

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**BEGINNER AND ELITE HOCKEY PLAYERS' PERCEPTION
OF RULE INFRACTIONS IN HOCKEY**

**A Thesis Presented to
The School of Kinesiology
Lakehead University**

**In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
Master of Science
in
Applied Sports Science and Coaching**

**by
Clarkson E. Newport**

© 1999



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-52069-2

Canada

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions of rule infractions in hockey between beginner and elite hockey players. Seven categories ("legal," "logical," "value non-moral," "contextual," "value moral," "authority" and "knowledge") were used to clarify the reasons(s) behind the perceived legitimacy of rule infractions. The instrumentation was a video of hockey clips and a questionnaire regarding the clips.

The first part of the study dealt with whether or not participants could identify when an infraction was occurring. Both the elite and the beginner sample groups were successful in identifying when rule infractions occurred. Beginner athletes had less success than elite athletes in identifying which specific rule was being broken.

The second part of the study examined what reason(s) participants gave for perceiving rule infractions as "okay to do." The reasons given most often by elite participants for rule infractions as "okay to do" were "contextual" with 25%, "value moral" with 20% and "authority" with 18%. Beginner athletes gave "value moral," "authority" and "legal" as the most frequent reasons at 19% for rule infractions being "okay to do." Elite athletes perceived rule infractions as "not okay to do" 54% of the time whereas the beginner athletes perceived rule infractions as "not okay to do" only 50% of the time. "Value moral" at 73% and "logical" at 57% were the two most frequently chosen reasons by elite athletes for why rule infractions are "not okay to do." Beginner athletes chose "value non-moral" at 54% and "logical" at 55% as the two most frequent reasons why rule infractions are "not okay to do."

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the hockey players in the Hamilton and Burlington area whose participation provided the cornerstone of this study. Specifically the contributions of the minor hockey associations Burlington (Greg Howard and Rick Dawson), Chedoke (Chris Kelly and Jacqueline Oddi), Coronation (Mickey Stollar, Betty Fishe, Marylou Kerrigan and Claudio Satori), Dofasco (Dennis Anilowski and Jim Carroll), Hamilton Hub Association (Bruce Aikman), Lawfield (Ron Greenway, Ron Day, Peter Martin, Brian Lambert and Bob Walker), Parkdale (Ian Mckenzie and Sue Main), Scott Park (Fred Gowling) Thunder Bay (Wayne Saltarinni) and the executives of all the associations were vital in the process of this study. I would like to express appreciation to the other contacts from Stoney Creek (Dianne Skirving, Jim and Janice Doer and Mike Chlan), and Hamilton (John Zavarella Elaine Brookes) who assisted in the process of this study. I am forever grateful to my classmate colleagues and to the Kinesiology students who provided feedback throughout this process.

Thank you to Professor Susan Tiura who never lost the faith. I would also like to thank Gord Todorovic for his continued support and encouragement throughout the process. It was helpful to have friends who have gone through the process (and were not linked to the study) to talk things over, your assistance in this area was greatly appreciated.

In particular, I would to thank my family Clay and Lisa Newport and Chris and Jennifer Newport who provided support both morally and physically through transportation and assistance with data collection. As well I would like to express my appreciation to my mother Lorna Newport and grandmother Gladys Russell who often expressed concern about me finishing, were not quite sure what I was doing but were always supportive. Special thanks to my niece Catrina

Newport for allowing me to borrow her parents on occasion to assist in my data collection.

Contributions from my thesis committee to my understanding of the process of the Master's program and Thesis is invaluable. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ron Lappage whose assistance during the writing process was and is indispensable. As this study is unique, so were the process and my two Thesis advisors. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Joey Farrell, my official advisor, for showing great patience and confidence in me and allowing me to work through this process and doing something different. Lastly, I would like to thank my unofficial thesis advisor and official mentor Dr. Dennis Nighswonger who spent more time and energy listening, teaching, encouraging, and motivating me than was ever expected. Dennis thank you for all those late night brain storming sessions. Joey thank you for your patience, persistence and guidance. Thank you all for allowing and helping me get to this point.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose	4
Significance	5
Definitions	6
Theoretical Background	6
Age/Level of Participation	6
Knowledge	7
Reasons for Perceptions	8
Legal	8
Logical	9
Non-Moral Value	11
Contextual	12
Value Moral	13
Authority	14
Hypotheses	15
Method	17
Participants	17
Instrumentation	17
Video Development	17
Questionnaire Development	18
Validation	18
Developmental study.	18
Pilot Study	18
Procedure	20
Beginner Players	20
Elite Players	20
Testing	21
Design	21
Results	22
Knowledge	22
Beginner Players	22

Elite Players	23
Summary	23
Reasons	23
Beginner Players	23
Elite Players	23
Summary	25
Discussion	27
Explaining Perceptions of Rule Infractions	27
Conclusion	33
References	35
Appendices	37
Appendix A - Informed Consent Package	38
Appendix B - Participant Questionnaire	41
Appendix C - Referee Questionnaire	44

List of Tables

Table

1	Theories and Responses for Rule Infractions	19
2	Participants' Answer to "Okay or not Okay to do"	24
3	Hierarchy of why Rule Infractions are Perceived as "Okay to do"	24
4	Hierarchy of why Rule Infractions are Perceived as "Not okay to do"	26

Introduction

Rules are a daily part of human life and are found in most if not all human activity, particularly activities that involve interaction with others. Although rules are central to both the theory and practice of games and sports, rules are not discussed extensively in academic sport literature. Currently philosophical literature describes or examines a variety of reasons frequently offered in support of the legitimacy of rule infractions. The various reasons may be based on perception which can be addressed both philosophically and psychologically. The philosophical perspective as applied in this study can contribute to clarifying classifications of responses given. The psychological perspective as applied in this study can contribute to an identification of the prevalence and prominence of these types of reasons given in support of legitimized rule infractions in sports.

This study attempted to answer the question "Are rule infractions perceived as justified to do in a sporting contest and/or allowed by the sport?". Literature indicates that rule infractions are perceived as being acceptable in sports. The question of why rule infractions are perceived as actions that are justifiable or allowed in a sporting contest was examined. In order to examine this question, the categories of reasons for rule infractions were: "legal" (Pearson, 1973; Shogun, 1988), "logical" (Suits, 1973; Fraleigh, 1982; Morgan 1987), "value non-moral" (Keating, 1964; Calder & Staw, 1975; Feezel, 1986), "contextual" (Leaman, 1981; Leaman, 1981), "value moral" (Miller, 1981; Vaz, 1982), "authority" (Vaz, 1982) and, "knowledge" (Vaz, 1982). Age and level of participation as discussed by Bredemeier (1985), Bredemeier and Shields (1984) and Silva (1983) are determining factors in individuals' perceptions of rule infractions and they were addressed in the current study.

Before examining the sports contest and its rule infractions, one must first understand the sports setting and the possible reasons behind rule infractions. Psychological literature offers the Contextual Theory as one possible reason for rule infractions. In sports, rule infractions tend to be treated differently from daily life issues (Goffman, 1974; Bredemeier, 1985) and by the time a person reaches grade six, his or her moral reasoning regarding sport situations, rules in particular, becomes significantly egocentric (Bredemeier, 1985; Bredemeier & Shields, 1984). The attitude of what can I (my team) gain from the specific infraction is what directs the specific action (Bredemeier & Shields, 1995). From this point of view, the individual's attitude toward rules does not indicate that rules were made to define sport (Silva, 1981) but rather, indicates that rules function as regulators or punishment. Research indicates that when the individual is less than 10 years old, the answer to the question "Why not break rules" is "I look bad or I did something wrong" (Bredemeier & Shields, 1995). Sport participants 10 years old and younger do not want the negative image of looking bad (Bredemeier & Shields, 1995). However, as a person ages, he or she processes the rule infraction differently and now looks to the good of the team, and rules become regulatory rather than defining. An example of this occurs in hockey when an opponent has a breakaway but he or she (the player) stops the opponent and does not give the opposition player a free attempt at scoring. In this situation the person is not concerned with his or her own image but the image of the team. The individual weighs the consequence of violating a rule versus allowing a score. If the situation allows a person to infract on a rule but still presents the opportunity to win, then the negative image of the team is not perceived as greater than the negative image of the team had he or she not infringed on a rule and the opponents scored

(Bredemeier & Shields, 1995). Once the individual passes the age of 10 the importance of the win becomes more evident in the individual's reasons for breaking a rule .

The decision to break a rule cannot be fully understood without examining the reasoning behind the infraction. Vaz (1982) states that the primary focus in sport is on winning and not on performance. This prominent attitude in sports can be illustrated by common aphorisms, such as those attributed to Vince Lombardi, former head football coach of the Green Bay Packers, "winning isn't everything it is the only thing", and Al Davis, majority owner of the Oakland/L.A./Oakland Raiders football team, "just win baby" (Vaz, 1982). Sayings attributed by Warren (1988) to Vince Lombardi "winning isn't [sic] everything, but wanting to win is" and to Bear Bryant, legendary college football coach, "winning isn't [sic] everything, but it beats anything that comes in second" further emphasize the point.

Philosophical literature offers many possible reasons why one chooses to break or not break a rule. The most prominent reasons for rule infractions are: "legal", "logical", "value non-moral", and "contextual". Pearson (1973) and Shogan (1988) propose "legal" reasons (each reason will be explained and discussed later see pages 8 to 15). Suits (1973), Fraleigh (1982) and Morgan (1987) explain the logical reasons for rule infractions. Feezell (1986) and Keating (1964) describe reasons that express value in non-moral terms. In psychological literature, Calder and Staw (1975) also describe reasons for breaking rules that express value in non-moral terms. Lehman (1981) and Leaman (1981) address "contextual" reasons for rule infractions. Bredemeier (1995) also addresses "contextual" reasons for rule infractions in psychological literature.

Additional literature from the social sciences provides three popular reasons why individuals choose to break or not break rules. The three reasons are: value reasons expressed in

moral terms, "authority" and age. Vaz (1982) describes reasons for infracting upon rules that express value in moral terms. In the philosophical literature Miller (1980) also describes reasons that express value in moral terms. Vaz (1982) explains "authority" as a reason for rule infractions referring to where individuals learn the rules and rule infractions. The Bredemeier (1985), Bredemeier and Shields (1984) and, Silva (1983) studies discuss age as an indicator for rule infractions being legitimized.

It is possible that intentional rule infractions are committed because the participant is unaware that either the rule exists or the action is not formally allowed in the sporting contest (Vaz, 1982). Therefore, it is important to add a category of "knowledge" as a possible reason for rule infraction as it relates to the reasons of "logical" and "authority".

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis was to examine differences in perceptions of rule infractions in hockey between beginner and elite hockey players. The categories of "legal", "logical", "value non-moral", "contextual", "value moral", "authority" and "knowledge" were used to clarify the reason(s) behind the perceived legitimacy of rule infractions. This study used literature from the philosophical discipline to express the philosophical reasons for rule infractions, to bring about an added awareness to the study of perception of rule infractions, and to add to the existing philosophical and psychological literature in the area of rules and rule infractions with a clarification of reasons for rule infractions which does not currently exist.

Significance

The intention of this study was to investigate perceptions toward rule infractions in the practical sport setting as well as the possible philosophical and psychological reasons for rule infractions. An analysis of both beginner and elite hockey players' perceptions toward rule infractions and their reasons for rule infractions were used to bring about an awareness of the problem with perceptions toward rules in the sport of hockey.

The problem of rule infractions can be studied by both philosophy and psychology. This problem is both relevant and important to both. An interdisciplinary study of this type was not found to have been done. Furthermore, the study was sport specific and used hockey clips to analyse active hockey players' perceptions of rule infractions. Past research has dealt with generalities using athletes from various sports (Bredemeier, 1985) as well as cognitive imagery (Silva, 1983) and/or still imagery of various sports (Case, Greer, & Lacourse, 1987). As neither the Silva (1983) nor the Bredemeier (1985) studies used video technology to study individuals' perceptions of rule infractions, using video technology would allow the participants to understand and witness what goes on before as well as after the play on video tape. This video instrumentation provided the study with a "game-like" action with continuous motion.

Definitions

As there are many interpretations of what "sport" and "rules" mean it is important to identify how these words are defined for this thesis. Sport is a goal and rule oriented activity demanding physical skill as defined by Meier (1981). Rules as defined by Fraleigh (1982) refer to the specific goal of the contest and the means the participants are allowed and are not allowed to use to pursue this goal.

Theoretical Background

Age/Level of Participation

Silva (1983) states that the longer an individual participates in sport the more accepting of rule infractions one will become. Bredemeier (1985) found that college level athletes did not judge rule infractions as being more legitimate than high school athletes. However, the Bredemeier (1985) study did recognize that at grade six, sport participants and nonparticipants begin to legitimize rule infractions. Bredemeier (1985) states that a change occurs in perception of rule infractions after grade six and that college and high school athletes have no significant differences in perceptions of rule infractions. If the longer an individual participates in sport the more accepting of rule infractions he or she becomes (Silva, 1983), then a study comparing both elite and beginner athletes in a specific sport should have provided support for the existing research.

Psychological and philosophical literature state rule infractions in sport are perceived by athletes as allowed actions. However, there is no clear reason as to why rule infractions are perceived as allowed actions. Therefore, further research to discover if rule infractions are actually perceived as allowed actions and to investigate the reason(s) why will help clarify the

perceptions of athletes. A study of this type would help to clarify the explanation for why rule infractions were perceived as "okay to do".

Information from psychological studies serves as a starting point for continuing the research. A comparison between athletes less than 10 years of age with elite athletes more than 15 years of age is a continuation of the Bredemeier (1985) research. Similarly a comparison between beginner and elite athletes provides a continuation of Silva's (1983) research.

Knowledge

Vaz (1982) suggests that Minor league hockey players do not know the rules of hockey and that they cannot identify rule infractions. The following quotation illustrates "knowledge" as a possible reason why players may perceive an action as, "okay to do", or not deserving of a penalty, when in fact it is a penalty "Yet it is unreasonable to expect youngsters to obey game rules if they have never been taught to do so in the first place" (Vaz, 1982, p. 76). This quotation from a Midget All-star coach exemplifies this further:

Most of the kids wouldn't [sic] know what hooking was. Well he probably knew he shouldn't [sic] have done that. I'm just saying some of the kids in Novice, and the kids in the House league, for sure, they wouldn't [sic] know what hooking really is. They might do it without knowing it, it's a method of holding the guy's stick down so he can't [sic] do anything. (Vaz, 1982, p.78)

As Vaz states, rule violation is acceptable and this perspective soon rubs off on the players and with the absence of formal training in rule obedience the players only know what they can get away with, without getting a penalty and when it is acceptable to do actions that incur penalties. An interesting finding of the Vaz (1982) study was that nowhere are young players formally taught the rules of the game. In fact, one of the major functions of organized hockey is to teach

the value of violating rules of the game. It is with this rationale that the reason of "knowledge" is included in the present study.

Reasons for Perceptions

Legal. One theory is that the focus on winning leads to the aforementioned attitude of "do what it takes to win". Pearson (1973) states that this attitude is deception and is not a part of sport. Pearson refers to the trying to win at all costs focus as definitional deception "when one has contracted to participate in one sort of activity, and then deliberately engages in another sort of activity" (p. 264). The intentional committing of a rule infraction is definitional deception and is engaging in an activity outside the parameters of the agreed upon activity. As Pearson mentions "... penalties for fouling are contained within the rule-book for a game, the act of deliberate fouling is indeed, outside the rules for that game." (p. 265) and "... deliberate betrayal of the rules destroys the vital frame of agreement which makes sport possible"(p. 265). Pearson (1973) states that this is a breach of an agreement between the participants.

Shogan (1988) reemphasizes the point that rules are sports' legal systems. She states that a referee or official's role is to be responsible for legal transgressions not moral ones. "Retributive penalties ensure the legal and logical conduct of game players, but do not ensure moral conduct, which is based on motivation to respond in such a way that others are treated well or fairly" (Shogan, 1988, p. 9). The major contribution of Shogan's research and in particular this article is the distinction between legal and moral reasons for rule infractions. Shogan (1988) states that there is no legal justification for breaking a rule, whether it be deliberate, accidental or from ignorance. This, as Shogan refers to, is a result of the logic of rules applying to all equally. Her expression of rule infractions as a breach of the sport's legal system supports Pearson's breach of

agreement theory. Silva (1981) agrees with Shogan and Pearson that when a participant enters into a sports contest he or she freely accepts to play by the rules that define the sport. It is quite possible for participants to agree to not follow the rules of the contest or in fact decide not to follow the rules of the contest once the opposition has breached the rules of the contest.

However, Pearson (1973) states that a person cannot participate and intentionally commit a rule infraction (definitional deception) in a sport. It is with this in mind that the "legal" reason is included in the present study.

Logical. The Logical Incompatibility Theory, popularized by Morgan in 1987, specifically states that it is not logically consistent to participate in a specified sport while trying to intentionally not comply with its rules. If one is to agree to play a specified sport it logically follows that the participant, once agreeing to participate agrees to the rules of the contest/sport (Morgan, 1987). Suits (1973) argues that there are four elements of a game. The four elements of a game are: the goal; the means for achieving the goal; the rules; and the lusory [*Latin for game*] attitude. Using hockey as an example the goal is to put the puck in the opponent's net (score a goal) and keep the puck out of your net; the means would be by hitting a puck with a hockey stick past the opposing goalie; the rules state how this can and cannot be done (ie., one cannot pick a puck up and carry it down the ice and throw it into the net); and the attitude is agreeing to the rules. Therefore as stated by Morgan (1987), for a game to bring about the logical conclusion of a contest with both a winner and a loser, individuals playing the game must not only agree to the rules of the game but also adhere to them. Silva (1981) agrees and states that without constitutive rules that define the contest and without the mutual consent of the participants no sport contest could occur. To intentionally commit rule infractions is to intentionally not

participate in the agreed upon activity. Therefore, to choose to participate and then choose to violate rules is not being consistent with participating. Silva (1981) refers to this as ceasing participation in a sport contest that was mutually agreed upon. Adhering to the rules is correct by definition and not adhering to the rules is incorrect by definition, or what Pearson (1973) calls definitional deception.

Fraleigh (1982) refers to definitional deception as the "good foul". Fraleigh states that the "good foul" is not good and cannot be good. Something that is a direct result of an action that has punitive repercussions is not, nor can ever be good. In fact looking specifically at the advantages of the "good foul" only shows how it detracts from the sports contest. Fraleigh (1982) explains this as a team gaining an advantage from the "good foul" by stopping an open attempt by the opposing team at scoring. It is deemed a "good foul". Fraleigh further states that if the opponents do not score as a result of the punitive repercussions of the "good foul" it may even be referred to as good strategy or a good decision. Shogan (1988) refers to this as a tactic many coaches and players use by trying to calculate when and how to deliberately break certain rules. Again this is inconsistent with the term good as by definition one does not receive penalties, punitive actions, for doing good (Webster's Dictionary, 1972). By definition this "good foul" is incorrect. The rules specifically dictate what can and cannot be done in a sporting contest. The "good foul" is not something that is prescribed by the rules but rather something that is proscribed by the rules (Fraleigh, 1982). This may not be understood by athletes and therefore is included as a possible reason for rule infractions.

Non-Moral Value. Feezel (1986) argues that the “good foul” or win at all cost attitude is simply a difference in value. Philosophers recognize that there are choices made by participants as to why they play the game. Feezel gives an example of two different basketball coaches. Coach one screams and yells at his or her players, referees and whomever else may influence the outcome of the contest. There is a ruthlessness in his or her pursuit of victory, and he or she is inclined to think that cheating is only cheating if you get caught. This coach expects nothing less from his or her opponent. Feezel describes coach two as a spirited competitor who focuses on the value of excellence in the performance and victory. However, he or she never forgets that basketball is a game invented to make possible an intrinsically satisfying activity. It is set apart from ordinary reality. This coach sees coaching and playing basketball as a joyful activity and the opponent not as an enemy but as a friendly competitor who is necessary to enhance his or her own play. The difference in the value placed upon the sport by these two different coaches is not a moral value but a non-moral value. As Keating (1964) states: “The primary purpose of sport is not to win the match, catch the fish or kill the animal, but to derive pleasure from the attempt to do so and to afford pleasure to one’s fellow participants in the process.” (p. 265)

From a psychological perspective Calder and Staw (1975) refer to the category of “value non-moral”, as discussed in this paper, in the terms of motivation, which they study as “self perception”. “Instead of asking what intrinsic motivation is and how it operates, it may be viewed as a perception on the part of the individual” (Calder and Staw, 1975 p. 599). Calder and Staw further state that a person may label his or her behaviour as intrinsically or extrinsically motivated dependent on the conditions of the situation. The Calder and Staw (1975) study supports Feezel’s (1986) analogy of the two basketball coaches where the self perception process is viewed as an

individual performing an intuitive means-end analysis of his or her behaviour. As Feezel states, the first coach appreciates the victory and only values the opponent as an enemy and a potential victim. The end is positive, however, the means are negative or neutral. The second coach values the competition to help his or her team improve, and never loses sight that basketball is valuable for the moment and the intrinsic enjoyment of the activity. The means are positive, but the end is neutral (or negative). It is just a game. Therefore, the explanation of value as expressed in non-moral terms (or motivation) is included as a possible reason for perceiving rule infractions allowable in sports.

Contextual. Lehman (1981) also agrees that basketball is just a game. In fact Lehman sees all sport as just a game and sport should not be confused with reality. To try to instill the moralities or values of reality in sport is not possible. Breaking rules in sport only results in penalties that are adhered to within the context of the given sport. "The spit ball and holding are part of the game of baseball and football, respectively, and are techniques sometimes practiced by winners in those sports" (Lehman, 1981, p. 285). Lehman does concede that a game cannot be played if too many of its rules are violated but emphasizes it is not necessary for playing or winning a game that all rules are followed. For example, even in North America there are a number of ways "softball" is played and various rules that go along with each, yet all are called "softball" and are recognised in essence to be the same game. It may be the literal truth that they are different games but as Lehman argues this is due to the fact that they are played in the context of different social customs not because the rules are different.

Lehman does not argue that if all rules or too many rules are broken then a game is no longer a game. However, Lehman states that the Logical Incompatibility Theory is not valid

either. The sport has rules and penalties within its definition and thus allows for such rule infractions within the sport's boundaries. Leaman (1981) suggests that the Logical Incompatibility Theory can only work if the rule infractions are intentional. Furthermore cheating can take place only if there is intention or as Pearson states, definitional deception. Rule infractions are planned for in the penalties of the game. Leaman states that what the Incompatibility Theory is missing is what actually happens in a game as opposed to what ought to occur. The emphasis has been on what is going on in the game and how it is logically, or legally wrong. This is not to state that what is going on is what ought to be going on. Leaman offers that stress should be put on what ought to occur between opponents. Each should agree to the contest and participate within the contest as agreed upon. On the surface, it seems that what would be agreed upon is the adherence to the formal rules of the sport. However, it is possible to consent to participate in a game where all participants agree to do what it takes to win or deceive each other whenever they feel it is possible. This "contextual" possibility (ie. when the action helps the team win) of why rules are broken will be included in this present study.

Value Moral. Vaz (1982) interprets Gordie Howe's assertion "Winning or losing is everything in the game of hockey" (p. 44) as you can either win or lose but you better not lose. According to Vaz the emphasis on winning, being better and not coming in second, emerges at an early age. As the athletes move up the levels of hockey winning becomes more and more important to the coaches and players. The moral dilemma is evident in these statements by Vaz (1982): "Given the moral mandate to become a success in society, anything less than total motivation to win the game is reprehensible"(p. 45), "Losing is to be avoided at almost all costs" (p. 45). Donna Mae Miller also expressed this view, that the win at all cost attitude does create a

problem. Miller (1981) states that participants have a choice between victory and honour.

According to Miller it is morally incompatible to compete and cheat. The value in sport is the fact that it is the training ground for ethical behaviours (Miller, 1981). Miller states that the problem lies in what sport (currently) is and what it ought to be are two different things. She makes suggestions such as the instruction of coaches and players to emphasize skills, strength and endurance rather than victory (at all cost). Furthermore, coaches and administrators need instruction in preparation of ethical skills that sport is supposed to provide, rather than "Will this action help me win?". "The attitudes of these players (especially the younger boys) are probably not akin to a general understanding of moral values". (Vaz, 1982, p. 86) Value as expressed in moral terms included in the present study will assist in dealing with the above statement.

Authority. According to Vaz (1982) there is a possibility that young athletes learn to appreciate the strategic value of violating rules in minor league hockey. The teachers are the teammates and the coaches (Vaz, 1982). Vaz states that the coaches are not indifferent to the rules of the game. In fact it is not the legitimacy of the acts of the players on the ice but the penalties which the actions incur that concern the coaches. Vaz's (1982) study established that players' perceptions of coach's discernment of the importance of playing by the rules decreased as the players' level of hockey increased. The lowest (youngest) level of hockey players studied were tykes and the highest level studied were Junior 'A' hockey players. Fifty-one percent of the tykes perceived that the coach's most sought after attribute in a player was being able to play by the rules, whereas only 7.1% of the Junior 'A' players perceived the same. A Midget All-star coach was quoted as saying, "Rules are created because someone is going to break them and we might as well break them, to win a hockey game as somebody else"(Vaz, 1982, p. 74). Similarly a

Bantam 'B' player responded to the question of "Where do you learn these illegitimate tricks?" "I guess from junior 'A' and those guys. You see them do it" (Vaz, 1982, p. 77). Another hockey player answered, "... you learn it because somebody else does it to you first" (p. 79). Yet another responded, "Well, I learn it from other hockey players. That's about the main thing" (p. 79). Vaz (1982) claims that "By observing the circumstance where it is acceptable to risk illegitimate tactics and rule infraction, the youngster learns that rule violation is not strongly condemned. Instead, he soon recognizes that such tactics are considered skills to be used judiciously under specific conditions" (p. 79). As Vaz reports, it is ironic that these informal training experiences teach the technically efficient ways to violate rules and the special circumstances where this particular conduct is encouraged. Yet the tykes had an attitude, similar to Bredemeier and Shields' (1995) findings of perceptions of athletes under the age of 10, where obedience to the rules of the game was essential for success. Rule infractions were considered disastrous and offenders would be stigmatized. However, this is not the present condition in sport as Vaz (1982) states "Players learn those conditions that favor [sic] rule violation with the least chance of detection, and jeopardy to the team" (p. 83). This would indicate learning is an important consideration for this study as it pertains not only to "knowledge" as a possible reason for perceptions of rule infractions as acceptable in sport but also to the authority of where this is learned as well.

Hypotheses

Seven primary categories: "legal", "logical", "value non-moral", "contextual", "value moral", "authority" and "knowledge" were examined as possible reasons for why hockey players would perceive rule infractions as "okay to do". Predictions of the current research were that:

beginner hockey players would be less accepting of rule infractions than would elite hockey players; and elite athletes would be able to specifically identify penalties better than beginner hockey players.

Method

Participants

The beginner sample group consisted of eighty-seven male novice hockey players under the age of 10 from Hamilton Minor Hockey leagues. The elite sample group consisted of sixty-six male hockey players over the age of 15 from the Hamilton Midget Hub Hockey League and the Midget 'AA' Burlington hockey team.

Instrumentation

Video Development

A tape of hockey clips was taken from a Canadian Junior 'A' hockey league, the American NCAA hockey league, and the Canadian CIAU hockey league. A hockey video tape developed by Dorsch (1993) was viewed by a panel of four referees qualified to referee at the Junior 'A' level. Referees were used to verify which clips illustrated penalties and to identify the specific penalty for the purpose of testing the participants' "knowledge" of the rules. The referees were asked to view the tape and answer a brief questionnaire regarding what they saw on the tape. For a clip to be deemed a rule infraction, all four referees must have identified it as the same rule infraction. Likewise the non-rule infraction clips were unanimously labelled as non-infractions. The clips chosen were clearly either rule infractions or non-infractions as labelled by the expert panel (Appendix C). The referees agreed on only five clips, four infractions and one non-infraction. These five clips were included for this study along with one sample clip. Video technology was utilized as it allowed the participant to understand and witness what went on before as well as after the play. Using video taped clips was an improvement on previous instrumentation which tended to use still photographs or flash picture cards as instrumentation for perception, or used

cognitive case study situations and no visual imagery. Video is consistent with continuous game play/action.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was developed to ask individuals as simply as possible what they thought of rule infractions and when they thought they were "okay to do". The questionnaire was modelled after a questionnaire by Case et al. (1975). The three questions asked were: question one: "Is there a rule being broken?"; question two: "If yes which one?"; and question three "Is this action okay to do?"(Appendix B). The questionnaire is repeated after each of five clips. The questionnaire procedure allowed the participants to choose both it is "okay and not okay" to break the rule. As the participants were allowed to choose both it is "okay and not okay" the responses were balanced to include a response from each of the categories for it is "okay" and it is "not okay" to break this rule (see Table 1).

Validation

Developmental study. An upper level class of Lakehead University Kinesiology students was asked to view the video tape and answer the questionnaire after each of the five clips. The questionnaire was revised following suggestions made by the class. Minor changes to the expression of reasons as to why the action was acceptable were made. Another suggestion was to read the whole questionnaire out loud to the participants before the video was played so that there were no questions with the questionnaire. This suggestion was accommodated for the study. The students experienced no difficulty with the timing of the video.

Pilot Study. Eleven volunteers from the Hamilton Chedoke summer hockey league served as the pilot sample group. These participants viewed the video completing the questionnaire after

Table 1
Reasons and Responses for Rule Infractions

Reasons	Yes, this action is "okay to do"	No, this action is not "not okay to do"
Value (moral response)	when the penalty does not hurt the team (Vaz, 1982, p. 147)	when the penalty hurts the team (Vaz, 1982, p. 147)
Contextual	when preventing a goal in overtime (Vaz, 1982, p. 84)	in the 3 rd period winning by one (Vaz, 1982, p. 73)
Legal	when the other team's player started it (Vaz, 1982, p. 155)	as the players agree to follow the rules (Suits, 1973)
Authority	when the referee is not calling this a penalty (Vaz, 1982, p. 156)	my coach or parents would not like it (Vaz, 1982, p. 73, and 157)
Value (non-moral response)	my teammates expect this (Vaz, 1982, p. 156)	as I would not want it done to my team
Logical	as this is acceptable in hockey (Vaz, 1982, p. 71)	as it is against the rules

each of the five clips. The pilot study volunteers did not find any difficulty with the speed of the video nor did they have any difficulty with the instructions or the questionnaire. A common suggestion from this group was that they be given an opportunity to complete a sample questionnaire with the sample video clip. This suggestion was accommodated for the study.

Procedure

Beginner Players

Contact was made with minor hockey associations in Hamilton. Letters of introduction and consent forms were sent out to seven associations for executives' approval. The researcher received contact phone numbers for the six associations who agreed to participate. After contacting the convenors, consent forms and letters of introduction were faxed to them. Arrangements were made for dates and times to do testing. The beginner hockey players were tested after league games in groups of two to three volunteers.

Elite Players

Prior to testing of midget hockey players, contact was made with the President of Burlington Minor hockey Association and Hamilton's Hub League. Letters of introduction and consent forms were sent to the associations and approval to approach coaches was given. Contact was then made with the Burlington Midget 'AA' coach and four coaches in the Hamilton Midget Hub League. Coaches arranged for testing dates and times. On testing days athletes arrived prior to a practice to volunteer for the study. The elite sample was tested after a practice in groups of two to six volunteers. Written consent was given by coaches citing the study as a team activity, and consent forms (Appendix A) were collected from volunteers immediately prior to testing.

Testing

All participants viewed the video tape in a designated testing area at the player's hockey arena. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire (Appendix B) after each video clip for a total of five clips. The participants were told that they would view five clips of hockey action (Appendix B). The participants reviewed and were read the questionnaire aloud prior to the video viewing and then viewed the sample clip (the tape was stopped) and filled out the sample questionnaire so that any and all questions or misunderstandings could be addressed before the start of testing. The participants were told that once the video started (after the sample clip) there could be no more questions. Finally the participants were asked to answer these questions as honestly as possible, and were assured that all answers would remain anonymous. They were then thanked for their assistance and instructed not to discuss the video with other participants.

Design

A quasi experimental design was used. The independent variable for the study was age/level of participation. The dependent variables were "knowledge", participant's ability to identify the rule infraction (or not) and reasons. Six reasons, including, "legal", "logical", "value non-moral", "contextual", "value moral", and "authority" (see Table 1) were measured by frequency of responses (Appendix B).

Results

Consistent with the purpose of this study, a descriptive analysis of responses to the question "Is this (rule infraction) okay to do?" was completed by noting the frequency of each type of response and the frequency of each different reason. This includes a comparison between younger/beginner athletes and older/elite athletes according to both frequency of reasons and changes in rankings for reasons selected among the two sample groups. The category of "knowledge" was treated similarly by noting the frequency of responses to the questions: "Is there a penalty?" and "Identify which one". This also included a comparison of responses between the two sample groups.

Knowledge

Data was analysed to see if participants correctly identified whether the video clip displayed a rule infraction or not. Identification of question one "Is there a rule being broken?" and, question two "If yes which one?" served as the "knowledge" test. Each sample received a percentage of correct answers to question one for each of the five clips (all responses were compared to the responses given by the expert panel). This was done to see if there was a problem with identifying rule infractions or non-infractions. The total correct responses for the five clips were combined for a score to be compared between the sample groups. Both sample groups were given a percentage score of penalties correctly identified for question two, and these percentages were also compared.

Beginner Players

The beginner athletes were correct in identifying rule infractions 90.8% of the time. Only 18.8% of the novice players correctly identified the non-infraction. Their combined score for

identifying rule infractions was 76.3% and they correctly identified the specific penalty only 47.4% of the time.

Elite Players

The elite sample athletes correctly identified whether there was a rule infraction or not 93.2% of the time, correctly identifying non-infractions 95.3% of the time. Specific penalties were identified correctly by the elite sample group 64% of the time.

Summary

Both the beginner and elite athletes identified the penalties over 90% of the time but the elite athletes identified the specific penalty more successfully than did the beginner athletes.

Reasons

Beginner Players

The Novice hockey players perceived rule infractions as “not okay to do” 50.4% of the time and as “okay to do” 8% of the time (see Table 2). The questionnaire allowed the participants to choose both “okay and not okay to do” and the novice hockey players perceived rule infractions as both “okay and not okay to do” 41.6% of the time. The most prominent answer to the question “Is the action okay to do?” allowed the researcher to help define the participant’s reasoning. They gave “value moral”, “authority” and “legal” as the most frequent reasons at 19% for rule infractions being okay, and chose “value non-moral” (54%) and “logical” (55%) as the two most frequent reasons why rule infractions are “not okay” (see Table 3).

Elite Players

Elite hockey players perceived rule infractions as “not okay to do” 54.1% of the time and identified rule infractions as “okay to do” 7.4% of the time and they perceived rule infractions as

Table 2
Participants' Answer to "Okay or not Okay to do"

Clip	Okay to do		Not okay to do		Okay & not okay to do	
	Elite	Beginner	Elite	Beginner	Elite	Beginner
1	7.9%	13.8%	50.8%	46.3%	41.3%	40%
2	66.7%	6.2%	33.3%	49.2%	0%	44.6%
3	8.6%	6.6%	60.3%	53.9%	31%	39.5%
4	9.1%	5.3%	36.4%	53.9%	54.5%	40.8%
5	3.5%	7.9%	75.4%	48.7%	21.1%	43.4%
Average	7.4%	8.0%	54.1%	50.4%	38.5%	41.6%

Note clip 2 is a non-infraction

Table 3
Hierarchy of why Rule Infractions are Perceived as "Okay to do"

Elite		Beginner	
Reason	Percentage	Reason	Percentage
Contextual	25.4	Legal	19.3
Value Moral	20.1	Authority	19.3
Authority	18.4	Value Moral	19.0
Legal	10.2	Contextual	12.6
Value Non-Moral	7.4	Logical	11.3
Logical	5.7	Value Non-Moral	9.7

“okay and not okay to do” 38.5% of the time (table 2). Their most frequent responses to why a rule infraction was “okay to do” was “contextual” 25 % of the time and “value moral” with 20% and “authority” with 18% (table 3). “Value moral” (73%) and “logical” (57%) were their two most frequently chosen reasons why rule infractions are “not okay to do” (Table 4).

Summary

Both elite and beginner hockey players perceived rule infractions as “not okay to do” over 50% of the time and “okay to do” under 10%. Reasons given for perceiving rule infractions as “not okay to do” were “value non-moral” i.e. “I would not want it done to my team” (beginner) and “value moral” i.e. “when the penalty hurts the team” (elite) and “logical” i.e. “it is against the rules”. Reasons chosen by both beginner and elite athletes for why rule infractions were perceived as “okay to do” were “value moral” i.e. “when the penalty does not hurt the team” and “authority” i.e. “when the referee is not calling this a penalty”. The beginner athletes also chose “legal” i.e. “when the other team’s player started it” as a reason for perceiving rule infractions as “okay to do” and the elite athletes chose “contextual” i.e. “when preventing a goal in overtime”.

Table 4

Hierarchy of why Rule Infractions are Perceived as "Not okay to do"

Elite		Beginner	
Reason	Percentage	Reason	Percentage
Value Moral	72.1	Logical	55.2
Logical	56.6	Value Non Moral	54.4
Value Non-Moral	41.8	Authority	41.3
Contextual	41.4	Value Moral	37.3
Authority	30.3	Contextual	26.8
Legal	12.7	Legal	14.7

Discussion

Explaining Perceptions of Rule Infractions

The results “Is there a penalty?” identifying rule infractions and “if yes which one?” identifying specific penalties did not support Vaz’s 1982 theory that hockey players would not be able to correctly identify rule infractions and specifically label each infraction. However the hypothesis that the elite hockey players would correctly identify the specific penalty better than the novice hockey players was supported. Responses to the question “Is this action okay to do?” yielded some insights into the reasons why athletes perceive rule infractions as “okay to do”. The novice hockey players’ three most frequently chosen reasons for this perception were “value moral” i.e. “when preventing a goal in overtime”, “authority” i.e. “when the referee is not calling this”, and “legal” i.e. “the other team’s player started it”. This, along with their two most frequently chosen reasons for perceiving rule infractions as “not okay to do” “value non-moral” i.e. “I would not want it done to my team” and “logical” i.e. “it is against the rules”, allows the researcher to speculate that value, whether it is “moral” or “non-moral”, plays an important part in the decision process of the beginner athlete.

Elite athletes chose “contextual” i.e. “when preventing a goal in overtime”, “value moral”, i.e. “when the penalty does not hurt the team”, and “authority” i.e. “when the referee is not calling this” as their most frequent reasons for perceiving rule infractions as “okay to do”. Beginner athletes chose “legal”, i.e. “when the other team’s player started it”, “authority”, i.e. “when the referee is not calling this” and “value moral” i.e. “when the penalty does not hurt the team” as their three most frequent reasons for why rule infractions are “okay to do”. These results suggest that not a lot differs between novice and elite hockey players’ perceptions of rule infractions and

why they are "okay to do". The elite athletes selected reasons of "value moral" i.e. "when the penalty hurts the team", "logical" i.e. "it is against the rules" and "value non-moral" i.e. "I would not want it done to my team" as the three most frequent selections for why rule infractions are "not okay to do". Beginner athletes selected "logical" i.e. "it is against the rules", "value non-moral" i.e. "I would not want it done to my team" and "authority" i.e. "my coach or parents would not like it" as their three most popular reasons for why rule infractions are "not okay to do". These results suggest that there is a value change from novice to elite from "non-moral" to "moral".

Elite and beginner hockey players recognized when a penalty occurred 90% of the time. What this shows regarding knowledge is that both groups appear to know when a penalty is occurring. Both groups also stated that the infractions were "not okay to do" over 50% of the time. The response corresponding with the "logical" i.e. "it was against the rules" category of reasons was selected over 50% of the time. What this illustrates is that the hockey players, from both groups, when recognizing a penalty also have a basic understanding of the role of rules in the structure of *game logic* as described by Suits (1973).

Results of this study did not support the research of Bredemeier (1985) and Silva (1983) who had indicated that there was a difference in the perception of legitimacy of rule infractions across age level and level of participation where older elite athletes would legitimize rule infractions more than younger beginner athletes. The younger beginner athletes perceived rule infractions as "okay to do" 8% of the time. The elite athletes perceived rule infractions as "okay to do" 7.4% of the time.

The "legal" reason for perception of why rule infractions are "okay to do," i.e. "the other team's player started it," was selected 19.3% of the time for the beginners and 10.2% by the elite. This reason was selected most frequently by the beginner athletes for why rule infractions are "okay to do". This suggests that the beginner athletes perceive that once the other team has broken a rule the legal structure of the game has changed. This reason was the fourth choice for why rule infractions are "okay to do" for elite athletes. This suggests that they recognize that just because an opponent breaks a rule it does not necessarily mean that the legal structure has changed. The "legal" reason for perception of why rule infractions are "not okay to do," i.e. "players agree to follow the rules," was selected 14.7% of the time for the beginner and 12.7% for the elite. Of the six possible reasons for why rule infractions are "not okay to do" both groups selected "legal" i.e. "players agree to follow the rules," as their least frequent choice. As discussed previously results indicate that these athletes know the rules ("knowledge") and understand the need to adhere to the rules ("logic"). However, the low ranking of the "legal" i.e. "players agree to follow the rules," reason, why rule infractions are "not okay to do" suggests a perception that it is okay to suspend adherence to the rules in some situations which may be included in the other reason categories i.e. "logic", "authority", etc. Not only is the "legal" reason for why rule infractions are "not okay to do" the least frequent selection but it is substantially lower than the next lowest which suggests athletes do not perceive other athletes as agreeing to the rules. This seems to indicate that there is a lack of trust in that the other athletes know the rules ("knowledge"); intend to follow the rules ("legal"), or understand that the rules should be adhered to ("logic"). However, there may be other factors contributing to this apparent lack of trust such

as the various ways referees call a game (i.e. enforce rules) or coaches' strategies concerning rules.

The two least often selected choices for it is okay to break a rule were "logic", i.e. "this is acceptable in hockey" and "value non-moral", i.e. "my teammates expect this". This suggests that it is understood that it is not acceptable to break rules and teammates do not play a large role in the perception of infractions. The second least chosen reason for rule infractions "not being okay to do" for the elite was "authority", ie. "coach or parents would not like it", and for the beginner "contextual", ie. "not in the third period winning by one". This suggests that the elite players moved away from being influenced by "authority" (41% to 30%) and more influenced by the "context" (27% to 41%) of the situation and that the influence of "authority" played a larger role with the novice players.

The hypothesis was that elite hockey players would have a larger percentage of "okay to do" than the beginner hockey players. Bredemeier (1985) recognized that before grade six (age 10), sport participants and nonparticipants do not legitimize rule infractions. Bredemeier's 1985 study showed that grade six (age 10) was the transition year. After grade six sport participants begin to legitimize rule infractions. This study did not support Bredemeier's research as all beginner participants were under the age of ten and perceived rule infractions as both "not okay and okay to do" 41.6% and just "okay to do" 8.0% of the time. This indicates that athletes under the grade six level (before Bredemeier's recognized transition period) perceived rule infractions as "okay to do," for at least one reason, close to 50% of the time. Also indicated is little difference in perception of rule infractions between older and younger athletes. Silva (1983) states that the longer an individual participates in sport the more accepting of rule infractions he or she will

become. This theory also was not supported as 54.1% of the elite athletes and 50.4% of the beginner athletes perceived rule infractions as “not okay to do” and indicates little difference in perception of infractions between beginner and elite athletes.

Results illustrated some similarities in the perception of athletes for both why rule infractions were perceived as “okay” and “not okay to do”. Both elite and beginner athletes chose “value moral” and “authority” as two of their first three selections for why rule infractions are “okay to do”. There was a reversal in the selection of “legal” i.e. “when the other team’s player started it” and “contextual” i.e. “when preventing a goal in overtime” reasons for why rule infractions are “okay to do” which is particularly important philosophically. The selection of “contextual” first by elite athletes and fourth by beginner athletes and the selections of “legal” first by the beginner athletes and “contextual” fourth by the elite athletes suggests that there is a sophistication among elite athletes and that they are more specific about situations for rule infractions and not just the fact that the other team started it. Similarly, the beginner athletes and elite athletes agreed on two of their first three choices for why rules are perceived as “not okay to do”; “value non-moral” i.e. “my teammates would not like this” and “logic” i.e. “It is against the rules”. The largest similarity, which was discussed previously, was that both groups chose “legal” as their least frequent selection for why rule infractions are “not okay to do”.

One implication of these results is that at least one of the two sample groups’ perception may have changed since the research done by both Silva and Bredemeier. As Bredemeier’s (1985) study and Silva’s (1983) study found a difference in perception between young and old and beginner and elite and the current results show no difference it is plausible that at least one group’s perception may have changed. Unfortunately neither the Bredemeier nor the Silva studies

provided a quantified indication as to the percentage of young beginner athletes or the older elite athletes that perceived rule infractions as "not okay to do". Possibly something has affected the perception of rule infractions since earlier studies of this type although it is not certain what this may be. A future study would be needed to ascertain whether this was the case.

Another implication of these results is that the hockey players do not hold rules in high regard as almost 50% of the time the athletes perceived at least one reason for why rule infractions are "okay to do". The future of hockey may be in question as young beginner athletes while playing in house leagues perceive rule infractions as "okay to do" (for at least one reason) 50% of the time. This suggests that it may increase difficulties for referees, as well as administrators, in enforcing rules as these young athletes know the rules but also perceive at least one reason for breaking them.

Conclusion

This study was unique in design and in nature using philosophical principles to qualify reasons for perceiving rules as “okay to do” and psychology to provide quantified insight into the athlete’s perception through frequency analysis. Future studies in this area should be done with more focus on “value” both “moral and non-moral”, “legal” (for novice participants especially as this was their third choice for why rule infractions are “okay to do”) and “authority” as these areas were the most frequently checked by participants in the study. Although every attempt was made to ensure the responses given accurately reflected the categories, the sport context is complex and there could be other factors that might influence the perceptions of participants. Other factors such as parents coaches and spectators were suggested but were not included in the present study. Future studies may be able to recognize these other possible factors and these additional variables may assist in analysing athlete’s perceptions.

The hypothesis that beginner hockey players would be less accepting of rule infractions than elite hockey players was not supported. Further research into this area is needed, as no published literature suggesting these findings could be found. The interest in this study and the overwhelming support by minor hockey leagues and participants in the city of Hamilton suggests that this may be the first of many studies done on this topic with hockey players.

This study provides a basis for future studies examining differences in perceptions of female and male athletes, coaches and players, referees and players, players and parents, professional and amateurs, Canadians and Americans, North Americans and Europeans. Also, this study provides a basis and potential foundation for further research with other sports such as

basketball and football. Examination into other sports could identify possible trends across sports or uniqueness in particular sports and the athlete's perceptions.

References

- Bredemeier, B. J. (1985). Moral reasoning and the perceived legitimacy of intentionally injurious acts. Journal of Sport Psychology, 7, 110-124.
- Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1984). Divergence in moral reasoning about sport and everyday life. Sociology of Sport Journal, 1, 348-357.
- Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1995). Character development and physical activity. Champaign, Illinois, Human Kinetics.
- Calder, B. J., & Staw, B. M. (1975). Self-perception of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31 (4), 599-605.
- Case, B. W., Greer, H. S., & Lacourse, M. G. (1987). Moral judgement development and perceived legitimacy of spectator behavior in sport. Journal of Sport Behavior, 10, 147-155.
- Dorsch K. D. (1993). The effects of presentation context on perceptions of the aggressiveness and legitimacy of various ice hockey behaviours. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Feezell, R. M. (1986). Sportsmanship. Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 1-13.
- Fraleigh, W. (1982). Why the good foul is not good. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 41-42.
- Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. New York Harper Row.
- Keating, J. W. (1964). Sportsmanship as a moral category. Ethics, LXXV, 25-35.
- Leaman, O. (1981). Cheating and fair play in sport. Pp. 25-30, Sport and the Humanities: A Collection of Original Essays, University of Tennessee, Bureau of Educational Research and Service.
- Lehman, Craig, K. (1981). Can cheaters play the game? Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 8, 41-46.
- Meier, K. V. (1981). On the inadequacies of sociological definitions of sport. International Review of Sport Sociology, 2, 79-97.
- Miller, D. M. (1981). Ethics in sport: Paradoxes, perplexities, and a proposal. Quest, 32, 3-7 .

- Morgan, W. J. (1987). The logical incompatibility thesis and rules: A reconsideration of formalism as an account of games. Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 14, 1-20.
- Pearson, K. M. (1973). Deception, sportsmanship, and ethics. Quest, 19, 115-118.
- Shogan, D. (1988). Rules, penalties and officials: Sport and the legality-morality distinction. CAPHER, November, 6-11.
- Silva, III, J. M. (1981). Normative compliance and rule violating behavior in sport. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 12, 10-18.
- Silva, III, J. M. (1983). The perceived legitimacy of rule violating behavior in sport. Journal of Sport Psychology, 5, 438-448.
- Suits, B. (1973). The philosophy of sport: A collection of essays, pp 48-64, Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas.
- Vaz, E. W. (1982). The professionalization of young hockey players. Lincoln and London, University of Nebraska Press.
- Warren, W. E. (1988). Coaching and winning. West Nyack, New York, Parker Publishing Company.
- Webster's Dictionary. (New Edition). (1972). New York: Pyramid Communications Inc.

Appendices

Appendix A
Informed Consent Package

September, 1998.

Dear Participants and Parents/Guardians,

I would appreciate your participation with the following survey, which is a vital part of my graduate thesis project undertaken by myself, Clarkson Newport, a graduate student, and Dr. Joey Farrell, my Faculty thesis advisor from the school of Kinesiology at Lakehead University.

The purpose of this research is to investigate knowledge and recognition of rules in minor league hockey.

Hockey players will be asked to view a video of hockey clips and fill out a short questionnaire following each clip (total time approximately 20 minutes).

All information you provide will be strictly confidential.

If you agree to participate in the survey, please complete and return the attached consent form.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

**Clarkson E. Newport
Researcher**

**Joey Farrell, PhD
Faculty Advisor**

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I _____ agree to participate in the study
(Full Name)

concerning minor league hockey and its rules, conducted by Clarkson Newport a Lakehead University Graduate student with Dr. Joey Farrell, faculty advisor.

I understand that I will be asked to view a series of video clips on a video tape and answer a questionnaire after each clip. This will require approximately 20 minutes to complete. The data will be stored by Dr. Joey Farrell at Lakehead University for seven years.

I understand that all information will be confidential and that I may withdraw my participation, in this research project, at any time.

SIGNATURE : _____

DATE: _____

PARENT/ GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

I _____ agree to allow
(Full Name)

my son _____ to participate in the study concerning minor league hockey and its rules, conducted by Clarkson Newport a Lakehead University Graduate student with Dr. Joey Farrell, faculty advisor.

I understand that my son will be asked to view a series of video clips on a video tape and answer a short questionnaire after each clip. This will require approximately 20 minutes to complete. The data will be stored by Dr. Joey Farrell at Lakehead University for seven years.

I understand that all information will be confidential and that my son may withdraw from participating in this research project at any time.

SIGNATURE : _____

DATE: _____

Appendix B
Participant Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS

I am a graduate student at Lakehead University. This study is designed to look at hockey players' knowledge of on-ice hockey activity.

You are asked to watch a video showing 5 events occurring in ice hockey. For each event you will be asked to answer up to 3 questions regarding your views of what is happening. This will require between 10 and 15 minutes of your time. Your responses will be held in absolute confidence. No one besides myself (not your coach, nor your parents, nor the directors of the league) will have access to the information you provide. In fact, there is no reason for you to place your name anywhere on the questionnaire. However, it is extremely important to us that you treat the questionnaire seriously and give your most honest responses. Each video clip will be shown twice and you will have 60 seconds to answer the questions. There are no right or wrong answers, so please be completely honest.

Thank you very much for your help.
Sincerely,

Clarkson E. Newport

VIDEO TAPE QUESTIONNAIRE

Video clip #1

Please answer the following as honestly as possible.

1. Is there a rule being broken? Yes No

If the answer to question # 1 is No, please stop and proceed to the next page.

2. If the answer to question #1 is yes, please identify which one rule is being broken? **PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE**

- | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Unsportsmanlike conduct <input type="checkbox"/> | Slashing <input type="checkbox"/> | Hooking <input type="checkbox"/> | Holding <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hitting from behind <input type="checkbox"/> | Tripping <input type="checkbox"/> | Roughing <input type="checkbox"/> | Fighting <input type="checkbox"/> |
| High Sticking <input type="checkbox"/> | Spearing <input type="checkbox"/> | Charging <input type="checkbox"/> | Boarding <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cross-checking <input type="checkbox"/> | Interference <input type="checkbox"/> | Obstruction <input type="checkbox"/> | Elbowing <input type="checkbox"/> |

3. Is the action okay to do? You may check more than one.

Yes . . .

- | | |
|--|---|
| when the penalty does not hurt the team <input type="checkbox"/> | when the referee is not calling this <input type="checkbox"/> |
| when preventing a goal overtime <input type="checkbox"/> | my teammates expect this <input type="checkbox"/> |
| when the other team's player started it <input type="checkbox"/> | this is acceptable in hockey <input type="checkbox"/> |

No . . .

- | | |
|--|---|
| I would not want it done to my team <input type="checkbox"/> | not in the 3 rd period winning by one <input type="checkbox"/> |
| the penalty hurts the team <input type="checkbox"/> | coach or parents would not like it <input type="checkbox"/> |
| the players agree to follow the rules <input type="checkbox"/> | it is against the rules <input type="checkbox"/> |

Appendix C
Referee Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS TO REFEREES

I am a graduate student at Lakehead University. This study is designed to look at hockey players' knowledge of on-ice hockey activity.

You are asked to watch a video showing 10 events occurring in ice hockey. For each event you will be asked to answer up to 3 questions regarding your views of what is happening. This will require between 15 and 20 minutes of your time. Your responses will be held in absolute confidence. No one besides myself will have access to the information you provide. In fact, there is no reason for you to place your name anywhere on the questionnaire. However, it is extremely important to us that you treat the questionnaire seriously and give your most honest responses. Each video clip will be shown twice and you will have 60 seconds to answer the questions. There are no right or wrong answers, so please be completely honest.

**Thank you very much for your help.
Sincerely,**

Clarkson E. Newport

VIDEO TAPE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following to the best of your ability as an official.

Video clip #1

1. Is there a rule being broken? Yes No

2. If yes, what would you call?

- | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Unsportsmanlike conduct <input type="checkbox"/> | Slashing <input type="checkbox"/> | Hooking <input type="checkbox"/> | Holding <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hitting from behind <input type="checkbox"/> | Tripping <input type="checkbox"/> | Roughing <input type="checkbox"/> | Fighting <input type="checkbox"/> |
| High Sticking <input type="checkbox"/> | Spearing <input type="checkbox"/> | Charging <input type="checkbox"/> | Boarding <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cross-checking <input type="checkbox"/> | Interference <input type="checkbox"/> | Obstruction <input type="checkbox"/> | Elbowing <input type="checkbox"/> |

other _____

Comments:
