of such statements.

... hitting a new maximum on a certain lift, or getting a certain muscle group pumped up like never before. Just super! Nothing like it and makes every rep worth while.

I look on a good workout as one in which I set out to run 5 miles and perhaps ran 6 or 7. I like to complete the mileage I set out to run....

Many runners and weight lifters felt that meeting or surpassing inanimate goals was a central aspect of a good workout. A substantial number of subjects in both sports also felt that progress in the sport was the key to their maintaining interest (table 5.5 provides the exact frequencies for your review). These frequencies are surprisingly high considering the variety of response options open to the subjects. Theoretically the response options were unlimited for these questions were not restricted to forced choice answers (see Appendix C). This substantiates the emphasis on skill and the high level of experience required in these
Table 5.5
Overcoming Inanimate Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest maintained through:</th>
<th>Weight Lifting</th>
<th>Running</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased physical performance</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good workout as meeting</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surpassing physical goals</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary on Competition Between Individuals and Competition With Inanimate Objects

Analysis, to be presented in the following pages, suggests that the forms of competition discussed above are interpreted by participants from the overriding perspective of competition with an ideal. As a result, competition between individuals and with inanimate objects, though relatively frequent, are perceived and interpreted in a manner uncommon to the larger society. These forms of competition are generally viewed as secondary, or merely a by-product of the more substantial goal of competition with a physical ideal, mental ideal, or spiritual ideal.

From this perspective, competition between individuals and competition with inanimate objects provide the setting for three essential social process of these sports: (1) assessing one's development towards ideals, (2) obtaining social support and encouragement for continued development,
and (3) providing legitimacy and significance through social ritual. In this way, competition between individuals and with inanimate objects have more of an importance for the development of social support than explicit rivalry.

SENSATIONS

Competition With An Ideal

Physical Ideal. Both weight lifters and runners place major emphasis on approaching an ideal physical state of being. One way of demonstrating this is to simply point out that a major percentage of weight lifters and runners (88.8% and 80.9%, respectively) said they engaged in their sport primarily to promote their physical health (see table 5.6).

One expression of physical health takes the form of bodily appearance. Even from this limited definition of a physical ideal, a substantial number of runners and weight lifters found their sports providing sensuous experience. For example, 63.9% of the weight lifters and 41.9% of the runners felt that their sports substantially increased their sexual attractiveness (see table 5.7).

However, these frequencies on physical attractiveness, if taken alone, represent a restricted notion of a physical ideal. To provide a more complete understanding of the significance of competition with a physical ideal requires the presentation of common subjective expressions on the issue.
Table 5.6
Engaged in Sport Primarily to Promote Physical Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7
Sport Substantially Increased Physical Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree-Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, self reports by participants of their development and interest in the sport follow:

I wanted to get a build like the ones in the books I saw. Everytime I read in a book each month my motivation keeps up. Plus seeing my own gains in build and strength keeps me going.

-or-

The two most important things that kept me interested in weight lifting are the tremendous increase in body size and weight; and the definition which my body has begun to develop.

Runners had similar commitments to a physical ideal. For example:
I have always been a very active and physical person, and seeing the disgusting level of fitness of my classmates (those who left school, ate dinner, studied, and went to bed), who didn't get any exercise, gave me even more stimulus to run regularly.

-or-

... increasing of time and distance, plus knowing, seeing and feeling the improvement in my body....

These quotes demonstrate the significance of a physical ideal as represented through sensations of improvement and growth.

However, the sensations and perceptions of a physical ideal are best brought out through participants' description and defense of the human body, as shaped by their sports. Weight lifters characterize the lifter's body as an art, a result of hard work, or superior dedication, and as perfected or fully developed in contrast to being overdeveloped. The following quote brings forth all three characterizations.

The weight lifter's body is not overdeveloped—it's superior. It takes a tremendous amount of work to get it that way. Only if one can understand the incredible amount of work and dedication of a lifter can he (or she) fully appreciate the lifter's body. It's a piece of precious art work.

Runners are similar to weight lifters in that they do not perceive the runner's body as overly fit, but merely obtaining its full potential. In addition, runners characterize the ideal physical body as efficient and of high endurance to physical stress and illness. For example,
How can you be overly fit? The runner's body is, in my mind, one which is effectively using its parts, keeping them in tone, and exercising them. The runner's body is properly lean and flexible, free from elements that cause sickness.

Mental Ideal. The subjects' commitment to a mental ideal is as important as their commitment to a physical ideal. There is a consistent and strong belief by participants that involvement in their sport can lead to an improved mental state. Weight lifters (79.1%) and runners (94.1%) expressed that their sport promotes mental health. These frequencies correspond to the sensations of stress reduction, anxiety releasing, though clearing, and relaxing or calming effects experienced by participants. Weight lifters often made statements similar to the following:

...I use bodybuilding as a form of therapy--it's a great way to remove tension or anxiety that builds up inside of me. Going through a good workout always relaxes me.

Participants also felt that improved mental health has fundamental social consequences. For example, one weight lifter put it this way:

Weight lifting helped my temper a lot....And it made me more friendlier to others.

Runners were even more likely to make comments about improved mental health and its social benefits. Runners stated that their sport functioned as:
... a socially acceptable means of displaying one's anger, frustration....

-or-

... time alone to sort out daily problems....

One runner provided a concise conclusion on this issue by characterizing his sport as being an "emotional vent."

Mental health is not the only psychological element making up the mental ideal experienced by participants of these sports. Members of both sports also adhere to the ideal that mental strength is developed through their sports. The term mental strength refers to the degree of worth and sense of competence an individual has about him/herself. Therefore, an ideal state of mental abilities and self concept are a major goal of the sports. Much of this may simply be the result of improved physical appearance having a broad impact on one's sense of well being. For both running and weight lifting, most subjects (91.9% and 97.2%, respectively) noted that improved body image through their sport increased the self concept each of them had of themselves.

Wherever one locates the source of mental strength, there is no doubt that for the participants of these sports the mental improvements are real and substantial. For example, one runner characterized the experience as a

Tremendous mental stabilization, self confidence and achievement.
A weight lifter considered the experience to be the central aspect of the sport. His development in weight lifting was due to its mental effects.

... a new self confidence was probably the single most important factor in my increased interest in the sport.

Comments such as these were not unusual and they give some indication of how involvement is perpetuated through sensations based on competition with an ideal. These can be sensations of physical or mental development or improvement that prove to be rewarding.

ENJOYMENT

Competition with a Spiritual Ideal

Finally there is the situation where participants may hold that there is an ideal spiritual experience that may be attained through their sports. The term spiritual ideal implies the existence of an altered state of consciousness and a unique reality that is experienced as pleasurable.

This definition of a spiritual ideal is purposely constructed in a relatively broad fashion. To do so, recognizes that the occurrence of an ideal spiritual experience can vary in degree and the form of expression. Furthermore, the relatively broad definition avoids the common restriction of conceiving spiritual ideals as belonging only to the religious
or sacred realm. For example, the mere finding that most weight lifters and runners, 86.1% and 91.2% respectively, experienced their sports as fun is an expression of a spiritual ideal.

A Way of Life. Prodigous activity in these sports involves considerable time, sweat, and pain. In contrast to the norms of the larger society, to hold that such is fun must involve an altered state of consciousness. The sports are not just fun to the participants but also are a central necessity to their lives. The weight lifters (76.4%) and the runners (83.9%) felt that their sport was something you get "hooked on." Therefore, involvement is beyond a mere hobby, recreation, or exercise; the sport is an essential need.

A State of Being. The most commonly known and extreme form of a spiritual ideal is what this study terms being "lost." A high percentage of weight lifters and runners (62.5% and 66.2% respectively) did experience being lost, at times, during workouts. This experience is most often associated, in the public literature, with the runner's high or, for weight lifters, the pump. Such an association between being lost and the runner's high or the pump was mentioned frequently by participants of this study.

However, the association was not true in all cases or, at least, was not clearly recognized and expressed by all
participants who told of the experience of being lost. Additionally, it was difficult to ascertain finite and explicit commonalities among the descriptions given of being lost, except for the unanimous expression of pleasure. Fortunately, two categories do prove useful.

On the one hand, being lost can refer to a dulling of the senses. In this situation, attention is diverted from the actual physical activity and the five senses tend to operate at a depressed level. Runners commonly refer to this process as disassociation and it was described this way:

You lose sense of your body, like mind and body separate. You no longer feel your legs moving, your feet hitting the ground, or your heavy breathing. You are wherever your mind is and totally there.

... it is most akin to daydreaming, of not really being aware of your present environment.

On the other hand, lost may refer to an enlivening of the senses. Here the five senses tend to be acutely aware and concentration is devoted to the physical activity. A weight lifter described the experience in the following manner:

Well, when you're having a good workout you sometimes forget about everything else but your muscle or body. Your concentration is very high and the blood is flowing through the muscle and you forget everything else.

Or consider the following expression:
Total involvement in the process at hand, extreme narcissism.

Both categories of being lost involve a loss of or departure from normative sensual experience. The result is an altered state of consciousness compared to the normative patterns of the larger society.

SOCIAL SUPPORT STRUCTURES

The Subcultural Interactive Context

This chapter has described each of the stages of socialization in somewhat of an isolated fashion. Now it is time to demonstrate their interdependence through a description of the interactive context which unites the stages as a whole.

The continued expression of sharedness and unity among members of weight lifting and running is based on the formation of social support structures. As indicated in chapter 2, these structures refer to patterns of interaction and understandings that provide social legitimation to given forms of social participation. For the subcultures of running and weight lifting, social support structures consist of three distinct patterns of interaction. These will be referred to as an associative structure, reward structure, and an ideological structure.

Associative Structure. The existence of an associative structure designates a dominant interaction pattern that
envelopes individuals' lives; that is, a pattern of interaction that is so central that it promotes a distinctive life style. One indication within the subcultures of weight lifting and running, is the extent to which subcultural interaction pervades beyond the sport itself, and affects the nature of other social relations. For example, both weight lifters and runners stated that they do at times associate with other members of their sport outside of gyms or meets (68.1% and 72.1%, respectively). Also it is not uncommon for the social relation of friendship to be interrelated with subcultural affiliation and activity. A high percentage of runners (62.5%) and weight lifters (69.4%) indicated that they do sometimes work out with close friends. The above figures indicate that these sports are not isolated events in the lives of members. Rather the subcultural interactions permeate across members' lives and promote socialization into a distinctive life style.

**Reward Structure.** The reward structure is an extension of the associative structure, but with the focus of attention being placed on interaction patterns of mutual recognition and sharing. Informal social approval is necessary to maintain individual participation and promote further socialization into the subcultures of running and weight lifting. To demonstrate this process, one can point to the many forms of sharing and encouragement between the participants of these sports. It is not uncommon for runners and weight
lifters to share information about their sports and give or receive suggestions on how to improve performance. Table 5.8 gives a quantitative summary of this mutual recognition and sharing between members within each sport. More qualitative expressions of these processes are as follows:

... most of the runners I know do not appear to be jealous of each other's abilities or accomplishments. They are happy to give advice and training tips, and in many ways help each other to improve.

The weight lifters will always try to give advice to help you break through a sticking point, or to help in a hard area. It's a great feeling to have a guy with a great chest come over and explain how if you changed this movement you can increase weight and pump the upper chest. The guys aren't thinking of you as a competitor, but as someone else to help spread the sport.

Table 5.8
Sharing Within the Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Do you readily share information and knowledge about your sport?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Do you give or receive suggestions on how to improve in your sport?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideaological Structure. The final social structure to be considered is the ideological structure. The concern here
is with the pattern of interactions that provide the rationales and legitimation of each of the sport activities. Part of this derives from participants interacting a great deal; thus coming to hold common values for the sport and viewing each other as authorities on the sport. It is no surprise then that many weight lifters and runners feel that some of the most useful information they have received has come from others in their sport (see table 5.9).

Table 5.9
Sources of Useful Information on the Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. From other participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. From magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No An.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good deal of ideological support also comes from subcultural literature. Runners and weight lifters read magazines, at least some of the time (99.9% and 82.0%, respectively), for useful information and knowledge about their sport (see table 5.9).

"Information and knowledge about these sports, whether obtained from other sport participants or magazines, includes the provision of values, rationales, and justifications for
the subcultural sport activities. Through this social support structure, runners and weight lifters come to define their activities as socially legitimate.

SUMMARY

Through the application of the conceptual framework of chapter 2 and the socialization model of chapter 3, this chapter has provided an understanding of basic sociological elements and their operation for the subcultures of weight lifting and running. The essential goal has been to sociologically describe the two subcultures, contrast them to the general societal structure, and most importantly, characterize the social meaning of these subcultural worlds. From this account it would seem that the model of socialization from experience to enjoyment is valid.

However, the presentation was largely limited to a description of stages, subcultural membership and identity, and how they are maintained through a social support structure. In chapter 6, the analysis will change from a concern with structure and description to one concerned with process. The following chapter will attempt to clarify and explain the process and stages by which individuals first become socialized into weight lifting and running subcultures. A specific testing of the model will take place.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 5


2. Question 3 of Section IV, "Biographical Information," comes the closest to relating to this issue of complexity in the sport. However, it was not explicitly written to tap this issue nor was it the only question to receive such a response.


6. Here the term progress is used to mean increased physical ability in overcoming inanimate objects of nature. There are other forms of progress which are deliberately excluded at this point in the analysis.

7. Although the study will give individual attention to each of the three forms of social support structures, the presentation to follow is not meant to imply that the social support structures are separate from each other or function in an independent fashion.
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CHAPTER 6. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS AND MODEL TESTING

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to quantitatively assess the model of socialization previously proposed. The model suggests three distinct stages of socialization into deviant subcultural activities. To recollect, these stages are: (1) minimal experience with and learning proper techniques for the activity, (2) recognition and expression of sensations associated with the activity, and (3) definition of the overall experience and involvement in the activity as enjoyable.

Factor analysis provides a quantitative and structural model to empirically test the deduced hypothesis of distinct stages of socialization. If the stages of socialization are shown to empirically exist, the hypothesized process of socialization ought to follow a distinct direction of development. In other words, the stages of socialization occur consecutively.

The sequential and unidimensional nature of the socialization model are characteristics it shares with Guttman analysis. As a result, Guttman analysis can be used to
test the hypothesis concerning stages of socialization.

MEASURES OF SOCIALIZATION

Minimal Experience

The first issue to be considered is what variables are to constitute measures of the three stages of socialization? There are a number of possible variables that could be combined to form an index for the first stage: minimal experience. These possibilities are level of sport, years in the sport, workouts per week, average length of workouts, entering competitive meets, receiving awards or recognition, and the number of awards received.

However, analysis done in previous chapters excludes the last three variables. In general, the exclusion is the result of their meaning and their relationship to the dimension of experience being too erratic. For example, entering competitive meets does not necessarily mean that one has obtained considerable experience or ability. There are none or few systematic or formal entrance requirements for most meets in these sports. Furthermore, as is especially true for running, meets are often specifically designed to encourage the participation of the relatively inexperienced. As a result of these facts, entering competitive meets can vary significantly in its meaning and relationship to experience in the sport.
Similarly, receiving awards or recognition does not necessarily have, as one might first think, a direct and consistent relationship to experience in the sport. Meets vary considerably as to type, seriousness, and difficulty. Coinciding with this, awards vary by category, type, and quantity. These variations can become quite extreme. For example, receiving a certificate for finishing a six mile run is nowhere near the same as being first in a marathon run.

These facts make it impossible for number of awards received to be consistently related to experience in the sport.

If one looks at this issue from a reversed perspective, one final fact excludes these variables as useful measures of experience. An experienced person in either running or weight lifting may not elect to enter competitive meets or, if he does, the person simply may not win. Entering and winning meets, at least the major ones, may require experience but it is not correct to conclude that not doing so is the result of a lack of experience. There are many weight lifters and runners who consistently enter competition and, though experienced, never win. Also the greater the self competition with an ideal, as discussed in the preceding chapter, the less likely even the experienced participant will emphasize entering competition and/or winning.

The remaining possible variables for a measure of experience prove to be the most useful. The variables of level of sport, years in the sport, workouts per week, and
average length of workouts are conceptually sound as measures of experience. They avoid the problems discussed above. Therefore, these variables are selected for a measure of experience to be incorporated in factor and Guttman analysis of the socialization model.

**Sensation**

The second stage of socialization is the social process of coming to recognize and express sensations associated with the sport activity. For example, fatigue, pain, or sweat are common physical sensations associated with serious running and weight lifting.

However, this study focuses on sensations and expression of sensations that are not purely physiological but based on social interaction and interpretation. More specifically, the socialization model offers an explanation of sensations that are socially derived through subcultural interaction.

The variables chosen as measures of the second stage of socialization are socially derived effects or sensations of running and weight lifting. These variables are the participants' expressions that their sports lead to sensations of increased self concept, mental health, and mental strength (see questions 3, 9, and 13 of "Section II - Views on the Sport" in Appendix B). It is hypothesized that through factor and Guttman analysis these variables will cluster to
form a common measure of the second stage of the socialization model.

Enjoyment

However, even with progress into the second stage of socialization, enjoyment of the sport is not assured. This is simply because these sensations are weighed against cost factors. Three basic cost factors incurred, through identity with these sport subcultures, are allotments of time, negative social sanction, and physical fatigue, or pain. Therefore, the third stage of the socialization process requires an interactive context which provides informal social rewards and social definitions that override cost factors. Chapter 5 provided a descriptive and qualitative account of this process.

The interest here is to empirically measure the stage of enjoyment and order it in respect to the other stages of socialization. Four variables are hypothesized to constitute a measure of enjoyment: the sport is fun, something one gets hooked on, something one is often willing to sacrifice other activities for, and an art form (see questions 1, 6, 14, and 15 of "Section II - Views of the Sport" in Appendix B). These variables represent a fairly wide range of how enjoyment might be conceived: that is, from being an addiction to being beauty. As with the earlier stages, factor and Guttman analysis are used to test this third stage of
socialization.

Summary of the Stages of Socialization

The variables constituting measures of minimal experience, sensation, and enjoyment correspond with the descriptive characterization of the sports in chapter 5. That is to say, the physical skill and prowess demanded in workouts, maintaining a scheduled and systematic orientation, engaging in competition, and commitment to a physical ideal all require minimal experience. Similarly, learning to recognize socially derived sensations must occur in order to experience and express the mental ideals described in chapter 5. Finally, in approaching the spiritual ideals discussed in chapter 5, a normative-ideological legitimation of overall enjoyment is required for the sports. As one moves from minimal experience to enjoyment, the stages become more complex and increasingly reliant on social force.

THE USE OF FACTOR ANALYSIS

The purpose of factor analysis is to determine whether or not the variables presented above will cluster, as hypothesized, into factors representing the three stages of socialization. Principle axis is the factor solution employed. Two items support this decision.

First, the model, as presented in chapter 3, emphasizes that socialization is a process and not a static nor
isolated event. As a result, interdependence between variables in the model are expected. The principle axis solution takes such intercorrelation into account in deriving factors.

Second, the statistical testing model should be logically consistent with the hypothesis being tested. In this case, the hypothesis is that the developmental stages of socialization are unidimensional. Since some stages are hypothesized to be prerequisites for later stages, the hypothesis is assuming a form of causality which ought to be empirically represented by correlations between the stages of socialization. The principle axis solution allows for this.

The above discussion implies that indirect effects will be involved. If the variables in the model are not independent, the variance of any variable will not be solely accounted for by any single factor. This should be recognized in the initial communalities selected for the factoring procedure. Since the author doubts the orthogonality of the factors (independence of socialization stages) unities should not be selected as estimates for the communalities (the principle components procedure). Initial communality estimates are given by the squared multiple correlation between a variable and the remainder of the variables in the matrix. However, these are not the final communalities used. Communality estimates are ultimately
arrived at through a process of iteration. This procedure is used because it is the best fit for maximizing the variance explained.

Three factors will be extracted based on the original hypothesis of three stages of socialization. Extraction of factors will stop here unless there are empirical indications, such as 4 or more eigen values greater than one, that would support doing otherwise.

The focus of analysis will be on the primary factor pattern. The reason for this is that the factor pattern provides the best indication of the clustering of variables. The factor structure and factor correlations will be presented as additional information.

The factor correlations will indicate the degree and direction of the relationship among the stages of socialization. They will also be a basis for judging if the original assumption of non-orthogonality is correct. Factor correlations obtain zero or close to it, if orthogonality is the actual situation.

Given the assumption of non-orthogonality, an oblique solution will be employed in rotation. More precisely, an oblimin solution will be employed. Its use has the important advantage of allowing the researcher to approximate the degree of correlation among the factors.

Primary factor loadings will not be considered substantial unless they obtain a .30 value, a standard
criterion in research. This assures that a factor is explaining close to 10% of the variance in a variable. 8

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR RUNNERS

Using the above criteria, factor analysis is applied to the data on runners (see Appendix D for zero order correlations). The expectation is that the variables will cluster to form three factors that correspond to the socialization model. Using the .30 criterion, the factor pattern confirms the hypothesis. Table 6.1 provides the primary factor loadings as empirical proof of the predictions.

Table 6.1
Factor Pattern for Runners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Level</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workouts/Week</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. Length of Workouts</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Self Concept</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Health</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Strength</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Fun</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Art Form</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Hooked On</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice Other Activities</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The factor pattern gives the best indication of the clustering of variables. It does not provide an accurate index of the percent of variance of a variable accounted for by a factor.

Close inspection of table 6.1 indicates one exception to the predictions. The exception is that sport level has
a high loading on two factors. This variable's moderately high loading with the factor representing the socialization stage of enjoyment is unexpected. However, this does not jeopardize the more fundamental relationships predicted for the loading has a negative relationship (-0.47) to the factor of stage of enjoyment. The factor structure is given for review in table 6.2. The factor structure does not provide any information that would alter the present conclusions.

This study hypothesized that the correlations among the factors representing the stages of socialization ought to be positive and moderately high. The factor correlations, table 6.3, substantiate this prediction for runners.

Table 6.2
Factor Structure for Runners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Sport Level</td>
<td>Workouts/Week</td>
<td>Aver. Length of Workouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The factor structure is useful in determining the amount of variation in a variable that is accounted for by a factor (e.g., a measure of correlation).
For runners, the factor procedure successfully extracted the three socialization stages and demonstrated their inter-correlation.

Before discussing additional implications or proceeding with further tests for runners, this study will first provide a replication of factor analysis for weight lifters.

**FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR WEIGHT LIFTERS**

There is a minor difference in the factor analysis for weight lifters in comparison to runners. For runners, the variable of level of sport is a sound measure of experience. Here development follows a progressive pattern from the lowest level (under 10,000 meters) to the highest level (full marathon) of the sport. As a result, the variable of sport level was successfully used in factor analysis for runners.

In contrast, the development of weight lifters cannot be ordered by this variable. For example, becoming a bodybuilder does not require a progression from power lifting...
to olympic lifting, and finally to bodybuilding. Since level of sport is an inadequate measure of experience for weight lifters, the variable is dropped from factor analysis. Other than this, the procedures of factor analysis are identical.

As originally hypothesized, the statistical analysis does provide a three factor solution for weight lifters (see appendix D, for zero order correlations). Table 6.4 provides the factor pattern loadings.

Table 6.4
Factor Pattern for Weight Lifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workouts/Week</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. Length of Workouts</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Self Concept</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Health</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Strength</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Fun</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Art Form</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Hooked On</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice Other Activities</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the expectation of a three factor solution is the only hypothesis substantiated. One variable, increased self concept, that was hypothesized to be an indicator of the stage of sensation does not load heavily enough to be considered important to any of the factors.

The factor correlations produce further negative results (see table 6.5). The expectations are that the factor correlations should be positive and relatively high. Contrary
to the hypotheses, the findings show that experience has little relationship to either sensation (0.04) or enjoyment (0.03). Furthermore, sensation and enjoyment, although substantially correlated, are negatively related.

Table 6.5
Factor Correlations for Weight Lifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical analysis at this point provides conclusions in fundamental opposition to the hypotheses on weight lifting. The factor structure does not offer any insights for understanding these unexpected results (see table 6.6).

Table 6.6
Factor Structure for Weight Lifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workouts/Week</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aver. Length of Workouts</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Self Concept</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Health</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mental Strength</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Fun</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Art Form</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Hooked On</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice Other Activities</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE USE OF GUTTMAN ANALYSIS

The literature on methods of scaling is filled with questions and cautionary remarks on the use of Guttman analysis. The critical reviews can generally be summarized into two central issues. First, there is the fear that any data set can be made to form a scalogram. The second issue is a debate on sufficient criteria for scalability. For example, there are questions on the adequacy of the coefficient of reproducibility as a statistical criterion of scalability.

It is not the purpose of this study to respond to all the separate points raised on Guttman analysis. Yet, these issues do necessitate that indiscriminate use of Guttman analysis be avoided. The use of Guttman analysis should proceed in a fashion that does not take advantage of its weaknesses as a statistical test. As a result, this study offers the following rationales for the use of Guttman analysis:

1. Guttman analysis is a relatively simple and well known procedure consistent with the purposes of this study.

2. The statistical model of Guttman analysis is congruent with the theory and logic of inquiry that guide this study (see chapter 4).

3. Guttman analysis can be related to the factoring procedure used in the first phase of statistical analysis.
4. The use of Guttman analysis proceeded in a deductive fashion, for an inductive strategy is prone to taking advantage of the weaknesses of Guttman analysis as noted above.13

5. Several statistical measures are used as criteria for judging Guttman analysis as a statistical index.

To apply Guttman analysis, the variables must have a common number of categories. Given the exploratory nature of this study and the moderate sample size, the simplest and most fruitful organization of the data is to dichotomize.

For the variables making up sensation and enjoyment this is straightforward because all the variables are measured on a five point scale. The overall score for each individual on sensation or enjoyment is simply the average of the scores they had on each of the variables making up these stages of socialization. To dichotomize the results, it was decided that the cut off point should correspond to the high side of the original five point scale for each variable. In other words, an individual's overall score had to be four or higher to be considered in either of these stages of socialization (or in Guttman analysis terms, to pass an item). Any lower cut off point would greatly increase the possibility of passing these items "easily." This would be inconsistent with the socialization model.

For the stage of experience, the dichotomizing procedure is not as simple and direct. The variables constituting
an index of experience do not have a common unit of measurement.

The procedure used to overcome this problem was first to determine what constituted moderate involvement on each of the variables making up the stage of experience. Informants, popular literature on the sports, and general physical education literature provided the foundation for making such a determination. For runners, a sport level of 2 (10,000 meters), average workouts per week of 3, and the average length of workouts of 0.5 hours are moderate levels of involvement. For weight lifters, the average workouts per week of 3, and the average length of workouts of 1.5 hours are moderate levels of involvement.\textsuperscript{14}

The second step was to assign a 1 to these moderate levels of involvement. Any higher degree of involvement on these variables was assigned a 2. Obtaining a summary index of the socialization stage of experience is simply a process of taking the average of the separate variable once recoded in the manner described above. The criterion for passing the stage of experience in Guttman analysis is then the average of the variables constituting the stage of experience exceeding the average that would result from moderate involvement on each variable; or 1. This provides a relatively stringent criterion of experience in these sports.

With the variables constituting the stages of experience, sensation, and enjoyment based on a common scoring
system, it is possible to apply Guttman analysis. The socialization model suggests that the stages ought to occur in a consecutive fashion; beginning with experience, then to sensation, and finally to enjoyment. In other words, one must obtain a certain level of experience (or pass the stage of experience from a Guttman perspective) before progressing to the second stage of sensation. Similarly, socialization to enjoyment requires prior socialization to the stage of sensation. Using Xs as symbols of achieving or passing a stage of socialization, the expected results of Guttman analysis can be diagrammed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages Passed</th>
<th>Enjoyment Stage 3</th>
<th>Sensation Stage 2</th>
<th>Experience Stage 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1  Expected Pattern in Guttman Analysis

The standard statistical criteria for assessing whether or not this pattern exists in the data are the coefficients of reproducibility and scalability. A value equal to or greater than .90 and .60 for these respective coefficients are required to conclude that the data follows the expected pattern. These criteria are used in the following analysis.
GUTTMAN ANALYSIS FOR RUNNERS

The results of Guttman analysis for runners substantiates the expected pattern of the stages discussed above. In other words, there is a progression from the stage of experience to the more advanced stage of enjoyment. The coefficients of reproducibility and scalability prove adequate: .94 and .73, respectively. The actual pattern of response is provided in table 6.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Sensation</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The socialization model also suggests that each stage should be positively related to the overall socialization process. The item-scale biserial correlations provide such a summary statistic and the hypothesis is supported. Table 6.8 does indicate that the biserial correlations, though relatively small, are positive in sign.
Table 6.8
Biserial Correlations for Runners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (stage)</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Sensation</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale (overall process)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUTTMAN ANALYSIS FOR WEIGHT LIFTERS

The results of Guttman analysis for weight lifters are less clear than for runners. The hypothesized patterning of stages, from experience to the more difficult or advanced stage of enjoyment, is not statistically substantiated. The reproducibility and scalability coefficients are both below the standard criteria of .90 and .60, respectively. The value of the coefficients of scalability (.52) is particularly weak. The coefficient of reproducibility is 0.89. The actual response pattern is provided in table 6.9

Table 6.9
Guttman Pattern for Weight Lifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Sensation</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation that each stage is positively related to the overall socialization process does not hold true.
The item-scale biserial correlations indicate a substantial negative relationship between experience and the overall socialization process (see table 6.10).

Table 6.10
Biserial Correlations for Weight Lifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (stage)</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Sensation</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale (overall process)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

In summarizing the results of factor and Guttman analysis, the chart below is the point of departure (figure 6.2).

Statistical Technique  | Runners | Weight Lifters |
-----------------------|---------|----------------|
Factor                 | +       | -              |
Guttman                | +       | -              |

+ = success
- = inconclusive

Figure 6.2 Success of the Theoretical Model of Socialization by Subject Group and Statistical Technique

In the case of runners, figure 6.2 indicates that the hypothesized model of socialization was substantiated by both factor and Guttman analysis. On the other hand, both factor and Guttman analysis provided little support for the hypothesized model of socialization in respect to weight lifters. Using several statistical techniques, and still arriving at internally consistent results for both groups
adds to the credibility and validity of the study.

What remains problematic is that the analysis in this chapter could not provide an explanation of why the model is appropriate for runners, but not weight lifters. This is particularly troublesome for the subject groups were selected, to a large degree, based on their similarities. It is now obvious that their similarities do not extend indefinitely, at least not to the process of socialization.

A reconciliation is necessary if the scope and utility of the socialization model is to be determined. Therefore, the next chapter will be in search of a plausible reconciliation of the different results for runners and weight lifters.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 6

1. There is an exception to this statement. The variable of level of sport is not a sound measure of experience for weight lifters. The reasons for this exception are discussed later in this chapter under "Factor Analysis for Weight Lifters."

2. Originally question 4 was also included as a possible measure of sensation. Although the basic hypothesized factors were extracted by the computer, question 4 caused problems of interpretation and assessing the nature of relationship between the factors extracted. This was true for both sports. However, before dropping question 4 as a variable in analysis, it was thought best to obtain a fuller understanding of its relationship to other questions of "Section II - Views of the Sport." Including other questions (7, 10, 16, 5, and 17) in the factor program led to the extraction of additional factors. Since in this larger analysis question 4 was associated with only one of these additional factors, and did not share a common factor with the other postulated variables of sensation, it was excluded from analysis.

4. There is a default procedure for the computer program. "In cases where the determinant of the matrix is smaller than \(10^{-8}\) or the matrix is singular, the absolute value of the largest element in each column is used instead of the squared multiple correlation." See Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent, *SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 480.

5. Factor scores are not mentioned for they have no bearing on the analysis of the socialization model via factor analysis. They do have a possible implication for Guttman analysis, and will be discussed at the appropriate time.


7. This is achieved through allowing the researcher to set a delta value. See Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, *SPSS*, p. 486. Since a moderately high correlation between factors was assumed, the delta value was set at .5. After using this delta value, other values were considered but were felt, in comparison to the increasing
complexity and work involved, to provide little statistical gain, did not have empirical justification, and/or lacked conceptual meaning.


9. Since the fundamental research question at this time is focused on the clustering of the variables, factor scores provide no interest or use, and are not discussed here. However, factor scores do have implications for decisions in the use of Guttman analysis and will be discussed at the appropriate time in the study.

10. For example, Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, *SPSS*, p. 533, note that with judicious choice of cutting points there is a high likelihood that any data set can be made to form a scalogram. For a more indepth critique of this issue, see Carmi Schooler, "A Note of Extreme Caution on the Use of Guttman Scales," in Gary M. Maranell (ed.), *Scaling: A Sourcebook for Behavioral Scientists*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1974, pp. 223-230.

12. See Benjamin W. White and Eli Saltz, "Measurement of Reproducibility," in Maranell (ed.), Scaling, pp. 190-191, for a discussion of similarity in the logic of factor and Guttman analysis. They note the basic distinction between the two is that Guttman analysis requires a range of item difficulties in the extraction of factors.

13. There are two inductive strategies that can be used. One is to simply run the separate variables through the Guttman procedure without first deductively arriving at a summary index for each of the stages of socialization. The test would be to see if the separate variables fall in an order of difficulty that corresponds to the overall model of socialization. The second possibility is to generate factor scores for each case on the factors extracted, and representing the stages of socialization. This is a purely statistical means of arriving at a summary or composite index. These factor scores could then be run through the Guttman procedure, with negative and positive scores representing failure to pass an item and passing an item, respectively. To be thorough and provide a basis of comparison, both these procedures were applied. The results proved unsuccessful.

14. Since sport level was excluded in the case of weight lifters during factor analysis, it is also excluded from the present Guttman procedure.

CHAPTER 7. RECONCILIATION

STRATEGIES TOWARD RECONCILIATION

An attempt to reconcile the differences between runners' and weight lifters' correspondence to the model of socialization proceeds on an exploratory and inductive basis. The study searches for a plausible explanation of why weight lifters failed to follow the hypothesized stages of socialization. The factor correlations for weight lifters demonstrate that the stage of experience has almost no relationship to the other stages, and the stages of sensation and enjoyment are negatively correlated. Further demonstration of weight lifters' failure to fit the theoretical model was provided through Guttman analysis. Of particular interest, the biserial correlations associated with Guttman analysis note a relatively strong negative relationship between the stage of experience and the overall socialization model.

Given these results, the only recourse is to search for any unique characteristics of weight lifters that suggest a rational explanation for their deviation from the socialization model. This search takes three basic forms of exploratory analysis:
1. procedures of statistical control
2. a search for and assessment of the effects of distinct social background characteristics
3. an evaluation of the orientation towards and subjective meanings of certain aspects of the sports.

EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS

Statistical Control

The purpose of statistical control is to determine if the hypothesized model of socialization is applicable to some specific subgroup of weight lifters. This form of analysis proved difficult and uninstructive to solving the problem.

The data presented the researcher with serious problems of control. There is a surprisingly high degree of homogeneity among weight lifters which nullifies any attempts at specification. Also, the size of the sample is not so great as to prevent some categories of the control variables from having few or no cases. Both factors reduce the possibility of making comparisons between subgroups of weight lifters.

These problems were particularly significant in attempts to control for race, college major, marital status, and level of weight lifting. Control was somewhat more successful with the variables of age and education. However, the categories of control seem arbitrary and have little
conceptual meaning when compared to their use in sociology generally. In other words, the range across which control categories were established was small; for example, almost everyone was under 30 years old and had some college education. In any case, the empirical results of control do not provide improvement over the original factor and Guttman procedures.

Assessment of Social Background Characteristics

The second approach towards developing a means of reconciliation is to note whether or not there are certain social background characteristics which weight lifters do not share with runners. If such characteristics do exist, they may present a plausible explanation for weight lifters' failure to follow the socialization model.

In chapter 5, high similarity on degrees of involvement was demonstrated for weight lifters and runners. Sport level, years in the sport, average number of workouts per week and even average hours per workout did not substantially vary between weight lifters and runners. At this time, one might additionally note that the variables of race, education, and college major are remarkably similar between the two sports. The only social background variables in which there is considerable contrast between the two sports are age and marital status. On these two variables, weight lifters and runners present diametrically opposed
patterns. (See table 7.1.)

Table 7.1
Contrast on Age and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight Lifters</th>
<th>Runners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-70</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are substantial differences between weight lifters and runners on age and marital status, no immediate explanation of how these variables might affect the socialization of weight lifters comes to mind. As a matter of fact, the initial inclination is to view these two variables, not as causes, but rather as a selection effect of the socialization process.\(^5\)

Subjective Meanings in the Sports

The last approach towards developing a plausible form of reconciliation proves much more insightful. An evaluation of the orientation towards, and suggestive meanings of certain aspects of these sports, does suggest differences that provide a plausible basis for weight lifters' failure to follow the model. Two types of comparison between weight lifters and runners prove particularly meaningful.
These are:

1. the orientation towards pain
2. the nature of being lost

The Management of Pain

In review of the weight lifters' and runners' responses to the question, "Would you describe running (or weight lifting) as sometimes painful?" and "If so, do you work around the pain?", one finds that the orientation towards pain varies considerably between the two sports. In general, response statements support the conclusion that runners attempt to circumvent and/or moderate the pain associated with their sport activity. On the other hand, weight lifters tend to view pain as a necessary and central aspect of the sport activity which is not to be avoided. The various ways in which these two tendencies are expressed is presented, beginning with the sport of running.

Runners. Three distinct ways of relating to pain predominate in the responses by runners. One type of response expresses the desire to avoid all pain of any substantial degree. In this case, even a minimal degree of pain destroys the enjoyment of the sport. If pain occurs, the only sensible alternative is to stop running. One runner expressed this orientation toward pain in the following way:
I only run when I am comfortable. If I am tired or in pain, I don't run or don't run as far as I normally would.

One runner went so far as to say:

I avoid pain in daily runs, else I would not run at all.

A second and more frequently expressed orientation toward pain by runners is to circumvent or moderate pain during the process of running. One does not stop running when pain occurs, but rather one attempts to control or regulate the pain experienced. Through conscious monitoring of the body, runners attempt to control and reduce pain by modifying equipment and technique or "working it out."

Attempts at circumventing pain through modification of technique or equipment is very common. A few responses should suffice as a demonstration.

... I can generally work around it by adjusting pace, repairing my shoes or with a temporary insert in the shoe. Pains while on the run can only be dealt with by changing your style some minute degree or by dropping out. It's easier and more rewarding to make the change.

The notion of "working it out" simply refers to pain gradually being reduced or disappearing, either at some point in the run or as the body gradually improves its physical condition. In either situation, the objective is
to monitor one's body and set a pace of exercise oriented
toward the alleviation of any pain. Therefore, the fol-
lowing responses, as examples, are not unusual.

Running is painful. I feel in each work-
out I do, there is a barrier of pain. Once
I reach and overcome it, the pain thres-
hold diminishes.

I have made a discovery of myself that I
can "run out" colds, physical pains such as
Achilles tendon, chondromalsisia (runners
knee) and bruised feet and knees....

A concise statement that gradual improvement in the sport
can reduce pain is given by one runner through the simple
response: "It all depends on how good of shape you are in."

If the pain does not "work out," but becomes severe
and persistent, runners generally opt to stop the run. For
example:

Usually the first mile I'm tight and some-
times in pain from a previous injury to the
Achilles tendon. I can usually run through
this at the 2-3 mile point. Sometimes how-
ever, I can't and have to stop.

The third way runners deal with pain is to remove it
from consciousness. This is the essence of runners' de-
scriptions of "getting lost." There are several ways in
which this occurs. One process is to simply block the
pain out of the mind. A runner expressed it this way:

As far as the actual pain in a muscle or
bone, I can usually put the pain out of
my head during the run.
Usually this process involves placing full concentration on other sensations of the run. Runners' responses often note sensations of movement, body processes (breathing, rhythm, temperature and sweat), time, surroundings, and/or thinking (work, family, problems, etc.).

This process of removing pain from consciousness can also occur by another means. Rather than concentrating on sensory sensations other than pain, it is possible for the runner to essentially remove himself from consciousness. The runner engages in a type of euphoric self-hypnosis. Although this particular way of handling pain does not seem to be an everyday occurrence, comments consistent with the following are not unusual.

You lose sense of your body, like the mind and body separate. Your no longer feel your legs moving, your feet hitting the ground, or your heavy breathing. You are wherever your mind is and totally there.

-and-

It's like putting my head in the clouds and not feeling much of anything.

Disassociation is the common term used to describe this phenomenon and various degrees of hallucinations are often related with the experience. 7

There is no doubt that running, for the majority of the respondents of this study, is painful (91.2% stating that it is sometimes painful). It is also true that for a given competitive event, pain is something that is simply
to be accepted for the sake of winning. However, on a day to day basis, it is obvious that the orientation of runners is to circumvent or modify any pain experienced. This goes to the point of denial or removal of pain in conscious experience through the process of becoming mentally lost.

Weight Lifters. Weight lifters also find their sport a sometimes painful activity (86.1%). However, unlike runners, weight lifters do not orient towards avoiding, circumventing, or modifying pain. In some ways, it may be said that they actively seek pain. To clarify this statement, three basic orientations by weight lifters toward pain will be described. These are pain as something:

1. to simply be endured
2. associated with gain
3. symbolic of work enjoyment and achievement

Those weight lifters who describe pain as simply to be endured are expressing a purely objective stance toward the experience of pain. Pain, in this sense, is neither something that can be avoided nor something of serious significance or meaning in itself. Pain is simply part of the sport. For example, consider these responses:

- Pain has to be expected, accepted, and endured in this sport as well as any other phase of life.

-or-
This is to me, not an unpleasant sensation but it doesn't rank as pleasant either. It is more like something you have to put up with.

The most common statements by weight lifters are those which are consistent with the cultural motto of "no pain, no gain." The association of pain with gain was put this way by a couple of weight lifters:

If I don't feel any pain then I know I'm not doing a good workout and no development will result (I would be wasting my time). If I am sore the following day then I know it was a good workout. We must tear down muscle tissue in order to cause repair and development.

-and-

Pain is the price to pay for a successful program....

In the above quotes, pain is a measure of one's gains or successes in the sport. Although worked for, the pain is still viewed in a negative light, as a price paid. The last type of orientation towards pain removes this negative aspect of pain. Here pain becomes symbolic of, and maybe synonymous with work enjoyment and achievement. Note the following example:

I love the pain. The pain makes you know its working.

-and-

... no matter what you do in life, you must take pain or hardship to accomplish something.
Plus it's a different kind of pain, it's hard to describe but I find it feels 'good.'

With this last quote, pain takes on a positive significance and becomes associated with pride.

If pain is viewed in any of the above three manners, it is difficult to envision weight lifters getting lost in workouts, at least in the same sense as runners. Being lost to runners diverts attention from explicit sensations of the running exercise to other more distant sensations, even to the point of hallucinations. Weight lifters, on the other hand, tend to concentrate on the physical sensations of exercise to the almost total exclusion of other sensations. The following type of responses are the norm:

If I can only focus on the weights I am lifting and feel each movement and each muscle group being worked, I can get lost in a workout. I think it is just a feeling of intense concentration with no distractions.

-and-

If you mean becoming completely oblivious to anything but the workout, getting "lost" is completely necessary.... I cannot remember anything but getting out that 465 lb. single squat or those last 10 reps with 315 lbs. before quitting. It is essential and good.

In this sense, "getting lost" actually means focusing in on the sensations, which are often painful ones.
Management of Pain and the Socialization Model

The distinctions raised between running and weight lifting, in respect to orientations toward pain and expressions of being lost, offer a plausible explanation of why weight lifters fail to follow the hypothesized model of socialization. As experience increases for weight lifters, the purely physical and painful aspects of the sport must play an increasingly heightened and central role. Without circumventing, or modifying pain to some extent as runners do, it is questionable how increased experience in weight lifting would enhance enjoyment. Such intense and conscious emphasis on the physical sensations of exertion and pain would seem to work toward the negation of enjoyment. Therefore, it is not surprising that for weight lifters the stage of experience is not related to enjoyment under factor analysis and is negatively related to the overall socialization model under Guttman analysis.

This conclusion raises questions. If increases experience does not lead toward enjoyment for weight lifters, why do they maintain their activity? In other words, what socialization pattern could explain the evolution of involvement in and commitment to weight lifting? An alternative model is presented in conceptual form.
Deviance seems to be easily understood if, by cultural definition, it is felt to be inherently enjoyable or meets some normative utilitarian end. For example, Lundgren notes that heroin use (inherently enjoyable) and check forging (normative utilitarian end) are easily understood.  

The explanation of other deviant activities, however, often implicitly assumes the development of subcultural norms characterizing the deviant activity as expressive and intrinsically enjoyable. Research has predominantly focused on expressions of self, social relationships, and the activity per se. Of course, all of these things are viewed as intrinsically meaningful and done for their own sake. This perspective corresponds to the expressive or non-utilitarian end of the conceptual framework presented in chapter 2. It also corresponds well with what many scholars mean by the term leisure. Therefore, activities that are fundamentally expressive in nature may be termed leisure enjoyment.

The unwitting bias of this study and much of the sociological literature is to consider leisure enjoyment the fundamental social purpose of deviant subcultures that do not fall within explanations of inherent enjoyment or normative utilitarian ends. Studies in this area have neglected the possibility that work can be a fundamental component of social purpose and a basic means of self
expression, social relationships, identity, and enjoyment. This neglect may be a result of work losing its cultural significance and meaning through history. A common conclusion is that:

Work has steadily lost its influence and power to command people's identification and loyalties; as they attempt to find alternative sources of moral experience, society loses an important source of normative integration.  

The sociological literature generally argues that people often substitute or compensate alienated work with subcultural forms of leisure, thereby regaining meaning, identity, and satisfaction in life. However, this study suggests that alienating work may increasingly be compensated for by subcultural forms of meaningful work. This study characterizes activities of this type as work enjoyment. Of course, the concept work enjoyment corresponds to the instrumental or utilitarian end of the conceptual framework presented in chapter 2.

The point of the above discussion is to suggest that weight lifting is a subculture of work. The primary social purpose of the activity is not leisure enjoyment, but instead is work enjoyment. The hypothesis being put forth is that weight lifters are principally instrumental and oriented towards subculturally defined roles of growth, appearance, and physical capabilities. The activity of weight lifting itself is not so important as is the resulting
product, in the form of bodily changes. Since enjoyment is derived from goals and not the process of the activity, weight lifters can endure and even seek pain during workouts based on ulterior motives. This is particularly true to the degree that the experience of pain becomes a measure of one's success towards the subcultural goals. In this manner, a conceptual and logical model begins to present itself as an explanation of how and why weight lifters maintain their activity.

**Alternative Model for Weight Lifters**

A rudimentary socialization model for the sport of weight lifting is offered by this study. The model can be diagrammed as follows:

![Diagram of model](image)

**Figure 7.1 Suggested Model for Weight Lifters**

The first stage in this model represents socialization to the goals of the sport. This includes the subcultural definitions of these goals as meaningful, satisfying, enjoyable, and a matter of work appreciation and dedication. This stage occurs through interaction with the subculture; possibly first through subculture literature and the media, and second, through direct contact with weight lifters.
This stage of work enjoyment must occur before major experience in the sport occurs, in order to subculturally socialize the individual in the proper ways of experiencing, defining, and handling pain.

The second stage of experience is probably the most critical. The first efforts in the sport of weight lifting must be plagued with difficulties and pain. This may be inferred by the descriptions of weight lifting given by respondents earlier in this chapter. With the values from the first stage of socialization and the support of others, the level of experience may proceed to the point where the socialization process enters the third stage.

In this third stage, the individual must learn to recognize and interpret sensations and physical changes as signs of achievement and gain in respect to work objectives. Since they may not be immediately apparent, the recognition of these changes and their meanings might first be pointed out by other members of the subculture.

Finally, the norms of work enjoyment of the first stage of the model must be reaffirmed. In other words, not only must recognition of achievement and gains occur (stage 3) but work benefits must also be judged to out-weigh the costs in pain. With this, the socialization model suggested for weight lifters and other work enjoyment subcultures becomes cyclical in nature. This is a more complex model of socialization, in contrast to the linear model.
confirmed for runners.

CONCLUSIONS

The original design of the study and operationalization of variables makes the testing of this alternative socialization model impossible. However, the presentation is an attempt at a logical reconstruction which can be useful and suggestive in several ways. This reconstruction does provide a rational, though untested, account of the weight lifters' failure to follow the socialization model. The role of pain and the greater complexity of the hypothesized model for weight lifters may even explain why weight lifters are generally young, single, and few in number compared to runners.

The alternative model also offers suggested conceptualizations to be explored in future research. Possibly a more important contribution is that this study emphasizes the need to recognize work enjoyment as a significant social force in subcultural activities. Work enjoyment can be as important as leisure enjoyment in directing social behavior.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 7

1. When faced with unexpected results and inadequate resources for explicit testing procedures, science only has recourse to begin to build anew through a process of reasoned judgement. See Kenneth R. Hoover, *Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*, New York: St. Martin's, 1976, pp. 8-10.

2. Of course, this is a restatement of earlier findings. See chapter 6 for a specific numerical and statistical account.


4. In chapter 5, differences in the average number of workouts per week and the average length of workouts are noted. However, the analysis of chapter five also indicated that these differences are not meaningful. For the present assessment of social background characteristics, these differences once again proved to be un insightful.
5. These differences could be a result of the sampling procedure employed. There is no guarantee that the purposeful samples of this study are representative of the populations of runners and weight lifters. If sampling bias does not exist, an explanation for these differences would at this point be purely speculative. Further analysis is suggestive (though not definitive) toward a resolution of this problem.

6. The discussion here refers only to the "normal" and "common" types of pain associated with running and weight lifting. Neither of the sport groups are truly masochistic. They both make a sharp distinction between pain due to injury and pain due to the normal actions of the sport. In all cases, injury pain was viewed as a disaster and generally meant a reduction in or temporary abstinence from the sport activity.

7. Disassociation is freely admitted to and discussed by the running subculture. It is a fairly common topic in the subcultural literature and has increasingly been a focus of more popular magazines. For example, see John Maher, "The Running Addiction," Columbus Monthly, March, 1981, pp. 121-129; and William P. Morgan, "The Mind of the Marathoner," Psychology Today, April, 1978, pp. 38-49.

9. For example, a number of works in Earl Rubington and Martin S. Weinberg (eds.), *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, 3rd ed., London: Macmillan, 1978; and Frank R. Scarpitti and Paul T. McFarlane (eds.), *Deviance: Action, Reaction, Interaction*, Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1975 apparently give tacit support to this assumption. However, this study has found no one, in the above works or others, that explicitly raises this issue for discussion.


CHAPTER 8. SUMMARY AND FUTURE RESEARCH

RECAPITULATION

This dissertation provided an exploration and understanding of the process of socialization into deviant subcultural identities. The theoretical model of socialization assessed was derived from Becker's classic study on "Becoming a Marihuana User."¹

An analytical framework was presented in chapter 2 justifying the application of the socialization model to subcultural, expressive, and positive deviant behavior. This analytical framework provided the conceptual context and assumptions within which the analysis of the model occurred. Weight lifting and running provided the concrete social setting and behaviors for the application and testing of the socialization model.

In chapter 3, the Becker model was refined and reduced to a three stage model for research purposes. Stage one of the model is the development of initial contact and minimal experience in the deviant activity. Stage two is the process of learning to recognize sensations produced and associating them with the deviant activity. Stage three is
coming to define the sensations experienced and the overall deviant activity as enjoyable.

For the sport of running, both qualitative and quantitative analysis supported the existence and sequential ordering of the stages. The extension and applicability of the socialization model for understanding positive deviant behavior within sport subcultures was verified.

The results of applying the model to weight lifting proved to be much less successful. Qualitative analysis supported the expectations of minimal experience, recognition of sensations associated with the sport, and genuine enjoyment of the sport on the part of weight lifters. However, the quantitative analysis found it difficult to establish these expectations as distinct stages and could not demonstrate a sequential ordering of them.

A tentative explanation was necessary to resolve the issue of why the socialization model was successful in the case of one sport but not the other. The analytical framework of chapter 2 conceptually placed the model within subcultural, expressive, and positive deviant behavior. A follow up and qualitative analysis suggested that the criterion of expressive behavior is not appropriate for both sports. The study indicates that instrumental or utilitarian interests are more pronounced in the sport of weight lifting. As a result a different model of socialization is suggested.
The instrumental or utilitarian interests of the sport of weight lifting force the painful aspects of the sport to explicit consciousness and in some ways requires that the participants actively seek pain. Since pain plays such a primary and explicit role, involvement in the sport first requires a commitment to the goals of the sport. Without this the pain of initial experience would not be endured for long. The study calls this step of socialization into the sport of weight lifting work enjoyment. The second stage of socialization then becomes minimal experience, and the third stage is the recognition of sensations and physical changes associated with the activity. These sensations and physical changes must be viewed as positive and outweigh the cost in pain. This last process re-affirms the initial commitment to work enjoyment. Hence the tentative or suggested model is cyclical in nature.

Work and Leisure as Societal Values

Quite serendipitously, this study discovered that avocational subcultures may not always exist for the purpose of leisure. This contradicts a major theme in the sociology of work and leisure.

There is a rather large body of literature in this field which assumes that in our modern technological and work alienated society increases in free time have predominantly resulted in more leisure activity. From this
perspective, alienating work is compensated for by leisure and one soon has a mass leisure society. Of course, this all assumes that work ethics and values have substantially waned in our society.

In contrast the final perspective taken on weight lifting in this study suggests that subcultural forms of work enjoyment, rather than leisure enjoyment, may be an equally viable form of individual adjustment and compensation in respect to a work alienated society.

However, this study of weight lifting offers only a tentative model and only one case as an example. Yet, this idea deserves attention in the future.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In any extension of this research, the first suggestion would be to develop more elaborate indexes of the stages of socialization. In this study, there are several variables used as measures for each stage of socialization. With a greater number of variables, a more rigorous test of the model could be conducted, and if successful, an even more detailed understanding of the socialization process could be presented. Many of the issues and variables discussed during qualitative analysis may offer suggestions for such an endeavor.

The second suggestion is that research explore the tentative model suggested for weight lifters. Since this model
could not be tested with the data from this study, it has the explicit purpose of being a heuristic model for additional research endeavors.

The third suggestion is that future research needs to expand the variety of deviant subcultural behaviors upon which the socialization model is tested. Hopefully in doing so, research will follow the example of this study and attempt to empirically specify and order the stages of the model.

Finally in testing the socialization model across a variety of deviant subcultures, the research ought to present further comparative analyses between expressive vs. utilitarian activities. Based on this study, comparative research between these forms of subcultural behavior should prove promising.
NOTES ON CHAPTER 8


3. For a thorough work which is based on this premise, see Kando, *Leisure and Popular Culture in Transition*.

4. For a concise discussion of this possibility, see Kando, *Leisure and Popular Culture in Transition*, especially chapter 5, pp. 92-141.
APPENDIX A:

THE COVER LETTERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES
Introduction:

I am a Ph.D. student in sociology at Ohio State. I have had an interest in sport and the sociology of sport for sometime. I am presently engaged in a sociological study of the sport of weight lifting. My specific interest in weight lifting arose out of my realizing the following things:

1. The general public seems to have little knowledge of the sport.

2. To my knowledge, no sociological studies have explored the sport.

3. To me, it is an intuitively interesting sport.

Objectives:

The study is designed to focus on three major areas. First, the social background characteristics of weight lifters will be explored. In short, who becomes involved in weight lifting? Secondly, I wish to know the image weight lifters have of their sport, how they view themselves, and their motivation or reason for being in the sport. Thirdly, I wish to explore how weight lifters get started and progress through the sport.

The Value of Your Cooperation

I need your help to meet the objectives I just discussed. Your aid is of more value than I can possibly express. Weight lifters are the only ones who can legitimately answer the questions I have raised. Your experiences, thoughts, and knowledge are the foundations of this study. Hopefully, the study will be of value to you. It may or may not. However, it does offer you the possibility to gain some insight into yourself and to express yourself on weight lifting and weight lifters.

General Information and Instructions:

1. The term weight lifting is used throughout the questionnaire. Interpret the term weight lifting from the perspective of the sport (that is, either power lifting, Olympic lifting, or bodybuilding) that you are primarily interested in. I am interested in getting responses from people in each of the three sports.
2. You must understand that you are in no way obligated to me or this study. Filling in this questionnaire and returning it is voluntary.

3. Information and material that you give will be published but your name will remain anonymous. Efforts will be made to insure your anonymity. Name, address, and telephone number are only requested in case of a follow up study or interview.

4. In the questionnaire there are no wrong or right answers. You are the expert, and I want to hear your opinions and personal experiences.

5. Feel free to contact me to raise questions or suggestions on any aspect of this study.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: __________

Name and Addresses:

Keith Ewald
84 Euclid Ave. Sociology Department
Columbus, Ohio 43201 383 Administration
Phone - 291-2721 Building
Phone - 422-6200

PLEASE TEAR THESE FIRST TWO PAGES OFF AND KEEP THEM FOR YOUR RECORDS.
Introduction:

I am a Ph.D. student in sociology at Ohio State. I have had an interest in sport and the sociology of sport for sometime. I am presently engaged in a sociological study of the sport of running. My specific interest in running arose out of my realizing the following things:

1. The general public seems to have little knowledge of the sport.
2. To my knowledge, no sociological studies have explored the sport.
3. To me, it is an intuitively interesting sport.

Objectives:

The study is designed to focus on three major areas. First, the social background characteristics of runners will be explored. In short, who becomes involved in running? Secondly, I wish to know the image runners have of their sport, how they view themselves, and their motivation or reason for being in the sport. Thirdly, I wish to explore how runners get started and progress through the sport.

The Value of Your Cooperation:

I need your help to meet the objectives I just discussed. Your aid is of more value than I can possibly express. Runners are the only ones who can legitimately answer the questions I have raised. Your experiences, thoughts, and knowledge are the foundation of this study. Hopefully, the study will be of value to you. It may or may not. However, it does offer you the possibility to gain some insight into yourself and to express yourself on running and runners.

General Information and Instructions:

1. The term running is used throughout the questionnaire. Interpret the term running from the perspective of the sport that you are primarily interested in. I wish to get responses from people interested in different types of running.

2. You must understand that you are in no way obligated to me or this study. Filling in this questionnaire and returning it to me is voluntary.
3. Information and material that you give will be published but your name will remain anonymous. Efforts will be made to insure your anonymity. Name, address, and telephone number are only requested in case of a follow up study or interview.

4. In the questionnaire there are no wrong or right answers. You are the expert, and I want to hear your opinions and personal experiences.

5. Feel free to contact me to raise questions or suggestions on any aspect of this study.

Signed: _____________________________ Date: ____________

Name and Addresses:

Keith Ewald
84 Euclid Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone - 291-2721

Sociology Department
383 Administration Building
Phone - 422-6200

PLEASE TEAR THESE FIRST TWO PAGES OFF AND KEEP THEM FOR YOUR RECORDS.
APPENDIX B:
RUNNING AND WEIGHT LIFTING QUESTIONNAIRES
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE SPORT OF RUNNING

Section I - General Background Information

Please fill in the blank or check the appropriate response.

1. Name: ____________________________

2. Address: ____________________________

3. Telephone: __________

4. May I contact you in the future for a follow up study or interview? _______

5. Age: _____ 6. Sex: _______

7. Race: ____ Black ____ White ____ Oriental

8. Education: _____ Less than high school
   _____ 1-3 years high school
   _____ 4 years high school
   _____ 1-3 years college
   _____ 4 years college
   _____ Graduate school

9. What was your major? _______________________

10. What is your occupation? _______________________

11. Marital status: ____Single ____Married ____Divorced

12. What type of running are you primarily interested in?
   ____ Full marathon
   ____ Half marathon
   ____ 10 thousand meter
   ____ Under 10 thousand meter

13. How long have you been running? _______ years.

14. How often do you work out per week? _______

15. On the average, how long are your work outs in time and distance? _______ Minutes or _______ Hours
   ______ Distance
16. Have you entered any competitive meets? ______
17. Have you received any awards or recognition? ______
18. If so, please list. ____________________________

19. Your father's occupation: ____________________________
20. Your mother's occupation: ____________________________
   ___ Less than high school    ___ Less than high school
   ___ 1-3 years high school    ___ 1-3 years high school
   ___ 4 years high school      ___ 4 years high school
   ___ 1-3 years college        ___ 1-3 years college
   ___ 4 years college          ___ 4 years college
   ___ Graduate school          ___ Graduate school

23. Did or do any of your family members run? ______
24. If so, who? ____________________________

Section II - View on the Sport

   SA - strongly agree
   A - agree
   U - undecided
   D - disagree
   SD - strongly disagree

circle one
SA A U D SD 1. Running is fun.
SA A U D SD 2. I engage in running primarily to promote my
physical health.
SA A U D SD 3. Improved body image, through running, in-
creases my self concept.
SA A U D SD 4. Hard running is an almost sexual, sublime
feeling.
SA A U D SD 5. I am reluctant to tell other people that I
am seriously into running.
SA A U D SD 6. Running is something you get hooked on.
SA A U D SD 7. I have often heard people express negative
attitudes toward my running.
SA A U D SD 8. Much of running is merely concerned with
gaining strength.
SA A U D SD 9. Running promotes mental health.
SA A U D SD 10. From my experience, people in general have
false ideas on what running is all about.
My ultimate goal in running is to win in major competition. Beyond a certain level of training, special diets are necessary to achieve competitive standing. Running builds mental strength. I find that I often sacrifice other activities in order to run. Running is an art form. People, in general, often treat me like some kind of deviant. I feel running can or has substantially increased my sexual attractiveness.

Section III - Progress through the Sport

A - always
S - sometimes
N - never

circle one
A S N 1. Do you run alone?
A S N 2. Do you readily share information and knowledge about running (techniques, diets, training procedures, etc.)?
A S N 3. Do you compete with other runners during work outs?
A S N 4. Do you read magazines for useful information and knowledge about running?
A S N 5. Do you participate in sports other than running?
A S N 6. Do you spend time observing other runners' training and performance?
A S N 7. Do you work out with close friends?
A S N 8. Do you associate with runners outside of gyms or meets?
A S N 9. Do you give or receive suggestions on how to improve performance in running?
A S N 10. Are you a spectator of sports other than running?
A S N 11. Does the most useful information you receive on running come from associating with other runners?

Section IV - Biographical Information

These questions are included to get a more detailed view of your experiences and thoughts as a runner. Please give them thorough consideration for they create a more accurate basis of information. If you need more room, use the back of the page.
1. How did you initially learn of and become interested in running (through what or whom)?

2. What kinds of things kept your interest up in running?

3. Can you describe how you progressed in running (important discoveries, teaching, learning, stages of development, etc.)?

4. How would you describe the motivation or encouragement given you by others to do well in running?
5. How would you describe a good work out?

6. Do you get "lost" (sensuously, mentally, or spiritually not geographically)? How would you describe the feeling?

7. Would you describe running as sometimes painful? If so, do you work around the pain?

8. Many people feel that runners are overly fit. How would you explain the runners' body to those people?
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE SPORT OF WEIGHT LIFTING

Section I - General Background Information

Please fill in the blank or check the appropriate response.

1. Name: ____________________________

2. Local Address: ____________________________

3. Telephone: ____________________________

4. Permanent address: ____________________________

5. May I contact you in the future for a follow up study or interview? ______

6. Age: ______ 7. Sex: ______

8. Race: ___ Black ___ White ___ Oriental

9. Education: ___ Less than high school
   ___ 1-3 years high school
   ___ 4 years high school
   ___ 1-3 years college
   ___ 4 years college
   ___ Graduate school

10. What is your major? ____________________________

11. Type of occupation sought? ____________________________

12. Marital status: ___ Single ___ Married ___ Divorced

13. Which is your sport of primary interest?
   ___ Power lifting
   ___ Olympic lifting
   ___ Bodybuilding

14. How long have you been practicing your sport? ____ years.

15. How often do you work out? _______ days a week.

16. How long are your work outs? _______ hours.

17. Have you entered any competitive meets? _______
18. Have you received any awards or recognition? _____
19. If so, please list. ____________________________________________
20. Your father's occupation: ______________________________________
21. Your mother's occupation: ______________________________________
22. Your father's education: 23. Your mother's education:
   ____________ _ Less than high school _ _ Less than high school
   1-3 years high school 1-3 years high school
   4 years high school 4 years high school
   1-3 years college 1-3 years college
   4 years college 4 years college
   Graduate school Graduate School
24. Did or do any of your family members practice weight lifting? _____
25. If so, who? ____________________________________________

Section II - Views on the Sport

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
U - undecided
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

circle one
SA A U D SD 1. Weight lifting is fun.
SA A U D SD 2. I engage in weight lifting primarily to promote my physical health.
SA A U D SD 3. Improved body image, through weight lifting, increases my self concept.
SA A U D SD 4. Being pumped up is an almost sexual, sublime feeling.
SA A U D SD 5. I am reluctant to tell other people that I am seriously into weight lifting.
SA A U D SD 6. Weight lifting is something you get hooked on.
SA A U D SD 7. I have often had people express negative attitudes toward my weight lifting.
SA A U D SD 8. Much of weight lifting is merely concerned with gaining strength.
SA A U D SD 9. Weight lifting promotes mental health.
SA A U D SD 10. From my experience, people in general have false ideas on what weight lifting is all about.
SA A U D SD 11. My ultimate goal in weight lifting is to win in major competition.
SA A U D SD 13. Beyond a certain level of training, steroids are necessary to achieve competitive standing.
SA A U D SD 14. I find that I often sacrifice other activities in order to lift weights.
SA A U D SD 15. Weight lifting is an art form.
SA A U D SD 16. People, in general, often treat me like some kind of deviant.
SA A U D SD 17. I feel weight lifting can or has substantially increased my sexual attractiveness.

Section III - Progress through the Sport

A - always
S - sometimes
N - never
circle one
A S N 1. Do you work out alone?
A S N 2. Do you readily share information and knowledge about weight lifting (techniques, diets, training procedures, etc.)?
A S N 3. Do you compete with other weight lifters during work outs?
A S N 4. Do you read magazines for useful information and knowledge about weight lifting?
A S N 5. Do you participate in sports other than weight lifting?
A S N 6. Do you spend time observing other weight lifters' training and performance?
A S N 7. Do you work out with close friends?
A S N 8. Do you associate with weight lifters outside of gyms or meets?
A S N 9. Do you give or receive suggestions on how to improve performance in weight lifting?
A S N 10. Are you a spectator of sports other than weight lifting?
A S N 11. Does the most useful information you receive on weight lifting come from associating with other weight lifters?

Section IV - Biographical Information

These questions are included to get a more detailed view of your experiences and thoughts as a weight lifter. Please give them thorough consideration for they create a more accurate basis of information. If you need more room use the back of the page.
1. How did you initially learn of and become interested in weight lifting (through what or whom)?

2. What kinds of things kept your interest up in weight lifting?

3. Can you describe how you progressed in weight lifting (important discoveries, teaching, learning, stages of development, etc.)?

4. How would you describe the motivation or encouragement given you by others to do well in weight lifting?
5. How would you describe a good work out?

6. Do you get "lost" in a workout? How would you describe the feeling?

7. Would you describe working out as sometimes painful? If so, do you work around the pain?

8. Many people feel that weight lifters are overly developed. How would you explain the weight lifter's body to those people?
APPENDIX C:
CODES SHEETS FOR
RUNNERS AND WEIGHT LIFTERS
CODE SHEET - RUNNERS

Section I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Var. Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Return Time</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Actual sequence of return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Questionnaire #</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Actual number assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Actual Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>M-1 F-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Black-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oriental-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>Arts-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological sciences-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math and physical sciences-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative sciences-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; home economics-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optometry-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary medicine-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Single-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Married-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sport of Interest</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>Full marathon-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Half marathon-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 thousand meter-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 10 thousand meter-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Years in Sport</td>
<td>XR</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>Actual number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Work outs per Week</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>Actual days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Length of work outs</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>Average hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>Length of work outs</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>Average distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Entered meets</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Number of awards</td>
<td>NAW</td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>Actual number of awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Family in sport</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Brother or sister-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Children-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>Spouse-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Grandparents-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>Other-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1=in sport, 0=not in sport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Views on the sport</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>SA-5 Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>thru</td>
<td></td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>A-4 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V17</td>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>U-3 Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>D-2 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>SD-1 Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>(card 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Progress in sport</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>A-3 Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>thru</td>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>S-2 Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>N-1 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>(card 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data from section I that was deleted from analysis because of insufficient response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Var. Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mother's occupation</td>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section IV

1. Initial interest through: IL-I6
   - Media 4
   - Other sports 6
   - Institutions 8
   - Friends 10
   - Family 12
   - Image of Others 14

2. Maintaining interest through: K1-KL3
   - Aid to other sports 16
   - Media 18
   - Progress (unspecified) 20
   - Appearance 22
   - Performance 24
   - Pleasurable sensations 26
   - Mental health 28
   - Competition 30
   - Friends 32
   - Others' Reactions 34
   - Relaxation 36
   - Individualist sport 38
   - Withdrawal pains 40

3. Progressed through: D1-D8
   - Media 42
   - Trial and error 44
   - Other people 46
   - Timing 48
   - Gains in performance 50

(card 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Var. Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nutrition and diet</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Encouragement: M1-M6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some positive-negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition as encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good workout: W1-W9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surpassing goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasurable sensations</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(card 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired mentally</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired physically</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pain or exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Getting lost in workouts</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No-1 Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Painful</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No-1 Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Dealing with Pain: H1-H5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monotonous</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore it</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not real pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through pain, for pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good pain, love pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The body:</td>
<td>B1-B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a great difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full development</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like other athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Var. Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Return time</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Actual sequence of return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Questionnaire #</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Actual number assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Actual age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>M-1 F-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Black-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oriental-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>Arts-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological sciences-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math and physical sciences-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative sciences-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural and home economics-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social work-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optometry-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary medicine-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols. Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Single-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Married-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sport of interest</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>Power listing-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olympic lifting-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bodybuilding-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Years in sport</td>
<td>YR</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>Actual number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Work outs per week</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>Actual days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Length of work outs</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>Average hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Entered meets</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Number of awards</td>
<td>NAW</td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>Actual number of awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Less than high school-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. high school-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. high school-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 yrs. college-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs. college-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Family in sport</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>No-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Parents-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25b</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Brother or sister-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25c</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Children-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25d</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>Spouse-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>Grandparents-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Other-0 or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1=in sport, 0=not in sport)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Views on sport</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>SA-5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>thru</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V17</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>U-3</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>D-2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>SD-1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(card 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Progress in sport</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pl1</td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>thru</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pl1</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>N-1</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>75-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(card 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8
9
10
11
11

Data from Section I that was deleted from analysis because of insufficient response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupation sought</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mother's occupation</td>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV

1. Initial interest through: I1-I6
   - Media 4
   - Other sports 6
   - Institutions 8
   - Friends 10
   - Family 12
   - Image of others 14

2. Maintaining interest through: K1-K13
   - Aid to other sports 16
   - Media 18
   - Progress (unspecified) 20
   - Appearance 22
   - Performance 24
   - Pleasurable sensations 26
   - Mental health 28
   - Competition 30
   - Friends 32
   - Others' Reactions 34
   - Relaxation 36
   - Individualist sport 38
   - Withdrawal pains 40

3. Progressed through: D1-D8
   - Media 42
   - Trial and error 44
   - Other people 46
   - Timing 48
   - Gains in performance 50
   - Nutrition and diet 52
   - Discipline 54

(card 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Var. Label</th>
<th>Cols.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Specialized techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouragement: M1-M6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some positive-some negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition as encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good workout: W1-W9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surpassing goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasurable sensations</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(card 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired mentally</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired physically</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pain or exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Getting lost in workouts</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No-1 Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plainful</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No-1 Yes-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Dealing with Pain: H1-H5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monotonous</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore it</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not real pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through pain, for pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good pain, love pain</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The body: B1-B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a great difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No such response-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full development</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Responded accordingly-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Var. Label</td>
<td>Cols.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like other athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D:
ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS IN FACTOR
ANALYSIS OF WEIGHT LIFTERS AND RUNNERS
Table D.1

Zero Order Correlations for Runners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sport Level</th>
<th>Average Workouts/wk.</th>
<th>Average Length of Workouts (hrs.)</th>
<th>As Fun</th>
<th>Increased Self Concept</th>
<th>Hooked On</th>
<th>Increased Mental Health</th>
<th>Increased Mental Strength</th>
<th>Sacrifice Other Activities</th>
<th>As Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Level</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average work-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outs/wk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workouts (hrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased mental</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average workouts/wk.</td>
<td>Average length of workouts (hrs.)</td>
<td>As fun</td>
<td>Increased self concept</td>
<td>Hooked on</td>
<td>Increased mental health</td>
<td>Increased mental strength</td>
<td>Sacrifice other activities</td>
<td>As art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average workouts/wk.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of workouts (hrs.)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As fun</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased self concept</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooked on</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased mental health</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased mental strength</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice other activities</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As art</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Zero Order Correlations for Weight Lifters
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