

FUNCTIONS OF SPORT: A STUDY OF
PERCEPTIONS AND INVOLVEMENT

By

STEPHEN JOHN GROVE

Bachelor of Arts
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas
1972

Master of Arts
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1979

Thesis
1979D
G-883f
cop. 2



FUNCTIONS OF SPORT: A STUDY OF
PERCEPTIONS AND INVOLVEMENT

Thesis Approved:

Richard A. Dodder

Thesis Adviser

J. F. Rooney, Jr.

Dean Cooper

George E. Arquitt, Jr.

Norman D. Bleeker

Dean of the Graduate College

1041507

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In light of its completion, I would like to recognize certain people who have had an affect upon the ultimate eventuality of this dissertation.

First, while unoriginal as it may be, I wish to note my family, particularly my mother, without whose moral and financial support this dissertation would never have been realized; for them I am most grateful.

I would also like to recognize Dr. Richard Dodder, my dissertation chairman, whose guidance, insight, and patience were indispensable and sincerely appreciated. The completion of this dissertation is a tribute to his ability to motivate.

In addition, I would like to extend my gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Ivan Chapman, Dr. George Arquitt, and Dr. John Rooney, for their contributions; to Dr. Betty Ambercrombie and Dr. A. B. Harrison, for their aid in the collection of the data for this dissertation; and to my typist, Joyce Ball.

Finally, since the dissertation was not written in a vacuum, I would like to recognize the following sources which have contributed in one way or another to the expediency and facility of this work: my fellow graduate students, Diana McConahy, the Fort Worth Rugby Club, Adolph Coors, the paper-publishing ethic of traditional sociology, and every auto mechanic that has ever worked on my car. All of these have provided elements of diversion, desired or not, influencing the speed and ease of completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	4
Introduction	4
Sport and the Individual	5
Sport and Society	13
Summary	24
III. RESEARCH METHODS AND OBJECTIVES	26
Introduction	26
Research Objectives	27
The Sample	28
The Questionnaire	33
The Method of Analysis	38
Summary	47
IV. THE SUBSEQUENT TEST OF SPREITZER AND SNYDER'S RESEARCH	49
Introduction	49
Spreitzer and Snyder's Study	49
A Subsequent Test of Spreitzer and Snyder's Research	55
Extension Beyond Spreitzer and Snyder's Research	59
Discussion	60
V. RESEARCH FINDINGS	63
Identification of Issues	63
Part One--ID	64
Part Two--Sex	65
Part Three--ID and Sex	66
Part Four--ID, Sex, and Attendance	72
Part Five--ID, Sex, and Participation	72
Part Six--ID, Sex, Attendance, and Participation	73
Part Seven--ID, Sex, and Involvement	75
Part Eight--Attendance	76
Part Nine--Participation	78

Chapter	Page
Part Ten--Involvement	80
Part Eleven--Interactions of Sex with Attendance, Participation, or Involvement	82
Part Twelve--Interactions of ID With Attendance, Participation, or Involvement	83
VI. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS: ORIENTATION TOWARD WINNING AND RELIGIOSITY	87
Introduction	87
Orientation Toward Winning	88
Religiosity	98
Summary	105
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	107
Introduction	107
Interpretation of Findings	108
Final Comments	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDIX	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Description of Sample	31
II. Unrotated Factor Loadings for the Items Representing the Proposed Nine Functions of Sport	35
III. Means and Factor Loadings for the Research of Sport	42
IV. Means and Factor Loadings for Sport Involvement, Religiosity, and Orientation Toward Winning Items	46
V. Means and Factor Loadings on Spreitzer and Snyder's Sport Function Items	51
VI. Ranges, Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of 12 Variables With the Social and Psychological Variables	58
VII. Means and N's on the Functions of Sport by Categories of ID, Sex, Participation, Attendance, and Involvement	67
VIII. Means and N's on Functions of Sport by Categories of Attendance, Participation, and Involvement with Sports	77
IX. Means and N's of Some Selected Functions of Sport by ID and Participation or Involvement	84
X. Means and N's on Functions of Sport by Categories of ID, Sex, Orientation Toward Winning, and Religiosity	91
XI. Results of Analysis of Variance on the Functions of Sport by Orientation Toward Winning, ID, and Sex	93
XII. Results of Analysis of Variance on the Functions of Sport by Religiosity, ID, and Sex	93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although sport has been an important facet of life in most societies throughout history, it has only been in the last few decades that it has come under the scrutiny of the social sciences. Today, due to the growing impact which sport has upon our daily lives, much more intense inspection of it is warranted. The present study was addressed to this end.

The scope of sport is perhaps best realized in a statement by James Michener (1976:25) when he writes, "I have found only one society in which sports were not a functional part." The observation that sport represents one of the most influential institutions of our society is difficult to refute. It has increasingly pervaded our social consciousness from the macrocosmic level to the social psychological. One need only look at the news coverage, financial expenditures, number of participants and spectators, movies, books, hours consumed, and time spent in conversation concerning sport over the last few years to substantiate this (Snyder and Spreitzer, 1978:2).

A precise definition of sport is difficult to come by, as are definitions for any term so widely used in everyday language. To place specific limits on the term may result in eliminating many of its connotations and restrict it (Coakley, 1978:4). With this in mind, perhaps the best broad definition of sport comes from Luschen (1967:127) when

he defines it as an institutionalized type of competitive physical activity located on a continuum between play and work. The aspects of institutionalization, physical action, and competition are basic to most definitions of sport. The fact that it falls somewhere between play and work gives it a wide breadth of possibilities.

One of the basic problems to which this research was addressed concerns this definitional dilemma. The present study sought to investigate people's perceptions of sport in order to gain perhaps a better understanding of what it entails. Based on a review of the literature dealing with the subject, certain aspects, or functions, of sport which appeared quite often were singled out for further investigation. These are discussed in Chapter II as the selected review of the literature and include individually related aspects (such as sport as a means to emotional health, self expression, sociability, and physical well-being) and societal related aspects (such as sport as a means to social integration, socialization, sex roles, entertainment, and pride in place).

As noted in Chapter III, these selected aspects of sport are by no means exhaustive of the numerous and varied elements posited as possible characteristics. Beyond this, little empirical substantiation has been provided concerning the speculated functions of sport. One study that was conducted, however, provided a pioneering effort toward this end and served as a general model for the present research. That study, conducted by Elmer Spreitzer and Eldon Snyder (1975), investigated the perceptions of what they termed psychophysical functions of sport.

Using their research as a broad guide, Chapter III deals with the methodological concerns of this study. In particular, the research

objectives, the operationalization and measurement of variables, the empirical testing of the suggested functions, and the sampling technique are discussed.

As detailed in that chapter, the analysis of the functions of sport suggested by the literature produced a set of five new characteristic elements. Except for Chapter IV, which deals with a subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's research, these functions are dealt with throughout the present investigation.

In order to gain a better understanding of people's perception of the functions of sport, a diverse sample of 637 university students (N=520) and faculty or staff (N=127) responded to a questionnaire designed for that purpose. Specific attention was paid to the comparison of perceptions by students versus faculty status, sex, and frequency of attendance, participation, and overall involvement with sport. The results of this analysis are found in Chapter V. Further considerations based on the effects of one's orientation toward winning and religiosity are related in Chapter VI. A final discussion of the research and some general conclusions based on the findings are presented in Chapter VII.

In summary, this research was conducted in order to (1) derive empirical evidence of some functions of sport, (2) subsequently examine a previous study by Spreitzer and Snyder, and (3) investigate perceptions of the derived functions of sport by categories of sex, student versus faculty status, frequencies of attendance, participation, and involvement with sport, orientation toward winning, and religiosity. The following represents those attempts.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature which follows deals with the relationship between man and his perceptions of the functions of sport. In this chapter an attempt will be made to bring together the views of different social scientists, philosophers, and educators concerning the effect which sport has for the individual and society. Special attention will be given to those specific functions of sport which appear most often in the literature or which are a source of controversy among the many researchers of the subject.

For convenience sake, the purported functions of sport as detailed in the literature may be classified into two different categories: one focusing upon those functions that sport serves for the individual, and the other focusing upon those functions that sport serves for society. It must be noted, however, that these categories are not always mutually exclusive.

Based on this, the following review of literature will be divided into three sections. The first section will deal with the individual-based functions of sport and the second section will deal with the societal-based functions of sport. A third section will serve as a brief summary.

Sport and the Individual

Emotional Health

One area of concern with regard to sport deals with how it affects the individual; of particular interest is its effect upon one's emotional health. In this regard, Layman (1960:560-599) has noted that by promoting physical fitness, by providing outlets for the expression of emotion in approved activities, and by facilitating the acquisition of desirable personality traits, sport has the potential for making a positive contribution towards the attainment of emotional health. Layman has added that sport enhances the development of a positive self-attitude and high self-esteem, particularly if there is marked improvement of physical skills or athletic success involved.

Konrad Lorenz (1966:281) has further emphasized the utility of sport for one's emotional well-being by stating that it is a means by which one may rid oneself of detrimental emotions. He writes that sport is a specifically human form of "nonhostile combat" and notes that it represents a "cathartic discharge" of the aggressive urge which educates man to a conscious and responsible control of his own fighting behavior. The contention here is that sport provides the individual with a means of tension release. McLuhan (1964:147) affirms this by noting that sports and games represent dramatic models of one's psychological life, providing release of particular tension.

In somewhat the same light, Howard Cosell (1972:76) has noted sport's contribution to one's emotional well-being when he refers to it as a vehicle for escaping the day-to-day stresses confronting man. He argues that:

Sport is one toy department of human life in this sense . . . the contest in the arena fulfills the primary function of sport, which is escape. In the face of stress and complexities of daily existence, people have to escape.

Slusher (1967:92) relates that one does not have to be a behavioral scientist to recognize sport's impact for emotional health and that it has the potential to become an arena for psychological solutions to conflict. Kluckhorn (1964), Luschen (1970), and Vanderzwaag (1972) further stress the value of sport as a means of tension release.

The argument may be extended that, beyond tension and aggression release, sport represents an outlet for a wide range of human emotions, not the least of which is brotherly love. Sport not only allows physical contact, affectionate display, and emotional attachments, but also encourages them (Wilkerson, 1973:12), thus, providing one more avenue of emotional release.

Not all, however, share the perspective that sport enhances one's emotional health. Ogilvie and Tutko (1970:61-73), for example, have concluded from their research that sport may impede one's emotional maturity and does not necessarily operate to build good character--a contradiction of the propositions posited by Layman (1960) and others. The question of sport's contribution to emotional health and well-being is further addressed by Coakley (1978) when he observes that the research to date indicates that there is a good chance that sport attracts those who already possess positive character traits and strong emotional health rather than building these.

Self Expression

Another function which sport may serve for the individual is that of self expression. Here, sport is viewed as a particular type of

activity allowing man to develop a sensitivity of his own self that can be most rewarding (Slusher, 1967:124). As Morford (1973:85) states, "Sport has the potential of assisting man in the demonstration of a meaningful concern relative to his existence." Slusher (1967:56) further notes that the sport situation is the raw material for man to discover personal reality, and that it brings one a sense of who he is. In these thoughts, the sport participant is seen as similar to the artist, with both sharing a common end of self expression.

The notion that sport is an avenue of self expression is further recognized by Friedenberg (1967) when he suggests that although athletics are among the most formal of the arts, their formality does not make them less expressive. He argues, instead, that the channeling of expression into the formal modes set forth by the rules of the athletic activities serves to make the expression more forceful. It may be held, then, that sport provides a powerful means of self actualization through the self extension inherent in the athletic contest (Slusher, 1967:61). In the words of Ingham and Loy (1973:67), "sport is an embodiment of human subjectivity . . . an externalization of the self."

In summarizing this aspect of athletics, it is argued that sport serves as a context in which the participant is able to express himself, and, in doing so, develops a sense of personal awareness. This property of sport is closely related to the function of sport as a promoter of emotional health in that it allows for a cathartic experience through self expression. This cathartic experience represents a particular type of emotional release.

It must be noted, however, that there is some question as to the scope of the self expression function. As Slusher (1967:57) observes, "The experience of sport is 'true' only for the 'performer', for it is he that makes the choice in the situation." The spectator may appreciate, emotionalize, or sense vicarious excitement in the athletic pursuit, but is not involved in the kinesthetic elements which are so very important for the true feeling of the situation and the sense so necessary for the affirmation of existence. Whether or not the spectator can experience self expression from viewing and involving himself in the athletic event is a matter of debate not easily resolved.

Closely related to the expressive aspect of sport is the view that sport represents an aesthetic endeavor. It is posited that within the framework of sport "the individual components of a graceful movement are isolated by the viewer and interpreted as an 'aesthetic'" (Lowe, 1971:14). It is suggested that this response stems either from an empathy for the movement itself or from the viewer's interpretation of the art form, composition, or technique of the movement. According to Kaelin (1968), the well-played game or the approach toward perfection in the athletic contest is the aesthetic ideal of all sporting events.

Miller and Russell (1971:103) note that sport has been considered an art form for centuries. They refer to it as an applied art and a formal classical art form which is perishable. Sport as art cannot be collected, exhibited in a museum, or displayed on a wall. Through the merging of body, equipment, field of contest, and other implements, the athlete creates a picture from which the observer may derive aesthetic enjoyment, but which lacks permanency. This is somewhat paradoxical since, according to Slusher (1967:216), sport as art does

not break away from previously known images. Unlike literature, sculpture, painting, and other forms of human expression which are devoted to creating the new, sport seeks to preserve and maintain previous form.

The discussion of sport as an expressive activity possessing properties common to the conventional art forms is furthered by some who have likened sport to drama. For example, Miller and Russell (1971: 299) write that in:

. . . a football game there is a beginning, a middle, and an end, and within a defined time period you watch villains and heroes playing out a drama; there are extraordinary feats to be seen . . . and all that is very much an art form like a play.

Plimpton (1968) agrees and observes that watching a sporting event is like seeing any dramatic art wherein the viewer can identify with the hero and "hiss" the villain.

Apart from the athletic contest itself being viewed as an art form producing an aesthetic experience, sport has had a grand effect upon the other realms of the art world. Much attention has been granted to sport in the areas of literature and drama. Sculpture and painting were greatly influenced in the classical times by the Olympic Games and are similarly affected by modern sport. Photography, a relatively new art form, owes some of its growth to sport, as it was athletics which prompted the innovation of the "instant replay". Sport has even had a major impact upon design and architecture, evidenced by the many and varied arenas and stadiums erected to house athletic events.

In one manner or another, sport represents an expressive mode of human behavior; it can provide the context for self expression by the athlete, or it can be viewed as an art form having particular meaning

and expressiveness for the spectator. In both instances, it has the ability to produce a cathartic experience or serve an aesthetic end.

Sociability

In a somewhat different light, it has been noted that sport may operate as one factor bringing people together and aid the individual in establishing interpersonal relationships. As Bouet (1966:139)

mentions:

It would seem that the basic role played in sport . . . brings together particular people practicing physical exercises. It creates a plane of equality between people, strengthening the realization of existence 'for somebody' and 'together with somebody.'

He further states, "Sport develops human relations, the need of which it feels itself. These relations constitute, therefore, a function of sport which it fulfills in its own interest, but also in the wider social interest."

Simply put, sport provides the individual with a social context conducive to the development of personal relationships. According to Miller and Russell (1971:10), sport gives to one an appreciation of the complexity of man's struggle with himself and his opponents, as well as a regard for the vastness of his feeling of togetherness and love of others. The participant shares a commonality with others involved in the same activity, and this commonality becomes the basis for the establishment and maintenance of friendships or appreciation of others. It provides a way of relating to people in an otherwise forbidding world (Beisser, 1967). Sport accomplishes this by giving rise to common loyalties, enthusiasms, and interests, and it can be deemed an integrating factor or common denominator.

Coakley (1978:88) summarizes the sociability issue when he writes:

The fact that friendships emerge from the interpersonal contacts made through sport involvement is undeniable. A common interest in sport has often been a facilitator of conversation and experiences enabling individuals to come to know one another better.

He further maintains that it accomplishes this because it gives participants and spectators, alike, an interactional context where commonly held goals may be pursued collectively and in which mutual identification can be expressed. The overall effect is to foster sociability among those involved.

Physical Health

A final manner in which sport may serve the individual is rather self evident, yet often overlooked as a primary property to discuss with regard to sport--namely, that participation in athletic activity increases one's physical health. The question arises, "How important is this function of sport, and to what degree does one perceive sport as physically beneficial?" Also, it must be noted that the term sport is a rather all-inclusive concept, and many of the activities subsumed under the label may vary with regard to the intensity of physical activity. In addition, this purported aspect of sport would, except in some possible extreme cases, necessarily exclude spectators. (An example of an exception, for instance, might be those people who attend a golf tournament and derive some physical benefit by following the action walking from hole to hole. Most spectator sports, however, give the viewer less opportunity for exercise.)

The attention granted to the physical health aspect of sport is obvious. Physical education and physical fitness are emphasized as an

essential part of youngsters' school life, and this emphasis may carry over into adulthood. Miller and Russell (1971) note that some of the benefits of athletics include the development of neuromuscular skills, organic fitness, and cardiovascular health, as well as numerous psychophysical benefits. Layman (1960) supports this by noting that one of the main by-products of sport is physical fitness.

James Michener (1976:24) argues that sport should enhance the health of both the individual and society in general. He writes that a sport, to be effective, should place a demand upon big muscles, lung capacity, sweat glands, and, particularly, the heart. His contention, however, is that relatively few persons receive the health benefits of sport; numerous reasons are cited. For example, he suggests that the emphasis on interscholastic sport within the American education system has presupposed a de-emphasis of satisfactory physical fitness programs for the majority of the students. In addition, certain sports contribute less to general health than others.

Not all agree that sports are necessarily physically beneficial. James Conant (1961:53-60) recognized that the "vicious overemphasis on sport in schools" has resulted in harm to the physical, as well as the psychological, development of youngsters. Participation often leads to injury. Michener (1976:111) notes that each year sports are responsible for some 17 million accidents (among the young) which are serious enough to require the attention of a doctor. Among the old, he suggests that participation in sport, when the individual is not properly conditioned for it, may be suicidal. So, while sport on the one hand, may be viewed as a means to greater physical health, it may also create serious physical problems as well.

Sport and Society

Social Integration

One function that sport purportedly serves for society is the ability to promote social integration and bring together the populace. Bouet (1966:137) notes that this function of sport "is of basic importance, even though this importance is not emphasized in so many words as the aim of sport." Luschen (1967:136) adds, "sport functions as a means of integration, not only for the actual participants, but also for the represented members." The implication here is that sport forms a bond of solidarity not only among the contestants themselves, but for the spectators of the athletic event and/or the community from which the participants come.

Wohl (1970) furthers the idea that sport integrates populations when he maintains that competitive sport aids in breaking through national barriers, suggesting that sport is a common language understood not only across entire societies, but internationally as well. This notion is supported by Slusher (1967), who attributes the popularity of sport to its capacity to cater to all mankind. He feels that certain aspects of sport, such as its rhythm, grace, and brutality, are universally identified with creating the basis for a common bond.

Miller and Russell (1971:51) further state that "Sport touches a common nerve evoking group feelings that words alone cannot describe, and that taps the mainstream of humanity, showing us that people everywhere are much the same." Again, the notion that sport is a universal language uniting us all is emphasized.

Lorenz (1962:282) brings the integrational aspect of sport into focus when he writes:

Sporting contests between nations are beneficial not only because they provide an outlet for collective militant enthusiasms of nations, but also because they have two other effects that counter the danger of war: they promote personal acquaintances between people of different nations . . . and they unite, in enthusiasm for a common cause, people who otherwise would have little in common.

Lorenz's perspective leaves little doubt of the importance he places upon the integrational capacity of sport.

The argument that sport serves a socially integrating function is possibly best made by Cozens and Stumpf (1953) who note that sport has provided the great integrating factors of common interests, common loyalties, and common enthusiasms, as well as other cultural elements. They observe that spectator sports have effectively furnished a common cultural interest, providing understanding across class lines and increasing the intimacy of association with different classes.

Whether it be within national limits or across international barriers, then, the position that sport integrates populations is held. It must be noted, however, that not all subscribe to this notion. Some maintain that sport, through its emphasis on competition, may operate to undermine social integration. As Coakely (1978:25) points out:

. . . the possibility that sport can generate divisiveness cannot be ignored. In many ways, competition activities lead to a generation of hostility and a polarization of interests rather than bringing people together. A close look at the phenomenon of sport in society readily shows that integration functions are not always served.

Miller and Russell (1971:72) expand this idea by writing that while sport may be regarded as a binding force in humanity, it has also inflamed nations with a kind of "explosive determination to beat the other guy." They feel that, at least internationally, sport has yet

to be shown as a unifying agent among nations. Orlick (1974) also recognizes that sport may fail to bring about integration when he suggests that instead of developing cooperation, it may develop intense rivalry and a complete lack of concern for others.

The controversy of whether or not sport enhances social integration--either among individuals or among nations--is not one that is likely to be easily resolved.

Socialization

Another suggested function of sport is its role as an agent of socialization. Much has been written detailing sport as a vehicle whereby culture is transmitted. As Locke (1973:88) puts it:

The patterns of our lives is not just filled with sport, it is integrated and maintained by sport. Sport teaches us all, spectators and participants alike, what it is to be American in the 20th Century.

Daniels (1966) adds that sport affects man's development, his forms of expression, and his value system. Snyder (1972), Wohl (1970), and Ingham and Loy (1973) also take note of the socialization function of sport.

It may be said that sport is not only a mirror of the sociocultural complex, but also a means of imparting it to the individual (Boyle, 1963). This argument is continued by Luschen (1967:136) who notes that since sport implies basic cultural values, it has the potential to pass these values on to its participants.

Perhaps Scott (1973:74) best summarizes the relationship between culture and sport as an agent of socialization when he writes, "Sport cannot exist separate from the reality of American society. Sport,

like all other institutional activities, will reflect and, in turn, reinforce dominant American values."

A popular perspective is the consideration of sport as a microcosm of society with its own division of labor, codes of ethics, government, ideologies, myths, religious practices, and so forth. This being the case, participation in sport is much like participation in society, and the sport milieu may represent an agent of socialization (Miller and Russell, 1971). Sport, like religion, offers its followers a group of symbols, myths, and rituals that facilitate one's total life experience (Slusher, 1967).

To participate in sport, actively or vicariously, is to participate in life in general; through sport one learns attitudes, beliefs, values, and ideals congruent with those held by society at large. As Schafer (1976) observes, sport contributes to the fitting of the athlete into the mainstream of the cultural and behavioral patterns held by the society. In agreement with Schafer, Edwards (1973) goes so far as to say that sport is a social institution which has primary functions in disseminating and reinforcing the values regulating behavior. Overall, then, sport is seen to have the capacity to instill the orientations of society to its followers.

More specifically, it has been submitted that sport has particular importance with regard to the transmission of character traits defined by society as desirable. Snyder and Spreitzer (1975) argue, for instance, that through interaction within the context of sport, the individual develops such socially desirable characteristics as personal initiative, competitiveness, perseverance, and subordination of self to the group. These traits, they note, are a basic part of the

Protestant Ethic. Luschen (1967) adds that sport induces some other positive traits (among those involved with it) such as achievement orientation and a sense of fair play.

Coakley (1978) observes that success in sport depends on hard work, dedication, and efficient expenditure of physical energy that may carry over to other activities.

Clearly, the implication of these arguments is that participation in athletics encourages the development and maintenance of personality characteristics which are deemed important for success in life. As with many of the aforementioned contributions of sport, there is some disagreement as to its ability to provide this service. Rushall (1972), a noted sport psychologist, for example, has concluded that after years of research no clear findings are to be found supporting a relationship between sport and positive personality development. Ogilvie and Tutko (1971) are in agreement by virtue of their research in which they found no character building process occurring through sport. They saw the traditional athletic personality arising out of a selection process rather than a socializing one. Schafer (1969) further supports this idea by noting that the observed negative relationship between delinquency and athletic participation may be due to a process that brings conformers rather than deviants into sport programs.

Some have even gone so far as to suggest that sport may have a negative effect on personality development. Ogilvie and Tutko (1971), for instance, recognize that there is evidence that athletic competition limits personal growth in some areas. In addition, the emphasis upon winning at all cost may presuppose the development of undesirable character traits, such as cheating; in other words, often times the

end justifies the means. Miller and Russell (1971) note that there exists among many a "cult of victory" in place of a "code of honor," and that the strong commitment to winning may operate to destroy the rules of the game and sport itself.

Coakley (1978:110-111) seems to best sum up the question of sport as a socializing agent when he expresses:

For some of those involved, the experience will be extremely favorable and may be accompanied by increases of self awareness and self esteem. For others, there will be bitterness, failure, and disappointment. For some, positive character traits may be developed or strengthened. For others, negative traits may be acquired or intensified. For many, the experience will probably not have an impact upon the development one way or another.

If sport does function as a means of socialization, it has yet to be conclusively proven.

Sex Roles

Sport has also been credited as an agent instrumental for the relating of proper sex roles. With regard to males Wilkerson (1973:16) notes that:

The function of sport as a temporary sustainer of traditional masculinity is viewed as a positive aspect by some in that it helps males establish not only an identity, but an identity which is congruent with traditional expectations, on the basis of which society operates.

The structure of sport provides an excellent context from which the individual may develop those characteristics consistent with the traditional male role, such as aggressiveness, self discipline, achievement orientation, competitive spirit, and courage. Luschen (1967) emphasizes that the disproportionately large number of males involved in sport can be expected since being identified with sport establishes a

power and achievement image which is traditionally masculine. Beisser (1967) has noted that in a society where male and female roles increasingly appear to resemble each other, sport helps to reaffirm his masculine identity.

George Stone (1970:162) in an attempt to measure interest in sport by sex, found that males overwhelmingly discussed sport more frequently than females, and he suggests that "if a man in our society does not have at least some conversational knowledge of sport, he is viewed as suspect" in terms of his maleness. Women, however, are not bound by this same reasoning. This indicates, perhaps, that the female role is not dependent upon sport for definition.

In a further study conducted by Kidd and Woodman (1975), it was found that women tend to have a weaker orientation toward winning than males when participating in athletic contests. The researchers explain that this is due to the fact that women are socialized to be less competitive as part of their sex roles. In short, whereas aggressive action becomes the male self-image, it is unbecoming of women, and success in competitive sport is not conducive to the female sex role.

It is generally accepted that sport enhances the male identity, yet there has been much speculation as to its influence upon the female sex role. While popular notion holds that sport is traditionally a male domain and participation connotes masculinity, some have found that engaging in sport does not necessarily undermine femininity. Spreitzer, Snyder, and Kivlin (1976), in a review of some of their studies dealing with the female athlete, found that there were no negative associations between female sports participation and measures of self identity, and, in fact, slight to moderately positive relationships

emerged in the opposite direction. They concluded that the intensity of conflict between the roles of woman and athlete seem to be fading.

Metheny (1965) created a typology of the appropriateness of certain athletic activities for women based upon the attitudes of college females, suggesting that some endeavors are more conducive to the role of the woman than others. According to Metheny, the basic determining factors differentiating between levels of appropriateness are strength and bodily contact, and skill and grace; the most appropriate activities demand less strength and bodily contact while requiring the greatest amount of skill and grace qualities. Using this typology, activities such as diving, skiing, tennis, and figure skating are supportive of the female role, while judo, weightlifting, and putting the shot are not.

Miller and Russell (1971) recognize that there is a cultural expectation involved with sport that imposes an "unlady like" label to athletic activity. They suggest that it's acceptable to compete in sports when young, but when the female reaches puberty, she must act like a women. Glansville (1965) goes so far as to say that for women to compete with the same intensity as men must lead to imbalance, psychological stress, and even physical distortion. Obviously, both echo an opinion that participation in sport runs counter to the idealized female role.

Summarizing their investigation of the topic, Snyder and Spreitzer (1978:121) write:

Our research indicates a continuation of the Victorian ideal that defines sport as an inappropriate activity for females. Given this role conflict, one might expect that female athletes would experience psychological stress. However, the research findings do not reveal any deleterious effect. In fact, the female athletes in these studies seem to be secure and well-adjusted to their femininity.

The implication, then, is that while others may stigmatize the female athlete as being more masculine than the nonathlete, she does not consider herself any less feminine. With all things considered, however, the literature seems to confirm the notion that sport does little to enhance the female roles.

Entertainment

Another function of sport as it relates to society deals with the idea that sport represents a type of entertainment. Perhaps this is the most obvious function of all. Whether one is involved as a spectator or as a participant, the context of sport provides a viable form of relaxation and "must be viewed as . . . one aspect of leisure behavior" (Rooney, 1974:14). Michener (1976:25) notes that sports have an obligation to provide public entertainment and that throughout history societies have turned to sport for this purpose.

It has been recognized, however, that for sport to exist as a form of entertainment, it must create and maintain interest. As Ingham and Loy (1973) note, it must be at the same time both play and display, and it must be structured in such a manner that the outcome of the competition is one of doubt. Beyond this, in order for the typically expressive sports (such as figure skating or gymnastics) to be entertaining, it is necessary that the aesthetic characteristic be easily recognized. This notion suggests that on a societal level the aesthetic aspect of sport must, to some degree, be a matter of collective definition.

Overall, if sport is to be considered a form of entertainment, the activity must be organized in such a way that it satisfied the needs of the spectators, and their motives for attending, watching, or

listening to the athletic events are varied. Generally, it can be stated that some combination of the following three factors must be present for the event to be appealing: (1) uncertainty of outcome, (2) definite stakes associated with victory or defeat, and (3) display of excellence by the performers. If a sporting event is characterized by all these elements it becomes a most popular attraction (Coakley, 1978:209-210). George Stone (1970) indicates, however, that there is a loss of dignity and value in sport if the sport is contrived with the audience in mind. This suggests that the truly entertaining athletic event must be one that is authentic in nature and scope.

It is fairly evident that the sport audience is increasing in numbers, and this is a reflection of the emphasis placed upon sport as entertainment. One only needs to spend a weekend in front of the television set to confirm the extent of exposure granted to various sporting events. For the mass media, sport as entertainment is big business. At present, for example, a staggering \$200,000,000 per year is spent by television to broadcast sports (Michener, 1976:289), and one network alone has paid \$85,000,000 for the television rights of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games.

Beyond the increase in television exposure and other forms of mass media, indicators of the spiraling popularity of sport as entertainment is evidenced by the increased construction of sport stadiums and coliseums, the growing sports equipment industry, numerous insurance company indicators, and the widespread extent of gambling on sporting events (Miller and Russell, 1971:144). All things considered, the emphasis on sport as entertainment is not likely to be reduced in the near future.

Pride in Place

The last social function of sport to be discussed involves sport as a source of pride in place. Whatever unit of analysis one cares to view--the scholastic setting, the community, the state, or the nation--there exists the contention that sport may influence one's sense of pride in the place. As Rooney (1978:5) notes, "the total feeling a place transmits is integrally tied to the sport which it embraces." The idea here is that the success or failure of the athletic team representing a particular locale has an impact upon the pride the members feel.

Although it has long been recognized that most spectators tend to support the home team due to its familiarity and accessibility, this is not an absolute and other factors may be noted (Shaw, 1978). For one to form an allegiance and to experience a sense of pride in place, the team or teams representing that place must usually be successful in some manner. A winning team, for instance, can enhance one's sense of school spirit, yet a losing record evokes little support from the student body (Springer, 1974). While victory of the home team usually results in a positive contribution to the notion of pride in place, such a feeling is also possible even when the home team loses. If the contest is well-played or if the team exhibits positive characteristics to which those represented can identify, then even in a losing effort, a sense of pride may emerge. These general principles may be observed to operate at all levels of spectator organization.

In essence, as Shaw (1978:49) relates, when a home team does well, those represented receive a positive feeling--perhaps ego gratification or a positive self-identity. Wilkerson and Dodder (1979:51) note that

sport engenders a communal pride; with this as the case, every time the home team takes the field, the communal spirit and the prestige of the place are on the line (Rooney, 1978:5). Obviously, the attachments to place based upon sport-generated spirit are tenuous and, overall, it may be recognized that sport has the potential to influence one's sense of pride in place, both positively and negatively. As Coleman (1975:71) writes, "The team is a community enterprise; its successes are shared by the community, and its losses are mourned in concert." The echos of the place and the sense of pride it commands from its members or residents are affected by the team's performance.

Summary

There are numerous ways in which the issue of sport might be addressed. In this review of literature an effort has been made to detail some possible functions that sport may serve for the individual and for the society; the intent has not been to suggest that these functions are either good or bad, but simply that sport has been observed to operate in the mentioned manners.

With regard to the individual, the functions discussed included sport as a means to greater emotional health, as a source of self-expression, as a promoter of interpersonal relationships and sociability, and as an avenue towards physical fitness.

With regard to society, the functions discussed included sport as a basis for social integration, as an agent of socialization, as an enhancer of sex roles, as a form of entertainment, and as a source of pride in place.

It is not suggested that the list of functions is exhaustive, nor that the categories are mutually exclusive. In most instances the functions represent somewhat arbitrary classifications and overlap does occur.

It is hoped, however, that the review provides some insight into the scope and nature of sport, as well as the foundation for a useful method of observing the phenomenon.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS AND OBJECTIVES

Introduction

This chapter deals with the methodological and procedural techniques used in this study. The method of data gathering employed in this research was a questionnaire administered to a sample of university students, staff, and faculty. The focus of this research is the perception of the functions of sport.

The first section of this chapter contains a discussion of the objectives of this research. Included in this section are a statement of the aims of the research, as well as the variables to be viewed. The second section of this chapter deals with the sampling technique. This section includes a discussion of the rationale behind the sampling method used in the study and also a description of the data sources.

The third section of this chapter is addressed to the perception of the functions of sport questionnaire. Included in this section are a discussion of the different components of the questionnaire, the variables to be observed, and the manner in which the questionnaire was constructed. Also, the strengths and the weaknesses of the questionnaire method will be outlined.

The fourth section of this chapter is comprised by the step-by-step description of the methods and procedures that were employed in the

analysis of the data. Included here as well is an overview of the techniques used in deriving the final set of research items and categories.

The final section of this chapter includes a summary of the techniques and methods used in the research.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this research have included the following:

1. The derivation and measurement of some functions of sport as suggested by the review of the literature and as noted in Chapter II.
2. A subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) research on the psychosocial functions of sport.
3. An analysis of the differences of perceptions of each proposed function of sport with regard to:
 - a. Student or faculty status
 - b. Sex
 - c. Sport involvement--measured by the frequency with which one participates or attends, converses about, watches or listens to, or reads about sport activities. In addition, participation and attendance aspects will be viewed separately.
 - d. Religiosity--measured by the frequency of one's attendance at church services, one's self-appraisal, and a number of items designed to indicate one's commitment to religious principles.
 - e. Orientation toward winning--measured by the emphasis one places upon winning in a competitive context.

An interpretation of the findings of the study has been based upon the above research variables and upon the functions of sport derived from a factor analysis of the questionnaire items.

The Sample

A sample of the students, staff, and faculty at Oklahoma State University was used as the data source for this research. In order to make an adequate test of the research objectives, it was necessary for the sample to include a large number of cases and possess as wide a variation on the study's major variables as possible. Of particular concern was the need to solicit enough data sources within the different categories of the research's independent variables, such as sex, faculty versus student status, and involvement. Consequently, a concerted effort was made to obtain a sample which would show adequate representation and variation on these variables. Rather than risk underrepresentation by utilizing a random sampling technique, a purposive or "scope sample" (Willer, 1967:97-115) was arranged. As a further note, it was felt that since the research is of an exploratory and descriptive nature, the adherence to a strict random format was unnecessary. This is particularly true if one accepts the idea that a random sample of Oklahoma State University students, staff, and faculty would no more significantly represent the greater population to which the research findings are generalized than the sample which was selected.

Basically speaking, the sample was divided into two major subsamples: one consisting of students at Oklahoma State University, and the other consisting of faculty and staff. These subsamples represent

two distinct groups of respondents which differ with regard to both educative background and age. There were, of course, instances of undergraduate students whose ages were more in line with those of the faculty and staff subsample, but those were substantially few. Of particular interest for the purposes of this research are comparisons of the perceptions of the functions of sport by sex and, therefore, the subsamples are further defined in terms of their sexual composition.

With regard to the sampling technique itself, student respondents were obtained from an assortment of undergraduate sociology and psychology classes at the university. Questionnaires were administered to introductory sociology and psychology classes, as well as some upper-division classes, through the solicitation and cooperation of the courses' instructors. No specific format was utilized to determine which classes would be sampled.

In addition, in order to meet the categorical needs of the research, as discussed earlier, the coaches of women's varsity sports were contacted and questionnaires were administered to a sample of undergraduate female varsity athletes. Also, questionnaires were administered to students enrolled in upper-division Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Science (HPELS) classes in order to insure representation in this academic major area and to insure, hypothetically, wide variation of type and frequency of involvement with sports among the student sample.

In order to guard against the same student completing a questionnaire twice or more, instructions were given to ignore the questionnaire if one had responded to it previously. It was thought that the length

of the questionnaire and the time needed to complete it would ostensibly preclude such an occurrence from happening.

The faculty and staff respondents were obtained through two general means. The major portion of the sample was gathered through personal contact. Faculty members in several different academic departments across the campus at Oklahoma State University were approached and asked to arrange for as many questionnaires as possible to be completed by fellow faculty members within their department or personal contacts in other disciplines. Sociology, Geography, Family Relations and Child Development (FRCD), Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Science (HPELS), Mathematics, and the Humanities all contributed to the cause.

Additional respondents were obtained by means of questionnaires dispersed through the inter-office mail system on campus to a sample of university faculty and staff. This group of respondents represented the participants in a physical fitness program devised by Dr. A. B. Harrison, and it was thought that their inclusion would insure a sizeable number of faculty data sources with regard to the sport involvement variables.

Overall, the total number of respondents was 637. Of this, 510 were students and 127 were faculty or staff members. Of the 510 students, 181 were male and 328 were female (one respondent failed to specify his or her sex); of the 127 faculty/staff members, 89 were male and 38 were female.

A detailed description of the respondents in terms of demographic variable categories is presented as Table I.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Variable	Students			Faculty		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<u>Age:</u>						
Under 20	49.2	68.6	61.8	2.2	2.6	2.4
20-30	50.8	29.9	37.3	10.1	26.3	15.0
Over 30	—	1.5	1.0	87.6	71.1	82.7
<u>Race:</u>						
Black	4.4	2.1	2.9	—	5.3	1.6
Mexican American	.6	.3	.4	—	—	—
Native American	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.1	2.6	1.6
White	91.7	94.8	93.7	98.9	92.1	96.8
Other	1.1	.6	.8	—	—	—
<u>Income:</u>						
Less than \$6,000	5.8	5.2	5.4	—	—	—
\$ 6,000-\$ 9,999	9.4	5.5	6.9	2.4	2.7	2.5
\$10,000-\$14,999	13.4	14.4	14.0	13.5	21.6	9.0
\$15,000-\$19,999	22.2	17.9	19.4	15.3	24.3	18.0
\$20,000-\$24,999	13.4	21.0	18.1	20.0	18.9	19.7
\$25,000-\$29,999	14.0	13.1	13.6	21.2	18.9	20.5
\$30,000 or above	21.6	23.0	22.5	37.6	13.5	30.3
<u>Education:</u>						
Completed H.S.	5.0	4.3	4.5	—	—	—
Some College	90.6	94.5	93.1	—	2.6	.8
Completed College	4.4	.9	2.2	1.1	5.2	2.4
Some Grad. School	—	.3	.2	2.2	2.6	2.4
Completed Grad. School	—	—	—	96.6	89.5	94.5
<u>Major:</u>						
Agriculture	11.0	.9	4.5			
Arts & Science	31.5	25.6	27.6			
Business	25.4	16.3	19.5			
Education	8.3	31.7	23.5			
Engineering	5.5	1.2	2.8			
Home Economics	.6	8.0	5.3			
Health, Phys.Ed.& Leisure Science	14.9	15.4	15.2			
Other	2.8	.9	1.6			
<u>Hometown Size:</u>						
Under 2,500	24.9	21.6	22.7	45.5	34.2	42.1
2,500-25,000	24.9	25.6	25.3	12.5	26.3	16.7
25,000-100,000	22.1	26.8	25.1	14.8	23.7	17.5
Over 100,000	28.2	25.9	26.9	27.3	15.8	23.8

DOES NOT APPLY

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Students			Faculty		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Marital Status:</u>						
Single	87.8	87.2	87.5	2.2	26.3	9.4
Married	10.5	11.6	11.2	91.0	57.9	81.1
Divorced	1.7	.6	1.0	5.6	13.2	7.9
Separated	—	.6	.4	—	—	—
Widowed	—	—	—	1.1	2.6	1.6
<u>Children:</u>						
Boys - 0	95.6	97.6	96.9	35.9	57.9	42.5
1	3.9	2.1	2.7	37.1	15.8	30.7
2	.6	.3	.4	19.1	18.4	18.9
3+	—	—	—	7.9	7.9	7.9
Girls - 0	98.9	96.3	97.3	31.4	73.7	44.1
1	1.1	3.0	2.4	33.7	18.4	29.1
2	—	.3	.2	30.3	5.3	22.8
3+	—	.3	.2	4.5	2.6	3.9

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire utilized in this research was constructed with three major purposes in mind: (1) to provide a subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) earlier investigation of the functions of sport, (2) to provide information concerning the nine functions of sport suggested by the review of the literature, and (3) to provide additional data regarding the respondents' background.

In order to satisfy the first purpose, Spreitzer and Snyder's research items were replicated within the present research's questionnaire schedule. Since the primary focus of this study was not the subsequent test of their research, it was felt that their fifteen items should be placed nearer to the end of the questionnaire schedule; this was done to protect the more important items pertaining to the present research from various forms of contamination. Thus, Spreitzer and Snyder's items appeared as items 59-73 on the questionnaire (See Appendix) and are listed in Table V in Chapter IV.

As with their original research, of course, the items were presented in a Likert-type manner, with response categories ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Unlike their original research, however, seven response categories instead of five were utilized.

In order to investigate the sample's perception of the nine functions of sport suggested by the review of literature, 26 items were constructed. Prior to inclusion on the questionnaire schedule, the items were informally pretested. Effort was made to alleviate any ambiguity or faulty grammar with regard to the items. Some of the items

were purposively given negative wording to protect against and control for respondent bias. Since the items were deemed the basis of the present research, they were placed nearer to the beginning of the questionnaire and are represented by items 12-34 and 51, 52, and 55. The items are shown in Table II. As with the Spreitzer and Snyder items, a Likert-type operationalization with seven response categories was employed.

The remaining items comprising the questionnaire were designed to gather additional data concerning the respondent's socioeconomic background and orientations to certain other phenomena. In general, these items represent the operationalization of the independent variables of the research.

Items 1-9 represent basic demographic data, such as sex, racial/ethnic background, marital status, and so forth. Items 37-39 and 45-48 represent one's religious background, including self-reported religiosity. Items 40-42 represent the operationalization of one's political involvement, while items 49 and 50 tap one's sense of nationalism.

Other groupings of items were designed to measure one's perception of the importance of sport as a part of academic life (items 53, 54, 57, and 58), and one's self-reported involvement in sport (items 43, 44, 74, 75, and 77). Further items were included to gain information concerning one's favorite sport to watch (item 76) or participate in (item 78), and the frequency (item 79) and level (item 80) of one's participation. A final item (item 81) was constructed to gain additional data concerning one's attraction and level of participation in sports other than one's favorite sport.

TABLE II
UNROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR THE ITEMS
REPRESENTING THE PROPOSED NINE
FUNCTIONS OF SPORT

Item	First Factor Unrotated
<u>Emotional Health:</u>	
*12. Involvement in sports is bad for my emotional health.	.23
13. When I'm upset involvement with sports helps to ease my tensions.	.54
14. Experience in sports helps me to cope with failure.	.64
<u>Self Expression:</u>	
15. I get a better understanding of who I am through involvement in sports.	.68
16. For me, sport is an art form that can be appreciated for itself.	.67
17. Participation in sports brings a pleasurable feeling seldom experienced elsewhere.	.70
<u>Sociability:</u>	
18. Sports help me to relate to other people better.	.77
*19. Sports make me feel lonely.	.56
20. Lasting friendships are easy to find in sports.	.64
<u>Physical Health:</u>	
21. Involvement in sports helps people to improve their health.	.62
*22. Sports do more harm physically than they do good.	.55
<u>Social Integration:</u>	
23. Sports bring people together who would not otherwise get together.	.61
24. Sports provide a common ground for cooperation.	.66
*25. Through sports we become more aware of our differences rather than our similarities.	-.01
<u>Socialization:</u>	
*26. Through sports we learn values that run counter to those of our society.	-.16
27. Involvement in sports develops within us an appreciation of the importance of others.	.71
28. Through sports we learn behavior important to succeed in life.	.72

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	First Factor Unrotated
<u>Sexual Identity:</u>	
29. For males, participation in sports enhances masculinity.	.37
30. For females, participation in sports enhances femininity.	.26
*31. Sports attract women who are unhappy with the traditional female role.	.01
<u>Entertainment:</u>	
*32. Sports are poor public entertainment.	.46
33. Spectator sports provide society with needed diversions from everyday life.	.58
34. Sports provide a rejuvenating experience seldom found in other leisure pursuits.	.61
<u>Pride in Place:</u>	
*51. It makes little difference if a sports team representing the town or area where I live loses.	.29
*52. When viewing international sporting events, it makes little difference to me if the American entry wins.	.26
55. Success in sports brings prestige to the community.	.45

*These represent negatively worded items.

Many of the items pertaining to the independent variables of the research were operationalized in the fore-mentioned Likert-type fashion. Others, such as the demographic variables, were constructed with more definite response categories. A few items were open-ended in order to allow for complete freedom of response. An example of this is given by the item pertaining to one's favorite sport. As with the previous items, these were pretested to locate any grammatical problems or ambiguities.

Overall, there were 79 items on the questionnaire schedule (the item numbers reach 81 because they represent column numbers, instead of actual items, to facilitate data card coding). The questionnaire was four pages in length and designed to elicit the most accurate responses from the research subjects; items of a particular format were not listed in too long a succession in order to control for the possibility of monotony. The questionnaire was constructed to require no more than approximately 15 minutes for its completion so that it would maintain the respondent's attention. Also, the most important research items were placed at the beginning, and those requiring the greatest investment of the respondent's time were placed at the last, the intent of which was to provide for a smoother and more easily completed questionnaire format. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix. The sample's mean response and standard deviation for each research item are noted on the questionnaire.

As with any questionnaire, certain shortcomings must be noted. For instance, while there were some open-ended items, the questionnaire is a rigid form of data collection allowing little individualistic participation outside the given boundaries of the response categories. With Likert-type items, such as present on the research questionnaire, a

forced-choice response predominates. In such an instance one may always question the reliability of the responses.

Another shortcoming derives from the inability to control satisfactorily the research setting where the questionnaire is administered. No concerted effort was made to standardize the settings with regard to the present research. Particular sensitivity to this shortcoming should be granted with regard to the mailed questionnaires. Those responding to the questionnaire within the classroom environment experienced a somewhat common setting, yet no such conclusion can be made with respect to those responding to the mailed questionnaire.

Apart from these suggested shortcomings and the observation that perhaps efforts to control for possible format difficulties were unsuccessful with regard to particular respondents, it is submitted that, overall, the present research's questionnaire represents a satisfactory data gathering device.

The Method of Analysis

Once the data collection phase of the research was completed, the information provided by the questionnaires was transferred onto data cards and analyzed utilizing a SAS computer program. The following is a discussion of the process of analysis employed with regard to the primary research items. For a discussion of the method of analysis employed with respect to the Spreitzer and Snyder items, consult Chapter IV.

The Function of Sport Items

Based on the review of the literature, nine proposed functions of sport were operationalized by means of 26 items. In order to investigate how well the items representing these functions measured their respective categories, as well as the larger category of the function of sport in general, a factor analysis was performed. The hope was that: (1) all the items would reflect the general category, and (2) that they would sort into nine separate factors corresponding to the proposed functions.

Unfortunately, but not totally unexpected, the initial factor analysis yielded a somewhat different structure. Instead of nine factors, six somewhat nondistinct factors emerged; also, of the 26 items, three (items 25, 26, and 31) had a very low loading on the first factor, suggesting that they were inappropriate. An orthogonal rotation was performed, but did little to change the situation. The unrotated first factor loadings for the 26 research items is presented in Table II.

To represent the data more accurately, the three low loading items were eliminated; in addition to their low loading, it was felt that their inclusion did not necessarily add to the understanding of the functions of sport they were designed to measure and, thus, were expendable. Once again, an unrotated and an orthogonally rotated factor analysis was performed. This time five factors emerged, with all items having a substantial loading on the first factor. Only slight variation from the first unrotated factor loadings was observed with the second unrotated analysis, yet a very different representation occurred with respect to the second orthogonal rotation compared to

the first. The five factors, however, were still not as distinct as desired since a number of items loaded high on more than one factor.

A factor analysis using an oblique rotation was attempted in order to perhaps represent the research items better. This, however, proved unsuccessful; the structure yielded by the oblique rotation was less distinct than the previous orthogonal rotation.

Concluding that separating the items into two categories representing individually and socially based functions, respectively, might produce two more distinct factor structures, an unrotated and orthogonally rotated factor analysis on each grouping was performed. The groupings were suggested by the review of the literature and the research functions derived from it. The rationale behind this consideration was that, perhaps, by removing the complicating effects of the societal based items, the individually based items might better factor into more distinct subcategories and vice-versa. Once again, however, this attempt failed to substantially add to the understanding of the research items.

After careful examination of the factor matrices derived from the previous analysis of the abbreviated, yet nonsubdivided, list of items, it was decided to eliminate two more items. Based upon the fact that they loaded relatively equally upon all of the derived factors and failed to add to the understanding of any of them, items 33 and 34 were removed from analysis. An unrotated and orthogonally rotated factor analysis was then performed. The orthogonal rotation produced the more distinct factor structure and was the one retained as the final representation of the research items.

Five factors were observed and, based upon the items comprising them, they were labeled as the following functions of sport:

1. Psychophysical Health
2. Self Expression
3. Sex Roles
4. Pride in Place
5. Social Integration

These functions and the items that comprise them, as well as their factor loadings, are represented in Table III. In addition, the sample's mean response for each item is included in the table. Since there were seven response categories ranging from "Strongly Agree" (1) to "Strongly Disagree" (7), a low score indicates a strong endorsement of the function which the item represents, while a high score indicates a weak endorsement. A mean score near 4.00 indicates an overall neutral perspective.

It may be noted that some of the items are negatively worded in order to control for respondent bias and to provide for a wide range of possible responses. These are considerations that must be made with regard to any scale. In compiling the mean scores this was taken into account and the negative items were statistically reversed in order to create a basis for comparison. By reversing the negative items, all items are then given a positive base, creating the possibility of item summation for each function. Thus, a score of 1.42 on the "negative" item 12 indicates support for the psychophysical function because the negativeness has been statistically corrected. If uncorrected, the mean score for item 12 would be 5.58. Overall, the range of item means was 1.42 (item 12) to 4.45 (item 30).

TABLE III
MEANS AND FACTOR LOADINGS FOR THE
RESEARCH FUNCTIONS OF SPORT

Item	Means	First Factor Unrotated	I	Factors Rotated <u>Orthogonally</u>				V
				II	III	IV		
<u>Psychophysical Well-Being</u>								
*12. Involvement in sport is bad for my emotional health.	1.42	.23	.07	<u>.45</u>	.15	.04	-.06	
*19. Sports make me feel lonely.	1.91	.57	.25	<u>.73</u>	.04	-.17	-.05	
21. Involvement in sports helps people to improve their health.	1.76	.62	.29	<u>.66</u>	-.05	-.24	.13	
*22. Sports do more harm physically than they do good.	1.70	.56	.17	<u>.78</u>	.02	-.20	-.00	
*32. Sports are poor public entertainment.	1.89	.46	.05	<u>.51</u>	.29	-.25	.01	
<u>Self Expression</u>								
13. When I'm upset involvement with sports helps to ease by tensions.	2.66	.55	<u>.68</u>	.25	.01	-.03	-.02	
14. Experience in sports helps me to cope with failure.	3.05	.65	<u>.76</u>	.08	.13	-.17	.04	
15. I get a better understanding of who I am through involvement in sports.	3.30	.70	<u>.82</u>	.06	.05	.22	.10	
16. For me, sport is an art form that can be appreciated for itself.	2.54	.68	<u>.62</u>	.33	-.01	-.21	.12	
17. Participation in sports brings a pleasurable feeling seldom experienced elsewhere.	2.92	.70	<u>.59</u>	.25	.04	-.28	.22	
18. Sports help me to related to other people better.	2.90	.78	<u>.66</u>	.18	.05	-.42	.15	

TABLE III (Continued)

Item	Means	First Factor Unrotated	Factors Rotated Orthogonally					V
			I	II	III	IV		
<u>Sex Role:</u>								
29. For males, participation in sports enhances masculinity.	3.49	.36	.08	.05	.14	-.16	<u>.84</u>	
30. For females, participation in sports enhances femininity.	4.45	.26	.17	-.09	-.02	-.05	<u>.83</u>	
<u>Pride in Place:</u>								
*51. It makes little difference if a sports team representing the town or area where I live loses.	3.24	.29	.03	.11	<u>.80</u>	-.07	.06	
*52. When viewing international sporting events, it makes little difference to me if the American entry wins.	2.61	.25	.07	.13	<u>.79</u>	-.01	-.04	
55. Success in sports brings prestige to the community	2.36	.44	.10	.04	<u>.51</u>	-.36	.22	
<u>Social Integration:</u>								
20. Lasting friendships are easy to find in sports.	3.17	.65	.45	.02	.13	<u>-.56</u>	.01	
23. Sports bring people together who would not otherwise get together.	2.38	.61	.15	.19	.01	<u>-.74</u>	.06	
24. Sports provide a common ground for cooperation.	2.24	.67	.10	.31	.04	<u>-.77</u>	.07	

TABLE III (Continued)

Item	Means	First Factor Unrotated	Factors Rotated Orthogonally				
			I	II	III	IV	V
27. Involvement in sports develops within us an appreciation of the importance of others.	2.69	.72	.33	.13	.13	-.70	.08
28. Through sports we learn behavior important to succeed in life.	2.62	.73	.35	.10	.16	-.68	.17

*These represent negatively worded items.

Respondent Description Items

In an attempt to gain information concerning the background of the respondents with regard to involvement in sport, religiosity, and orientation toward winning, an analysis was made of the items representing these respective categories.

Dealing first with the notion of sport involvement, a factor analysis was performed on the five items designed to measure this phenomenon. The factor loadings yielded by the analysis, as well as the sample's mean response to each item, are presented in Table IV. As can be seen, the items load very well on the first unrotated factor, suggesting that they do indeed tap the same phenomenon.

A factor analysis was also performed upon the items constructed to represent respondent religiosity. The means and factor loadings may also be seen in Table IV. Again, all of the items load well on the first unrotated factor, indicating that they also measure a common phenomenon.

The items designed to measure one's orientation toward winning and their respective means are shown in Table IV as well. Since only two items were utilized, however, a factor analysis was not performed. Instead, a Pearson's Correlation was computed and it yielded a .72 coefficient. Such a figure indicates a basic commonality between the items.

As with the items designed to indicate the proposed functions of sport, the response possibilities ranged from 1 to 7 and some were negatively worded. Once more, the negative aspect has been corrected in the computation of the means so that comparisons and summations may be made.

TABLE IV
 MEANS AND FACTOR LOADINGS FOR SPORT INVOLVEMENT,
 RELIGIOSITY, AND ORIENTATION TOWARD
 WINNING ITEMS

Item	Means	First Factor Unrotated
<u>Sport Involvement:</u>		
43. How often do you read the sports section of the newspaper?	3.23	.82
44. How often is sports a topic in your conversation?	2.87	.86
74. How often do you <u>attend</u> sports events?	2.72	.82
75. How often do you <u>watch</u> sports events on T.V. or <u>listen</u> to them on the radio?	2.67	.82
77. How often do you actively participate in sports?	2.84	.65
<u>Religiosity:</u>		
38. How often do you attend church?	3.71	.71
39. How religious do you consider yourself?	4.02	.79
45. Religious commitment gives life a purpose it would not otherwise have.	2.54	.81
46. My religion provides principles which guide my daily decisions.	2.85	.86
47. Religion has very little interest for me.	2.17	.84
48. There are more important things in life than religion.	2.91	.68
<u>Orientation Toward Winning:</u>		
35. Winning is the most important thing in a competitive contest.	5.28	*
36. Winning may not be everything, but it is more important than anything else.	5.26	*

*Since there are only two items representing this category, a factor analysis was not computed. A Pearson's correlation, however, yielded a .72 coefficient ($p < .01$).

For later analysis purposes, a mean score for each respondent with regard to the above mentioned categories was computed; a low mean score indicated a greater involvement with sport, religiosity, or orientation toward winning, and a high mean score indicated a weaker characterization, respectively. Eventually, the sample was dichotomized with regard to involvement with sport and religiosity on the basis of the higher 50 percent of the category means compared to the lower 50 percent. The orientation toward winning variable was dichotomized also, but since the sample's overall orientation was weak, equal percentages were not used. The two categories that were created represented those who had a strong or neutral orientation toward winning. These procedures enabled more efficient analysis of the research investigations.

Summary

Within this chapter has been a discussion of the objectives of this study, a description of the sample, an explanation of the questionnaire used to collect the research data, and the method of analysis employed with regard to the data. The research is aimed at gathering information concerning the relationship between one's perceptions of some derived functions of sport and one's demographic background, as well as involvement in sport, religiosity, and orientation toward winning. From the original nine functions suggested by the review of literature, five functions of sport emerged through a factor analysis process. Each respondent's endorsement of the respective functions was computed by deriving the mean of the responses to the items comprising the function. Likewise, each respondent's involvement with sport, religiosity, and

orientation toward winning was computed. The relationships that were observed from the sample of Oklahoma State University students and faculty are detailed in Chapter IV, Chapter V, and Chapter VI.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUBSEQUENT TEST OF SPREITZER AND SNYDER'S RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter deals with the subsequent testing of the findings of Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) study of the psychosocial functions of sport. Included in this chapter is a brief discussion of the Spreitzer and Snyder research, a comparison of their findings with those obtained by the present study, and an extension of the original research by noting the relationships between Spreitzer and Snyder's dependent variables. Finally, a discussion section detailing the contribution of the subsequent testing is included at the end of the chapter.

Spreitzer and Snyder's Study

Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) research into the psychosocial functions of sport represents one of the first noteworthy attempts to assess empirically some functions of sport for society and the individual. Prior to their study other researchers (Layman, 1960; Albonico, 1967; Bouet, 1969; Martens, 1970; Wohl, 1970; Takaii, 1973, etc.) had devoted their efforts to delineating a wide assortment of some possible functions of sport activity. These studies, however, were largely based on qualitative methodological techniques and, while they

contributed to the theoretical posture of the subject, they failed to encompass a more systematic approach to the problem. Spreitzer and Snyder accomplished this in their research.

The Spreitzer and Snyder (1975:88) study utilized a sample of 945 persons selected by a systematic probability method of drawing every Nth name from the City Directory of Toledo, Ohio, and its suburbs. Inclusion in the City Directory was not dependent upon telephone service but was instead compiled through a street by street enumeration of residences. A questionnaire was mailed to those selected with one follow-up mailing to the subjects who failed to respond to the first mailing. The final number of respondents totaled 510 (54 percent return rate). The sample included 25 percent suburban, 75 percent urban, 49 percent female, a mean age of 42 years, and a mean of 13 years completed education.

Included in their questionnaire were 15 Likert-type items with five possible response categories ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." These items were constructed to delineate some possible functions of sport (see Table V). In addition, Spreitzer and Snyder (1975:91) included items pertaining to independent variables such as age, educational attainment, and degree of participation in athletics. This last variable was operationalized in terms of a:

summated scale based on the extent of active and passive participation in athletics, the thoroughness with which the sports are a topic in one's conversation, and subscription to sports magazines.

The investigation produced a number of interesting findings. First, utilizing factor analysis and rotating the factors orthogonally (Varimax method), the researchers found that the 15 items detailing the dependent variable produced two factors--one consisting of seven

TABLE V

MEANS AND FACTOR LOADINGS ON SPREITZER
AND SNYDER'S SPORT FUNCTION ITEMS

Items	Means	Unrotated Factors			Factors Rotated Orthogonally			Spreitzer and Snyder's Rotated Factors Orthogonally	
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II
1. Sports are not particularly important for the well-being of our society.	5.01	-.53	.05	.44	-.28	-.20	.60	-.08	-.15
2. If more people were involved in sports, we would not have so much trouble with drugs in our society.	4.51	.43	.39	.38	.62	.16	.27	.61	.21
3. Sports are valuable because they help youngsters to become good citizens.	3.43	.67	.41	.12	.76	.21	-.05	.76	.14
4. The emphasis that sports place on competition causes more harm than good.	3.49	.46	-.12	-.61	.16	.14	-.75	-.19	-.22
5. Sports are valuable because they teach youngsters respect for authority.	3.48	.66	.45	-.06	.77	.10	-.20	.65	.12
6. Sports are valuable because they teach youngsters self-discipline	2.34	.57	.25	-.08	.56	.16	-.23	.58	.13

TABLE V (Continued)

Items	Means	Unrotated Factors			Factors Rotated Orthogonally			Spreitzer and Snyder's Rotated Factors Orthogonally	
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II
7. Sports are valuable because they contribute to the development of patriotism.	3.97	.60	.49	-.13	.75	.00	-.24	.69	.10
8. Sports are valuable because they provide an opportunity for individuals to get ahead in the world.	3.54	.54	.27	.06	.57	.19	-.09	.53	.22
9. Sports promote the development of fair play.	3.16	.65	.35	-.05	.69	.16	-.21	.62	.13
10. Sports are a good way for me to relax.	2.49	.63	-.43	.27	.15	.79	-.06	.20	.72
11. For me, sports are pretty much a waste of time.	1.81	.63	-.49	-.17	.05	.66	-.48	-.15	-.73
12. For me, sports are a way of getting together with friends and having a good time.	2.05	.62	-.36	.20	.18	.71	-.11	.26	.62
13. Sports are part of being a well-rounded person.	2.59	.66	-.14	.27	.38	.62	-.02	.44	.46

TABLE V (Continued)

Items	Means	Unrotated Factors			Factors Rotated Orthogonally			Spreitzer and Snyder's Rotated Factors Orthogonally	
		I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II
14. Sports are a source of little or no satisfaction in my life.	2.01	.64	-.50	-.14	.06	.68	-.45	-.04	-.74
15. Sports help me to get away from the worries and pressures of the day.	2.71	.62	-.41	.26	.16	.76	-.07	.16	.74

items and pertaining to some functions of sport for society, and the other consisting of five items and pertaining to some functions of sport for the individual. Items 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 loaded heavily on one factor and focused on such social functions as developing citizenship, respect for authority, self-discipline, patriotism, and opportunities for advancement. Items 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15, on the other hand, centered on such attributes as helping a person relax, get together with friends, escape worries, and find life satisfaction. Two of the items, 1 and 4, did not factor well and a third, item 13, loaded equally on both factors. Of the variance explained by the two factors, 76 percent was attributed to the social factor and 24 percent was attributed to the psychological or individual factor. For each respondent, the scores of the items pertaining to each factor were summated to give an index of the degree to which the individual perceived sport as socially or psychologically functional.

In viewing the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, Spreitzer and Snyder noted that both age and athletic involvement were inversely related to the perceived functions of sport while one's level of educational achievement was positively related. The Chi Square and Gamma tests of association were employed in the testing of the relationships with a .01 level of significance as the criterion for evaluation.

Age and education were broken down into four categories (16-30, 31-45, 46-64, 65 and up; and under 12, 12 years, 13-15, and 16 or more years, respectively), and involvement in sports was trichotomized (low, intermediate, and high). The perceived functions of sport were operationalized in terms of the Social Function and the Psychological

Function, as indicated by the factor analysis, and each of these categories was also trichotomized into low, intermediate and high levels.

A Subsequent Test of Spreitzer
and Snyder's Research

The present research into some possible functions of sport included a subsequent test of the Spreitzer and Snyder study. The sample of 510 students and 127 faculty at Oklahoma State University were asked to respond to the same 15 items that Spreitzer and Snyder utilized. Instead of using a five category Likert-type response structure, however, a seven category structure was employed. The possible responses ranged, of course, from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." As it was taken from the student body and faculty at Oklahoma State University, the sample included a rather even distribution of hometown residences ranging from "Small Town" (under 2,500 population) to "Large City" (over 100,000 population). Also, the sample included 57 percent female and a mean educational level indicated as having completed "Some College."

As with the Spreitzer and Snyder study, a factor analysis was used to discern if a fewer number of dimensions could be located within the 15 items. A Varimax rotation was employed and three factors emerged as compared with two reported by Spreitzer and Snyder. As Table V indicates, a comparison of the present factor analysis results with those of Spreitzer and Snyder reveals that there exists a remarkable congruence between the two. In the present study, however, negatively phrased items (items 1, 4, 11, and 14) were scored reversely; thus, opposite signs are reported for these items in the two studies when

the relationships are the same. The same items which loaded on a Social Factor for Spreitzer and Snyder were found to be likewise in the present research. In addition, the same items which loaded on a Psychological Factor also repeated themselves. Of the three items which failed to load well for Spreitzer and Snyder, two of them (item 1 about the importance of sport for the well-being of society and item 4 concerned with the results of stress in competition) loaded on a third factor for the present research, and the other item (item 13 about sport producing a well-rounded person), which loaded equally on both of their factors, produced a similar multiple loading in the subsequent test. This time, however, loaded it considerably stronger upon the Psychological Factor in the present research than it did upon the other factors. Yet, with this one major exception, the factor structures and the loadings of the items of the first two factors were extremely and unusually similar.

The third factor, in addition to being loaded primarily by items 1 and 4, was also loaded moderately by other items which loaded primarily on one of the other factors. This factor also explained only 19 percent of the variation as compared to 38 percent by the Psychological Factor and 42 percent by the Social Factor. Consequently, the third factor was not scored or analyzed further. Scores were calculated for the other two factors, however, by summing the seven items loading on the Social Factor and by summing the five items loading on the Psychological Factor. These two indices were used to investigate the relationships between the two factors and other variables.

With regard to the subsequent testing of the affect of Spreitzer and Snyder's independent variables upon the perceived functions of sport, the present research found positive relationships between age

and the dependent variable and educational achievement and the dependent variable (see Table VI). This contradicts Spreitzer and Snyder who found age to be inversely related to the perceived functions of sport.

The relationships were tested by means of a product-moment correlation with an established .01 level of significance (with an N of 637, $r > .11$ is needed to assume significance at the .01 level). This differs from the Chi Square and Gamma tests employed by Spreitzer and Snyder; the same relationships in both studies proved significant, however, and in both cases only the relationship between age and the perceived psychological value of sport proved nonsignificant. All others held true and, as noted, only the direction of the relationships differed.

Unlike Spreitzer and Snyder's research, an index was not utilized in determining the relationship between involvement with sport and the perceived functions of sport. Instead, separate variables such as participation (how often one engages in sport activity), attendance (how often one attends sport activities), and watching or listening (how often one watches or listens to sporting events on the television or radio) were studied individually. As Table VI indicates, all three of these variables were positively and significantly related to the dependent variables. The strongest relationship (.59) existed between participation and the perceived psychological function of sport. These findings are also contrary to those noted by Spreitzer and Snyder who found their index of involvement with sport to be inversely related to the dependent variables.

TABLE VI
 RANGES, MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND
 CORRELATIONS OF 12 VARIABLES WITH THE
 SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

Variables	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	r Social Factor	r Psycho- logical Factor
1. Sex	1-2	1.58	.49	-.16*	.02
2. Age	17-65	24.42	9.81	.15	.10
3. Income	1-7	4.83	1.74	-.03	-.05
4. Education	4-8	5.56	1.21	.22	.12
5. Hometown Size	1-4	2.50	1.14	.10	-.01
6. Religiosity	1-5	2.88	.97	.10	.11
7. Attendance	1-7	2.72	1.67	.41	.48
8. Watch/Listen	1-7	2.67	1.66	.29	.42
9. Participate	1-7	2.84	1.70	.24	.59
10. Diversion	1-7	2.54	1.45	.35	.29
11. Improves Health	1-7	1.76	1.36	.20	.27
12. Winning	1-7	5.28	1.85	.13	-.07

*With an N of 637, $r > .11$ at the .01 level of significance.

Extension Beyond Spreitzer
and Snyder's Research

In addition to the subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's research, the present study included an extension beyond their findings in order to embrace the affect of numerous other independent variables upon the perceived functions of sport. A summary of these additional relationships is included in Table VI. Utilizing the product-moment correlation and a .01 significance level, variables such as sex, family income, hometown size, self-reported religiosity, the degrees to which sport is seen as a positive means of diversion or an avenue toward better health, and one's orientation toward winning were viewed. Sex, income, and hometown size were not significantly related to the perceived functions of sport. Religiosity was significantly related to the psychological factor ($r = .11$), but not to the social factor. Those who viewed sport as a positive means of diversion from everyday life also perceived sport as serving social and psychological purposes ($r = .35$ and $r = .29$, respectively). Likewise, those who felt that participation in sport enhances one's health saw sport as functional in both realms ($r = .20$ and $r = .27$, respectively). Also, those who felt that winning was the most important thing in a competitive contest perceived sport as functional for society ($r = .13$), but not necessarily serving psychological purposes ($r = .07$). Finally, with regard to sex, female respondents significantly viewed sport as more socially functional than males ($r = .16$); this relationship, however, disappeared when viewing the psychological factor ($r = .02$).

Discussion

The findings of the subsequent test and extension of Spreitzer and Snyder's research provide some interesting observations. First, the involvement variables indicate that the more that one attends, participates in, or watches or listens to sport activities, the more likely one is to view sport as serving social or psychological purposes. These are among the strongest relationships found by the present research and in each case the perception of sport as psychologically functional is greater than the perception of sport as socially functional. This discrepancy is particularly distinct with regard to the degree of participation variables where there exists a .24 correlation with the social aspects of sport and a .59 correlation with the psychological aspects of sport. This would lead one to believe that, as far as the present research is concerned, involvement in sport has a greater influence psychologically than socially, yet makes a significant contribution in both realms.

Spreitzer and Snyder's study indicated an opposite emphasis as their involvement index showed a greater relationship to the social factor than to the psychological factor. Beyond this, unlike the present research, the direction of the relationships in their study was negative. This may possibly be explained by the different samples. The sample for the present study was drawn from students and faculty within the university setting where sport activities are highly esteemed and very much emphasized in the daily routine. In contrast, the sample for the Spreitzer and Snyder research was selected from the general population of Toledo, Ohio, and its suburbs; as such, it represented a more heterogeneous and aged cross section of people from an environment

where sport activities would seemingly carry a lesser impact. The discrepancy may also be explained, however, by a changing attitude concerning sport and physical activity over the past few years--an attitude visible in the emphasis placed on athletics and physical fitness in the literature and media, as well as other aspects of the American culture.

Another relationship worthy of note is that between one's attitude toward winning and their perception of the functions of sport. Popular notion and the literature in general seem to maintain that the greater the emphasis placed upon winning, the less likely it is that one will derive benefits in other areas from the athletic contest. The present research findings do not support this; no significant inverse relationship appears when viewing the orientation toward winning and the perception of the social and psychological functions of sport ($r = .13$ and $r = .07$, respectively). At best, the purported relationship is contradicted, particularly with regard to the social purposes of sport. The research indicates that the greater one's orientation toward winning, the more likely one is to perceive social benefits associated with sport. While statistically significant, however, this relationship is less than impressive substantively. Again, this apparent discrepancy may be reflective of the university-based sample and the importance that sport carries within this environment.

Somewhat stronger and more substantive relationships emerged with regard to one's perception of sport as a vehicle toward better health or diversion from everyday life and the perception of the social and psychological functions of sport. In both cases the relationships were positive and significant with the correlations above .20. While these findings are not surprising, it is interesting to note that the health

variable showed a stronger relationship with respect to the psychological factor compared to the social factor and that the reverse was true with regard to the diversion variable. This would lead one to assume that health is more important as a property of the psychological aspect of sport and that diversion is more important as a property of the social aspect of sport.

Overall, it must be noted that although many of the relationships presented in Table VI are significant, their substantive strength is somewhat suspect. An inspection of Table VI will demonstrate which variables these are. Also, as a point of emphasis, it is important to note that perhaps the greatest contribution of the subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's research lies with the factor analysis. The impressive congruence between their factor analysis of the 15 sport items and that of the present study would seem to enhance both the reliability and validity of the sport function factors.

CHAPTER V

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Identification of Issues

One of the objectives of this research was an analysis of the differences of perceptions of each derived function of sport.

The study has dealt with five basic descriptive variables in conjunction with the functions of sport. These variables included sex, student versus faculty status (ID), frequency of attendance, frequency of participation, and degree of involvement. Each one of these variables was represented by dichotomized categories:

ID--student/faculty
Sex--male/female
Attendance--high/low
Participation--high/low
Involvement--high/low

The final three of these, as stated earlier, were derived by summing the responses to the seven-category Likert-type items pertaining to the variables and dichotomizing the subjects into near-equal groups based on the median of the total.

The following is a presentation of the findings as they were sequentially observed. The results of the research are presented in Table VII and VIII dealing with category means for the different variables. As stated earlier, a lower score with regard to the means indicates a more favorable perception of the given function.

Analysis of variance was employed to discern if the category means were significantly different. A .01 level of significance with the appropriate degrees of freedom was utilized for this purpose.

Part One--ID

One's status as faculty or student (ID) was found to be related to the perception of two of the five functions of sport. The direction of the relationships was the same, however, in all cases. The following results were noted:

Self Expression--Student versus faculty status (ID) was found to be an insignificant variable in accounting for the perception of sport as an avenue for self expression. Only 2.04 of 937.62 units of variation were accounted for by ID. The mean difference between students and faculty was only .33 (2.83-3.16), with students having a slightly greater endorsement of the function.

Psychophysical Health--ID was found to be an insignificant variable with regard to the perception of the psychophysical health function of sport. Only 3.38 of 541.46 units of variation were explained by ID and the mean difference between students and faculty was only .28 (1.68-1.96), with students showing a slightly greater endorsement.

Social Integration--A significant difference between means concerning the perception of sport as a source of social integration was found with regard to ID. A difference of .37 (2.63-3.00) was present between the student and the faculty mean, with students exhibiting more endorsement. ID accounted for 10.15 of 724.80 units of variation.

Pride in Place--Student versus faculty status emerged as a significant variable in accounting for the perception of the pride in place

function. The mean difference was .84 (2.57-3.41), with students manifesting a greater endorsement. Overall, 46.55 of 908.86 units of variation were accounted for by ID.

Sex Roles--An insignificant difference between means was found with regard to the perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles by ID. A very low .35 of 263.71 units of variation was explained by ID and only .07 points separated student (3.94) from faculty (4.01) means.

Part Two--Sex

One's sex was found to be unrelated to the perception of the five functions of sport. As a means of providing understanding of the differences of perception of sport, the sex variable was not helpful. The following results were observed:

Self Expression--Sex was not found to be a significant variable in determining one's perception of this function of sport. A mere .51 of 937.62 units of variation were explained by sex and the mean difference between males and females was only .01 (1.89-1.90).

Psychophysical Health--Again, sex was not noted as a significant indicator--this time with regard to one's perception of the psychophysical health function. The mean difference between males and females was .20 (1.85-1.65), with females endorsing the function slightly more than males. Only 0.6 percent of the variation was accounted for by sex (3.69 of 541.46 units).

Pride in Place--The perception of sport as a provider of pride in place was not influenced by one's sex. The mean difference between males and females was only .11 (2.80-2.69), with females noting sport

as a stronger contributor of this function. Only 0.59 of 908.86 units of variation were accounted for by the sex variable.

Social Integration--Sex did not emerge as a significant variable with respect to the perception of social integration function. Females (2.54) had a more positive mean score than males (2.74), but an analysis of variance indicated that only 2.23 of 724.80 units of variation were explained by sex.

Sex Roles--One's sex was not found to be a significant factor in determining the perception of sport as a contributor to sex roles. A very small portion (0.08) of the total variation units (1263.71) were accounted for by sex, and males and females had an identical mean score (3.97) with regard to this function.

Part Three--ID and Sex

The variables of ID and sex taken together did not result in significant relationships with respect to the five functions of sport. The mean responses by these categories are depicted in Table VII. In each case, the amount of variation explained by the two variables was low. The ID and sex combination explained only 1.69 of 937.62 total units of variation when viewing the self expression function; 0.40 of 541.46 total units of variation when viewing the psychophysical function; 3.58 of 908.86 total units of variation when viewing the pride in place function; 0.86 of 724.80 total units of variation when viewing the social integration function; and 10.95 of 1263.71 total units of variation when viewing the sex roles function. New relationships with the endorsement of the functions of sport were not found by observing the two variables together.

TABLE VII
 MEANS AND N'S ON THE FUNCTIONS OF SPORT BY
 CATEGORIES OF ID, SEX, PARTICIPATION,
 ATTENDANCE, AND INVOLVEMENT

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
<u>ID</u>					
Students (N=510)	2.83	1.68	2.57	2.53	3.94
Faculty (N=127)	3.16	1.96	3.41	3.00	4.01
<u>Sex</u>					
Male (N=270)	2.90	1.85	2.80	2.74	3.97
Female (N=366)	2.89	1.65	2.69	2.54	3.97
<u>ID*Sex</u>					
Male Students (N=181)	2.74	1.76	2.53	2.57	3.94
Female Students (N=328)	2.88	1.63	2.59	2.50	3.94
Male Faculty (N=89)	3.21	2.05	3.36	3.08	4.03
Female Faculty (N=38)	3.04	1.77	3.53	2.80	4.18
<u>ID*Sex*Attendance</u>					
Male Students High Attendance (N=106)	2.48	1.63	2.29	2.41	3.90
Female Students High Attendance (N=186)	2.51	1.44	2.36	2.24	3.84
Male Students Low Attendance (N=72)	3.12	1.94	2.89	2.81	4.00

TABLE VII (Continued)

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Female Students Low Attendance (N=142)	3.35	1.88	2.89	2.86	4.08
Male Faculty High Attendance (N=30)	2.64	1.67	2.77	2.49	3.50
Female Faculty High Attendance (N=13)	2.76	1.26	2.82	2.15	3.50
Male Faculty Low Attendance (N=59)	3.49	2.24	3.66	3.39	4.30
Female Faculty Low Attendance (N=25)	3.18	2.04	3.89	3.13	4.54
<u>ID*Sex*Participation</u>					
Male Students High Participation (N=112)	2.40	1.58	2.32	2.37	3.90
Female Students High Participation (N=147)	2.28	1.46	2.46	2.16	3.69
Male Students Low Participation (N=65)	3.31	2.06	2.80	2.92	3.98
Female Students Low Participation (N=180)	3.36	1.77	2.70	2.80	4.15
Male Faculty Low Participation (N=45)	2.62	1.80	3.28	2.94	3.87
Female Faculty High Participation (N=12)	2.29	1.67	3.75	2.72	4.29

TABLE VII (Continued)

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Male Faculty Low Participation (N=44)	3.81	2.30	3.44	3.24	4.20
Female Faculty Low Participation (N=26)	3.38	1.82	3.42	2.83	4.13
<u>ID*Sex*Attendance*</u>					
<u>Participation</u>					
Male Students High Attendance High Participation (N=89)	2.39	1.58	2.17	2.32	3.79
Female Students High Attendance High Participation (N=111)	2.16	1.43	2.25	2.06	3.60
Male Students High Attendance Low Participation (N=16)	3.08	1.92	2.77	3.01	4.34
Female Students High Attendance Low Participation (N=75)	3.03	1.47	2.52	2.50	4.20
Male Students Low Attendance High Participation (N=22)	2.48	1.58	3.02	2.59	4.30
Female Students Low Attendance High Participation (N=36)	2.64	1.57	3.12	2.46	3.94
Male Students Low Attendance Low Participation (N=49)	3.39	2.10	2.82	2.89	3.87

TABLE VII (Continued)

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Female Students Low Attendance Low Participation (N=105)	3.60	1.98	2.82	3.01	4.11
Male Faculty High Attendance High Participation (N=19)	2.25	1.57	2.27	2.45	3.60
Female Faculty High Attendance High Participation (N=4)	1.50	1.05	1.92	1.85	2.50
Male Faculty High Attendance Low Participation (N=11)	3.32	1.85	2.42	2.54	3.32
Female Faculty High Attendance Low Participation (N=9)	3.31	1.36	3.22	2.29	3.94
Male Faculty Low Attendance High Participation (N=26)	2.88	1.97	3.51	3.29	4.06
Female Faculty Low Attendance High Participation (N=8)	2.69	1.98	4.67	3.15	5.19
Male Faculty Low Attendance Low Participation (N=33)	3.97	2.45	3.78	3.47	4.50
Female Faculty Low Attendance Low Participation (N=17)	3.41	2.07	3.53	3.12	4.24

TABLE VII (Continued)

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
<u>Involvement*Sex*ID</u>					
Male Students High Involvement (N=122)	2.44	1.59	2.27	2.41	3.86
Female Students High Involvement (N=148)	2.28	1.38	2.27	2.03	3.87
Male Students Low Involvement (N=59)	3.37	2.10	3.06	2.90	4.10
Female Students Low Involvement (N=180)	3.37	1.84	2.85	2.90	4.01
Male Faculty High Involvement (N=42)	2.69	1.75	2.85	2.80	3.81
Female Faculty High Involvement (N=13)	2.67	1.31	2.77	2.31	3.69
Male Faculty Low Involvement (N=47)	3.67	2.31	3.82	3.34	4.23
Female Faculty Low Involvement (N=25)	3.23	2.02	3.92	3.05	4.44

A lower score indicates higher endorsement.

Part Four--ID, Sex, and Attendance

The combination of the three variables of ID, sex, and frequency of attendance at sporting events failed to produce any significant relationships when viewed in conjunction with the five functions of sport. The combination accounted for only 1.91 of 937.62 total units of variation with regard to the self expression function; 0.05 of 541.46 total units of variation with regard to the psychophysical health function; 0.11 of 724.80 total units of variation with regard to the social integration function; 0.33 of 908.86 total units of variation with regard to the pride in place function; and 0.05 of 1263.71 total units of variation with regard to the sex roles function. Viewing the functions of sport with respect to the three variables collectively did not result in new understandings of them.

Part Five--ID, Sex, and Participation

The combination of the ID, sex, and frequency of participation in sport variable also failed to produce significant results when observed in conjunction with the five functions of sport. As in earlier cases, the amount of explained variation produced by the variables taken collectively was quite low. The three variables accounted for only 3.14 of 932.75 total units of variation with regard to the self expression function; 0.44 of 540.32 total units of variation with regard to the psychophysical health function; 0.97 of 720.27 total units of variation with regard to the social integration function; 0.98 of 903.18 total units of variation with regard to the pride in place function; and 3.99 of 1253.23 total units of variation with regard to the

sex roles function. Again, no new understandings of the perception of the functions of sport were noted by viewing these three variables collectively.

Part Six--ID, Sex, Attendance,
and Participation

The variables of ID, sex, frequency of attendance, and frequency of participation taken collectively resulted in significant relationships with respect to each of the five derived functions of sport. The following is a presentation of the findings:

Self Expression--Self expression proved to be significantly related to the above combination of variables with the category of female faculty members with high attendance and high participation frequencies endorsing the function the greatest ($\bar{X} = 1.50$); male faculty with low attendance and low participation frequencies endorsed the function the least ($\bar{X} = 3.97$). Overall, 216.38 of 931.95 total units of variation (23.2 percent) were explained by the variables taken collectively.

Psychophysical Health--A significant relationship was also found between the above combination of variables and the psychophysical health function of sport. Female faculty of high attendance and high participation maintained the greatest endorsement of this function also ($\bar{X} = 1.05$), while once again male faculty of low attendance and low participation showed the least endorsement ($\bar{X} = 2.45$). A total of 56.86 of 540.04 units of variation (10.5 percent) were attributed to the variables viewed collectively.

Pride in Place--The results indicated that the combination of ID, sex, attendance, and participation was significantly related to the

pride in place function. The greatest endorsement of this function once more came from the female faculty of high participation and attendance ($\bar{X} = 1.92$); the least endorsement, however, came from a different source--female faculty of high participation and low attendance ($\bar{X} = 4.67$). The attendance variable is obviously a crucial element in regard to this analysis. Overall, 17.9 percent of the variation was accounted for (160.92 of 900.18 total units).

Social Integration--The interaction between the above variables and the perception of the social integration function of sport proved to be significant, also. Female faculty with high frequencies of attendance and participation again had the lowest mean (1.85), while male faculty of low participation and low attendance had the highest mean (3.47). A total of 112.89 of 718.77 units of variation were explained by the combination of variables; this represents 15.7 percent.

Sex Roles--The analysis of variance on the relationship between the four variables and the perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles resulted in significant findings. Consistent with previous findings, the female faculty exhibiting high participation and attendance frequencies endorsed this function the most ($\bar{X} = 2.50$); as with the pride in place function, the category of female faculty with high participation and low attendance frequencies endorsed the function the least ($\bar{X} = 5.19$). Only a comparatively low 5.4 percent of the variation with regard to this function was explained by the collection of variables (67.40 of 1252.16 units of variation).

Part Seven--ID, Sex, and Involvement

Following the tests of the perception of the functions of sport by combinations of ID, sex, frequency of attendance, and frequency of participation, the variable of involvement was introduced. This variable, as noted in Chapter III, includes the attendance and participation items as well as others designed to indicate the respondent's overall involvement with sport. Since the attendance and participation variables in combination with ID and sex failed to produce significant results, yet were found to be significantly related to the functions of sport when in combination with each other and the ID and sex variables, it was felt that the involvement variable might shed some light on the perception of the functions. The combination of ID, sex, and involvement, however, failed to be significantly related to any of the five functions of sport.

Overall, the variation explained by the collectivity of variables with respect to the five functions was very low. They accounted for only 2.48 of 939.70 total units of variation with regard to the self expression function; 0.49 of 542.26 total units of variation with respect to the psychophysical health function; 1.17 of 912.24 total units of variation with regard to the pride in place function; 1.10 of 726.62 total units of variation with regard to the social integration function; and 1.19 of 1265.71 total units of variation with regard to the sex roles function.

The introduction of the involvement variable in conjunction with ID and sex obviously did not produce new relationships with regard to the functions of sport.

Part Eight--Attendance

In order to further explore the perception of the functions of sport, the involvement variables (attendance, participation, and index of involvement) were tested by themselves. This seemed to be the next logical step in the investigation since the combination of the ID and sex variables with the involvement measures had been found to produce no significant relationships.

The first of the involvement variables, frequency of attendance, proved to be significantly related to each of the derived functions of sport. As the means depicted in Table VIII indicate, those in the category of high frequency of attendance at sporting events consistently endorsed the functions of sport to a greater degree than those in the low attendance category. The following is a presentation of the findings:

Self Expression--Frequency of attendance was significantly related to the perception of sport as a means of self expression; those who attended sporting events more often endorsed this function more readily ($\bar{X} = 2.51$) than those who attended less frequently ($\bar{X} = 3.31$). The attendance variable was found to account for 97.16 of 937.62 total units of variation, or 10.4 percent.

Psychophysical Health--It was found that those who attended sporting events more often were more likely to perceive the psychophysical function of sport ($\bar{X} = 1.52$) than those who attended less ($\bar{X} = 2.01$). Attendance explained 33.63 of 541.46 total units of variation, or 6.2 percent.

Pride in Place--Once again, those who showed a high frequency of attendance at sporting events were more likely to support this function

TABLE VIII
 MEANS AND N'S ON FUNCTIONS OF SPORT BY CATEGORIES
 OF ATTENDANCE, PARTICIPATION, AND
 INVOLVEMENT WITH SPORTS

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
<u>Attendance</u>					
High (N=305)	2.51	1.52	2.39	2.31	3.82
Low (N=308)	3.31	2.01	3.13	2.98	4.14
<u>Participation</u>					
High (N=316)	2.37	1.56	2.58	2.36	3.77
Low (N=315)	3.41	1.90	2.88	2.89	4.11
<u>Involvement</u>					
High (N=315)	2.41	1.50	2.36	2.36	3.78
Low (N=311)	3.40	1.90	3.12	2.98	4.10

($\bar{X} = 2.39$) than those who showed a low frequency of attendance ($\bar{X} = 3.13$). A total of 9.4 percent of the variation was explained by the attendance variable, or 85.02 of 908.86 total units.

Social Integration--Frequency of attendance was also significantly related to the perception of sport as a facilitator of social integration. A high frequency of attendance at sporting events was associated with greater endorsement of this function of sport ($\bar{X} = 2.31$), while a low frequency of attendance was associated with less endorsement ($\bar{X} = 2.98$). Overall, 69.56 of 724.80 total units of variation (9.6 percent) were attributed to the attendance variable.

Sex Roles--The perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles was also significantly related to frequency of attendance. Those with a high frequency of attendance supported this function more ($\bar{X} = 3.82$) than those with a low frequency of attendance ($\bar{X} = 4.14$). Only a substantively low 1.3 percent of the variation of the sex role function was accounted for by the attendance variable, or a mere 16.66 of 1263.71 total units.

Part Nine--Participation

As with the attendance variable, participation proved to be significantly related to the five functions of sport. Once again, those who exhibited a high frequency of participation in athletic endeavors consistently endorsed the functions to a greater degree than those who were categorized in the low participation grouping. Participation, like attendance, seems to be a very salient element with regard to the perception of the functions of sport. The following is a presentation of the specific findings:

Self Expression--The findings of the research confirmed that those who participated in sports more frequently endorsed sports as a context for self expression ($\bar{X} = 2.37$) more than those who participated less frequently ($\bar{X} = 3.41$). Participation played a crucial role in the perception of this function as it accounted for 18.4 percent of the variation, or 171.60 of 932.75 total units.

Psychophysical Health--Although the relationship between frequency of participation and the perception of this function was also significant, only 3.5 percent of the variation was accounted for by the participation variable (18.91 of 540.32 total units). Still, the conclusion is that those who more often participate in sports are more apt to perceive it as psychophysically beneficial than those who do not participate as much. The former group had a mean score of 1.56 with regard to this function, while the latter group had a mean score of 1.90.

Pride in Place--Participation was also significantly related to the perception of sport as a source of pride in place, yet it explained only 1.6 percent of the variation with regard to this function (14.48 of 903.18 total units of variation). The relationship indicated by the analysis was that those who engaged in athletic pursuits more frequently viewed sport as providing pride in place more ($\bar{X} = 2.58$) than those who engaged in athletics less ($\bar{X} = 2.88$).

Social Integration--Frequency of participation proved to be significantly related to the perception of sport as a facilitator of social integration. A high frequency of participation was associated with a strong endorsement of this function ($\bar{X} = 2.36$), while a low frequency of participation was associated with a weak endorsement ($\bar{X} = 2.89$).

Overall, 43.26 of 720.27 total units of variation (6.0 percent) were attributed to the participation variable.

Sex Roles--Participation in sports was also related to the endorsement of sports as an enhancer of sex roles; only 1.2 percent of the total variation was explained by the participation variable, however, as it accounted for 15.22 of 1253.23 units. The relationship that was found indicated that those who more often participated in sport perceived it as an affirmer of sex roles moreso ($\bar{X} = 3.77$), than those who participated less ($\bar{X} = 4.11$).

Part Ten--Involvement

One's overall index of involvement was found to be significantly related to four of the five derived functions of sport; the only relationship found to be insignificant was that between involvement and the perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles. With regard to the significant relationships, it was noted that those who were categorized as more involved with sport endorsed the functions more than those who were involved less. The following is a presentation of the specific findings:

Self Expression--Involvement was positively related to the perception of sport as a context for self expression; those who were more involved endorsed this function more readily ($\bar{X} = 2.41$) than those who were less involved ($\bar{X} = 3.40$). A relatively large 16.6 percent of the variation was explained by the involvement variable, or 156.43 of 939.70 units of the self expression function's total variation.

Psychophysical Health--The findings of the research indicated that those who were more involved with sport were more apt to support this

function ($\bar{X} = 1.50$) than those who were less involved ($\bar{X} = 1.90$). A moderate amount of the variation with regard to the psychophysical health function was explained by the involvement variable; it accounted for 35.77 of 542.26 units of total variation, or 6.6 percent.

Pride in Place--A significant relationship was found between one's involvement in sport and the perception of it as a promoter of pride in place, also. The more involved category endorsed the function more ($\bar{X} = 2.36$) than the less involved category ($\bar{X} = 3.12$). Again, a moderate amount of the variation in the function was explained (10.0 percent), as the involvement variable produced 91.40 of 912.24 units of the total variation.

Social Integration--Involvement proved to be significantly related to this function of sport, too. Those who exhibited high involvement with sport were more apt to perceive it as a source of social integration ($\bar{X} = 2.36$) than those who exhibited low involvement ($\bar{X} = 2.98$). The involvement variable was responsible for 76.76 of 726.62 units of the total variation with regard to the social integration function, or 10.6 percent.

Sex Roles--As noted above, one's degree of involvement was not significantly related to the perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles. The direction of the insignificant relationship, however, was congruent with the previous findings in that those who were more involved with sport tended to endorse the function more. With regard to this particular function, involvement accounted for only 9.38 of 1265.71 total units of variation.

Part Eleven--Interactions of Sex with Attendance,
Participation, or Involvement

The results of the analysis of variance tests designed to locate interactions between the sex variable and the three different involvement measures with regard to the functions of sport produced few significant findings.

Sex and one's frequency of attendance at sporting events resulted in no significant interactions when viewing the five research functions; the two variables together acted as would be expected based upon information provided by each variable separately.

Sex and one's frequency of participation in sporting activities, however, accounted for one significant interaction when viewing the five research functions. With regard to the psychophysical function, the interaction of the two variables proved significant at the .01 level. Only 8.27 of 540.32 units of total variation (1.5 percent) were accounted for, though, suggesting that the interaction, while statistically significant, lacked substantive importance.

Two statistically significant interactions were noted between sex and the index of involvement variables with respect to the five research functions. These, however, were also substantively lacking. Interaction was found when viewing the psychophysical function, but only 9.00 of 542.26 units of total variation (1.7 percent) were explained. In addition, interaction was found when viewing the social integration function, but only 12.35 of 726.62 units of total variation (1.7 percent) were explained in this case.

Overall, the combination of sex with the three different involvement variables did not result in any substantial interactions in their relationship to the function of sport.

Part Twelve--Interactions of ID with Attendance,
Participation, or Involvement

The results of the analysis of variance tests designed to locate interactions between the ID variable and the three different involvement measures with regard to the functions of sport produced some noteworthy findings.

ID and one's frequency of attendance at sporting events resulted in one statistically significant interaction. When related to the function of sport as an enhancer of sex roles, ID and attendance taken collectively produced an interaction significant at the .01 level. Only 10.95 of 1263.71 units of total variation (0.8 percent) were accounted for, however, suggesting little substantive significance.

The interaction between ID and frequency of participation proved to be more interesting, as statistically significant and more substantively important results were found with regard to three of the five research functions. While no interaction was found with respect to the self expression and sex roles functions, the psychophysical health, pride in place, and social integration functions provided an interactional effect.

The means of the categories are depicted in Table IX. The psychophysical health aspect, for instance, was found to embody a significant interaction accounting for 7.38 of 540.32 units of total variation (1.4 percent). Based on the findings with respect to the

TABLE IX
 MEANS AND N'S OF SOME SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF SPORT
 BY ID AND PARTICIPATION OR INVOLVEMENT

Categories	Psychophysical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration
<u>ID*Participation</u>			
Students High Participation (N=259)	1.51	2.40	2.25
Students Low Participation (N=245)	1.85	2.73	2.83
Faculty High Participation (N=57)	1.77	3.38	2.89
Faculty Low Participation (N=70)	2.12	3.43	3.09
<u>ID*Involvement</u>			
Students High Involvement	--	2.27	2.20
Students Low Involvement	--	2.90	2.90
Faculty High Involvement	--	2.83	2.68
Faculty Low Involvement	--	3.85	3.24
A lower score indicates higher endorsement			

ID and participation variables separately, it would be expected that students with high participation in sporting activities would endorse the psychophysical health function the greatest while faculty with low participation would endorse the function the least; this held true. The interaction occurred within the intermediate categories, as the expectation that students with low participation would exhibit a higher endorsement than faculty with high participation was not met (see Table III).

Significant interaction was found in relation to the pride in place function, also, where once again the intermediate category expectations were not met. Contrary to what previous findings would lead one to believe, faculty with high participation exhibited higher endorsement than students with low participation (see Table III). Overall, 71.59 of 903.18 units of total variation were explained by the interaction, representing 7.9 percent of the total variation.

The perception of sport as a facilitator of social integration by ID and degree of participation resulted in a significant interaction, too. Of 720.27 units of total variation, 23.01 (3.2 percent) were explained by the interaction of the variables. As before, students with a high frequency of participation exhibited the strongest endorsement and the faculty with a low frequency of participation exhibited the weakest endorsement. As expected, it was in the intermediate categories that the interaction occurred (see Table III).

Two significant interactions were recognized among the five research functions with regard to ID and degree of involvement (see Table IX). The perception of sport as a facilitator of social integration in conjunction with ID and involvement demonstrated a significant

interaction accounting for 17.12 of 726.62 units of total variation (2.4 percent). Likewise, the perception of sport as an enhancer of one's pride in place when viewed by degree of involvement and ID resulted in a significant interaction accounting for 64.06 of 912.24 units of total variation (7.0 percent). As with the interactions noted earlier, it was in the intermediate categories that the interaction took place. As expected, students with a high degree of involvement and faculty with a low degree of involvement represented the strongest and weakest endorsements, respectively. Students with a low degree of involvement showed a lesser endorsement than faculty with a stronger endorsement, running contrary to what would be expected by the results of the ID and involvement categories viewed separately (see Table III).

CHAPTER VI

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS: ORIENTATION TOWARD WINNING AND RELIGIOSITY

Introduction

This chapter deals with the exploration of two additional variables--orientation toward winning and religiosity--and their relationship to the perceived functions of sport.

As noted in Chapter III, the respondent's orientation toward winning and religiosity were operationalized and measured by means of Likert-type items (see Table IV). A mean score reflecting one's orientation toward winning and one's degree of religiosity was derived by summing the item scores and dividing by the total number of respective items representing the two variables. A low mean score indicated a greater orientation toward winning, or higher degree of religiosity, and a high mean score indicated a weaker or lower characterization. Finally, for comparison purposes, the sample was dichotomized into categories representing the higher 50 percent and the lower 50 percent of the mean score for the religiosity variable, and those who had a strong or neutral orientation compared to those with a weak one as demonstrated by the category means with regard to the winning variable.

The following sections of the chapter note the relationships that were observed between one's orientation toward winning and their

perception of the functions of sport, and one's degree of religiosity and the perceptions of the functions of sport.

Orientation Toward Winning

Background

One aspect of sport that has been given much attention in the popular literature is the emphasis upon winning which is found associated with competitive athletics. It has been observed that to win within the rules is the chief objective of all competitive sports (Beisser, 1967). Common slogans such as "winning is the only thing" and "no one likes a loser" are a testimony to how deeply rooted the emphasis upon victory may be. As Coakley (1978:41) writes, "From Little League to professionals, the emphasis upon being 'Number 1' permeates American sport Players, teams, and coaches are evaluated and remembered by their win-loss records."

Recently, there has been a growing awareness of an emerging "win-at-all-costs" attitude (Coakley, 1978; Apgar, 1977), suggesting an over-emphasis upon winning. Some (Scott, 1973; Sage, 1974; Morford, 1973) have posited that such an orientation has caused a distortion of traditional values. Certainly, it may be offered for consideration that an over-emphasis upon winning might detract from the value of other aspects of sport. The thrust of sport as an aesthetic endeavor, as an agent of socialization, or as a promoter of cooperation and sociability may be undermined by a strong orientation toward winning.

While there has been much speculation concerning the effect an emphasis upon winning might have upon sport and the individuals involved

with it, there has been little empirical research in the area. One study by Apgar (1977) looked into the orientation toward winning among male high school students. In the face of much criticism concerning an over-emphasis upon winning within high school athletic programs (Morford, 1973; Scott, 1973), Apgar (1977:258) found that "male high school students did not over-emphasize winning to the detriment or exclusion of other dimensions of interscholastic athletics." He did note, however, that male athletes exhibited a significantly stronger attitude toward winning than their nonathlete counterpart. Even so, it is interesting to note that the athletic group did not rate the pursuit of victory any higher as a dimension of athletics than the nonathletic group; both groups ranked it sixth among eight possible dimensions.

In a further extension of the research, Apgar concluded that there was no difference in the orientation toward winning according to the type of activity pursued among athletes (team versus individual sports).

Another attempt to test empirically the orientation toward winning and its relationship to other social phenomena was conducted by Kidd and Woodman (1975). In their study they sought to investigate orientation toward winning by sex. Using a collegiate sample, their findings indicated that females tended to place a lesser emphasis upon winning in the athletic contest than males. A further exploration demonstrated that women from more urbanized areas placed a greater emphasis upon winning than those from more rural backgrounds. No significant difference between rural or urban background was found among males. Also, females with more traditional college majors (such as social sciences

and education) showed a lesser orientation than those with nontraditional female college majors (such as the biological or physical sciences).

Finally, the researchers found that in viewing marital status, the orientation toward winning was less for married male and female respondents than for their single counterparts, with the married female group possessing the weakest orientation toward winning of all.

Present Study

The present study sought to explore the relationship between the sample's orientation toward winning and their perception of the functions of sport, particularly in conjunction with the variables of sex and ID. One's orientation toward winning was measured by means of two research items (see Table IV). The category means that were found are presented in Table X. An analysis of variance was performed on the data, and results of which are portrayed in Table XI.

The findings of the research indicate that there exists a significant relationship ($p < .01$) between orientation toward winning and three of the five derived functions of sport: psychophysical health, pride in place, and sex roles. Insignificant relationships were found with regard to the functions of self expression and social integration.

With regard to psychophysical health, it was found that those with a stronger orientation toward winning endorsed this function less than those with a weaker orientation. The winning variable accounted for 9.70 of 542.26 total units of variation, or 1.78 percent.

Dealing with the pride in place functions, it was found that those with a strong orientation toward winning endorsed this function more

TABLE X
 MEANS AND N'S ON FUNCTIONS OF SPORT BY
 CATEGORIES OF ID, SEX, ORIENTATION
 TOWARD WINNING AND RELIGIOSITY

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
<u>Orientation Toward</u>					
<u>Winning</u>					
Male Students High Orientation (N=29)	2.75	1.84	2.33	2.44	3.73
Female Students High Orientation (N=98)	2.96	1.84	2.40	2.50	3.50
Male Students Low Orientation (N=102)	2.74	1.69	2.68	2.67	4.10
Female Students Low Orientation (N=230)	2.84	1.54	2.67	2.51	4.13
Male Faculty High Orientation (N=32)	3.39	2.17	3.18	3.23	3.91
Female Faculty High Orientation (N=7)	3.48	2.63	3.52	2.63	3.07
Male Faculty Low Orientation (N=57)	3.09	1.98	3.46	3.00	4.10
Female Faculty Low Orientation (N=31)	2.94	1.58	3.53	2.83	4.44
<u>Religiosity</u>					
Male Students High Religiosity (N=75)	2.62	1.63	2.32	2.35	3.89

TABLE X (Continued)

Categories	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Female Students High Religiosity (N=181)	2.62	1.58	2.52	2.41	3.98
Male Students Low Religiosity (N=106)	2.83	1.85	2.68	2.72	3.98
Female Students Low Religiosity (N=146)	2.94	1.70	2.68	2.63	3.91
Male Faculty High Religiosity (N=36)	3.11	1.92	3.13	2.83	4.07
Female Faculty High Religiosity (N=22)	2.89	1.62	3.59	2.59	3.98
Male Faculty Low Religiosity (N=52)	3.26	2.13	3.52	3.25	4.01
Female Faculty Low Religiosity (n=16)	3.24	1.99	3.44	3.08	4.47

A lower mean score indicates greater endorsement.

TABLE XI
 RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE FUNCTIONS
 OF SPORT BY ORIENTATION TOWARD
 WINNING, ID, AND SEX

	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Winning	N.S.	.01	.01	N.S.	.01
ID*Winning	.01	.01	N.S.	.01	N.S.
Sex*Winning	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
ID*Sex*Winning	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

TABLE XII
 RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE FUNCTIONS
 OF SPORT BY RELIGIOSITY, ID, AND SEX

	Self Expression	Psycho- Physical Health	Pride in Place	Social Integration	Sex Roles
Religiosity	N.S.	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
ID*Religiosity	N.S.	.01	.01	.01	N.S.
Sex*Religiosity	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
ID*Sex*Religiosity	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

N.S. = No significant relation was found.

than those with a weak orientation. Overall, the winning variable accounted for 14.10 of 912.24 total units of variation, or 1.55 percent.

Looking at the sex role function, it was recognized that those with a stronger orientation endorsed this function of sport more than those with a weak orientation. A total of 37.21 of 1265.71 units of variation were explained by the orientation toward winning variable. This represents 2.94 percent.

Overall, as the means portrayed in Table X indicate, regardless of one's orientation toward winning, the sample tended to endorse the five functions of sport. This holds true even when viewing the effect of ID and/or sex. Few significant interactions were located by the analysis of variance (see Table XI). None were found when combining the sex variable with orientation toward winning, or in conjunction with ID and orientation toward winning.

The significant interactions that did appear were noted between ID and orientation toward winning with regard to the self expression, psychophysical health, and social integration functions. Orientation toward winning was not significantly related to the self expression or social integration functions when viewed by themselves, but when controlling for faculty or student status significant relationships emerged. In the case of the psychophysical health function, a significant relationship was observed with regard to the winning variable by itself and in conjunction with ID. As with the first order relationships, the significant interactions failed to account for a substantial amount of variation.

Discussion

As noted earlier (see Table IV), the sample's overall orientation toward winning was weak. The distribution of responses to the items assigned to measure the phenomenon was skewed toward the nonendorsement extreme. This is somewhat in agreement with Apgar's (1977) research in which he found that male high school students did not over-emphasize the pursuit of victory and ranked it sixth out of eight possible dimensions of sport.

The results of the present research, however, may be qualified. Perhaps the items designed to research one's orientation toward winning were not valid; in particular, the time placement of the research might have had an invalidating effect. In the midst of growing controversy concerning an over-emphasis upon a "win-at-all-costs" philosophy present in sport, respondents may have been over-reacting. It may also be suggested, however, that perhaps such a philosophy is a creation of the media and does not exist in the minds of the people. With these points in mind, the following discussion is presented.

In viewing the orientation toward winning in conjunction with the present research's five functions of sport, mixed results were noted. Popular literature and the perspective of some writers (Scott, 1973; Morford, 1973) suggest that a strong orientation toward winning might reduce the recognition of the functional aspects of sport. This was not found to be the case in all instances with regard to the present research. A strong orientation toward winning, for instance, was found to be positively and significantly related to the endorsement of sport as a source of pride in place. This was not totally unexpected;

however, as the review of literature dealing with this function (see Chapter II) indicates, one's sense of pride in place is often contingent upon the success of its athletic teams.

Orientation toward winning was also positively related to the endorsement of sport as an enhancer of sex roles. The implication here is that those who place a premium upon victory also view sport as a way of achieving masculinity and femininity. The notion that winning and masculinity are positively related is a popular one and is supported by the present research. Popular perspective, however, would lead one to believe that femininity might be undermined by a strong orientation toward winning, as the traditional female role has been characterized as less competitive (Kidd and Woodman, 1975). The present research does not necessarily support this. This may be due to two factors.

First, because it is a composite of both male and female oriented items, the endorsement of the sex role function does not distinguish between the endorsement of the male role and the endorsement of the female role individually. In the analysis it is assumed that the respondent who positively endorses the function does so with near equal emphasis upon male and female items. It may be, however, that a strong endorsement of the male-related item carries the weight for a neutral or slightly weak female-related item, resulting in a distortion of effect.

A second possibility is that the unexpected results echo a changing perspective concerning the female role in sport. Women's athletics are becoming more prominent and a strong orientation toward winning may be becoming more within the female domain. At the very least, the results may reflect an awareness of the recent notoriety

given to the shifting role of the female. Those with a strong orientation toward winning may be more sensitive to sport as an avenue whereby women may actualize their popularized liberated and relatively more assertive role.

Beyond this, it is also important to note a perceived methodological problem with regard to this function. With all of the recent publicity given to women's athletics and women's liberation, the placing of the somewhat obtrusive male and female items back to back on the questionnaire schedule may have had a biasing effect. The subjects may have felt compelled to respond similarly to both items as a reaction to the emphasis upon women's equality; the placement of the items may have affected this.

A third function that was significantly related to the orientation toward winning variable was that of psychophysical health; the relationship, however, was an inverse one. This seemingly supports the notion stated earlier that an emphasis upon winning may detract from other functions sport might serve. Whereas the sample in general recognized sports as a contributor to one's psychophysical well-being, those with a strong orientation toward winning were less likely to endorse this function. Apparently those who place a greater emphasis upon the pursuit of victory do not perceive psychophysical benefits deriving from sport. For them the outcome of the contest is of paramount importance, superseding the psychological and physical attributes.

As noted earlier, some interactions were found when viewing the relationship between the functions of sport and orientation toward winning with regard to ID. No interactions were found when the sex variable was employed. This interactional pattern is not totally

unexpected, though, as earlier results (see Chapter V) suggest that the respondents' status as student or faculty does have some affect upon the perception of the functions of sport while sex does not. The combination of either variable or both together in conjunction with other relationships resulted in similar interactions (or lack of them) to those found here.

Overall, there were few interactions and those that did occur failed to account for a substantive amount of the total variation.

Religiosity

Background

Another aspect of sport that has received attention is its relationship to religion. Eitzen (1979:333) has noted that there is a strong possibility that sport is a functional equivalent to religion. Like religion, sport provides idols, shrines, pilgrimages, rituals, fanatic leaders, and testimony.

Novak (1976:15) observed that sports are based on "a deep natural impulse that is radically religious: an impulse of freedom, respect for ritual limits, a zest for symbolic meaning, and a longing for perfection." He further expounds that sports are organized and dramatized in a religious way. As with religion, sports have their rituals, vestments, and excitement of anticipation. They serve religious functions by satisfying a deep human hunger and providing an experience of at least a pagan sense of godliness; sports impart religious qualities of heart and soul.

Like religion, sports are organized and structured. There are formalized behaviors and expectations, and they demonstrate a right and a wrong way of doing things. Within this framework unacceptable actions are distinguished from the acceptable ones. Failure to "play by the rules" meets with such indignation and public outrage so as to suggest that sports are more religious in their basis than they are entertainment; as Novak (1976) writes, if they were simply entertainment, why should we care?

To succeed in the sport requires the maximization of one's given talents. Beyond this it usually requires such qualities as self-denial, strength of will, and dedication--characteristics which are common to and extolled by most religions.

Further parallels may be drawn. Eitzen (1979), for instance, notes that sport, like religion, has its belief in mysticism or faith in supernatural forces or powers which transcend the normal human experience. It is often felt that the competitor with the greatest amount of "heart" or "spirit" will win and that such intangible entities as "team spirit" or "momentum" will have a decided affect upon the outcome of any athletic contest. The athletes themselves often rely on a wise assortment of fetishes, rituals, and observances of taboos which supposedly influence their performance (Gmelch, 1971).

A relationship also exists between sport and religion based upon the reciprocal uses each has for the other (Eitzen, 1976). For instance, sport legitimizes itself through religious invocations during pregame rituals. Religion has also been used in sports to motivate athletes beyond themselves toward stellar performances. Many

professional teams maintain team chaplains, engage in team prayers, and schedule team chapel services.

Religion employs sport for its purposes, also. Most recognizably, sport has been used as a device to gain converts. Through maintaining teams, leagues, and athletic facilities, churches have encouraged people to become associated with them. In addition, as Deford (1976) observes, there has been a recent surge of religious organizations designed specifically for athletes, such as the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Athletes in Action, and Pro Athletes Outreach. Once again, the purpose of these organizations is to win converts.

In summary, the parallels between religion and sport are many; whereas it is obvious that sport is not the highest form of religion, it certainly shares a recognizable commonality with it.

Present Study

The present research sought to investigate the relationship between religiosity and the perception of the functions of sport. Based upon the literature it would follow that those who had a strong commitment to religion (religiosity) might also demonstrate a strong endorsement of the functions of sport. As with the orientation toward winning variable, ID and sex were utilized in the analysis. One's degree of religiosity represented a composite index of six research items (see Table IV). The results of an analysis of variance test of the variables is presented in Table XII.

The findings of the research indicate that there exists a significant relationship ($p < .01$) between religiosity and three of the five derived functions of sport: psychophysical health, pride in place, and

social integration. Insignificant relationships were found with regard to the functions of self expression and sex roles.

With regard to psychophysical health, it was found that those exhibiting a greater degree of religiosity endorsed this function more than those exhibiting a weaker degree. Religiosity accounted for 6.12 of 541.53 total units of variation, or 1.13 percent.

Dealing with the pride in place function, it was found that those exhibiting a high degree of religiosity again endorsed the function. Overall, 9.00 of 912.16 total units of variation were accounted for by the religiosity variable. This represents .99 percent.

Looking at the social integration function, it was recognized that those showing a greater degree of religiosity also endorsed this function more than those with a lesser degree. A total of 16.69 of 724.52 units of variation were explained by religiosity; this represents 2.30 percent.

As the means depicted in Table X demonstrate, regardless of one's degree of religiosity, the sample in general tended to endorse the five functions of sport. This holds true even when the variables of sex and ID are taken into account. Few significant interactions were found through the analysis of variance (see Table XII). None were found when viewing the sex variable with religiosity or in conjunction with ID and religiosity.

Those interactions that were found existed between ID and religiosity with regard to the psychophysical health, pride in place, and social integration functions. These are the same three functions which were significantly related to the religiosity variable by itself. One's

status as faculty or student has an interactive effect upon religiosity's explanatory power with regard to the three functions.

Discussion

The relationships that were found in viewing the religiosity variable indicate some support for the notion that religion and sport are related. Significant relationships in the anticipated direction were found in three of the five functions of sport; those in the high religiosity category endorsed the functions more than those in the low religiosity category. The results with regard to the other two functions (self expression and sex roles) indicate that although religiosity was not significantly related, the findings were not contrary to expectations. In other words, they were not related to religiosity in directions opposite of what would be expected.

The overall conclusion, then, is that those who are more religious tend to see sports as more functional. The basis for this may well be that, as the literature suggests, sport serves some of the same perceived functions that religion does. As with the orientation toward winning variable, however, the variation explained by religiosity was low.

In particular, it was noted that religiosity was positively related to the psychophysical health function. For those who exhibit a high degree of religiosity, sport, like religion, may be seen as a stabilizing force. Through it, one experiences emotional benefits, such as release of tensions, and is able to overcome loneliness through vicarious or active participation--all of which can provide a sense of personal equilibrium. Beyond this, the psychophysical function notes

that sport provides physical well-being; since a basic religious contention is that the body and soul are immutably intertwined ("The body is the temple of the soul"), it follows that those who are highly religious might extoll the benefits that sport has for the body. Viewing these aspects of the psychophysical functions of sport collectively, it is not surprising that those with a high degree of religiosity endorsed this function.

Religiosity was also positively related to the pride in place function of sport; those who were highly religious tended to view sport as providing a sense of pride in a community or locale more than those who were not as religious. This may be due to the notion that religion itself is basically an ethnocentric phenomenon. Many religions tend to elevate their own perspectives and religious ideologies to the exclusion of others. Often times a territory imperative may be involved (for example, Southern Baptist). The same people who derive a sense of pride from their religious affirmation may perceive similar functions operating in sport.

A third function that was positively related to religiosity was that of social integration. This relationship may be best explained by the idea that religion instills in one an appreciation of others, a contextual basis for the nurturing of friendships, an emphasis upon cooperation, and an understanding of behaviors that are important for success in life. These are the same things which are categorized under the social integration function. The parallels between this function of sport and religiosity are perhaps the most lucid of all. It would follow that one who subscribes to religious perspectives would also endorse the social integration function.

As noted earlier, the self expression function and the sex role function of sport were not related to religiosity. The lack of a relationship dealing with self expression may be explained by the notion that many specific religions differ with regard to the individual's expressive participation; for instance, the relatively dogma-free Unitarian Church most certainly is more tolerant and accepting of self expression than Catholicism, which is more dogma-oriented. Since the religiosity variable dealt with all religions uniformly and did not differentiate between them, it would follow that a positive orientation toward self expression might not be found. A highly religious Catholic may be less supportive of the self expression function than a relatively nonreligious Unitarian. Perhaps controlling for specific religions would result in a significant relationship. In any case, it is suggested that perhaps religion and not religiosity is a more crucial factor here.

The fact that religiosity was not related to sport as an enhancer of sex roles may well be an artifact of the methodological problems associated with this function. As recognized earlier, the recent emphasis upon women's athletics and upon the shifting role of the female, along with the sequential placing of the obtrusive items designed to measure this function, may have had a biasing effect upon its endorsement.

One who is highly religious is often assumed to be conservative and, thus, would be assumed to be less endorsing of the sex role function--in particular, the notion that sport enhances femininity, an idea which is associated with the liberation of the female role. The lack of an inverse relationship emerging between religiosity and this

function may be due to the bias mentioned above. It may also be due to the inconsistency, from a religious perspective, of two items comprising the function.

It is suggested that viewing religiosity in conjunction with the male-related and female-related items separately might be profitable. It is also suggested that perhaps controlling for religion, as noted with regard to the self expression function, might be worthwhile, too.

As noted previously, some interactions were located when viewing the relationship between the functions of sport and religiosity with regard to ID. No interactions were found when the sex variable was viewed. Once again, as the findings in Chapter V will attest, this is not totally unexpected. The respondent's status as faculty or student has an affect upon the perception of sport functions while one's sex does not. Previously, the combination of either variable or both together in conjunction with other relationships resulted in similar interactions (or lack of them) to those noted here.

An interesting aspect is that interactions were found with regard to ID for the same three functions that were related to religiosity by itself. The implication here is that ID and religiosity interacted with each other to explain more variation in the functions than would be expected.

Overall, however, there were few interactions and those which did occur failed to account for a substantial amount of the total variation.

Summary

This chapter sought to discern the relationship between the perception of the findings of sport and one's orientation toward winning.

In addition, the relationship between one's degree of religiosity and their perception of the functions of sport was investigated.

With regard to the winning variable, the findings suggests that the greater the importance one places upon victory in an athletic contest, the more likely one is to perceive sport as a source of pride in place or enhancer of sex roles. Also, the stronger the orientation toward winning one maintains, the less likely one is to perceive psychophysical benefits deriving from sport. Insignificant relationships were noted between the winning variable and the social integration and self expression functions. Overall, the results cast doubt upon the popular perspective that a strong orientation toward winning in sport undermines other dimensions which it has to offer.

With regard to the religiosity variable, the findings indicate that the more religious one is, the more likely it is that one will perceive sport as an avenue to psychophysical health, as a social integrating force, and as a source of pride in place. Insignificant relationships were noted between religiosity and the self expression and sex role functions. The conclusion surmised from these findings is that sport may indeed, as the literature suggests, serve parallel purposes with religion.

In viewing the relationships, few interactions were found with the introduction of the ID variable and none were found with respect to sex.

As a final point, it seems necessary to note that while the relationships noted above were significant and generally in the expected direction, the variation explained was substantially low.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The major purpose of this research was to gain a better understanding of the perception of sport. While scholars in many fields have recognized the growing impact of sport in everyday life, very little has been done to substantiate its influence. With sport increasingly demanding more of the populace's leisure time, money, and energy, it would seem that there is a feeling among the populace that sport provides benefits for the individual and society. The present inquiry sought to locate and measure the perception of these benefits.

Utilizing the questionnaire method of research, responses to Likert-type items designed to measure the perception of sport were gathered from 637 students and faculty at Oklahoma State University. In particular, certain functions of sport suggested by the literature were operationalized and investigated. In addition, a subsequent examination of a previous study was performed. The sample's responses to the research items were compared with regard to a number of descriptive variables and indices. Factor analysis, Pearson's correlation, and analysis of variance was utilized for the purpose of locating relationships; the findings of these statistical tests are related in Chapter III through Chapter VI. The following are general discussions and considerations of those findings.

Interpretation of Findings

As detailed in Chapter III, the research objectives of this study included the derivation and measurement of some functions of sport suggested by the review of literature, a subsequent test of Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) research on the psychosocial functions of sport, and the analysis of the perceptions of the functions of sport with respect to the different descriptive variables.

The Derivation of the Functions of Sport Items

Based on the review of literature, nine basic functions of sport were operationalized by means of 26 questionnaire items and tested by means of a factor analysis. The results of the test indicated that five of the items were not valid as measures of any particular aspect of sport and that the original nine functions were not concisely observed. Instead, five functions of sport were perceived by the sample.

Four of the five functions shared enough of a common base with some of the proposed functions that it was decided to keep their rubric; they were denoted as self expression, pride in place, social integration, and sex roles. In most cases, the items comprising these functions were at least somewhat different than what was originally envisioned. A fifth function that emerged was a composite of numerous items and termed psychophysical health. Overall, the functions did not distinctly align themselves into broader categories of psychological or social functions. Instead, there was some overlap, suggesting the functions satisfied conditions of both.

These five functions, derived from the sample's perception of items designed to measure the proposed nine, were utilized throughout the research.

The question arises, however, "why were the original nine functions not actualized?" One obvious answer is that they may not have been operationalized properly. Although painstaking attempts were made to concisely denote the functions with items pertaining to their specific content, the attempts may have fallen short.

Another explanation may be that the given sample simply did not perceive sport as serving the same purposes as those noted from the review of the literature. This indicates either a property of the sample (perhaps those involved with the university setting have different perceptions than the populace in general) or an inaccuracy among the speculations of the reviewed researchers as to how sport operates, or perhaps both.

What has emerged with regard to this particular research objective is a set of functions of sport which are empirically based and confirmed. Obviously, the worth of these functions may be further ascertained, and it is suggested that a retest of the research items with different samples may accomplish this.

The Subsequent Test of Spreitzer and Snyder's Research

Another research objective was the subsequent examination of Spreitzer and Snyder's (1975) research into the psychophysical functions of sport. As depicted in Chapter IV, the results of this segment of the research were quite noteworthy.

Utilizing the same statistical techniques as Sprietzer and Snyder to analyze the sample's endorsement of their 15 research items, similar dimensions were located. As with their study, a factor analysis of the items resulted in two basic dimensions: psychological and social. A third dimension consisting of two items not significant in Spreitzer and Snyder's study did emerge, however, but failed to account for much variation. Of particular interest was the fact that the rest of the Spreitzer and Snyder items in the present study aligned themselves with the two dimensions in an identical manner to the items in the Spreitzer and Snyder research; even the factor loadings were similar.

Differences between the studies occurred, however, when viewing the affect of independent variables. For instance, unlike Sprietzer and Snyder's research, age and involvement with sports were positively related to the endorsement of the psychological and social dimensions. It is suggested that the discrepancies may be due to a number of factors, the foremost of which is the fact that the samples differed greatly. The present research was conducted with a university sample and was more homogeneous and younger. The setting was one where the respondent was very likely to come in contact with athletics on a regular basis as they play a prominent role in collegiate life. Sports tend to be esteemed and emphasized in the daily routine. Sprietzer and Snyder's sample was more aged and heterogeneous, coming from an environment where sports probably carry less impact. Thus, it might be expected that involvement with sport would be accompanied by positive orientations in a university setting, but by negative ones in a nonuniversity setting. Youth, outside the university backdrop or departing from it, might become disenchanted with the presumed benefits of sport activities over time.

This explanation is further substantiated by the finding in the subsequent test that attendance, watching or listening to, and participation in sport activities were positively correlated with the perception of the psychological and social functions of sport. Since the university provides a readily available context for such involvement, it is not surprising that the present sample endorsed the dimensions.

Another explanation might be that orientation within the nonuniversity environment may have changed with the recent emphasis on health and physical activity.

The overall contribution of the subsequent test was that it provided substantial supportive evidence that Spreitzer and Snyder's research items were indeed aligned to psychological and social provinces of sport. With this confirmed, it leads the way for the discovery and delineation of more specific aspects of sport within the psychological or social dimensions, to which end the major thrust of this dissertation was aimed.

In addition, the subsequent test seemed to indicate the importance of involvement variables upon the perception of sport, particularly with regard to the psychological aspects. Across the different variables of frequency of attendance, watching or listening, or participation in sporting activities, those who more often engaged, perceived more benefits deriving from sport. This may be due to the notion that these "involved" persons are in a position to better observe how sport operates.

Spreitzer and Snyder operationalized involvement by means of only one variable designed to indicate, among other things, the elements noted above. The present research's measurement of involvement by

separate indicators resulted in different perceptions, suggesting that perhaps Spreitzer and Snyder's conceptualization was not specific enough. It would seem that by breaking involvement down into its component parts a more accurate representation was found. As suggested by these results and later investigated in further research, different types of involvement might be related to different perceptions of the functions of sport.

Analysis of the Derived Functions

The perceptions of the five functions of sport derived from analysis of the research items were viewed in conjunction with the descriptive variables of ID, sex, separate indicators of involvement, orientation toward winning, and religiosity. Overall, the sample tended to perceive sport as supportive of the five functions: That is, sport provided those certain services or benefits suggested by the analysis.

ID. First of all, with regard to ID, mixed results were found. One's status as faculty or student had an effect on the perception of sport as a facilitator of social integration and as a source of pride in place; it was not related to the perception of sport as a context for self expression, avenue toward psychophysical health, or enhancer of sex roles. The direction of the relationships, however, was the same in all cases as students endorsed the functions more than faculty.

The pattern which was shown may be based on the fact that students are more involved with sport and, as such, are in a better situation to recognize its influence. Within the university setting where people from numerous backgrounds come together, students may be particularly

keen to sport as a unifying element. It serves as a common denominator, bringing people together and fostering friendships. A pickup game of basketball or attendance at a football game is a sure way to make new associations.

In other words, students may experience a closer and more intense involvement with athletics. Through physical education classes, intramural participation, intercollegiate programs, as well as the recent popularity of physical fitness programs among youth, students seem to be in a position to experience more immediate effects from sport--one of which is social integration.

Related to this is the notion that students would seemingly tend to form stronger identifications with their school than the faculty since it often represents the single most dominant element in their lives for a certain period of time. Because of this, they may be more apt to note a pride in place deriving from sport--the success of the schools athletic teams has a bearing on some aspects of its prestige and school spirit.

Age and education may also have an influence in explaining why students' perceptions were greater. Sport, while becoming more common to all age groups, is still generally a youth-oriented enterprise; since the student faction of the research was younger, it might follow that they would be more attuned to its benefits. Likewise, students, while being less educated, might be less apt to recognize or criticize the "warts" and "wrinkles" of sport.

In summary, the ID variable indicated that students generally recognized sports as more functional than faculty. One crucial element that might shed some additional light upon the findings is the

inspection of the age variable; it may be this, and not the status as faculty or student, that has true impact here.

Sex. With respect to the sex variable, the results consistently indicated that one's sex was not a crucial factor influencing their perceptions of sport; no significant differences of perceptions of the five functions were found by sex.

The similarities of perceptions may in part be explained by the growing involvement of women in sports. What was once a traditionally male domain has become increasingly a province of the female, too. With women's increased involvement in sport--both vicariously and actively--may have come a convergence toward male perceptions.

One point that needs to be noted, however, is that the women in the present study's sample are a unique group in that they are all in some way associated with the university setting. This may have an impact upon their perception since, as observed previously, sports play an important role here--more than what might be observed in the community at large. In other words, the university setting may have an affect upon inducing more endorsement with regard to women, yet not necessarily affect male endorsement.

The basic implication of the study, however, is that females and males perceive the functions of sport in a like fashion. An interesting aspect of this is that it is an extension beyond findings suggested by the literature which affirm similarities between male and female athletes (Snyder and Sprietzer, 1978), yet neglect to note similarities between the male and female populations in general. If anything, it suggests that sport is no longer a "closed shop" for males.

Involvement Variable. Perhaps the most noteworthy findings with regard to the derived functions of sport came when analyzing the involvement variables. Frequency of attendance, participation, and overall involvement were each positively related to the endorsement of the functions--the only exception came when viewing the relationship between overall involvement and the sex roles function.

The obvious assumption to be made from this is that participating in, attending, or having greater involvement with sport places one in a situation where he or she may be better able to experience and/or notice how sport operates. Those less involved with sport most likely have less access to as complete a knowledge of it.

It may also be that those who are expending time, energy, and money in the sphere of sport are more prone to note functions deriving from sport as a means of rationalizing such investments. Even if sport does not provide services and benefits for the individual and society in actuality, it might be necessary to at least perceive that it does.

The major thrust of the research with regard to the involvement variables is that the findings place doubt upon the observation of many writers which maintains that close contact with sport may awaken one to its failings (Conant, 1961; Coakley, 1968; Michener, 1976; Ogilvie and Tutko, 1971; Orlock, 1974, etc.). While most of these same writers note the benefits of sport, they also delineate some of the shortcomings encountered by those involved with it. The present study does not support this.

Also, in noting the amount of variation explained by the involvement variables in relation to the given functions, attendance, participation, and overall involvement were the most crucial factors

influencing the perceptions. They were far and away more enlightening than either ID or sex, and surpassed orientation toward winning and religiosity, also.

Interactions. An attempt to locate possible interactions among combinations of the ID, sex, and involvement variables with respect to the five functions of sport produced few noteworthy findings; few interactions occurred, and those which did occur accounted for only slight amounts of the variation in the perception of the functions. What this implies is that, in general, the variables combined to relate to the functions as would be expected based upon information provided by viewing the variables separately.

One interaction which did occur that warrants closer inspection was that between the ID, sex, participation, and attendance variables. Viewing these variables collectively resulted in female faculty of high participation and high attendance consistently endorsing the functions more than all other possible groups. Based on the evidence from the individual variables it would probably be expected that female students of high participation and attendance show the greatest endorsement. This particular female faculty group is somehow different. Perhaps they endorse the functions more because their high involvement represents a greater commitment due to their status as female and faculty--both of which would seemingly be nonsupportive of such involvement. In other words, their strong endorsements may be an over-rationalization justifying their interest. Related to this, the possibility exists that this category consisted of female faculty in the Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Science (HPELS) Department; as such, the response pattern

may be a manifestation of their career orientation, which is unique when compared to other female faculty. In addition, it is important to note that this category represented only four respondents, making the results somewhat suspect.

An interesting point to note, however, is that in this same set of interactions, the category with the lowest endorsement of two of the five functions was female faculty of high participation and low attendance. Only the frequency of attendance was different from the high endorsing category. With regard to the other functions, it was the male faculty of low participation and low attendance who endorsed the least (as would probably be expected).

For some reason, the attendance variable influenced different perceptions with respect to the pride in place and sex roles function for the female faculty with high participation category. Once again, the size of the category was small ($N = 8$), placing some doubt upon the results. It may also be that in order to perceive sport as enhancing sex roles or pride in place, the female faculty need to observe sport in action, not simply participate.

Also worthy of noting are the interactions which occurred between ID and participation (with regard to three of the five functions) and between ID and the index of involvement (with regard to two of the five functions). While the variation explained by these interactions was relatively low, it is interesting to observe that in all cases the highest and lowest endorsements came from expected categories. This means that the two variables either combined to create a greater and lesser endorsement from these categories than expected and/or that the other categories failed to respond as expected. The latter seems to be

more the case. Based on the data, the implication is that participation or involvement, when combined with one's status as student or faculty, influence rather unpredictable perceptual responses from students of low participation or involvement and faculty of high participation or involvement.

In viewing the interactive effects within the research in total, however, it is maintained that they were by and large insignificant. The variables studied related collectively to the perceptions as would be expected.

Orientation Toward Winning. The most distinctive finding with regard to the orientation toward winning variable was that the sample, in general, showed weak support for the notion that winning is an important element of athletic contests. For them the old adage, "it's not whether you win or lose, but how you played the game," appears more befitting. Certain cautions, as noted in Chapter VI, must be observed with regard to this finding; in particular it must be recognized that the research was conducted at a time when criticism of a "win ethic" was popular.

Also it must be noted that the sample was predominately female (female respondents = 366, male respondents = 270), and this may have had an affect upon the sample's general orientation. As Kidd and Woodman (1975) noted, females tend to have a weaker orientation toward winning than males and, since female respondents outnumbered males, the sample in general might be expected to be less supportive of the winning variable.

The winning variable proved significant in relation to three of the five functions of sport; of specific interest was the positive

relationship between a strong orientation toward winning and the perception of sport as an enhancer of sex roles. The implication here is that perhaps competition and the pursuit of victory is becoming as much a part of the female sex role as the males. Title IX legislation and increased emphasis and exposure of women's athletics may have had an influence here.

Another finding of importance is that those who placed a premium upon winning viewed sport as a source of pride in place. This supports much of the literature which ties community, school, or regional prestige to the success or failure of teams representing it (Coleman, 1975; Rooney, 1978; Shaw, 1978).

Orientation toward winning was found to be negatively related to one's perception of the psychophysical benefits of sport. This finding suggests that those who elevate the pursuit of victory may be cognizant of the price of the pursuit--it may undermine psychological or physical satisfaction to be derived from sport under less intense conditions.

No substantively significant or extraordinary interactions were observed for ID or sex variables in conjunction with the orientation toward winning variable.

The overall conclusion to be made with regard to this variable is that winning, contrary to some popular perspective, is not the most important aspect of sport; nor does the pursuit of it necessarily exclude the perception of the other sport elements (only the psychophysical function was inversely related to orientation toward winning). Whether winning was important or not to the sample, they tended to endorse sport as functional.

Religiosity. The variable of religiosity, a composite of six different indicators, proved to be a relatively significant indicator of the perception of the functions of sport. In general, it was found that those who were more religious endorsed the functions of sport more than those who were not. As a word of qualification, however, it must be noted that the operationalization of this variable represents a somewhat "secularized" conceptualization of religiosity (see Table IV). Nowhere in the items comprising the index of religiosity is there any direct reference to a belief in God, mysticism, or theism--elements which represent a more "sacred" perspective of religion.

With this in mind, the basic contention to be arrived at regarding the findings is that sport seemingly parallels religion. This notion has been popularized in the literature (Novak, 1976; Eitzen, 1979; Gmelch, 1971) and the results of the data analysis support it. The evidence, while not overwhelmingly strong (the explained variations were low), was consistent.

In particular, those who cite a resemblance between sport and religion (Eitzen, 1979; Novak, 1976) observe that sport operates in similar ways. Their perspective is not that sport is replacing religion as a basic institution, nor that it is even a "high" or pure form of it, but that sport is a context wherein one may recognize similar symbols, properties, and practices. Those who are more religious--who affirm the symbols, properties, and practices of religion--also recognize the functional aspects of sport, suggesting such a parallel. Their endorsement of the psychophysical health function may coincide with the emotional and physically stabilizing effect of religion; their endorsement of the social integration function may coincide with the social bonding

and cohesive aspect of religion. In other words, the religious segment of the sample, through their endorsements, may be recognizing the parallel functions of sport and religion.

Interactions with respect to this variable were not substantively significant nor enlightening. One's status as faculty or student had an interactive effect in a few cases while sex did not. The conclusion here is that sex and ID had little influence undermining the overall explanatory power of the religiosity variable.

Final Comments

In light of this research, it would seem proper to conclude that people in general perceive sport as functional. In particular they perceive it as a context for self expression, a means toward psychophysical health, a source of pride in place, a facilitator of social integration, and an enhancer of sex roles.

The perceptions did not substantively vary by sex and only occasionally by student versus faculty status--students being more supportive. While orientation toward winning and religiosity accounted for some variation in perceptions, they too lacked substantial strength as overall indicators.

The most enlightening variables influencing the perception of sport were frequency of attendance, participation, and involvement. These variables were responsible for a sizeable portion of the variation. Consistently, those who attended sporting events more often, participated in athletics more regularly, or involved more with with the sphere of sport, perceived sport as more functional.

Some points need to be observed, however, in order to qualify these conclusions. First of all, as noted throughout this report, the sample was comprised of people associated with a unique setting--the university. Generalizations and comparisons with the larger community should be carefully noted. For this reason, further research of the same concepts with respect to the more general population is suggested. Such an undertaking might better establish validity, reliability, and scope.

A second point to note is that, in some respects, the research has dealt with perceptions and not actual behavior; it is one thing to perceive a phenomenon as occurring, and quite another to actually experience it. Much of what has been reported have been respondents' judgements; such as how frequently they participate in sports ("Very Frequent" to "Hardly Ever") or how religious they are ("Very Religious" to "Not Religious"). One person may participate in sports one a week and judge it as frequent while another may participate as often and judge it as infrequent. The point here is that judgements may not be the most accurate method of ascertaining behavior. The effect of such a phenomenon is possibly a distortion of findings when compared to actual behaviors. This is a problem often confronting self-report type research and it must be recognized.

Another point to be addressed with respect to the findings and conclusions of this research is the use of the term "function." The term has been employed throughout the research to denote an operate imperative of sport and does not necessarily connote a value judgement as good or bad.

In some instances, however, a value judgement is implied and unavoidable. The function of psychophysical health, for instance, would

be difficult to conceive as a negative feature; physical and psychological well-being seem to be desired ends for everybody. The function of social integration, on the other hand, can carry either positive or negative aspects--it can be a force generating cohesion or one undermining individuality--depending upon how it is viewed. The functions were not meant to be, nor should they be, related to any larger theoretical scheme beyond the respondents' perceptions.

As a final note, this research has attempted to investigate empirically and substantiate many speculations concerning the nature of sport. While recognizing its limitations, the research has provided some new or more complete understandings of the topic. In doing so, it has raised questions that may further be investigated. Enterprises, such as determining perceptions of other possible functions of sport, detailing more closely the affect of involvement with sport upon perceptions, and comparing perceptions by various other demographic variables, might well be undertaken. Since there has been little previous research to give guidance, what has been accomplished here may serve as a basis.

In the coming years the study of sport will undoubtedly become a more and more important enterprise. Compared to other social institutions, the accumulation of knowledge concerning sport has hardly been started. As sport continues to infiltrate our daily lives, there will be a growing demand for research into this segment of our social world; this study has been one response to that demand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albonico, R.
1967 "Modern University Sport as a Contribution to Social Integration." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 2: 155-162.
- Apgar, Fred
1977 "Emphasis Placed on Winning by Male High School Students." *Research Quarterly* 48:254-259.
- Ball, D. W.
1976 "Failure in Sport." *American Sociological Review* 41: 726-739.
- Beisser, A.
1967 *The Madness in Sports*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bouet, M.
1966 "The Function of Sport in Human Relations." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 1:127-140.

1968 "A Projective Test for Sport Participants." In G. Kenyon (ed.), *Contemporary Psychology of Sport*. North Palm Beach, Florida: The Athletic Institute.
- Boyle, R.
1963 *Sport: A Mirror of American Life*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Charnofsky, H.
1968 "The Major League Professional Baseball Player: Self-conception Versus the Popular Image." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 3:39-53.
- Coakley, Jay
1978 *Sport and Society: Issues and Controversies*. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Company.
- Coleman, J. S.
1961 "Athletics in High Schools." *Annual American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 338 (November):33-43.
- Conant, James
1961 "Athletics: The Poison Ivy in Our Schools." *Look* (January 17):56-60.

- Cowell, C. C.
1960 "The Contributions of Physical Activity to Social Development." *Research Quarterly* 31:286-306.
- Cozens, F. and F. Stumpf
1953 *Sports in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Daniels, A. S.
1966 "The Study of Sport as an Element of Culture." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 1:153-167.
- Deford, Frank
1976 "Religion in Sport." *Sports Illustrated* (April 19):92, 95-96, 98-99.
- Edwards, H.
1973 *Sociology in Sport*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley
1979 *Sport in Contemporary Society*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Elias, N. and E. Dunning
1970 "The Quest for Excitement in Unexciting Societies. In G. Luschen (ed.), *The Cross Cultural Analysis of Sport and Games*. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company.
- Friedenberg, E. Z.
1967 "Forward." In H. S. Slusher (ed.), *Man, Sport and Existence*. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.
- Gent, P.
1973 *North Dallas Forty*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Glanville, Brian
1965 "The Amazons." *Mademoiselle* (May):166-167, 228-236.
- Gmelch, George
1971 "Baseball Magin." *Transaction* 8 (June):39-41, 54.
- Harris, Bea
1968 "Attitudes of Students Toward Women's Athletic Competition." *Research Quarterly* 39:278-284.
- Hart, M. M.
1972 "On Being Female in Sport." In M. M. Hart (ed.), *Sport in the Socio-Cultural Process*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers.
1972 "Sport in Socio-Cultural Process." In M. M. Hart (ed.). Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers.

- Ingham, Alan and John Loy
1973 "The Social System of Sport: A Humanistic Perspective."
Quest 19 (January):3-24.
- Kaelin, E. F.
1968 "The Well-Played Game: Notes Toward an Aesthetics of
Sport." Quest (May):16-28.
- Kenyon, G. S.
1968 "Six Scales for Assessing Attitude Toward Physical Activity.
Research Quarterly 39:566-574.
1968 "Sociological Considerations." Journal of Health, Physical
Education, and Recreation 39:31-33.
- Kidd, Thomas and W. F. Woodman
1975 "Sex and Orientation Toward Winning." Research Quarterly
46:476-483.
- Kleinman, Seymour
1968 "Toward a Non-Theory Sport." Quest (May):29-34.
- Landers, Daniel and Gunther Luscher
1974 "Team Performance, Outcome, and the Cohesiveness of the
Competitive Coaching Group." International Review of Sport
Sociology 9 (Summer):57-73.
- Layman, Emma McCoy
1960 "The Contribution of Exercise Sports to Mental Health."
Pp. 560-599 in Warren R. Johnson (ed.), Science and Medicine
of Exercise and Sport. New York: Harper.
- Locke, L. F.
1973 "Are Sports Educational?" Quest 19 (May):69-72.
- Lorenz, K.
1966 On Aggression. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Lowe, Benjamin
1971 "The Aesthetics of Sport: The Statement of a Problem."
Quest 1 (June):13-18.
- Loy J. W.
1968 "The Nature of Sport: A Definitional Effort." Quest 10
(May):1-15.
- Loy, J. W. and G. S. Kenyon (eds.)
1969 Sport, Culture, and Society. New York: MacMillan, Inc.
- Luschen, G.
1967 "The Interdependence of Sport and Culture." International
Review of Sport Sociology 2:127-139.

- Martens, R.
1975 Social Psychology and Physical Activity. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- McLuham, Marshall
1964 Understanding Media: The Extension of Man. Hightstown, New Jersey: McGraw-Hill.
- McPherson, B. D.
1975 "Past, Present, and Future Perspectives for Research in Sport Sociology." International Review of Sport Sociology 1:55-71.
- Meggyesy, D.
1971 Out of Their League. Berkeley, California: Ramparts Press, Inc.
- Metheny, Eleanor
1965 Connotations of Movements in Sport and Dance. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, Publishers.
- Michener, J.
1976 Sports in America. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Miller, D. M. and K. R. E. Russell
1971 Sport: A Contemporary View. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.
- Novak, Michael
1976 The Joy of Sport: End Zones, Bases, Baskets, Balls, and the Conservation of American Sports. New York: Basic Books.
- Ogilvie, B. C. and T. A. Tutko
1971 "Sport: If You Want to Build Character, Try Something Else." Psychology Today 5:61-63.
- Playboy
1972 "Playboy Interview: Howard Cosell." Playboy 19 (May): 75-94.
- Plimpton, George
1965 "The Celestial Hell of the Super Fan." Sports Illustrated (September 13):104-120.

1968 "Does a Woman Need Sports Appeal?" Mademoiselle (April): 196-197, 294-298.
- Rehbert, R. A. and W. E. Schafer
1968 "Participation in Interscholastic Athletics and College Expectations." American Journal of Sociology 73 (April): 732-740.
- Rentzel, L.
1972 When All the Laughter Died in Sorrow. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.

Rooney, John F.

- 1974 A Geography of Sport: From Cabin Creek to Anaheim.
Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Rushall, B. S.

- 1972 "The Status of Personality Research and Application in Sports and Physical Education." Paper presented at the Physical Education Forum, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Sage, G. H.

- 1974 "Socialization and Sport." In G. H. Sage (ed.), Sport and American Society. Reading: Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Scott, J.

- 1973 "Sport and the Radical Ethic." Quest 19 (Winter):71-77.

Shaw, David

- 1978 "The Roots of Rooting." Psychology Today (February):48-51.

Shaw, G.

- 1972 Meat on the Hoof. New York: St. Martins Press.

Slusher, H. S.

- 1967 Man, Sport, and Existence: A Critical Analysis. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.

Snyder, E.

- 1970 "Aspects of Socialization in Sports and Physical Education." Quest 14 (June):1-7.

Snyder, E. E. and J. Kivlin

- 1975 "Women in Sports: Cross-National Comparisons of Psychological Well-Being and Body Image. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Phoenix, Arizona.

- 1975 "Women Athletes and Aspects of Psychological Well-Being and Body Image." Research Quarterly 46:191-199.

Snyder, E. E. and E. Spreitzer

- 1974 "Sociology of Sport: An Overview." Sociology Quarterly 15 (Autumn):467-487.

- 1975 "Basic Assumptions in the World of Sport." Quest 24 (Summer):1-9.

- 1976 "Participation in Sport as Related to Educational Expectations Among High School Girls. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association meetings, New York.

- 1978 Social Aspects of Sport. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Spreitzer, E. and E. E. Snyder
 1975 "The Psycho-Social Functions of Sport as Perceived by the General Population." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 3-4:87-93.
- Springer, F.
 1974 "The Experience of Senior Colleges That Have Discontinued Football." In G. Hanford (ed.), *An Inquiry Into the Need for and Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics*, Appendix 1. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
- Stillwater News-Press
 1978 "Sports and Geography Compatability Interests for Dr. John F. Rooney." (September 12):5.
- Stone G.
 1969 "Some Meanings of American Sport: An Extended View. In G. S. Kenyon (ed.), *Aspects of Contemporary Sport Sociology: Proceedings of C. T. C. Symposium on the Sociology of Sport*. North Palm Beach, Florida: The Athletic Institute.
- Takau, Niwa
 1973 "The Function of Sport in Society Today." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 8 (Spring):53-69.
- Tobin, R. L.
 1967 "Sports as an Integrator." *Saturday Review* 50 (January 21): 32.
- Vanderzwaag, H. J.
 1972 *Toward a Philosophy of Sport*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Wenkert, R. and R. C. Selvin
 1962 "School Spirit in the Context of a Liberal Education." *Social Problems* 10:156-168.
- Wilkerson, Martha
 1973 "Collective Conscience in Complex Society: A Study in the Sociology of Sport. Unpublished Dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Wilkerson, Martha and Richard A. Dodder
 1979 "What Does Sport do for People?" *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation* 50 (February):50-51.
- Willer, David
 1967 *Scientific Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Wohl, A.
 1970 "Competitive Sport and its Social Functions." *International Review of Sport Sociology* 5:117-124.

APPENDIX

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE WITH SAMPLE MEANS
AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SELECTED ITEMS

Your responses to all items in this questionnaire will be kept ANONYMOUS.

1. Sex
 - 1. Male
 - 2. Female
2. Age at last birthday _____
3. Ethnicity/Race
 - 1. Black
 - 2. Mexican American
 - 3. Native American
 - 4. White
 - 5. Other _____
4. What was your family's income for 1977?
 - 1. Less than \$6,000
 - 2. \$6,000 - \$9,999
 - 3. \$10,000 - \$14,999
 - 4. \$15,000 - \$19,999
 - 5. \$20,000 - \$24,999
 - 6. \$25,000 - \$29,999
 - 7. \$30,000 or more
5. What level of formal education have you completed?
 - 1. Some grade school
 - 2. Completed grade school
 - 3. Some high school
 - 4. Completed high school
 - 5. Some college
 - 6. Completed college
 - 7. Some graduate school
 - 8. Graduate school degree (M.A., Ph.D., etc.)
6. If a student, in what area of education are you involved?
 - 1. Agriculture
 - 2. Arts and Sciences
 - 3. Business
 - 4. Education
 - 5. Engineering
 - 6. Home Economics
 - 7. Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Science (HPELS)
 - 8. Other _____
7. Which of the following best describes the place where you were raised?
 - 1. Small town (under 2,500 people) or rural area
 - 2. Small city (2,500 - 25,000 people)
 - 3. City (or suburb of a city) of 25,000 - 100,000
 - 4. City (or suburb of a city) of over 100,000
8. What is your marital status?
 - 1. Single
 - 2. Married
 - 3. Divorced
 - 4. Separated
 - 5. Widowed
9. How many children do you have?
 - 1. boys
 - 2. girls

Please circle the number which you feel best represents your position from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

	Strongly Agree							Strongly Disagree							\bar{X}	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
12. Involvement in sports is bad for my emotional health.															5.59	1.04
13. When I'm upset involvement with sports helps to ease my tensions.															2.66	1.63
14. Experience in sports helps me to cope with failure.															3.04	1.64
15. I get a better understanding of who I am through involvement in sports.															3.30	1.60
16. For me, sport is an art form that can be appreciated for itself.															2.54	1.54
17. Participation in sports brings a pleasurable feeling seldom experienced elsewhere.															2.91	1.58
18. Sports help me to relate to other people better.															2.89	1.54
19. Sports make me feel lonely.															6.09	1.40
20. Lasting friendships are easy to find in sports.															3.16	1.50
21. Involvement in sports helps people to improve their health.															1.76	1.36
22. Sports do more harm physically than they do good.															6.30	1.36

	Strongly Agree							Strongly Disagree							\bar{X}	S
23. Sports bring people together who would not otherwise get together.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.38	1.39
24. Sports provide a common ground for cooperation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.23	1.29
25. Through sports we become more aware of our differences rather than our similarities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.15	1.54
26. Through sports we learn values that run counter to those of our society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.06	1.78
27. Involvement in sports develops within us an appreciation of the importance of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.69	1.30
28. Through sports we learn behavior important to succeed in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.62	1.41
29. For males, participation in sports enhances masculinity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.49	1.77
30. For females, participation in sports enhances femininity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.45	1.49
31. Sports attract women who are unhappy with the traditional female role.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.87	1.76
32. Sports are poor public entertainment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6.12	1.50
33. Spectator sports provide society with needed diversions from everyday life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.54	1.46
34. Sports provide a rejuvenating experience seldom found in other leisure pursuits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.95	1.52
35. Winning is the most important thing in a competitive contest.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.28	1.85
36. Winning may not be everything, but it is more important than anything else.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.25	1.88
37. What is your religious preference?																
1. Baptist																
2. Catholic																
3. Church of Christ																
4. Episcopal																
5. Lutheran																
6. Methodist																
7. Presbyterian																
8. Other																
9. None																
38. How often do you attend church?																
1. Never														3.71	1.72	
2. Once a year																
3. Several times a year																
4. Once a month																
5. Several times a month																
6. Once a week																
7. Several times a week																
39. How religious do you consider yourself?																
1. Very religious														5.13	1.66	
2. Quite religious																
3. About average																
4. Slightly religious																
5. Not religious																

	Very Frequently							Hardly Ever	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	\bar{X}	S
40. How often is politics a topic in your conversation?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.36	1.77
41. How often do you watch national news on T.V.?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.07	1.71
42. How often do you get involved in political campaigns?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.63	1.63
43. How often do you read the sports section of the newspaper?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.23	2.15
44. How often is sports a topic in your conversation?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.87	1.65
	Strongly Agree							Strongly disagree	
45. Religious commitment gives life a purpose it would not otherwise have.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.54	1.66
46. My religion provides principles which guide my daily decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.85	1.74
47. Religion has very little interest for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.83	1.58
48. There are more important things in life than religion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.10	1.94
49. To serve one's country is an honor above all others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.99	1.76
50. A nation deserves its citizens' loyalty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.36	1.43
51. It makes little difference if a sports team representing the town or area where I live loses.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.76	1.74
52. When viewing international sporting events, it makes little difference to me if the American entry wins.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.39	1.67
53. Varsity sports are an important part of university life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.85	1.67
54. A strong athletic program helps unify the student body.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.68	1.57
55. Success in sports brings prestige to the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.35	1.36
56. Sports promote the development of fair play.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.19	1.62
57. Life in Stillwater (and at OSU) would be much less attractive without Big-8 sports.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.00	1.85
58. I would be as happy in a town or university without intercollegiate sports.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.91	1.93
59. Sports are not particularly important for the well-being of society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.00	1.56
60. If more people were involved with sports, we would not have much trouble with drugs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.52	1.81
61. Sports are valuable because they help youngsters become good citizens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.43	1.40
62. The emphasis that sports places on competition causes more harm than good.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4.50	1.66
63. Sports are valuable because they teach youngsters respect for authority.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.50	1.46
64. Sports are valuable because they contribute to the development of patriotism.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.99	1.47
65. Sports are valuable because they teach youngsters self-discipline.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.34	1.26

	Strongly Agree							Strongly Disagree							\bar{X}	S
66. Sports are valuable because they provide an opportunity for individuals to get ahead in the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.54	1.44
67. Sports promote the development of fair play.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3.16	1.46
68. Sports are a good way for me to relax.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.48	1.38
69. For me, sports are pretty much a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6.13	1.74
70. Sports participation is a way of getting together with friends and having a good time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.05	1.26
71. Sports are a part of a well-rounded person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.59	1.39
72. Sports are a source of little or no satisfaction in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5.99	1.43
73. Sports help me to get away from the worries and pressures of the day.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.71	1.59

	Very Frequently							Hardly Ever								
74. How often do you <u>attend</u> sports events?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.72	1.67
75. How often do you <u>watch</u> sports events on T.V. or <u>listen</u> to them on the radio?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.67	1.66
76. What is your favorite sport to <u>watch</u> ?	_____															
77. How often do you actively participate in sports?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2.84	1.70
78. What is your <u>favorite</u> sport to participate in?	_____															
79. How frequently do you participate in this favorite sport?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7									
80. At what level do you participate in this favorite sport?																
___ 1. Varsity																
___ 2. Club																
___ 3. Intramural																
___ 4. Informally																
	----->															
															Is your participation co-educational?	
															___ yes	
															___ no	

81. What other sports do you participate in and at what level? (see previous question)

<u>Sports</u>	<u>Level</u>
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

VITA²

Stephen John Grove

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: FUNCTIONS OF SPORT: A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS AND INVOLVEMENT

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Munich, Germany, June 24, 1950, the son of Col. G. B. Grove and Mrs. A. Gangi.

Education: Graduated from Bedford High School, Bedford, Massachusetts, in June, 1968; received Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from Texas Christian University in May, 1972; received Master of Arts in Sociology from Texas Christian University in May, 1975; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1979.

Professional Experience: Research Assistant, Department of Sociology, Texas Christian University, August, 1972 to May, 1973; Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, August, 1974 to May, 1975; Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, August, 1976 to May, 1979.