



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

12-2002

Athletic Participation: A Test of Learning and Neutralization Theories.

Mario Bernard Hankerson
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hankerson, Mario Bernard, "Athletic Participation: A Test of Learning and Neutralization Theories." (2002). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 713. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/713>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Athletic Participation: A Test Of Learning And Neutralization Theories

A thesis
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Masters of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology

by
Mario Bernard Hankerson
December 2002

Dr. Stephen Brown, Chair
Dr. Marian H. Whitson
Dr. Larry Miller

Keywords: Athletes, Athletic Participation, Crime, Deviance, Learning Theory, Neutralization Theory, Sports

ABSTRACT

Athletic Participation: A Test of Learning and Neutralization Theories

by

Mario Hankerson

Athletics has been regarded as a means of encouraging youth to develop character, discipline, and healthy habits. However, literature has emerged that asserts athletics do not prevent deviant behaviors, but instead, influence one to commit deviant acts. As such, this research examined effects of athletics on the commission of deviant behaviors via learning and techniques of neutralization theories.

Subjects for this project included 325 college students from a southern regional university. Data were generated through the use of a self-report questionnaire, which measured variables pertaining to self-reported deviant behaviors including perceptions of peer deviance, neutralizing indicators, and sports participation.

The findings suggest some support for each theoretical model, differential association and techniques of neutralization. Both theoretical models were supported, in general, with learning theory having the most support. When participation in sporting activity was considered, however, the results consistently showed no effect on various types of self-reported deviant behavior.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most importantly, I would like to thank God for assisting me in the maturation process, which has allowed me to evolve into a much stronger, more confident, and more compassionate individual.

I would like to give thanks to my committee members, Dr. Stephen Brown, Dr. Marian Whitson, and Dr. Larry Miller, for their continued support in helping me to achieve my goals.

To Steve: I am grateful that I have come to know you on a more personal level over the last couple of years. It has been a joy working with your son, Cory, and coaching youth football with you. You have given me an opportunity to experience one of my great passions. As a person with so many admirable qualities, you have definitely played a role in shaping the person I wish to become.

To Marian, My Substitute Mother: Thank you for all that you have done for me. You are a wonderful woman who has assisted in molding me into a much more disciplined, structured, conscientious, considerate, and dependable young man. Thank you for all the memories that I will cherish forever and never forget for the rest of my life.

To Slick: Thanks for all the humorous moments that are branded into my brain forever. I appreciate your relaxed personality and the way you handle situations of immense pressure that comes with your position.

To Chasity, an honest, dependable, and trustworthy young lady, whom I am so thankful to have met: There truly are no words to convey how much knowing you over the last three years has helped me address certain inadequacies within myself. Thank you for the support and constant friendship from the first day of graduate school, which has allowed me to gain a sense of belonging instead of feeling as if I were a lone wolf lost in the forest. I often wonder how

graduate school and my life would have been if I had not met you and whether or not I would have developed academically and personally to the level I have. As you know, I do not believe in coincidences, yet, instead, I believe we are in the place we are supposed to be. My heartfelt thanks goes out to you for everything.

To My Family: Thanks for believing in me and always stressing the importance of an education. Mom, where would I be without you? You are my shoulder to lean on and to cry on when times are rough. You are the constant ear who always has a wise word, which allows me to assess a situation in order to make the best decision. Pops, thank you for the mechanical approach on how to deal with all the curve balls that life throws. I cherish our tight relationship, which has developed significantly over the years. To my little sister, Ariel, continuously strive to be better than I. Your unconditional love and humor have allowed me to emerge from some difficult times a much better person. Brother, Carlos, remember to look within and you can accomplish anything. I love you all.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	9
LIST OF FIGURES	12
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	13
History of Sports	13
History of Sports and Deviance	15
Statement of the Problem	16
Theoretical Framework.....	18
Research Hypotheses	19
Methodological Issues.....	20
Conclusion	22
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	23
Sports and Deviance.....	23
Interscholastic Athletics and Deviance.....	24
Relationship of Gender to Deviance	28
The “Sport Group”.....	31
Sport Group in relation to Work Group and Deviance	32
Logic of Theoretical Framework	33
Underlying Assumptions	37
Major Contributors.....	38

Criticisms of Theories	40
Conclusion	42
3. METHODOLOGY	43
Procedures for Collecting Data	43
Sample.....	43
Apparatus	44
Dependent Measures	45
Deviant Behavior	46
Independent Measures.....	47
Peer Deviance	47
Neutralization.....	49
Other Independent Measures	49
Gender	49
Race.....	50
Year in School.....	50
Major	50
GPA.....	50
Religious Affiliation	50
Student Organizations	51
High School Participation.....	51
University Sport Participation.....	51
Analysis of the Data	52
Conclusion	53
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	54
Preliminary Analysis	54
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	54
Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables.....	56

Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations	57
Multicollinearity.....	65
Multivariate Analysis	66
Athletes vs Non-Athletes	67
Self-reported Total Deviance	67
Self-reported Academic Cheating.....	68
Self-reported Drug Deviance	69
Self-reported Property Deviance.....	71
Self-reported Violent Deviance	72
Self-reported Sexual Deviance.....	73
Contact vs Non-Contact Athletes.....	75
Self-reported Total Deviance	75
Self-reported Academic Cheating.....	76
Self-reported Drug Deviance	78
Self-reported Property Deviance.....	79
Self-reported Violent Deviance	80
Self-reported Sexual Deviance.....	82
Conclusion	84
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
Limitations of the Study	88
Conclusion	88
REFERENCES	90
APPENDICES	99
Appendix A: Aggregate Self-Reported Deviance Scale	99
Appendix B: Self-Report Deviancy Scales	100
Appendix C: Aggregate Differential Association Scale	102
Appendix D: Peer Deviancy Scales	103

Appendix E: Aggregate Neutralization Scale	105
Appendix F: Neutralization Scales	106
Appendix G: Consent Form.....	107
Appendix H: Athlete College Experiences Survey.....	111
Appendix I: Non-Athlete College Experiences Survey	118
VITA	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Characteristics Of The Sample (n=325)	55
2. Descriptive Statistics For Independent Variables	57
3. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Violent And Property Deviance (n=325)	59
4. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Drug Deviance And Academic Cheating (n=325)	60
5. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Sexual And Total Deviance (n=325)	61
6. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Violent And Property Deviance For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	63
7. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Drug Deviance And Academic Cheating For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)	64
8. Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Sexual And Total Deviance For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	65

9. Ols Regression Estimates For Total Deviance	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	68
10. Ols Regression Estimates For Academic Cheating	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	69
11. Ols Regression Estimates For Drug Deviance	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	70
12. Ols Regression Estimates For Property Deviance	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	72
13. Ols Regression Estimates For Violent Deviance	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	73
14. Ols Regression Estimates For Sexual Deviance	
Incidence Measures (n=325)	74
15. Ols Regression Estimates For Total Deviance	
Incidence Measures For Contact Versus	
Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	76
16. Ols Regression Estimates For Academic Cheating	
Incidence Measures For Contact Versus	
Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	77
17. Ols Regression Estimates For Drug Deviance	
Incidence Measures For Contact Versus	
Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	78
18. Ols Regression Estimates For Property Deviance	
Incidence Measures For Contact Versus	
Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	80
19. Ols Regression Estimates For Violent Deviance	
Incidence Measures For Contact Versus	
Non-contact Sports (n=156).....	82

20. Ols Regression Estimates For Sexual Deviance

Incidence Measures For Contact Versus

Non-contact Sports (n=156)..... 83

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Findings For Athlete Versus Non-athlete	87
2. Findings For Contact Athlete Versus Non-contact Athlete	87

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sports represent a major social institution with more than 25 million youths participating each year in the United States (Browne & Francis, 1993; Hines & Groves, 1989). Sports have come to dominate and vastly influence the lives of contemporary Americans in many ways. Not only are sports a form of physical activity, which over the years has gained popularity in a more health conscious society, but also it is believed that participation in athletics builds character, self-confidence, and discipline (Begg, Langley, Moffitt, & Marshall, 1996; Hines & Groves, 1989; Landers & Landers, 1978; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978). Further, it has been stated that athletics encourage the development of a competitive spirit, ability to cooperate, sportsmanship, good manners, courage, a greater capacity for delay of gratification, persistence, resistance to pain and fatigue, and a release from tension and aggressive impulses (Educational Policies Commission, 1954, p.1; Landers & Ajzen, 1981; Nolan, 1954). Of even greater significance, however, is the fact that sports have increasingly become a major element in programs aimed at delinquency prevention or at reforming delinquents (Beck & Beck, 1967; Coleman, 1965; Kvaraceus, 1954; Lutzin & Orem, 1967; Neumeyer, 1955; Segrave, 1983; Yiannakis, 1980), thus, demonstrating the importance of this issue for the field of criminology.

History of Sports

Sports have been a vital part of most societies since the time of the Greeks (Begg et al., 1996). Seen as an alternative to war, competitive sports in ancient times were viewed as a place where youths' aggressive behaviors could be managed (Appleboom, Rouffin, & Fierens, 1988).

Sport has long been an important part of the culture in the United States as well, with children's sport considered by some to be a foundation for the development of sound social and personal adjustment, good self-concept, and other quality personality characteristics (Ash, 1978; Maul & Thomas, 1975; Pease & Anderson, 1986). The rich history of youth sport activities and their attractiveness is reflected in the growth of organized programs such as Little League Baseball and Pop Warner football (Weinberg, 1981). Numbers of both participants and supporters of such programs have increased considerably since the 1950s. The National Youth Sports Coaches Association estimated in 1985 that between 25 and 26 million youths participated in organized sports programs (Hines & Groves, 1989).

American intercollegiate athletics was born in 1852 with a series of rowing matches between such ivy-league schools as Harvard and Yale. These events were organized, funded, and conducted by involved and interested students. As popularity grew, university administrators took control of the sport, hiring coaches, building "programs," and treating sports as a phenomenon that could increase the institution's prestige and attract new students (Figler, 1981).

Throughout the United States, interscholastic athletics occupy a central place in the life of the high school. Some have even argued that athletics may be a more important part of one's school experience for many students than academic achievement (Schafer, 1969). Justifications for this significant focus on athletics include the use of sports in teaching values, their serving a function, and social control preventing delinquency among students or participants through productive investment of time (McIntosh, 1971; Segrave, 1983). Moreover, athletes themselves have given credibility to the claim that athletic involvement prevents misconduct by declaring in

biographies as well as interviews that were it not for their athletic participation they would probably have become involved in delinquency, crime, and drugs (Wolf, 1972).

History of Sports and Deviance

A beneficial relationship between sports and deviance has long been assumed and widely accepted. Almost a century ago in 1904, G. Stanley Hall, a renowned American psychologist, wrote that athletics "supplies a splendid motive against all errors and vices that weaken or corrupt the body. It is a wholesome vent for the reckless courage that would otherwise go to disorder or riotous excess" (as cited in Betts, 1974, p. 229). It has been expressed among educators and researchers that delinquent or deviant behavior could be controlled by initiating sporting activities into an individual's routine. The idea first appeared in practice in the English Public Schools during the mid-nineteenth century when sport became a form of social control (McIntosh, 1971), serving as a replacement for the activity of vandalism, bullying, and drunkenness which had previously dominated boys' leisure time (Donnelly, 1981). Subsequently, sport became a significant part of the curriculum at correctional institutions for juvenile delinquents in Britain (Healy & Alper, 1941; Tappan, 1949).

In 1954, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation stated that: "The Association sincerely believes that sound programs of health, physical education and recreation can help lessen delinquency" (Sandborn & Hartman, 1970, p. 97). Several sport slogans capture the antidotal nature of this notion: "Play sports and stay out of the courts," "Live by the code or get out," and "He who stays up with the owls at night can't soar with the eagles during the day" (Snyder, 1972). This is evident in Schafer and Armer's (1968) study which states that the high-school drop out rate for non-athletes was four times higher than for athletes.

Likewise, Coleman (1965, p. 44-45) observed, "If it were not for interscholastic athletics or something like it, the rebellion against school, the rate of drop out, and the delinquency of boys might be far worse than they presently are."

Others have argued athletics may actually promote delinquency. For example, Lueschen suggested that "Overall, sports may be positively as well as negatively related to criminal behavior" (1971, p. 1391). In a later study, Lueschen (1976) expressed concern that delinquent behavior is learned in athletics due to cheating that takes place in athletic contests. Along these lines, an early study of Chicago youth (Thrasher, 1963) found that delinquent gangs often emanated from sports groups. Similar ideas have been stated by others, although they represent a minority viewpoint regarding possible consequences of participation in sports. A majority of studies probing the relationship between participation in organized sport activity and involvement in delinquent behavior have found a negative association (e.g., Purdy & Richard, 1983; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave & Hastad, 1984). That is, those who participate in organized sports are less likely to become delinquent. Debate, however, continues and has been fueled in recent years by the publicity surrounding deviant behaviors amongst elite athletes. Consequently, a number of research questions call for further examination.

Statement of the Problem

Most prior research focuses on the effects of athletics on high school students and their participation in delinquent behavior. The focus of this study, however, was on the relationship between athletic participation and deviant behavior among college athletes. Prior studies of high school athletes carry considerable weight with the current study, however, because most college athletes were once high school athletes. Whatever the effects of participation in sports, they

likely began prior to college enrollment but could be different for those whose participation extends to the college ranks. Moreover, the college athletic experience could differ from that of younger athletes. This study undertook an assessment of athletes who participated in all intercollegiate sports within a southern regional university. Their self-reported deviance was examined and contrasted with that of their peers not involved in intercollegiate athletics. More specifically, the main objectives of the current study were to (a) determine if participation in organized sporting programs decreases or increases one's chances of becoming deviant, (b) examine the relationship between participation in various sports and deviant behavior through the frameworks of differential association theory and techniques of neutralization theory, and (c) to contrast involvement in deviant behavior across types of sports.

Sykes and Matza (1957) argued that techniques of neutralization actually compose a critical element of Sutherland's differential association, which is the concept of definitions favorable to the violation of law. Thus, it is believed that participation in sports will actually preclude an increased chance of participation in deviant behavior by athletes. That is, "team" lack of deviance will be linked to favorable definitions of crime/deviancy, which is then reinforced by the "sport group." In short, acceptance of deviant behavior committed by members of an athletic team will not be tolerated; therefore, current and incoming fellow athletes will adhere to the "group norms" of non-deviant behavior.

Further, those not involved in athletic and physical activities may be drawn to peer groups who exhibit more non-conventional attitudes and behaviors. These attitudes then become internalized and can lead to acts of deviancy, also allowing for future justifications of deviant behaviors (Dabney, 1995).

Conversely, persons who participate in sports and physical activities may learn values such as physical aggression, disproportionate emphasis on winning, or that athletes should be accorded different standards of behavior than others. Based on conflicting prior studies, this research poses a nondirectional hypothesis regarding the relationship between participation in athletic activity and deviant behavior.

Theoretical Framework

Edwin Sutherland coined the concept of differential association to describe the process of learning criminal behavior and his efforts popularized the idea that criminal behavior was learned. Upon conception, differential association was meant to explain all crime and delinquency. According to Vold, Bernard, and Snipes (1998), Sutherland drew ideas from three major perspectives within the Chicago School of thought: ecological and cultural transmission theory, symbolic interactionism, and culture conflict theory. These related schools of thought allowed him to understand crime and delinquency from a social scientific perspective.

Sutherland set out to disprove psychological and biological theories that were popular in the early twentieth century with his sociological interpretation of crime by shifting the focus to the criminal and his or her behavior. The theory was proposed in 1939 and finalized in 1947 as a positivistic theory attempting to explain criminal behavior among groups and individuals. The theory of differential association consists of nine postulates, including these three basic concepts; “criminal behavior is learned, the principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups, and a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law”

(Sutherland, 1947, p. 7). The third concept is the essence of Sutherland's theory of differential association.

Learning theorists in criminology largely agree that delinquency is learned and that it is learned via social interaction. Sykes and Matza's (1957) theory of delinquency, techniques of neutralization, which was directed towards male juvenile delinquency, was partially patterned after Edwin Sutherland's theory differential association (Cohen, Lindesmith, & Schuessler, 1956). The learning process included Sutherland's (1947, p. 7) "definitions favorable to violation of the law." Delinquency occurs by learning these definitions, "rather than by learning moral imperatives, values or attitudes standing in direct contradiction to those of the dominant society" (Sykes & Matza, 1957, p. 656). Sykes and Matza's theory does not predict delinquency, instead, only that neutralization will allow delinquent behavior to occur.

Research Hypotheses

To date, very few studies have focused on college athletics and the effects of participation upon involvement in deviant behaviors. Moreover, no single study exists that examines sports and deviance in light of techniques of neutralization and differential association. Also, much of the earlier research is suggestive and requires replication. The current research extended earlier work by using self-report surveys administered to intercollegiate athletes participating in a variety of sporting activities at a southern regional university. The respondents were asked a variety of questions to assess their sports involvement and their deviant behaviors, to measure neutralization and learning, and included various relevant demographics.

For purposes of this research, data were collected from an availability sample of university athletes who were usually present for administrative purposes within the athletic

activity unit. Also, two required history classes were sampled in order to create the non-athletic sample. This study assessed a number of hypotheses reflecting some of the important components addressed by differential association and techniques of neutralization. Although regression analysis entailed examination of many relationships, the study was guided by several general research hypotheses, including the following. Athletes were suspected to have different definitions of deviance than their non-athlete counterparts and, therefore, to report different roles of deviance. Similarly, athletes and non-athletes were predicted to differ in frequency of neutralizing deviant behavior and, consequently, to report different amounts of deviant behavior. Non-contact sport participants were expected to have less favorable definitions of deviance than contact sports participants, thus reporting less deviant behavior. Similarly, less neutralization was expected among the non-contact athletes when compared to those in contact sports. Male respondents were thought to be more likely to report deviant behavior than female respondents.

In addition to descriptive analysis of the variables, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations assessed the degree and the direction of the relationship among each of the outcome variables of the hypotheses described above. Multiple regression techniques were employed to assess the effects of a number of independent variables on one dependent variable. Thus, six separate models were used to assess the effects of peer associations and neutralization techniques on the prevalence and incidence of deviance while controlling for various other variables.

Methodological Issues

Two chief methodological flaws exist in prior research examining sports and deviant behavior as well as the current study. First is the issue of sample representativeness or sample size. As in Landers and Landers (1978), a significant limitation to the current study was that of

sample representativeness resulting from studying only a single school. Most prior research focused only on males, thus limiting the sample even further and making the results impossible to apply to any given population. Further, the age distribution of previous research has been limited, tending to focus on juveniles. Also, race has rarely been examined and represented in any of the studies. The present study had limited racial variation among subjects but was at least able to examine difference between black and white students.

Secondly, is the issue of causal order. It is possible that deviants may have self-selected themselves out of organized sport programs, thus, delinquents or deviants would not have been drawn to athletics in the first place (Agnew & Petersen, 1989; Hastad et al., 1984; Sugden & Yiannakis, 1982; Yiannakis, 1980). This results from relying on cross-sectional data to examine the sports/deviancy relationship. Further longitudinal data will be vital in attempting to resolve the causal ordering dilemma.

Another example of temporal ordering specific to the current study was described in Dabney (1995). Retroactive neutralizations were used to demonstrate how individuals participate in after-the-fact rationalization that allows them to reconstruct the reality of the situation in a way that it corresponds with their predetermined notions of acceptable behavior. In short, the nurses in the Dabneys' study were offered certain rationalizations from the nursing work group that excuse or condone certain forms of deviant behavior. This, in turn, increased the probability that the nurses would internalize such redefined definitions of acceptable behavior for future reference. Thus, the temporal ordering issue was exhibited by the fact that the nurses implied that they would continue to participate in employee deviancy. Further, this suggested that these definitions were being used as stimuli to shape future behaviors.

In sum, there are several methodological strengths of the current study. First, the current research examined both genders and their relationship to athletic participation and deviance. Much prior research was limited to only males (Kelly & Baer, 1969; Kelly & Baer, 1971; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave, Moreau, & Hastad, 1985; Willman & Chun, 1973). Secondly, many of the preceding studies concentrated solely on high school students (Agnew & Petersen, 1989; Marsh, 1993; Landers & Landers, 1978; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave, Moreau & Hastad, 1985) with an occasional split of high school and college mixed (Segrave & Chu). The current study, however, focused on college athletes in a major southern university. Lastly, the present study, unlike any others preceding, attempted to gather information on as many different types of athletes as possible, including soccer, volleyball, football, basketball, baseball, golf, and track.

Conclusion

The current study investigated the topic, athletic participation and deviant behavior, which has only been superficially studied in the past. Typically, in prior studies, only a select few of sporting events have been examined. However, in the current study, participants in seven different athletic events were surveyed. Moreover, not one single study exists involving the effects of social psychological processes, theories of differential association, and techniques of neutralization, on sport participation and deviance. Thus, the purpose of the present inquiry was to explore dynamic social processes underlying the linkage between participation in physical sporting activity and deviant behavior among a sample of intercollegiate athletes and non-athletes at a southern regional university.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Sports and Deviance

Yiannakis (1980) proposed that participation in organized sports is likely to thwart the onset of deviant activity. In the earliest known study on recreation and deviancy, Burns (1907) concluded from a survey conducted in Chicago that, by providing a district with play facilities, there was an average reduction in delinquent activity of 44%. Truxal stated in 1929 that the following cities, as well as others, experienced a reduction in juvenile delinquency after play areas were established: Knoxville by 50%, Binghamton by 96%, and St. Louis by 50%. Likewise, the National Recreation Association also published evidence from local police departments, juvenile authorities, and other leaders indicating that recreation services were a powerful force in the prevention of deviancy (Sapora & Mitchell, 1961). Further, Buhrman (1971) and Schafer (1969) expanded the proposition that involvement and participation in athletics or recreation might dissuade deviant activity.

Perhaps, the most comprehensive study of the relationship between recreation and deviance was conducted in Chicago for the Chicago Recreation Commission (Shanas, 1942). A total of 15,217 boys and 7,939 girls aged 10 to 17 years old participated in supervised recreation. The sample included 1,262 official and 536 unofficial deviants. After 1,281,553 hours were spent in supervised recreation, it was found that of the boys who committed deviant acts, those who attended recreational events committed fewer deviant acts than those who did not. Of the non-deviants studied, Shanas detailed that those who did not commit any acts of deviant

behavior and did not participate in recreation, but ultimately became deviant, was three times as high as the rate of non-deviant who were participating in recreational activities.

The position that sport participation does not serve as a preventive measure for deviance has been advanced by both sociologists and criminologists (e.g., Donnelly & Young, 1988; Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Segrave, Moreau, & Hastad, 1985; Tappan, 1949). Tappan affirmed that without supporting evidence, one could not simply state that being a good athlete would solely prevent deviant behavior, and, that if a child is exposed to criminal activity, it would take more than games to correct the problem. He further stated that the public was allowing itself to be deluded into defining sports programs as deviant behavior treatment measures but also declared that something more than supervised recreation could be investigated to promote the proposition. Hughes and Coakley stated that devotion to sporting activity can result in extreme forms of behavior “in which there is collective encouragement to push the limits and pay the price [which] produces an excessive commitment to action that is destructive, not necessarily desired, and deviant” (p. 320).

Interscholastic Athletics and Deviance

It was not until Schafer's (1969) research that the relationship between participation in interscholastic athletics and deviance was properly subjected to empirical evaluation. Despite a finding by Schafer that athletes are often less deviant than non-athletes, he suggested the possibility that athletics attracted conforming types of boys. Since then, however, there has been a growing interest in the arena. Most of the investigation into the topic has yielded predicted results of a negative association between athletic participation and deviance (Agnew & Petersen, 1989; Buhrman, 1977; Buhrman & Bratton, 1978; Hastad, Segrave, Pangrazi, & Petersen, 1984;

Landers & Landers, 1978; Marsh, 1993; Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave & Hastad, 1982; Schafer). Convergent validation for the negative association between interscholastic athletics and deviance has been provided by studies using both official and unofficial measures of deviant behavior as well as various types of athletic endeavors. While the overall picture emerging from the investigation on athletics and deviance is limited and in some cases confusing, four conclusions appear warranted.

The first conclusion is that athletes tend to be less deviant than comparable non-athletes. Many studies have found that male athletes exhibit less deviant behavior than male non-athletes (Buhrman, 1977; Buhrman & Bratton, 1978; Landers & Landers, 1978; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave & Hastad, 1982). For example, Schafer examined 585 boys of whom 164 (28%) were classified as athletes. Seven percent of the athletes had a court record as compared to 17% of the male non-athletes, suggesting a negative association between athletic participation and deviance. In addition, Segrave & Hastad stated that seasons of participation seemed to have little or no effect on deviant behavior among athletes except for males and low socioeconomic status groups. Further, it was found that the greater the number of years of participation, the less involvement in deviant behavior.

A second conclusion is that the overall relationship between athletics and deviance appears to be a function of an association among lower socioeconomic groups. Several studies indicated the greater differences were among low-status youth, where athletes were less deviant than non-athletes (Buhrman, 1977; Buhrman & Bratton, 1978; Hastad et al., 1984; Schafer, 1969; Segrave & Chu, 1978). Schafer, in fact, found that if one controls for class and achievement, the relationship between athletics and deviance almost completely disappears.

The third conclusion is that the overall relationship between athletics and deviance appears to be a function of the seriousness of the offense. Data from several studies (Hastad et al., 1984, Segrave & Chu, 1978; Segrave, 1981; Segrave & Hastad, 1982) also identified that the severity of the offense was an important variable operating within the relationship between athletic participation and deviant behavior. These studies demonstrated that deviant behavior among athletes decreased when the type of offense was classified as more serious. In other words, sport appears to prevent serious rather than non-serious deviance.

Lastly is the conclusion that the profiles of deviants and athletes are different, making way for the argument that deviant individuals would not choose to participate in athletic events, thus raising the question of causal order. It has been shown that, as a group, athletes exhibit different characteristics than deviants (Buhrman, 1977; Buhrman & Bratton, 1978; Hastad et al., 1984). Both studies by Buhrman and Buhrman and Bratton, although different in some ways, found that deviants and athletes were completely opposite of one another. This raises some questions about the presumed preventive effects of involvement in sports.

In fact, Skolnick (1993), in a study at a single university at one point in time, found that college athletes who played certain sports were more likely to engage in high risk behavior. While only 7% of boys who did not participate in a team sport reported drinking alcohol for the first time, 17% of those who played on one or more teams and 23% of those involved with three or more teams reported drinking alcohol. However, while 15% of non-athletic girls reported smoking, only 6% of girls who played on one or two teams and none who were involved with three or more teams reported smoking behavior. Moreover, Skolnick found that members of the college football team, compared with all other athletes, were more likely to report driving under the influence of alcohol or other drugs, rode in a vehicle driven by a driver under the influence of

alcohol or other drugs, and were less likely to wear seat belts. Basketball players reported having multiple sex partners and track team members reported the highest incidence of sexually transmitted diseases. In other words, athletes were found to have participated in very risky behaviors as compared to non-athletes. This study further supports prior studies that actually report the link between physical involvement and a manifestation of deviant behavior to be modest at best (Gauvin, 1989; Leonard, 1998; McTeer & Curtis, 1990).

Nonetheless, according to a Los Angeles Times survey of athletes and crime in 1995, 22 athletes and 3 coaches were accused of a drug-related crime in 1995. Thus, the public read, on average, about a new sports figure with a drug problem every two weeks. Put into context, however, 1.9 million Americans used cocaine each month and 2.1 million used heroin throughout their lives (Lapchick, 2000). In short, a very small fraction of athletes committed drug offenses in that particular year and, further, it seems to be over-exaggerated by the media when cases do occur.

The same Los Angeles Times survey reported that 28 athletes and 4 coaches had charges relating to alcohol. Yet, 13 million Americans engaged in binge drinking at least 5 times per month. Consequently, though, one could have read about a new athlete with an alcohol problem every 11 days (Lapchick, 2000). Comparatively speaking, then, athletes committed much fewer crimes in relation to the rest of society.

In another study, Segrave, Moreau, and Hastad (1985) reviewed the relationship between participation in minor league Canadian ice hockey and deviance and found no significant difference between participants and non-participants in the incidence of deviant behavior. However, it was determined that the hockey players were more involved in deviance of a physically violent nature than non-players.

Needless to say, the literature thus far has been exceptionally mixed on the reviews concerning athletic participation/physical activity and reporting of deviance/high-risk behaviors. Furthermore, many of the empirical studies tend to focus on simple high risk behaviors, such as drinking alcohol, or smoking cigarettes, of athletic participants. However, the current study evaluated several different deviant behaviors, including violent and property offenses, which are very limited in the existing body of research while controlling for various variables. Specifically, gender and the effect on athletes and deviancy will be addressed independently.

Relationship of Gender to Deviance

Previous research indicates that gender is a significant predictor for delinquency with males being substantially more delinquent than females. However, differences began to occur when individual offenses were examined. According to Warr (1996), offending groups usually are male and very close in age. Caspi, Lynam, Moffit, and Silva (1993) stated that delinquency is modeled for juvenile females by peers and is reinforced by their delinquent group. The researchers noted that females and males with favorable or unfavorable definitions of violating the law are similar. In other words, the male-female differentials in delinquency may be accounted for by learning experiences. Agnew (1991) found that delinquents spend more time with their peers, and that these delinquents have positive peer reinforcement to commit more delinquent acts. Likewise, according to Warr's (1993) findings, the amount of time an individual spends with peers has a significant effect on his/her deviance. Therefore, the amount of time an individual spends with peers regulates his/her degree of deviance. Thus, those females who spend greater amounts of time with peers may have higher rates of involvement in deviance.

Liu and Kaplan's (1999) study focused on an ongoing longitudinal panel study which began in 1971 and consisted of all seventh grade students in a random half of junior-senior high schools in Houston. Among the selected students, over 3,100 students supplied data for the collection. Results indicated that adolescent males and females engage in similar levels of delinquent activity. Such results were consistent with the argument that male and female delinquent acts, at least minor ones, were similar and comparable to one another (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

The results also indicated that gender difference in deviance was directly and indirectly mediated by attachment to conventional values, delinquent peer exposure, and negative experiences with authorities. Much of the gender difference in deviance was accounted for by the above mentioned arbitrating variables. Male and female criminal behavior proved to be increasingly similar when drug offenses were evaluated also (Mears, Ploeger, & Warr, 1998; Orcutt, 1987; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). Research completed by Liu and Kaplan was consistent with the assumption that female and male deviance was similar and comparable, focusing on less serious, victimless/status offenses (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979; Simons et al., 1980; Singer & Levine, 1988; Smith & Paternoster, 1987; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

Heimer and De Coster (1999) used data from the National Youth Survey, looking at 11-17 year olds in the United States in 1976. The participants were interviewed initially in their respective homes in 1977 and were subsequently re-interviewed annually. Heimer and De Coster found that learning violent definitions is an important predictor of violent delinquency among both males and females. In other words, such delinquent behavior is not an exclusively male phenomenon, counter to popular myths that portray females as non-aggressive (White & Kowalski, 1994).

Previous research rarely has examined the causes of variation in violence by females and when it has done so, it has focused mostly on the effects of structural factors without specifying exactly the underlying cultural processes (see Simpson, 1991). This leads to another contribution of Heimer and De Costers' research. It clearly identified and assessed associations between social structural and cultural processes in the pathways leading to violence among females and males, thereby, demonstrating how gender-differentiated experiences during adolescence lead to violent deviance. The research does this by developing a theoretical perspective that incorporates differential association theory along with arguments from feminist and gender studies.

Overall, Heimer and De Coster (1999) found that mechanisms that produce violence among females are much more subtle and indirect in nature than those that produce violence among males. Further, the results indicated that indirect familial controls reduced the learning of violent definitions, and thus violent delinquency, among girls but not boys. Females also learned fewer violent definitions than boys, on average. In sum, the study found that boys are more violent than females mainly because females are influenced more strongly by bonds to family, learn fewer violent definitions, and are taught that violence is inconsistent with the meaning of being female.

Closely related to the learning theory proposition that states definitions favorable to deviance are learned from peers and others is the learning of neutralizations. Neutralization theory states that delinquents are for the most part committed to conventional beliefs, and that it is not until special justifications are developed that deviance takes place (Sykes & Matza, 1957). The majority of criminological theorists view Sykes and Matza's theory as a perspective rather than a theory, and because of this not much empirical data has been gathered. Of the few studies

that do exist, many have established that acceptance of neutralization is positively related to deviance, although with a small to moderate relationship (Agnew & Peters, 1986; Ball & Lilly, 1971; Minor, 1981; Thurman, 1984). According to Ball (1977) females were just as likely to accept neutralization as males, even though they subsequently found males were more violent. Ball's results indicated that females were comparable to males when accepting neutralization techniques, thereby, justifying their delinquent behavior. Minor confirmed that neutralization techniques had a relatively weak effect on subsequent violence. The findings in Minor's study indicated that neutralization does not contribute greatly to violent behavior. According to Agnew and Peters, neutralization leads to deviant behavior only when the individual feels that neutralization techniques apply to his/her current situation (Agnew, 1994; Minor; Sykes & Matza; Thurman). Male and female deviance varied according to neutralization because each group has its own rationalizations and justifications for committing deviant acts (Ball).

The "Sport Group"

Sport teams are task-oriented groups of 2 to 20 or more members who are mutually motivated and at the same time dependent on one another to achieve their own unique tasks (Landers & Ajzen, 1981). Thus, the "sport group," like the work group, employs peer association principles, differential association theory. No research exists that examines this phenomenon of the "sport group." However, one can liken it to what has been termed the work group; wherein, Dabney (1995) specifically addressed this concept with that of a nursing workgroup. He stated that nurses are socialized into a particular work group where they tend to change their general normative definitions to conform to those held by the work group. The norms do not compel or require deviations from the hospital or legal regulations nor do they

portray such deviations as something a “good” nurse should do. But instead, they simply excuse the acts as not really wrong when committed under some circumstances, using techniques of neutralization. In other words, there are certain acts that are acceptable by the group and certain acts that are not acceptable by the group. This phenomenon can be applied to that of a “sport group,” thus, requiring the athletes to conform to what the group accepts or does not accept. In short, the theories of techniques of neutralization and differential association are operating simultaneously.

Sport Group in relation to Work Group and Deviance

According to Dabney (1995), in some cases, the established organizational norms of the hospital conflicted with the work group norms. When this occurred, the work group either provided the individual nurses with a set of rationalizations for violating the rules or provided shortcuts or innovative adaptations for going around hospital policy. However, the work group did not condone narcotic drug theft and it was suggested that they did not tolerate it. If a nurse was suspected of stealing such drugs, that particular nurse was not afforded protection from the work group. Thus, Dabney concluded that this process was directly in line with the theoretical propositions of differential association and social learning theory, specifically techniques of neutralization. It is surmised in the current study that athletes, to some degree, participate in the same form of logic, making certain decisions about certain behaviors according to the mores established by the team for various reasons (i.e. athletic status on the team, protection from peers, protection from coach, or simply appearance to the public).

Similarly, Sieh (1987), Benson (1985), and Tatham (1974) all detailed the same philosophy in their studies. Each focused on organizational crime of employees and applied the

neutralization concept to that of organizational deviance. Although different as far as work setting, each study illustrated how the normative definitions of the work group enabled employees to redefine deviant acts committed at work.

Logic of Theoretical Framework

Sutherland stated that every individual has certain patterns of behavior and the contents of patterns in association differ from person to person. He blamed the cause of crime on patterns of association or, in other words, different learning experiences. Sutherland's differential association theory consists of nine postulates that collectively describe the process of learning criminal behavior. The first postulate declared by Sutherland is that "criminal behavior is learned" (Sutherland, 1947, p. 7). This behavior must be learned simply because people are not born criminals. A person's behavioral conduct is either learned from someone or is an imitation of something he/she has seen. His second postulate maintains that "criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication" (Sutherland, p. 7). Verbal and non-verbal communication plays a role in learning criminal behavior based on this postulate. This interaction process allows people the chance to learn criminal behavior from other individuals. Sutherland's (p. 7) third postulate is, "The principle part of learning criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups." Within this postulate he asserts that criminal behavior is learned primarily from personal contact with family members and friends and that they must have a close personal relationship (Sutherland). The fourth postulate states, "When criminal behavior is learned, the learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes very complicated, sometimes very simple; and (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes" (Sutherland, p. 7). Here Sutherland affirms that

once criminal behavior is learned, the person also learns the techniques required to perpetuate a crime along with the mental toughness and intent needed to achieve his/her goals.

Edwin Sutherland's fifth postulate states, "The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable" (Sutherland, 1947, p. 8). This postulate maintains that a person's specific directional motive for committing a crime relies on the favorable or unfavorable definitions of legal codes; therefore, a person who views the law on authority beyond challenge will not commit the crime because of his/her favorable definitions for the law. Conversely, the person who is disproportionately exposed to definitions favorable to law violation will more likely do so. Further, differential learning includes the specific direction of motives, attitudes, and rationalizations, whether toward viewing legal codes as rules to be observed or broken (Matsueda, 1982).

The sixth postulate, which is Sutherland's main proposal (see Sutherland, 1947; Vold et al., 1998) asserts, "A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over unfavorable definitions to violation of the law" (Sutherland, p. 8). According to this postulate a person adjusts his/her level of criminality to fit learned definitions favorable or unfavorable to violations of the law concerning the commission of delinquent acts. Groups of people that have definitions favorable or unfavorable to violations of the law are inversely related in the frequency of their delinquent behavior.

The seventh postulate is, "Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity" (Sutherland 1947, p. 8). In other words, one's exposure to delinquent or non-delinquent others will be varied depending on the peer social involvement. The eighth postulate concerns "the process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns and involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in any other learning"

(Sutherland, p. 8). Here Sutherland states that criminal behavior is learned and is comparable to other behaviors and activities that have to be learned. This principle left the door open to expand the theory in accordance with more recent knowledge of the human learning process. This provided the basis for Akers (1996) expansion of differential association in expounding his version of learning theory.

The ninth and final postulate asserts, "While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values, since non-criminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values" (Sutherland, 1947, p. 8). According to Sutherland's ninth postulate, he theorizes that people are compelled to commit criminal acts as an expression of their general needs. In other words, criminals and non-criminals maintain the same wants and needs, thus, criminal behavior cannot be explained or rationalized by those wants and needs.

Sutherland's differential association theory was the first to intimate that the learning process behind criminal behavior is the same as that behind non-criminal behavior. At the center of his theory is the concept of "definitions." According to Sutherland, these definitions serve as the normative attitudes and beliefs toward behavior. That is, an excess of definitions favorable to an act increases the likelihood of its occurrence as well as an excess of negative definitions decreases the likelihood of its occurrence. More importantly, social learning theory affirms that definitions favorable to deviancy can take on two forms: They can define the behavior as morally correct or they can redefine a morally incorrect behavior in an advantageous light. That is, in the second circumstance, a set of excuses, justifications, or rationalizations serves as stimuli for the deviant behavior.

Delinquency manifests itself as a result of an individual participating in the techniques of neutralization. Sykes and Matza's theory, techniques of neutralization, lists five major types of neutralization: *the denial of responsibility*, *the denial of injury*, *the denial of victim*, *the condemnation of the condemners*, and lastly, *the appeal to higher loyalties* (Sykes & Matza, 1957). Denial of responsibility suggests that the individual denies personal accountability. The deviant denies personal responsibility for the offense, claiming that it was not his or her fault. Batterers, for example, often deny responsibility for an abusive incident by claiming that they were drunk.

Denial of injury concept focuses on the distinction between *mala in se* and *mala prohibitum*. *Mala in se* is defined as "inherently evil conduct;" whereas, *mala prohibitum* is defined as "prohibited conduct" (Samaha, 1999, p. 9). The individual claims the element of harm is absent while involved in the illegal behavior. Thus, individuals arrested for illegal gambling will sometimes maintain their innocence on the ground that no one gets hurt from what they do.

Denial of victim transforms the victim into a justifiable target and allows the delinquent to escape culpability. Often, court room participants will argue that a rape occurred because the woman was dressed provocatively and therefore deserved what she received.

Condemnation of the condemners allows the delinquent to shift attention from his/her delinquency and criticize those persons who allege violations of the law. For example, a child whose parent catches him smoking marijuana may argue, "Why shouldn't I smoke pot? You drink and everyone knows that alcohol is worse for you than marijuana."

The last technique, appeal to higher loyalties, explains justification of violating the law by conforming to the demands of the group he/she belongs to, claiming to have done the act to

benefit others besides themselves. A fraternity brother caught for stealing an exam might say that he did so for the benefit of his brothers. Sykes and Matza (1957) argue that techniques of neutralization are significant in diminishing the effectiveness of social controls and that these techniques are behind a great portion of delinquency. Because Sykes and Matza argued that a major function of techniques of neutralization is that they allow the individual to engage in deviance while protecting himself or herself from guilt, shame, or a negative self-image, thus, participating in favorable definitions of crime via justification, the combination of neutralization and differential association warrants attention. These neutralization techniques, it is assumed, will offer support for the present research.

Underlying Assumptions

Neutralization, like differential association, is a positivistic theory. According to differential association, individuals are social “blanks” until socialized into conforming social roles by primary groups such as families and friends (Sutherland, 1947). A person’s gender does not prohibit him/her from becoming socialized with learned definitions of criminal behavior and the ability to commit crimes. Differential association assumes conventional values and traditions coexisting and conflicting with “subterranean values” (Matza & Sykes, 1961). According to the authors subterranean values are “the search for adventure, excitement, and thrills” (p. 716). Subterranean values are not noticed until the individual has demonstrated delinquent learned behavior. Vold, Bernard, and Snipes (1998) contend that subterranean values are not evil or deviant, but that they are values that are widely held throughout society. Subterranean values can lead to neutralization by allowing the delinquent to rationalize or justify his/her behavior.

Neutralization validates and excuses the commission of deviant acts (Sykes & Matza, 1957). This notion asserts that delinquents are excused from any criminality, but this validation only exists in the delinquent's mind. It also assumes that delinquents hold the same values but are able to neutralize under certain circumstances; therefore, a delinquent's ethics do not necessarily oppose the values of most people (Matza & Sykes, 1961; Sykes & Matza). Techniques of neutralization are favorable to crime and delinquency, thereby allowing the perpetrator(s) to justify their actions as non-deviant (Agnew, 1994). Both differential association and learned techniques of neutralization have been shown to have an effect on female and male delinquency.

Major Contributors

W. I. Thomas and other members of the Chicago School were instrumental in shaping Sutherland's ideology (Vold et al., 1998; Williams & McShane, 1988). Thomas, Sutherland's mentor, recommended that he write a book on criminology, which ultimately became the catalyst for Sutherland's theory of Differential Association. The first edition, *Criminology*, was published in 1924. Vold et al. contend that Michael and Adler influenced Sutherland by publishing a report on criminology and scrutinizing criminological theory and research in 1933. The report, written by Michael and Adler, prompted Sutherland to create a general theory so he could organize facts known about criminal behavior (Vold et al.).

The theory of differential association was also influenced by George Mead's theory of symbolic interactionism. Vold and Bernard (1986, p. 211) explain the relationship by saying that individuals create somewhat permanent "definitions" of their situations from the meanings they develop from their experiences. That is, they derive specific meanings from specific experiences

but then generalize them so that they become a set way of looking at things. On the basis of those different definitions, two individuals may act toward similar situations in very different ways.

Sutherland's theory of differential association has two basic elements: "the content of what is learned" and "the process by which the learning takes place" (Vold, Bernard, & Snipes, 1998, p. 211). Sutherland built the framework for his theory based on the above two elements. He used Mead's argument that people construct definitions and that through social interaction with others, people learn behaviors and ideas (Vold et al., 1998). Williams and McShane (1988, p. 49) stated, "Park and Burgess' conception of the city as a multifaceted organism, the ecological work of Shaw and McKay, and Sutherland's association with Thorsten Sellin were crucial to the actual development of the theory." Sellin argued in the 1930s that crime was an outcome of a conflict between cultures. According to Sellin (1938), in a homogenous society the "conduct norms" that are digested into law represent an unanimity of society. However, in a heterogeneous society that contains many diverse subcultures, the law represents the conduct norms of the dominant culture and members of various subcultures may violate the law when they follow their groups' native conduct norms. From these ideas, Sutherland developed the concepts of differential association. As denoted above, Sutherland extracted pieces of information from various sources to formulate his theory that explains all crime and delinquency.

To understand neutralization, one must also understand the concept of drift. According to Sykes and Matza, adolescent behavior runs along a continuum, with complete freedom at one end and complete constraint at the other. Rather than plant themselves at one end or the other, the adolescents fluctuate between the two extremes. The delinquent adolescent exists in a limbo between convention and crime but never settling on one (Matza, 1964). Moreover, drift is said

to occur in areas of the social structure in which control has been loosened, freeing the delinquent to respond to whatever conventional or criminal forces to happen along (Vold et al., 1998). Thus, according to Akers (1994), neutralization can be considered a control theory based on the above explanation. Further, the drift into delinquency is made possible by learning justifications or rationalizations, which Sykes and Matza called techniques of neutralization, that neutralize the constraint of society's norms of behavior and thus legitimate deviation.

Research by Albert Reiss has proven critical in establishing later works in control theory by Walter Reckless and Sykes and Matza. Reiss (1951) combined personality and socialization in order to formulate three components of social control that explain delinquency: the lack of proper internal controls, breakdown or absence of internal controls, and conflict in social rules provided by important social groups, all of which compose the social controls needed to explain deviance (Reiss).

Criticisms of Theories

All criminological theories are assessed and analyzed; wherein, critics of differential association identify certain weaknesses. Vold et al. (1998) contend that testing differential association is problematic for a variety of reasons, causal ordering being one of the most apparent problems. Differential association does not delineate how the first criminal became a criminal (Sutherland, 1947). Sutherland never goes into any detail about how crime started. Thus, his theory is not applicable to the very first criminal. According to Williams and McShane (1988), Sutherland's original adaptation of differential association contained a number of central concepts that were not clearly defined and depend on an explanation of social learning (Cohen, Lindesmith, & Schuessler, 1956). Differential association also does not clarify how some

behaviors derive or who started them, how some crimes are committed without associates, and what counts as a surplus in definitions. In addition, the theory of differential association does not explain illogical acts of violence or destruction (Sutherland). Sutherland addressed why some people kill others via learning violence as an appropriate response to certain stimulus, but he did not address the issue of suicide. Lastly, differential association fails to answer why each person in contact with an excess of illegal actions does not develop into a criminal (Vold et al., 1998; Williams & McShane). Sutherland's theory cannot predict how people will rationalize events; therefore, differential association does not explain why some people who do not become criminals have an excess of illegal actions surrounding their lives.

Previous studies on neutralization do not generally offer strong support. Many criminologists argue that the theory is not sufficient because of testability and causal ordering problems (Agnew, 1994). Neutralization does not clarify at which point a delinquent justifies his/her behavior. Another significant issue concerning neutralization is that a person's justifications and rationalizations cannot be tested because they change over time. Hamlin (1988) determined that establishing a causal order between obedient behavior and justifications is nearly impossible to prove irrefutably (Minor, 1981). Further, Hamlin stated that people see their own behavior differently, and it is this difference that leads to causal order problems. Some also point out that neutralization allows delinquency but does not necessarily lead to it. Therefore, it may have a strong effect on delinquents, but none on others. Hamlin also argued that the lack of support for neutralization is a possible indicator that the theory is incorrect. The inability to achieve empirical support for the theory denotes another criticism for neutralization.

Conclusion

As can be seen by the results of the above empirical studies and differential theoretical perspectives, athletic participation may be positively or negatively associated with deviant behavior. These diverse findings and perspectives demonstrate a need for further investigation concerning this issue. With this in mind, the current research provided a comparison of the effects across different groups of athletes i.e., football, basketball, golf, volleyball, baseball, track, softball, soccer, in an attempt to establish a theoretical framework for understanding the role of athletic participation in explaining deviant behavior.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to examine and compare patterns of deviance among college athletes and non-athletes. The data collected in this study were derived from an anonymous self-report survey administered during the fall of 2001 and spring 2002 at a southern regional university. The instrument measured variables derived from the framework of differential association and neutralization theories and several demographics.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Sample

Two versions of the survey were dispensed to the respondents, one for intercollegiate athletes and the other for non-athlete students. The athletic survey contained a question asking what sport(s) they participated in. The non-athletic survey simply omitted that question. Permission was obtained to administer the survey to the athletes for the study through the university's athletic director. After meeting with the director, it was determined that athletes' participation would be requested on a voluntary basis, with no reward extended to participants or sanctions for those who did not participate. Athletes from all but one university sport (tennis) were surveyed. These were volleyball, golf, football, basketball, track, baseball, soccer, and softball. However, members of the soccer and basketball teams had to be individually contacted by the surveyor because of mandatory scheduled meetings rendering them unavailable on the

days the survey was administered. Football and softball players were surveyed during their own mandatory club meetings.

Non-intercollegiate athlete students were asked to voluntarily complete surveys in two history classes. History classes were selected because they are required and the combined enrollment of two sections was approximately equal to the number of athletes.

There were 325 total respondents that participated in the study. Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) state that a minimum of 100 cases must be used for multiple regression analysis, suggesting an adequate sample size for the planned analysis. Subjects included 156 students at the university who participated in an intercollegiate sport as well as 169 non-athletes who were enrolled in required history classes, creating a total sample of 325. The non-athlete student sample was limited to those who were present on the day the survey was administered. Of those 325 individuals, 49% were female and 51% were male. The sample was 80% white and 20% black. The total number of athletic undergraduate students in the university was 253, thus, 62% of athletic undergraduate students were included in the sample.

Prior to taking the survey, each participant was presented with a three page consent form (see Appendix G) to be initialed and signed. The consent form provided individuals with a description of the study and informed them that their answers would be anonymous.

Apparatus

Instruments incorporated in the survey were generated via the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) survey, which was developed by Esbensen and Osgood (1999), and from Agnew (1994), and Agnew & Peters (1986). The items adopted from the survey included measures of self-reported deviance, perceptions of friends' deviance (a learning indicator), and

neutralization indicators. That is, the items used in the survey were measurements of a theoretical framework (i.e. differential association and techniques of neutralization), which explain the frequency of deviance among an athletic college population as compared to a non-athletic college population. A number of relevant demographic measures were also included.

The seven-page survey (see Appendices H & I) began with an introductory paragraph informing the participants that completing the questionnaire was completely voluntary and that their answers were strictly confidential and guaranteed anonymity. Page one of the questionnaire consisted of questions that related to the participant's demographic characteristics. For the athletic population, questions were asked concerning their participation in sports, while for the non-athletic population those questions were omitted. Both groups were asked to specify high school athletic activities. Pages two through seven contained questions that were designed to assess peer relationships, levels of peer deviance, deviant behaviors of the subjects, neutralizations of the subjects in the study to commit crime, and sex deviance.

Dependent Measures

It has been recommended that individual scales be used in assessing types of deviant behavior which individuals report being involved in as well as the extent of that involvement (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). That is, one cannot assume that just because an individual reports substance abuse that he/she has also participated in violent behaviors. Furthermore, Sorensen and Brownfield (1995) have stated when testing any theoretical model, an extensive list of deviant behaviors should be included.

Deviant Behavior

This research attempted to assess a wide range of deviant activity engaged in by college students as compared to student athletes. A 16-item deviance scale (see Appendix A) was used to gauge the prevalence and frequency of deviant involvement attributed to each subject in the study. The overall deviance scale was composed of four sub-scales and a one item measure: cheating offenses, which included cheating on tests and papers for class; drug offenses, which included drinking, smoking marijuana, chewing tobacco, and using other prohibited drugs; property offenses, which included destroying or defacing public or private property, stealing items worth more than \$50.00, and stealing items worth less than \$50.00; violent offenses, which included hitting someone you are angry with, cursing out someone you are angry with, illegally carrying a gun or knife, or taking part in a fight; sex deviance, which included had sex with someone other than a regular partner.

Subjects were asked whether or not they had engaged in each of the 16 behaviors ever in their lives and the number of times in the last 12 months. Response categories for each time period included a possible "yes," (scored as 1), and a possible "no" (scored as 0), as well as the number of times the deviant act had been committed in the past 12 months. Each participant's total deviance measure was computed by summing the total number of deviant behaviors in which the subject reportedly engaged, including two items for academic cheating, five items for drug offenses, four items for property offenses, four items for violent behaviors, and a single item measuring relationship integrity (see Appendix B). Each of the sub-scales and the one-item measure were also scored separately.

Independent Measures

It has been argued that the most consistent finding on the causes of deviance is that individuals with deviant peer associations are more likely to be deviant themselves (Agnew, 1991). Moreover, McCarthy (1996) suggested that recent studies have employed a general interpretation of Sutherland's theory when testing differential association. That is, people acquire definitions legitimizing crime or deviance through contact with persons who display deviant behaviors and attitudes (e.g., Warr, 1993; Warr & Stafford, 1991). In fact, Paternoster and Triplett (1988) found that friends' definitions and behaviors were significantly related to the prevalence and incidence of three out of four delinquent acts included in their study. The current research followed this logical construct.

Peer Deviance

Numerous empirical studies have strongly supported the relationship between delinquent associates and delinquent behavior (e.g., Agnew, 1991; Johnson, 1979; McCarthy, 1996; Tittle, Burke, & Jackson, 1986); however, no research has been conducted on the relationship between athletic participation and delinquent peers. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that athletes are typically exposed to conforming influences, both within the school and the community. These influences include increased interest in school; high academic achievement; membership in elite groups; and expectations of participation in college sport (Matza, 1964; Schafer, 1969; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1990). Rehberg and Schafer (1968) found that athletes tend to have close friends who are more positive in educational attitudes, aspirations, and behavior than are the close friends of non-athletes.

This manner of operationalizing differential association assessed properties of current friends involved in various types of deviance. The overall measure consisted of a 20 item scale (see Appendix C), which was the compilation of suspected peer deviance (see Appendix D). It included six items for drug offenses, four items for property offenses, and two items for violent offenses that asked the subject to characterize deviant involvement of their friends for each behavior. Possible responses included “none” (scored as 1), “few” (scored as 2), “half” (scored as 3), “most” (scored as 4), and “all” (scored as 5); however, six questions were reverse coded with the possible responses “none” (scored as 5), “few” (scored as 4), “half” (scored as 3), “most” (scored as 2), and “all” (scored as 1). Respondents were asked the following questions about behaviors of their current friends: almost always obeyed team rules, skipped classes without an excuse, lied, disobeyed, or talked back to teachers, coaches or other authority figures, purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them, got along well with teachers at school, stole something worth less than \$50, stole something worth more than \$50, gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something, have been involved in community activities such as volunteer and youth groups, hit someone with the idea of hurting them, attacked someone with a weapon, regularly took part in their family activities, sold marijuana, sold other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD, have been regularly involved in religious activities, used tobacco products, used alcohol, used marijuana, have been thought of as good students, used other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD. Thus, possible scores on associations favorable to deviance ranged from 20 to 100 for all forms of deviance combined.

Neutralization

These variables (see Appendix E & F) were conceptualized as the level of rationalization of the subjects' willingness to commit offense and were drawn from earlier work by Agnew (1994) and Agnew and Peters (1986). Using a combined scale of 11 items, the first four consisted of measures justifying violent behavior: it's alright to beat up people if they started the fight; it's alright to physically beat people who call you names; if people do something to make you really mad, they deserve to be beaten up; if you don't physically fight back, people will walk all over you.

Another seven items measured justifications of cheating behavior: the instructor deliberately gave an overly difficult or tricky exam; the outcome of the exam was crucial to your future career: a low grade might keep you out of professional school or keep you from getting the job you want; other students in the class refused to share their notes with you or help you in some other way; you found out that most of the other students in the class had cheated sometime during their college career; your friends pressured you to help them cheat; you knew the exam material very well, but were so nervous that you just couldn't remember it; the professor shows favoritism toward certain students when giving grades. Responses to all questions ranged along a five-point Likert scale from "strongly agree" (scored as 5) to "strongly disagree" (scored as 1).

Other Independent Measures

Gender

Participants were asked to report their sex based on the options of "male" (scored as 1) and "female" (scored as 0).

Race

Participants were also instructed to state their ethnic background by marking “black” (scored as 1), or “white” (scored as 0).

Year in School

The year in school of each respondent was determined by responding to the following options: “Freshman” (scored as 1), “Sophomore” (scored as 2), “Junior” (scored as 3), “Senior” (scored as 4), or “Graduate” (scored as 5).

Major

This item was assessed by asking the participant an open ended question that required a qualitative answer.

GPA

GPA was determined by asking the respondents to report their current GPA.

Religious Affiliation

This item was measured with an open-ended question asking respondents to name their religious affiliation.

Three other questions were asked of the participants to get a better measure of religious commitment. Respondents were asked how many hours per month they devote to attending church services. Secondly, they were asked how many hours per month they spend attending Sunday school. Lastly, participants were required to note how many hours per month they

devoted to religious or spiritual activities other than attending church or Sunday school. These three questions were combined into one religious variable, religious involvement, which summed the scores across the three questions.

Student Organizations

Participants were asked to mark a box, either “present” or “past,” as well as how many years they had participated in various organizations (i.e. academic, fraternities, governance programs, greek life, honor societies, religious organizations, residence halls, service, sororities, sports clubs, special interest groups, study abroad).

High School Sport Participation

This item was assessed by asking respondents to first check “yes” or “no” to whether or not they had participated in sports in high school. Then they were asked to report the sport and the number of years of participation in that sport.

University Sport Participation

This item was measured by asking respondents which sport(s) (i.e. football, volleyball, basketball, track, golf, tennis, softball, baseball, soccer) they had participated in, “present” or “past,” as well as the total number years of participation.

Analysis of the Data

The first phase of data analysis involved an examination of the frequency distributions of respondent characteristics. A distribution of characteristics was reported for the entire sample. This allows the researcher to obtain a clear picture of the sample by reporting the characteristics of each respondent. Various descriptive statistics were used to provide the number of valid cases, the mean, and the standard deviation for each variable in the analysis.

The selected variables for the self-reported deviance scales were examined to determine the reliability and inter-item correlations for the scales. For widely used scales, the reliability should not fall below .80 (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). A reliability analysis of the scales used in the current study revealed standardized alpha of .80 for the total self-reported deviance scale, which indicates that these scales are reliable measures of self-reported deviance collectively; however, the subscales cheating, drug, property and violent offenses were not reliable measures above .80. The peer deviance scale had an alpha of .85 indicating reliable measures overall, which include subscales violent, drug, and property. However, violence and property (see Appendix D) subscales were below .80, while the peer drug scale had a reliability of .81 indicating reliable measures for only the drug subscale. The neutralization scales aggregate reliability was .89 which includes the following subscales with their associated alphas above .80, violence .82 and cheating .91 indicating reliable measures of neutralization.

In the second phase of the study, the hypotheses were examined through the use of ordinary least squares regression (OLS). Regression was the most suitable test to use in an analysis of this type for various reasons. In addition to the dependent variables measuring deviance, OLS also incorporates the effects of multiple independent variables on a continuous dependent variable. Also, OLS analysis allows for the prediction of the dependent variable

based on the cumulative effects of multiple independent variables. It determines the strength and direction of the linear relationship among a set of independent variables on a single dependent variable. For purposes of this research, deviance was regressed on the dummy athlete/non-athlete variable, two indicators of differential association, neutralization measures in some cases, and a series of demographic/control variables.

In order to use the OLS method to estimate and make inferences about the coefficients in linear regression analysis, a number of assumptions must be satisfied (Berry, 1993; Berry & Feldman, 1985; Lewis-Beck, 1980). Also, the linear regression model can easily be extended to suit dichotomous predictors (Berry & Feldman, 1985, p. 64-75; Lewis-Beck, 1980, p. 66-71), such as the sex variable. Otherwise, all variables must be continuous and measured on an interval or ratio scale. In addition, the dependent variable should be normally distributed around the prediction line. This all assumes that the variables are related to each other linearly. Accordingly, all variables should be normally distributed in the population and the sample should be randomly selected.

Conclusion

This chapter examined how research was conducted by describing the survey instrument and the procedure for collecting the data. The independent, dependent, and control measures used in the study were discussed and their respective scales delineated. Finally, the types of statistical analysis that were conducted were described. The findings are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this research was to assess the relationship between athletic participation and deviant behavior among college students through a theoretical framework of differential association and techniques of neutralization. This was accomplished by administering a survey to an athletic and non-athletic sample of university students. The data were analyzed through the use of regression analysis in order to test the effects of multiple independent variables on various forms of deviance.

Preliminary Analysis

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Demographic characteristics for each of the 325 respondents are presented in Table 1. The sample consisted of 52% (n=169) non-athletes and 48% (n=156) athletes. Fifty-one percent (n=167) of the respondents were male, and 49% (n=158) were female. The majority of the sample was White (n=253 or 78%), while 19% (n=63) were Black. The modal age of respondents was 19 or 20, with a mean age of 20. Over a third of respondents (n=127 or 39%) maintained a GPA of 2.02 to 3.0, with an average GPA of 3.0. A majority of the sample were freshmen (n=169 or 52%), while 28% were classified as sophomores. Most respondents reported spending less than four hours a month on religious or spiritual activities (n=235 or 72%), and less than two hours a month in Sunday school (n=214 or 66%), while 37% (n=121) reported spending less than two hours monthly attending church services.

Table 1

Characteristics Of The Sample (n=325)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Label</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Athlete (n=325)	No	0	169	52.0
	Yes	1	156	48.0
Gender (n=325)	Female	0	158	48.6
	Male	1	167	51.4
Race (n=316)	White	0	253	77.8
	Black	1	63	19.4
	Missing	-9	9	2.8
Age (n=323)		17 to 18	124	38.1
		19 to 20	134	41.2
		21 to 22	47	14.4
		23 to 45	18	5.4
	Missing	-9	2	.6
GPA (n=264)		1.00 to 2.0	17	5.2
		2.02 to 3.0	127	38.8
		3.10 to 4.0	120	36.9
	Missing	-9	60	18.5
School Year (n=325)	Freshman	1	169	52.0
	Sophomore	2	91	28.0
	Junior	3	45	13.8
	Senior	4	20	6.2

Table Continues

Table 1

Characteristics Of The Sample continued...

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Label</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Religious Activities (n=310)		0.00 to 4	235	72.4
		5.00 to 10	50	15.3
		12.0 to 20	19	5.7
		25.0 to 60	6	1.8
	Missing	-9	15	4.6
Sunday School (n=315)		0.00 to 2	214	65.8
		3.00 to 8	85	26.2
		10.0 to 30	14	4.3
	Missing	-9	10	3.1
Church Attendance (n=317)		0.00 to 2	121	37.3
		3.00 to 6	96	29.5
		7.00 to 10	59	18.1
		11.0 to 15	15	4.5
		16.0 to 24	17	5.2
	Missing	-9	9	2.7
	Missing	-9	8	2.5

Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables

Descriptive statistics for the independent variables are listed in Table 2. Subjects assessed the involvement of their friends in 20 deviant acts to serve as an indicator of differential association. Scores on the total peer deviance scale ranged from 20 to 70, with a mean of 41.44. Subscales were constructed for peer violent, property, and drug offenses.

A neutralization scale was comprised of 11 items, with four being for violence and seven for cheating. Total neutralization scores ranged from 11 to 52, with a mean of 27.4.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics For Independent Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>
<u>Differential Association Measures</u>				
Peer Violence	2	10	3.08	1.38
Peer Drug Deviance	6	23	11.88	3.93
Peer Property Deviance	4	14	5.85	2.15
Peer Total Deviance	20	70	41.44	8.88
<u>Neutralization Measures</u>				
Neutralization Of Violence	4	20	10.35	3.45
Neutralization Of Cheating	7	35	17.06	5.52
Neutralization Total	11	52	27.42	7.65

Pearson's Product Moment Correlations

Tables 3 through 5 display the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for the independent and dependent variables. Correlation does not indicate causation but only shows how two variables relate to each other in terms of significance, magnitude, and direction. The Pearson product-moment correlations for the independent variables with self-reported violent and property offenses appear in Table 3. The differential association measures were consistent with theoretical expectations, the peer violence scale being significantly and positively related to both self-reported violent ($r=.212$) and property offending ($r=.119$). In addition, peer drug deviance was significantly and positively related to self-reported property deviance ($r=.157$). Peer property deviance was significantly and positively related to self-reported property deviance

($r=.178$). In sum, reported peer deviance was positively related to all forms of self-reported deviance, and significantly to most.

The neutralization measures also complied with theoretical expectations. Individuals' neutralization of violence was significantly related to self-reported violent deviance ($r=.133$). Likewise, respondents' neutralization of cheating behaviors was also significantly related to self-reported violent behavior ($r=.201$). Furthermore, the sum of neutralization behaviors was significantly related to self-reported violent deviance ($r=.206$). That is, as one's level of neutralization increases, chances of reporting deviant behavior decreases. Finally, the sum of neutralization measures was significantly related to both self-reported sexual deviance ($r=.163$) and self-reported total deviance ($r=.142$). Overall, neutralization was positively related to all forms of deviance, significantly to most.

Gender was significantly related to sexual deviance ($r=.133$) (see Table 5), indicating that males were more likely to participate in such behavior. Surprisingly, however, gender was not significantly related to any other deviant behaviors. Religious involvement was negatively correlated with all forms of deviance, but significantly so only for drug use. GPA was weakly and inconsistently related to deviance. Race was significantly related to both drug deviance ($r=-.126$) and academic cheating ($r=.129$), but in opposite directions (see Table 4). Thus, blacks reported a higher level of academic cheating but a lower level of drug deviance compared to whites.

The most surprising finding was the absence of any correlation between the athlete/nonathlete variable and all forms of deviance. While there are both theoretical and prior empirical grounds for predicting correlation in either direction, none of the six correlations were significant.

Table 3

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Violent And Property Deviance (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Violent Deviance	Property Deviance
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-.002	-.012
Gender	.054	.063
GPA	.000	-.030
Race	.007	-.016
Religious Involvement	-.075	-.076
Peer Violence	.212**	.119*
Peer Drug Deviance	.073	.157*
Peer Property Deviance	.110	.178**
Peer Total Deviance	.142*	.214**
Neutralization Of Violence	.133*	.200**
Neutralization Of Cheating	.201**	.202**
Neutralization Sum	.206**	.239**

*denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 4

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Drug Deviance And Academic Cheating (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Drug Deviance	Academic Cheating
Athlete or Non Athlete	-.104	.079
Gender	.020	.078
GPA	-.044	-.087
Race	-.126*	.129*
Religious Involvement	-.141*	-.065
Peer Violence	-.030	.221**
Peer Drug Deviance	.296**	-.039
Peer Property Deviance	.058	.032
Peer Total Deviance	.183**	.115*
Neutralization Of Violence	.028	.205**
Neutralization Of Cheating	.053	.253**
Neutralization Sum	.051	.277**

*denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 5

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Sexual And Total Deviance (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Sex Deviance	Total Deviance
Athlete or Non Athlete	.076	-.089
Gender	.133*	.046
GPA	-.091	-.039
Race	.072	-.111
Religious Involvement	-.087	-.163*
Peer Violence	.053	.051
Peer Drug Deviance	.154**	.305**
Peer Property Deviance	.115*	.091
Peer Total Deviance	.167**	.229**
Neutralization Of Violence	.153**	.104
Neutralization Of Cheating	.132*	.132*
Neutralization Sum	.163**	.142*

*denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)
**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Tables 6 through 8 display the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for the independent and dependent variables for the contact versus non-contact respondents. The differential association measures were again somewhat consistent with theoretical expectations, with a quarter (6 of 24) correlations being significant. Peer violence was significantly and positively related to both self-reported violent ($r=.424$) and property offending ($r=.233$). In addition, peer property deviance was significantly related to self-reported property offending

($r=.313$). Total peer deviance was significantly related to both self-reported violent behavior ($r=.268$) and self-reported property deviance ($r=.293$).

The neutralization measures also generally complied with theoretical expectations, with half (9 of 18) being positive and significant (see Table 6). Neutralization of violence was significantly and positively related to both violent offending ($r=.323$) and property deviance ($r=.257$). Neutralization of cheating was also significantly related to both self-reported violent deviance ($r=.231$) and self-reported property deviance ($r=.304$). The sum of neutralization measures was significantly related to self-reported violent deviance ($r=.305$) as well as self-reported property deviance ($r=.336$).

Table 7 also reveals that peer violence was significantly and positively related to self-reported academic cheating ($r=.241$), supporting learning theory. Neutralization of violence ($r=.217$), neutralization of cheating ($r=.258$), and sum of neutralization ($r=.282$) were all positively and significantly related to self-reported academic cheating. That is, as one's level of neutralizing increases so does self-reported academic cheating behavior.

Again athletic participation failed to correlate with any forms of deviance. The dummy-coded contact/noncontact variable was unrelated to all forms of deviance. Thus preliminary bivariate analysis suggested that while learning and neutralization variables play roles in explaining deviance among college students, no evidence emerged to support a focus on athletic participation as either insulating students from or motivating students toward deviance.

Table 6

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Violent And Property Deviance for Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Violent Deviance	Property Deviance
Contact or Non-Contact	-.071	-.100
Gender	.043	-.131
GPA	.063	.101
Race	.066	.004
Religious Involvement	-.041	-.007
Peer Violence	.424**	.233**
Peer Drug Deviance	.089	.143
Peer Property Deviance	.122	.313**
Peer Total Deviance	.268**	.293**
Neutralization Of Violence	.323**	.257**
Neutralization Of Cheating	.231**	.304**
Neutralization Sum	.305**	.336**

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 7

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Drug Deviance And Academic Cheating for Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Drug Deviance	Academic Cheating
Contact or Non-Contact	-.040	-.135
Gender	.067	.019
GPA	-.032	-.025
Race	-.157	.136
Religious Involvement	-.130	-.067
Peer Violence	-.064	.241**
Peer Drug Deviance	.115	-.108
Peer Property Deviance	-.007	-.014
Peer Total Deviance	.040	.110
Neutralization Of Violence	.007	.217**
Neutralization Of Cheating	-.070	.258**
Neutralization Sum	-.048	.282**

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Table 8

Pearson's Product-moment Correlations Between Independent Variables And Self-reported Sexual And Total Deviance for Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variables</u>	
	Sex Deviance	Total Deviance
Contact or Non-Contact	.084	-.081
Gender	.080	.061
GPA	-.134	-.010
Race	.071	-.110
Religious Involvement	-.049	-.129
Peer Violence	.020	.093
Peer Drug Deviance	.051	.105
Peer Property Deviance	.069	.010
Peer Total Deviance	.112	.120
Neutralization Of Violence	.155	.138
Neutralization Of Cheating	.044	.034
Neutralization Sum	.096	.083

Multicollinearity

Correlations between independent variables are useful to identify potential problems associated with multicollinearity. When the independent variables in a regression equation are highly correlated with one another, they are said to be collinear. Collinearity means there is a

linear relationship among the independent variables. Ideally, the independent variables will be strongly correlated with the dependent variable but less correlated with one another.

Multicollinearity decreases the reliability of the regression analyses due to the presence of highly correlated independent variables (Blalock, 1979). Although not a hard-and-fast rule, multicollinearity is likely when variables are correlated above .70. At this level, problems arise with the causal interpretation and sampling errors may occur due to high inter-correlations. However, an examination of bivariate correlations revealed that multicollinearity was not a concern for the current study. The highest correlation between independent variables, for example, was .36 for race and athlete/non-athlete; and .44 for neutralization violence and peer violence.

Multivariate Analysis

The proposed theoretical framework depicted deviance as a function of learning, neutralization, involvement in sports, and a series of demographic influences. Previous research has found highly consistent support for a relationship between peer behavior and deviance (Agnew, 1991; Costello & Vowell, 1999; Jackson, Tittle, & Burke, 1986; Matsueda, 1982; McCarthy, 1996; Paetsch & Bertrand, 1997; Tittle, Burke, & Jackson, 1986; Voss, 1969; Warr, 1993, 1993; Warr & Stafford, 1991), often interpreted as evidence of learning influences. Likewise, some support has been found for neutralization leading to deviance (Agnew, 1994; Agnew & Peters, 1986; Austin, 1977; Ball, 1968; Ball & Lilly, 1971; Costello, 2000; Hindelang, 1973; Hirschi, 1969; Minor, 1981; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Thurman, 1984). The third variable, sports involvement, has been far less clear. Prior research has suggested a relationship between participation in sports and deviant behavior, with mixed results. Some of the prior studies

demonstrate that participation in sports decreases deviant behavior (Agnew & Petersen, 1989; Buhrman, 1977; Buhrman & Bratton, 1978; Hastad, Segrave, Pangrazi, & Petersen, 1984; Schafer, 1969, 1969; Segrave & Hastad, 1982). Conversely other studies insinuate that athletes reported increased deviant behavior (Begg et al., 1996; Segrave, Moreau, & Hastad, 1985; Skolnick, 1993; Young, 1990). Still, other research provides that sport participation has little or no significant influence upon deviant behavior (Landers & Landers, 1978; Leonard, 1998; Yiannakis, 1980). To consider the influence of these three components (learning, neutralization and sports involvement) on deviance, the following regression equation was estimated for each type of deviance:

$$\text{deviance} = \text{constant} + \text{friends' deviance} + \text{neutralization} + \text{sports involvement}.$$

The model was then elaborated by the introduction of the following control variables: gender, race, grade-point average, and religious involvement, and by operationalizing deviance with different categories of behavior.

Athletes vs Non-Athletes

Self-reported Total Deviance. Table 9 illustrates the model that regressed self-reported total deviance on the seven independent variables. The significance for the overall model of self-reported total deviance was ($F=3.24, p<.05$). It explains 12% of the variation (**R squared=.117**) in self-reported total deviant behavior. However, only the perceived deviance of peers was significant in the equation. Thus only learning theory is supported in attempting to explain overall deviance and not involvement in sports, neutralization or any of the demographic variables.

Table 9

Ols Regression Estimates For Total Deviance Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Total Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-36.944	-.141	.083
Gender	20.344	.078	.318
GPA	-22.718	-.102	.197
Race	-52.623	-.152	.055
Religious Involvement	-.896	-.105	.170
Peer Total Deviance	2.936	.187	.018*
Neutralization Sum	1.421	.082	.328
Intercept		-14.194	
F		3.237	
Overall Significance		.003 ^a	
R ²		.117	
Adjusted R Square		.081	

* denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

Self-reported Academic Cheating. Turning to specific types of deviance, Table 10 depicts the results of the OLS regression estimates of self-reported academic cheating on the same seven independent variables. The significance of the overall model for self-reported academic cheating was ($F=3.37$, $p<.01$), explaining approximately 10% of the variation (**R squared**=.096) in self-reported academic cheating. Of the seven independent variables, only the neutralization of cheating behavior ($B=.235$) was statistically significant. Thus academic

cheating appears to be a function of neutralization, but not learning, sports involvement or any of the four demographic variables.

Table 10

Ols Regression Estimates For Academic Cheating Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Academic Cheating		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	.133	.017	.805
Gender	-.193	-.025	.713
GPA	-.272	-.042	.536
Race	.439	.042	.542
Religious Involvement	-8.705e-03	-.032	.631
Peer Total Deviance	5.374e-02	.122	.073
Neutralization Of Cheating	.172	.235	.001**
Intercept		-2.527	
F		3.373	
Overall Significance		.002 ^a	
R ²		.096	
Adjusted R Square		.068	

**denotes significance at p<.01 (two-tailed)

Self-reported Drug Deviance. The results of regressing self-reported drug deviance on the athlete and learning variables, along with the four demographic variables, are presented in Table 11. The significance for the overall model of self-reported drug deviance was (F=4.29,

p<.01). It explains approximately 13% of the variation (**R squared**=.132) in self-reported drug use. Results indicate that for peer drug deviance, the learning indicator, was the only significant predictor of self-reported drug use (B=.275). Drug use, therefore, appears to be explained only by learning from peers and not sports involvement, neutralization, or demographics.

Table 11

Ols Regression Estimates For Drug Deviance Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
		Drug Deviance	
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-31.596	-.137	.069
Gender	21.002	.091	.206
GPA	-19.831	-.103	.146
Race	-26.010	-.088	.247
Religious Involvement	-.638	-.081	.244
Peer Drug Deviance	8.344	.275	.000**
Neutralization Sum	.302	.020	.786
Intercept		5.056	
F		4.294	
Overall Significance		.000 ^a	
R ²		.132	
Adjusted R Square		.102	

**denotes significance at p<.01 (two-tailed)

Self-reported Property Deviance. Table 12 reports the OLS regression of self-reported property deviance on the full model, revealing overall significance ($F=3.53$, $p<.01$). It explains 10% of the variation (**R squared**=.097) in self-reported property deviance. Results demonstrate that the sum of the neutralization measures was the only significant predictor of self-reported property deviance ($B=.257$). This indicates that as one's level of neutralization increases, so do the chances of self-reported property deviant behavior.

Table 12

Ols Regression Estimates For Property Deviance Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Property Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-.853	-.094	.176
Gender	.154	.017	.802
GPA	-.186	-.024	.716
Race	-.552	-.046	.506
Religious Involvement	-9.232e-03	-.029	.654
Peer Property Deviance	.235	.111	.097
Neutralization Sum	.158	.257	.000**
Intercept		-3.616	
F		3.529	
Overall Significance		.001 ^a	
R ²		.097	
Adjusted R Square		.070	

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Self-reported Violent Deviance. Self-reported violent deviant behavior was regressed on seven of the independent variables (see Table 13). The overall model failed to significantly predict violent behavior. None of the individual variables were significant predictors in the original model.

Table 13

Ols Regression Estimates For Violent Deviance Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Violent Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-5.721	-.075	.320
Gender	1.231	.016	.832
GPA	-1.132	-.018	.815
Race	-4.241	-.042	.579
Religious Involvement	-.107	-.041	.565
Peer Violence	4.074	.135	.078
Neutralization Of Violence	.523	.046	.567
Intercept		-.255	
F		.971	
Overall Significance		.453 ^a	
R ²		.032	
Adjusted R Square		-.001	

Self-reported Sexual Deviance. The next model regressed self-reported sexual deviance on the seven independent variables in the full equation (see Table 14). The significance for the overall model was (F=2.40, p<.01) and explains approximately 7% (**R squared**=.068) of the variation in self-reported sexually deviant behavior. Results indicate that peer total deviance was the only significant predictor of reported sexual deviance (B=.148). Thus, the more one's friends

are reported to be deviant, the more likely one will report deviant sexual acts. Neither of the other theoretical measures, neutralization and sports involvement, was supported.

Table 14

Ols Regression Estimates For Sexual Deviance Incidence Measures (n=325)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
		Sex	
	B	Beta	Sig.
Athlete or Non-Athlete	-6.537e-02	-.021	.770
Gender	.407	.128	.061
GPA	-.179	-.068	.315
Race	.110	.026	.710
Religious Involvement	-4.288e-03	-.039	.562
Peer Total Deviance	2.755e-02	.148	.033*
Neutralization Sum	1.236e-02	.059	.425
Intercept		-.637	
F		2.399	
Overall Significance		.022 ^a	
R ²		.068	
Adjusted R Square		.040	

* denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

Contact vs Non-Contact Athletes

The following analysis was conducted in order to compare participation in contact sports to non-contact sports to determine if type of sports participation was related to participation in deviant behavior. Thus, the athletic variable becomes one of type athlete (contact or not) instead of participating in a college sport or not. The coding scheme employed in the current analysis involved labeling non-contact athletes with a zero and contact athletes with a value of one. Prior research, although limited, has shown that contact sports tend to be associated with illegitimate violence and aggression (Crosset, Ptacek, McDonald, & Benedict, 1996; Skolnick, 1993; Segrave, Moreau, & Hastad, 1985).

Self-reported Total Deviance. Table 15 delineates the model that regressed self-reported total deviance on the seven variable model. The overall model was not significant.

Table 15

Ols Regression Estimates For Total Deviance Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Total Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	-33.354	-.168	.855
Gender	44.752	.220	.156
GPA	-9.112	-.050	.682
Race	-39.824	-.184	.132
Religious Involvement	-.559	-.064	.584
Peer Total Deviance	1.265	.103	.371
Neutralization Sum	-.221	-.017	.893
Intercept		17.318	
F		.834	
Overall Significance		.562 ^a	
R ²		.070	
Adjusted R Square		-.014	

Self-reported Academic Cheating. Table 16 depicts the OLS model, which regressed self-reported academic cheating on the seven independent variables. The model's overall significance was reported to be (F=2.02, p<.01) with an explained variation of 12% (**R squared**=.120). The strongest predictor of the model was neutralization of cheating behavior

(B=.223). As the willingness to neutralize increases, so does the chance of self-reporting deviant behavior. These results parallel those of the original equation (see Table 10) comparing athletes with non-athletes. Thus, it appears that the best predictor of academic cheating was the ability to neutralize. Neither participation in college athletics or type of sport selected was predictive of academic cheating.

Table 16

Ols Regression Estimates For Academic Cheating Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Academic Cheating		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	-1.309	-.145	.235
Gender	-.499	-.055	.655
GPA	-7.636e-02	-.010	.923
Race	1.238	.126	.196
Religious Involvement	-1.067e-02	-.026	.790
Peer Total Deviance	7.558e-02	.153	.113
Neutralization Of Cheating	.188	.223	.025*
Intercept		-3.622	
F		2.023	
Overall Significance		.059 ^a	
R ²		.120	
Adjusted R Square		.061	

* denotes significance at p < .05 (two-tailed)

Self-reported Drug Deviance. Self-reported drug deviance was regressed on seven independent variables (Table 17), but was not a statistically significant model. These results are also consistent with those of the athletic participation equation (see Table 11). Neither sports participation, type sports, nor any of the other variables were predictive of drug use.

Table 17

Ols Regression Estimates For Drug Deviance Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Drug Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	-24.058	-.140	.290
Gender	37.078	.215	.122
GPA	-4.004	-.027	.794
Race	-29.764	-.164	.157
Religious Involvement	-.561	-.073	.490
Peer Drug Deviance	1.494	.062	.555
Neutralization Sum	-.273	-.026	.812
Intercept		24.316	
F		.980	
Overall Significance		.451 ^a	
R ²		.067	
Adjusted R Square		-.001	

Self-reported Property Deviance. Table 18 illustrates the OLS model for self-reported property deviance and the original independent variables. The model had an overall reported significance level of ($F=5.46$, $p<.01$) with an explained variation of 26% (**R squared**=.258). The single most significant predictor of self-reported property deviance was the total neutralization score ($B=.381$), followed by peer property deviance ($B=.220$). These results are very similar to those of the sports participation equation (see Table 12). Thus, it appears that both learning and neutralization measures hold predictive power regarding property offenses amongst college students and college athletes.

Table 18

Ols Regression Estimates For Property Deviance Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Property Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	-.531	-.098	.359
Gender	-.910	-.166	.130
GPA	.393	.085	.338
Race	.223	.038	.667
Religious Involvement	1.095e-02	.044	.609
Peer Property Deviance	.251	.220	.016*
Neutralization Sum	.134	.381	.000**
Intercept		-5.064	
F		5.464	
Overall Significance		.000 ^a	
R ²		.258	
Adjusted R Square		.211	

* denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Self-reported Violent Deviance. When self-reported violent deviant behavior was regressed on the seven independent variables (Table 19), it was determined that the overall

model's significance was ($F=3.74$, $p<.05$) and 22% (**R squared**=.220) of the variation was explained. Peer violence was the strongest significant predictor ($B=.320$), closely followed by neutralization of violence ($B=.298$). An increase of violent peers enhances the likelihood one will report violent behavior, thus, coinciding with learning theoretical expectations. Likewise, neutralization predictions were met, which state that the more one neutralizes negative behaviors, the more likely one will report deviant behaviors because of one's ability to circumvent normative guides to behavior.

Table 19

Ols Regression Estimates For Violent Deviance Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
	Violent Deviance		
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	-5.820	-.164	.186
Gender	-2.451	-.069	.588
GPA	.898	.029	.772
Race	-1.818	-.048	.633
Religious Involvement	3.400e-02	.021	.824
Peer Violence	3.644	.320	.003**
Neutralization Of Violence	1.670	.298	.011*
Intercept		-20.382	
F		3.738	
Overall Significance		.001 ^a	
R ²		.220	
Adjusted R Square		.161	

*denotes significance at $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

**denotes significance at $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

Self-reported Sexual Deviance. When self-reported sexual deviance was regressed on the independent variables (Table 20), the overall significance was ($F=1.71$, $p<.05$) and 10% (**R**

squared=.100) of the variation was explained. Peer total deviance was the only significant predictor of the model (B=.200). That is, the more one reports deviant peers, the chances of self-reported sexually deviant behavior increases, consistent with a learning interpretation. Type sport participated in had no influence.

Table 20

Ols Regression Estimates For Sexual Deviance Incidence Measures For Contact Versus Non-contact Sports (n=156)

<u>Independent Variables</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>		
		Sex	
	B	Beta	Sig.
Contact or Non-Contact	7.347e-02	.031	.797
Gender	.310	.131	.282
GPA	-.292	-.147	.131
Race	.359	.141	.149
Religious Involvement	-5.753e-03	-.054	.576
Peer Total Deviance	2.662e-02	.200	.041*
Neutralization Sum	-1.406e-02	-.094	.350
Intercept		.394	
F		1.709	
Overall Significance		.114 ^a	
R ²		.100	
Adjusted R Square		.041	

* denotes significance at p < .05 (two-tailed)

Conclusion

Overall, the analyses demonstrated some support for each theoretical model, differential association or learning theory and techniques of neutralization. Both theoretical principles were supported, in general, with significance of learning theory leading. When participation in sporting activity was considered, the results consistently showed no effect on the types of self-reported deviant behavior studied.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to assess possible impact of athletic participation among college students using a theoretical model consisting of learning theory and techniques of neutralization. In order to explore the influence of sports participation on deviance, it was necessary to obtain information on a number of aspects of the students' lives including self-reported deviant behaviors, peer delinquent involvement, athletic histories, and various demographic factors. The self-report survey provided a comprehensive measure of these variables.

Data were gathered during the fall of 2001 and spring 2002 from 325 college students from a southern regional university. The first phase of data analysis involved an examination of the frequency distribution of respondent characteristics. The second phase of analysis entailed evaluating the hypotheses through the use of regression analysis. Six separate models were employed to regress each self-reported form of deviant behavior on peer deviance and other independent variables for athletes compared to non-athletes. Also, the same six models were used to regress self-reported deviant behavior on the independent variables to compare contact athletes with non-contact athletes.

As expected, both theoretical models, learning theory and techniques of neutralization, were supported by the data. In fact, in all of the models analyzed, the theoretical variables derived from learning and neutralization theories lent the most predictive power. Contrary to expected outcomes, athletic participation did not significantly alter reports of deviant behavior. In fact, no differences in self-reported deviant behavior were reported for those who participated

in sports as compared to those who did not participate in sports. In addition, the hypothesis that athletes participating in contact sports would engage in more violence or other deviance than non-contact sport participants was unsupported.

In sum, results of the analyses contradicted prior literature associated with athletic participation and self-reported deviant behavior. No evidence was found to suggest that deviance is either controlled or increased through participation in intercollegiate athletics. The findings suggest that future research is required to reach a more stable conclusion on the effects of sport participation and its power in determining or preventing deviant participation. For this reason, a number of areas which may be of particular interest to future research into the effects of sport participation can be suggested.

The following tables demonstrate the overall findings for the theoretical equations tested in the current research project. According to the athlete versus non-athlete results, self-reported deviance was explained by the learning indicators in 50% of the equations. Self-reported deviance was explained by the neutralization indicators in 20% of the models. None of the self-reported deviance was explained by the athlete versus non-athlete variable. In other words, sport participation had no significant effect on self-reported deviance.

Similarly, when contact athletes versus non-contact athletes were evaluated, self-reported deviant behavior was explained by both the learning and neutralization indicators in 50% of the models. None of the self-reported deviance, however, was significantly explained by the contact or non-contact sport participation. Participation in college sports was found unrelated to deviant behavior.

Figure 1

Findings for Athlete versus Non-athlete

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables		
	Learning	Neutralization	Athlete/Non-athlete
Total Deviance	P, S	NS	NS
Academic Cheating	NS	P, S	NS
Drug	P, S	NS	NS
Property	NS	P, S	NS
Violent	NS	NS	NS
Sex	P, S	NS	NS
	50% P, S	20% P, S	----

P=Predicted result, S=Significant, NS=Not significant

Deviance= constant + friends' deviance + neutralization + sports involvement

Figure 2

Findings for Contact Athlete versus Non-contact Athlete

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables		
	Learning	Neutralization	Contact/Non-contact
Total Deviance	NS	NS	NS
Academic Cheating	NS	P, S	NS
Drug	NS	NS	NS
Property	P, S	P, S	NS
Violent	P, S	P, S	NS
Sex	P, S	NS	NS
	50% P, S	50% P, S	----

P=Predicted result, S=Significant, NS=Not significant

Deviance= constant + friends' deviance + neutralization + sports involvement

Limitations of the Study

Despite the findings, the current study consisted of a number of limitations that may have an unknown effect on the results. First, the sample was somewhat small and was based on the principle of convenience. Thus, findings may have been the result of some unknown systematic bias limiting their generalizability to the entire college population. Moreover, the limited sample size also may have contributed to the lack of significant result in comparing athletes to non-athletes and contact athletes to non-contact athletes. Increasing sample size as well as adding additional college campuses to the study might allow for different results. In addition, reliability of some of the scales used to test self-reported deviant behavior was extremely low. Modification of these scales to increase reliability may significantly alter the results. Different results could also emerge from incorporating additional forms of deviance.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research suggests that peer influences and neutralizing one's own deviance contribute to additional reported deviant behavior. These results are consistent with many prior tests of learning and neutralization theories. The findings also correspond with prior conflicting research concerning the deviance levels of athletic participants, suggesting further replication is necessary to form a more definitive conclusion on the positive or negative effects of athletic participation, or as this study found, the absence of any relationship. This research failed to find support for both the proposition that sports participation insulates the college athlete from involvement in deviance and that it amplifies deviant behavior. If this finding is replicated by additional studies, both proponents and opponents of intercollegiate athletics will have to support their positions on basis other than deviance control.

Sports are major components of our social lives. They are an integral part of education, recreation, entertainment, and the economy. While sports can be assessed from many perspectives, one important issue is their relationship to molding conformity amongst participants. This study suggests that we are far from understanding the relationship between participation in sports and involvement in deviant behavior.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (1991). The interactive effects of peer variables on delinquency. *Criminology*, 29, 47-72.
- Agnew, R. (1994). The techniques of neutralization and violence. *Criminology*, 32, 555-580.
- Agnew, R., & Peters, A.R. (1986). The techniques of neutralization: An analysis of predisposing situational factors. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 81-97.
- Agnew, R., & Petersen, D.M. (1989). Leisure and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 36, 332-350.
- Akers, R.L. (1994). *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Akers, R.L. (1996). Is differential association/social learning cultural deviance theory? *Criminology*, 34, 229-247.
- Appleboom, T., Rouffin, C., & Fierens, E. (1988). Sport and medicine in ancient Greece. *American Journal Sports Med*, 16, 594-600.
- Ash, M.J. (1978). The role of research in children's athletics. In R.A. Magill, M.J. Ash, & F.L. Smoll (Eds.), *Children in sport: A contemporary anthology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Austin, R.L. (1977). Commitment, neutralization, and delinquency. In T.N. Ferdinand (Eds.), *Juvenile delinquency: Little brother grows up* (pp.121-137). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ball, R.A. (1968). An empirical exploration of neutralization theory. In M. Lefton et al (Eds.), *Approaches to deviance* (pp.255-265). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Ball, R.A. (1977). Emergent delinquency in a rural area. In T. N. Ferdinand (Eds.), *Juvenile Delinquency: Little brother grows up*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Ball, R.A., & Lilly, R.J. (1971). Juvenile delinquency in an urban county. *Criminology*, 9, 69-85.
- Beck, B.M., & Beck, D.B. (1967). Recreation and delinquency. In the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (Eds.), *Juvenile delinquency and youth crime* (pp.331-342). Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Begg, D.J., Langley, J.D., Moffitt, T., & Marshall, S.W. (1996). Sport and delinquency: An examination of the deterrence hypothesis in a longitudinal study. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 30, 335-341.

- Benson, M.L. (1985). Denying the guilty mind: Accounting for involvement in a white-collar crime. *Criminology*, 23, 583-607.
- Berry, W.D. (1993). *Understanding regression assumptions*. Sage University Press series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-092. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berry, W.D., & Feldman, S. (1985). *Multiple regression in practice*. Sage University Press series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-050. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Betts, J.R. (1974). *America's sporting heritage: 1850-1950*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Blalock, H. (1979). *Social statistics*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Browne, B.A., & Francis, S.K. (1993). Participants in school-sponsored and independent sports: Perceptions of self and family. *Adolescence*, 28, 383-391.
- Buhrman, H.G. (1971). Athletics and status. *CAHPER Journal*, 37, 14-17.
- Buhrman, H.G. (1977). Athletics and deviance: An examination of the relationship between athletic participation and deviant behavior of high school girls. *Review of Sport Leisure*, 2, 17-35.
- Buhrman, H.G., & Bratton, R. (1978). Athletic participation and deviant behavior of high school girls in Alberta. *Review of Sport Leisure*, 3, 25-41.
- Burns, T. (1907). Relation of playgrounds to juvenile delinquency. *Charities*, 21, 25-31.
- Carmines, E.C., & Zeller, R.A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage University Papers.
- Caspi, A., Lynam, D., Moffitt, T.E. & Silva, P.A. (1993). Unraveling Girls' Delinquency: Biological, dispositional, and contextual contributions to adolescent misbehavior. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 19-30.
- Cernkovich, S.A., & Giordano, P.C. (1979). A comparative analysis of male and female delinquency. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 20, 131-145.
- Cohen, A., Lindesmith, A., & Schuessler, K. (1956). *The Sutherland Papers*. Indiana University Press.
- Coleman, J.S. (1965). *Adolescents and the schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Costello, B.J. (2000). Techniques of neutralization and self-esteem: A critical test of social control and neutralization theory. *Deviant Behavior*, 21, 307-329.

- Costello, B.J., & Vowell, P.R. (1999). Testing control theory and differential association: A reanalysis of the richmond youth project data. *Criminology*, 3, 815-841.
- Crosset, T.W., Ptacek, J., McDonald, M.A. & Benedict, J.R. (1996). Male student-athletes and violence against women: A survey of campus judicial affairs offices. *Violence Against Women*, 2, 163-179.
- Dabney, D. (1995). Neutralization and deviance in the workplace: Theft of supplies and medicines by hospital nurses. *Deviant Behavior*, 16, 313-331.
- Donnelly, P. (1981). Athletes and juvenile delinquents: A comparative analysis based on a review of literature. *Adolescence*, 16, 415-429.
- Donnelly, P., & Young, K. (1988). The construction and confirmation of identity in sport subcultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 223-240.
- Esbensen, F., & Osgood, D.W. (1999). Gang resistance education and training (Great): Results from the national evaluation. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 2, 194-225.
- Educational Policies Commission. (1954). *School athletics: Problems and policies*. Washington, D.C.
- Figler, K., Stephen. (1981). *Sport and Play in American Life*. New York. Saunders College.
- Gauvin, L. (1989). The relationship between regular physical activity and subjective well-being. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 12, 107-114.
- Hamlin, J. (1988). The misplaced role of rational choice in neutralization theory. *Criminology*, 26, 125-138.
- Hastad, D.N., Segrave, J.O., Pangrazi, R., & Petersen, G. (1984). Youth sport participation and deviant behavior. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1, 366-373.
- Healy, W., & Alper, B.S. (1941). *Criminal youth and the borstal system*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.
- Heimer, K., & De Coster, S. (1999). The gendering of violent delinquency. *Criminology*, 37, 277-317.
- Hindelang, M.J. (1973). Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems*, 20, 471-487.
- Hines, S., & Groves, D.L. (1989). Sports competition and its influence on self-esteem development. *Adolescence*, 24, 861-869.

- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive deviance among athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8, 307-325.
- Jackson, E., Tittle, C., & Burke, M.J. (1986). Offense-specific models of the differential association process. *Social Problems*, 33, 335-356.
- Johnson, R.E. (1979). *Juvenile delinquency and its origins: An integrated theoretical approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelly, I.J., & Baer, D.J. (1969). Jesness inventory and self concept measures for delinquents before and after participation in outward bound. *Psychological Reports*, 25, 719-724.
- Kelly, I.J., & Baer, D.J. (1971). Physical challenge as a treatment for delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 17, 437-445.
- Kerlinger, F.N., & Pedhazur, E.J. (1973). *Multiple regression in behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kvaraceus, W.C. (1954). *The community and the delinquent*. Yonkers-On-Hudson, NY: World Book.
- Landers, D.M., & Ajzen, I. (1981). Group performance: Interaction and leadership. In G.R.F. Luchen & G.H. Sage (Eds.), *Handbook of social science of sport* (pp. 297-315). Chicago, IL: Stipes.
- Landers, D.M., & Landers, D.M. (1978). Socialization via interscholastic athletics: Its effects on delinquency. *Sociology of Education*, 51, 299-303.
- Lapchick, R.E. (2000). Crime and athletes: New racial stereotypes. *Society*, 37, 14-28.
- Leonard, W.M. (1998). The influence of physical activity and theoretically relevant variables in the use of drugs: The deterrence hypothesis revisited. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21, 421-428.
- Lewis-Beck, M.S. (1980). *Applied regression: An introduction*. Sage University Press series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-022. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Liu, X., & Kaplan, H.B. (1999). Explaining the gender difference in adolescent delinquent behavior: A longitudinal test of mediating mechanisms. *Criminology*, 37, 195-214.
- Lueschen, G. (1971). Mental and emotional disorders: Delinquency. In American college of sport medicine (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sport science and medicine* (pp. 1391-1393). New York: Macmillan.

- Lueschen, G. (1976). Cheating in sport. In D.M. Landers (Ed.), *Social Problems in Athletics* (pp. 67-77). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Lutzin, S.G., & Orem, A.R.C. (1967). Prevention through recreation. In William E. Amos, & Charles F. Wellford (Eds.), *Delinquency prevention: Theory and practice* (pp. 150-170). Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Marsh, H.W. (1993). The effects of participation in sport during the last two years of high school. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 18-43.
- Matsueda, R.L. (1982). Testing control theory and differential association: A causal modeling approach. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 489-504.
- Matza, D. (1964). Position and behavior patterns of youth. In R.E.L. Faris (Eds.), *Handbook of modern sociology* (pp. 191-216). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Matza, D., & Sykes, G.M. (1961). Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 712-719.
- Maul, T., & Thomas, J.R. (1975). Self-concept and participation in children's gymnastics. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 41, 701.
- McCarthy, B. (1996). The attitudes and actions of others: Tutelage and sutherland's theory of differential association. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 135-147.
- McIntosh, P.C. (1971). An historical view of sport and social control. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 6, 5-16.
- McTeer, W., & Curtis, J.E. (1990). Physical activity and psychological well-being: Testing alternative sociological interpretations. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7, 329-346.
- Mears, D.P., Ploeger, M., & Warr, M. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in delinquency: Peer influence and moral evaluations of behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 35, 251-266.
- Minor, W.W. (1981). Techniques of neutralization: A reconceptualization and empirical examination. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18, 295-318.
- Minor, W.W. (1984). Neutralization as a hardening process: Considerations in the modeling of change. *Social Forces* 62, 995-1019.
- Neumeyer, M.H. (1955). Juvenile delinquency in modern society. New York: D. Vann Nostrand.
- Nolan, J.B. (1954). Athletics and juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 28, 263-265.

- Orcutt, J.D. (1987). Differential association and marijuana use: A closer look at sutherland (with a little help from becker). *Criminology* 25, 341-358.
- Paetsch, J.J., & Bertrand, L.D. (1997). The relationship between peer, social, and school factors, and delinquency among youth. *Journal of School Health*, 67, 27-33.
- Paternoster, R., & Triplett, R. (1988). Disaggregating self-reported delinquency and its implications for theory. *Criminology*, 26, 591-625.
- Pease, D.G., & Anderson, D.F. (1986). Longitudinal analysis of children's attitudes toward sport team involvement. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 9, 3-10.
- Purdy, D.A., & Richard, S.F. (1983). Sport and juvenile delinquency: An examination and assessment on four major theories. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 6, 179-193.
- Rehberg, R.A., & Schafer, W.E. (1968). Participation in interscholastic athletics and college expectations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 732-740.
- Reiss, A.J. (1951). Delinquency as the failure of personal and social controls. *American Sociological Review*, 16, 196-207.
- Samaha, J. (1999). *Criminal law*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Sandborn, M.A., & Hartman, B.G. (1970). *Issues in physical education*. Philadelphia: Lea and Febinger.
- Sapora, A.V., & Mitchell, E.D. (1961). *The theory of play and recreation*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Schafer, W.E. (1969). Participation in interscholastic athletics and delinquency: A preliminary study. *Social Problems*, 17, 40-47.
- Schafer, W.E. (1969). Some social sources and consequences of interscholastic athletics: The case of participation and delinquency. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 4, 63-79.
- Schafer, W.E., & Armer, J.M. (1968). Athletes are not inferior students. *Trans-action*, 6, 21-26.
- Segrave, J.O. (1981). Athletics and delinquency: Review and reformulation. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 82-89.
- Segrave, J.O. (1983). Sport and juvenile delinquency. In R.L. Terjung (Eds.), *Exercise and sport sciences reviews* (pp.181-209). New York: Upstate Medical Center.
- Segrave, J.O., & Chu, D.B. (1978). Athletics and juvenile delinquency. *Review of Sports and Leisure*, 3, 1-24 .

- Segrave, J.O., & Hastad, D.N. (1982). Delinquent behavior and interscholastic athletic participation. *The Journal of Sport Behavior*, 5, 96-111.
- Segrave, J.O., & Hastad, D.N. (1984). Future directions in sport and juvenile delinquency research. *Quest*, 36, 37-47.
- Segrave, J., Moreau, C., & Hastad, D.N. (1985). An investigation into the relationship between ice hockey participation and delinquency. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2, 281-298.
- Sellin, T. (1938). *Culture conflict and crime*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Shanas, E. (1942). *Recreation and delinquency: A study of five selected Chicago communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sieh, E.W. (1987). Garment workers: Perceptions of inequity and employee theft. *British Journal of Criminology*, 2, 174-190.
- Simons, R.L., Miller, M.G., & Aigner, S.M. (1980). Contemporary theories of deviance and female delinquency: An empirical test. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17, 42-56.
- Simpson, S.S. (1991). Caste, class, and violent crime: Explaining differences in female offending. *Criminology*, 29, 115-131.
- Singer, S.I., & Levine, M. (1988). Power-control theory, gender, and delinquency: A partial replication with additional evidence on the effects of peers. *Criminology*, 26, 627-647.
- Skolnick, A.A. (1993). Studies raise doubts about benefit of athletics in reducing unhealthy behavior among adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 270, 798-800.
- Smith, D.A., & Paternoster, R. (1987). The gender gap in theories and deviance: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 24, 140-172.
- Snyder, E. (1972). High school athletes and their coaches: Educational plans and advice. *Sociology of Education*, 45, 313-325.
- Snyder, E.E. (1972). Athletic dressing room slogans as folklore: A means of socialization. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 7, 89-92.
- Snyder, E.E., & Spreitzer, E. (1990). High school athletic participation as related to college attendance among black, hispanic and white males: A research note. *Youth and Society*, 21, 390-398.
- Sorensen, A.M., & Brownfield, D. (1995). Adolescent drug use and a general theory of crime: An analysis of a theoretical integration. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 37, 19-37.

- Steffensmeier, D., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459-487.
- Sugden, J., & Yiannakis, A. (1982). Sport and juvenile delinquency: A theoretical base. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 6, 22-30.
- Sutherland, E. (1947). *Principles of criminology*. Lippincott: New York.
- Sykes, G.M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664-670.
- Tappan, P.W. (1949). *Juvenile delinquency*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tatham, R.L. (1974). Employee views on theft in retailing. *Journal of Retailing*, 50, 49-55.
- Thornberry, T.P., & Krohn, M.D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime. *Criminal Justice 2000*, 4, 33-84.
- Thrasher, F.M. (1963). *The gang*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thurman, Q.C. (1984). Deviance and the neutralization of moral commitment: An empirical analysis. *Deviant Behavior*, 5, 291-304.
- Tittle, C.R., Burke, M.J., & Jackson, E.F. (1986). Modeling sutherland's theory of differential association: Toward an empirical clarification. *Social Forces*, 65, 405-431.
- Vold, G.B., & Bernard, T.J. (1986). *Theoretical criminology* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vold, George B., Bernard, Thomas J., Snipes, Jeffrey B. (1998). *Theoretical criminology* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Voss, H.L. (1969). Differential association and containment theory: A theoretical convergence. *Social Forces*, 47, 381-391.
- Warr, M. (1993). Age, peers, and delinquency. *Criminology*, 31, 17-40.
- Warr, M. (1993). Parents, peers, and delinquency. *Social Forces*, 72, 247-265.
- Warr, M. (1996). Organization and instigation in delinquent groups. *Criminology*, 34, 11-37.
- Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1991). The influence of delinquent peers: What they think or what they do? *Criminology*, 29, 851-866.
- Weinberg, R. (1981). Why kids play or do not play organized sports. *The Physical Educator*, 38, 71-75.

- White, J.W., & Kowalski, R.W. (1994). Deconstructing the myth of the nonaggressive woman: A feminist analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 487-508.
- Williams III, F.P., & McShane, M.D. (1988). *Criminological theory* (pp.48-57). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Willman, H.C., & Chun, R.Y.F. (1973). Homeward bound: An alternative to the institutionalization of adjudicated juvenile offenders. *Federal Probation Quarterly*, 37, 52-58.
- Wolf, D. (1972). *Foul: The connie hawkins story*. New York: Warner.
- Yiannakis, A. (1980). Sport and deviancy: A review and appraisal. *Motor Skills: Theory into Practice*, 4, 59-63.
- Young, T.J. (1990). Sensation seeking and self-reported criminality among student-athletes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 70, 959-962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Aggregate Self-reported Deviance Scale

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Cheated on a test?
2. Hit somebody you were angry with?
3. Drank enough alcohol to feel high?
4. Stolen from a store or business?
5. Cursed out someone you were angry with?
6. Smoked marijuana?
7. Chewed tobacco?
8. Smoked tobacco?
9. Cheated on a paper for class?
10. Had sex with someone other than regular partner?
11. Used an illegal drug other than marijuana?
12. Illegally carried a gun or knife in case of trouble?
13. Taken part in a fight?
14. Intentionally destroyed or defaced public or private property?
15. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50.
16. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something more than \$50.

Alpha level = .80

APPENDIX B

Self-report Deviancy Scales

Cheating Scale

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Cheated on a test?
2. Cheated on a paper for class?

Alpha level = .41

Drug Offense Scale

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Drank enough alcohol to feel high?
2. Smoked marijuana?
3. Chewed tobacco?
4. Smoked tobacco?
5. Used an illegal drug other than marijuana?

Alpha level = .68

Property Offense Scale

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Stolen from a store or business?
2. Intentionally destroyed or defaced public or private property?
3. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50.
4. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50.

Alpha level = .77

Violent Offense Scale

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Hit somebody you were angry with?
2. Cursed out someone you were angry with?
3. Illegally carried a gun or knife in case of trouble?
4. Taken part in a fight?

Alpha level = .60

Sex Deviance Measure

Respondents answered either yes, or no concerning their deviancy during the past year.

1. Had sex with someone other than regular partner?

APPENDIX C

Aggregate Differential Association Scale

Respondents were asked how many of their current friends had committed the following acts in the past year. They had the following choices to choose from: none, few, half, most, all.

1. Almost always obeyed team rules?
2. Skipped classes without an excuse?
3. Lied, disobeyed, or talked back to teachers, coaches or other authority figures?
4. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them?
5. Got along well with teachers at school?
6. Stole something worth less than \$50?
7. Stole something worth more than \$50?
8. Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something?
9. Have been involved in community activities such as volunteer and youth groups?
10. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
11. Attacked someone with a weapon?
12. Regularly took part in their family activities?
13. Sold marijuana?
14. Sold illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD?
15. Have been regularly involved in religious activities?
16. Used tobacco products?
17. Used alcohol?
18. Used marijuana?
19. Have been thought of as good students?
20. Used other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD?

Alpha level = .85

APPENDIX D

Peer Deviancy Scales

Drug Offense Scale

Respondents were asked how many of their current friends had committed the following acts in the past year. They had the following choices to choose from: none, few, half, most, all.

1. Sold marijuana?
2. Sold illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD?
3. Used tobacco products?
4. Used alcohol?
5. Used marijuana?
6. Used other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD?

Alpha = .81

Property Offense Scale

Respondents were asked how many of their current friends had committed the following acts in the past year. They had the following choices to choose from: none, few, half, most, all.

1. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them?
2. Stole something worth less than \$50?
3. Stole something worth more than \$50?
4. Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something?

Alpha = .78

Violent Offense Scale

Respondents were asked how many of their current friends had committed the following acts in the past year. They had the following choices to choose from: none, few, half, most, all.

1. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
2. Attacked someone with a weapon?

Alpha = .66

APPENDIX E

Aggregate Neutralization Scale

Respondents were asked their viewpoints and how much they agreed or disagreed with the following questions below. They had the following choices to choose from: strongly agree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree.

1. It's alright to beat up someone if they started the fight.
2. It's alright to beat up someone who called you names.
3. If people do something to make you really mad, they deserve to be beaten up.
4. If you don't physically fight back, people will walk all over you.
5. The instructor deliberately gave an overly difficult or tricky exam?
6. The outcome of the exam was crucial to your future career; a low grade might keep you out of professional school or keep you from getting the job you want.
7. Other students in the class refused to share their notes with you or help you in some other way.
8. You found out that most of the other students in the class had cheated sometime during their college career.
9. Your friends pressured you to help them cheat.
10. You knew the exam material very well, but were so nervous that you just couldn't remember it?
11. The professor shows favoritism toward certain students when giving grades.

Alpha level = .89

APPENDIX F

Neutralization Scales

Cheating Scale

Respondents were asked their viewpoints and how much they agreed or disagreed with the following questions below. They had the following choices to choose from: strongly agree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree.

1. The instructor deliberately gave an overly difficult or tricky exam?
2. The outcome of the exam was crucial to your future career; a low grade might keep you out of professional school or keep you from getting the job you want.
3. Other students in the class refused to share their notes with you or help you in some other way.
4. You found out that most of the other students in the class had cheated sometime during their college career.
5. Your friends pressured you to help them cheat.
6. You knew the exam material very well, but were so nervous that you just couldn't remember it?
7. The professor shows favoritism toward certain students when giving grades.

Alpha = .91

Violent Offense Scale

Respondents were asked their viewpoints and how much they agreed or disagreed with the following questions below. They had the following choices to choose from: strongly agree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree.

1. It's alright to beat up someone if they started the fight.
2. It's alright to beat up someone who called you names.
3. If people do something to make you really mad, they deserve to be beaten up.
4. If you don't physically fight back, people will walk all over you.

Alpha = .82

APPENDIX G

Consent Form October 2001

East Tennessee State University

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

INFORMED CONSENT

PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR: Mario Hankerson

TITLE OF PROJECT: College Student Activities, Attitudes and Behaviors

The following Informed Consent explains the details of you being a research subject in this study. The importance of reading the enclosed material cannot be overly stressed. Your decision to volunteer in this study needs to be based on your full awareness of all the sections contained in the Informed Consent.

PURPOSE

The purposes of this research study are as follow: to evaluate college student's activities, attitudes and behaviors (including but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, beliefs or practices, and social behavior.) The participants' identity for this study will be completely anonymous as well as confidential. Thus, please feel free to be as candid as possible in answering the questions on the survey.

DURATION

The length of time required of your involvement in this study amounts to the time needed for you to complete the survey.

PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR: Mario Hankerson

TITLE OF PROJECT: College Student Activities, Attitudes and Behaviors

PROCEDURES

The procedure consists of you answering a questionnaire focusing on your personal experiences and beliefs.

POSSIBLE RISK/DISCOMFORT

There are no perceptible risks to you with your involvement in this survey. However, some of the survey items may be disturbing to answer. Please answer to the best of your ability.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS

There are no personal benefits in your completing this survey.

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS

If you have any questions, or research related problems at any time, tell the survey administrator or call Mario Hankerson at (423) 439-1509. You may call the Chairman of Institutional Review Board at (423) 439-6134 for any questions you may have regarding your rights as a research participant. You may also contact the chair of my thesis committee Dr. Stephen Brown at (423) 439-4388 for any further inquiries.

PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR: Mario Hankerson

TITLE OF PROJECT: College Student Activities, Attitudes and Behaviors

CONFIDENTIALITY

Every attempt will be made to see that any study results are kept confidential. A copy of the records from this study will be stored in the East Tennessee State University Department of Criminal Justice for at least 10 years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming me as a subject. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the East Tennessee State University/V.A. Medical Center Institutional of Review Board, and the ETSU Department of Criminal Justice have access to study records. My records will be kept completely confidential according to current legal requirements. They will not be revealed unless required by law, or as noted above.

COMPENSATION FOR TREATMENT

East Tennessee State University (ETSU) will pay the cost of emergency first aid for any injury which may happen as a result of your being in this study. They will not pay for any other medical treatment. Claims against ETSU or any of its agents or employees may be submitted to the Tennessee Claims Commission. These claims will be settled to the extent allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-8-307. For more information about claims call the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board of ETSU at 423/439-6134.

PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR: Mario Hankerson

TITLE OF PROJECT: College Student Activities, Attitudes and Behaviors

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

The nature, demands, risks, and benefits of the project have been explained to me as well as are known and available. Further, I understand what my participation involves. In addition, I understand that I am free to ask any questions and withdraw from the project at any time, without penalty. I have read or have had read to me, and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily.

The study record will be kept in strictest confidence according to current legal requirements and will not be revealed unless required by law or as noted above.

SIGNATURE OF VOLUNTEER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

DATE

APPENDIX H

Athlete College Experiences Survey

This survey is part of a study concerning the experiences of college students. It is being conducted as part of the requirements for my Master’s degree. It asks questions about your activities, attitudes, behaviors and it is important that you answer each question honestly. It is an anonymous questionnaire, so no one will know how you answered any questions. **Thank you for your cooperation and participation.**

What is your age? _____

Gender M F

Race Black White Other _____

Year in School Freshmen Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

Major _____

GPA _____

What is your religious affiliation? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to attending church services at any church? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to attending Sunday Church School at any church? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to religious or spiritual activities other than attending church or Sunday Church School? _____

Identify each Student Organization you have or are currently participating in:

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Past</u>	<u>Total years</u>
Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Fraternities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Governance & Program Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Greek Life	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Honor Societies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Religious Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Residence Halls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Past</u>	<u>Total years</u>
Sororities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Sports Clubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Special Interest Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Study Abroad	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Did you participate on any high school sports teams? NO YES

If yes:	<u>Sport</u>	<u>Number of years</u>
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

Identify each sport you have or are currently participating in: (i.e. on an ETSU team)

<u>Sports</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Past</u>	<u>Total years of participation</u>
Football	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Volleyball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Basketball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Track	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Golf	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Softball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Baseball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Soccer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Most people have done some of the things listed below. Check whether or not you have *ever* done each of the following and indicate how many times *in the past year* you have done each:

	Ever done?	If yes, number of times in the past year...
1. Cheated on a test	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
2. Hit somebody you were angry with	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____

- | | Ever done? | If yes, number of times in the past year... |
|--|--|---|
| 3. Drank enough alcohol to feel high | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 4. Stolen from a store or business | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 5. Cursed out someone you were angry with | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 6. Smoked marijuana | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 7. Chewed tobacco | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 8. Smoked tobacco | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 9. Cheated on a paper for class | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 10. Had sex with someone other than regular partner | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 11. Used an illegal drug other than marijuana | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 12. Illegally carried a gun or knife in case of trouble | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 13. Taken part in a fight | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 14. Intentionally destroyed or defaced public or private property | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 15. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50. | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |
| 16. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something more than \$50. | <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no | _____ |

During the last year, how many of your current friends have done the following?
Circle the one answer that best describes your friends for each question.

1. Almost always obeyed Team rules?
None Few Half Most All
2. Skipped classes without an excuse?
None Few Half Most All
3. Lied, disobeyed, or talked back to teachers, coaches or other authority figures?
None Few Half Most All
4. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them?
None Few Half Most All
5. Got along well with teachers at school?
None Few Half Most All
6. Stolen something worth less than \$50.
None Few Half Most All
7. Stolen something worth more than \$50.
None Few Half Most All
8. Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something?
None Few Half Most All
9. Have been regularly involved in community activities such as volunteer and youth groups?
None Few Half Most All
10. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
None Few Half Most All

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|------|------|-----|--|
| 11. | Attacked someone with a weapon? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 12. | Regularly took part in their family activities? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 13. | Sold marijuana? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 14. | Sold illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack or LSD? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 15. | Have been regularly involved in religious activities? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 16. | Used tobacco products? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 17. | Used alcohol? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 18. | Used marijuana? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 19. | Have been thought of as good students? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 20. | Used other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |

Most people get in fights or believe there are circumstances where one should fight. For each of the following questions circle the one answer that best reflects your view.

1. It's alright to beat up someone if they started the fight.
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
2. It's alright to beat up someone who called you names.
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
3. If people do something to make you really mad, they deserve to be beaten up.
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
4. If you don't physically fight back, people will walk all over you.
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

Many students cheat sometime in their college career. For each of the following, circle the one answer that best reflects your feelings; **It's all right to cheat on a test or class paper if....**

5. The instructor deliberately gave an overly difficult or tricky exam?
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
6. The outcome of the exam was crucial to your future career; a low grade might keep you out of professional school or keep you from getting the job you want.
Strongly agree Agree Neither Agree Nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

7. Other students in the class refused to share their notes with you or help you in some other way.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree
Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
8. You found out that most of the other students in the class had cheated sometime during their college career.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree
Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
9. Your friends pressured you to help them cheat.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree
Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
10. You knew the exam material very well, but were so nervous that you just couldn't remember it.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree
Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
11. The professor shows favoritism toward certain students when giving grades.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree
Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|

APPENDIX I

Non-Athlete College Experiences Survey

This survey is part of a study concerning the experiences of college students. It is being conducted as part of the requirements for my Master's degree. It asks questions about your activities, attitudes, behaviors and it is important that you answer each question honestly. It is an anonymous questionnaire, so no one will know how you answered any questions. **Thank you for your cooperation and participation.**

What is your age? _____

Gender M F

Race Black White Other _____

Year in School Freshmen Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

Major _____

GPA _____

What is your religious affiliation? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to attending church services at any church? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to attending Sunday Church School at any church? _____

How many hours per month, on average, do you devote to religious or spiritual activities other than attending church or Sunday Church School? _____

Identify each Student Organization you have or are currently participating in:

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Past</u>	<u>Total years</u>
Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Fraternities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Governance & Program Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Greek Life	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Honor Societies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Religious Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Past</u>	<u>Total years</u>
Residence Halls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Sororities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Sports Clubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Special Interest Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Study Abroad	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Do you participate on any college sports teams? NO YES
 If yes, what? _____

Did you participate on any high school sports teams? NO YES

If yes:

<u>Sport</u>	<u>Number of years</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Most people have done some of the things listed below. Check whether or not you have *ever* done each of the following and indicate how many times *in the past year* you have done each:

	Ever done?	If yes, number of times in the past year...
1. Cheated on a test	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
2. Hit somebody you were angry with	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
3. Drank enough alcohol to feel high	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
4. Stolen from a store or business	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____

	Ever done?	If yes, number of times in the past year...
5. Cursed out someone you were angry with	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
6. Smoked marijuana	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
7. Chewed tobacco	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
8. Smoked tobacco	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
9. Cheated on a paper for class	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
10. Had sex with someone other than regular partner	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
11. Used an illegal drug other than marijuana	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
12. Illegally carried a gun or knife in case of trouble	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
13. Taken part in a fight	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
14. Intentionally destroyed or defaced public or private property	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
15. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____
16. Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something more than \$50.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	_____

During the last year, how many of your current friends have done the following?
Circle the one answer that best describes your friends for each question.

1. Almost always obeyed Team rules?
None Few Half Most All
2. Skipped classes without an excuse?
None Few Half Most All
3. Lied, disobeyed, or talked back to teachers, coaches or other authority figures?
None Few Half Most All
4. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them?
None Few Half Most All
5. Got along well with teachers at school?
None Few Half Most All
6. Stolen something worth less than \$50.
None Few Half Most All
7. Stolen something worth more than \$50.
None Few Half Most All
8. Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something?
None Few Half Most All
9. Have been regularly involved in community activities such as volunteer and youth groups?
None Few Half Most All
10. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
None Few Half Most All

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|------|------|-----|--|
| 11. | Attacked someone with a weapon? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 12. | Regularly took part in their family activities? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 13. | Sold marijuana? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 14. | Sold illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack or LSD? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 15. | Have been regularly involved in religious activities? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 16. | Used tobacco products? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 17. | Used alcohol? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 18. | Used marijuana? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 19. | Have been thought of as good students? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |
| 20. | Used other illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD? | | | | | |
| | None | Few | Half | Most | All | |

Most people get in fights or believe there are circumstances where one should fight. For each of the following questions circle the one answer that best reflects your view.

1. It's alright to beat up someone if they started the fight.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

2. It's alright to beat up someone who called you names.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

3. If people do something to make you really mad, they deserve to be beaten up.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

4. If you don't physically fight back, people will walk all over you.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

Many students cheat sometime in their college career. For each of the following, circle the one answer that best reflects your feelings; **It's all right to cheat on a test or class paper if....**

5. The instructor deliberately gave an overly difficult or tricky exam?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

6. The outcome of the exam was crucial to your future career; a low grade might keep you out of professional school or keep you from getting the job you want.

Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------------------

7. Other students in the class refused to share their notes with you or help you in some other way.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
8. You found out that most of the other students in the class had cheated sometime during their college career.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
9. Your friends pressured you to help them cheat.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
10. You knew the exam material very well, but were so nervous that you just couldn't remember it.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
11. The professor shows favoritism toward certain students when giving grades.
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|

VITA

MARIO BERNARD HANKERSON

Personal Data: Date of Birth: October 23, 1975
 Place of Birth: Oglethorpe, Georgia
 Marital Status: Single

Education: Macon County High School, Montezuma, Georgia, 1994

 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
 Criminal Justice, B.S., 1998

 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
 Criminal Justice and Criminology, M.A., 2002

 East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
 Computer Science, M.S., Expected 2003

Professional
Experience: Technical Support, Sears Payment Systems, Gray, TN, 1999-
 2000

 Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University,
 College of Arts and Sciences, 1999-2003

Presentations: Whitson, Marian H. & Hankerson, Mario B. "Hazing: A
 Gender Violence Prevalence in Black Sororities."
 Presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, March,
 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Honors and
Awards: Outstanding Service Award, Department of Criminal
 Justice and Criminology, East Tennessee State
 University, 2001

 Member-East Tennessee State University Graduate Criminal
 Justice Society