



HAL
open science

Predictors of antisocial and prosocial behavior in an adolescent sports context

Esther Anne Rutten, Carlo Schuengel, Evelien Dirks, Geert Jan J.M. Stams,
Gert Biesta

► **To cite this version:**

Esther Anne Rutten, Carlo Schuengel, Evelien Dirks, Geert Jan J.M. Stams, Gert Biesta. Predictors of antisocial and prosocial behavior in an adolescent sports context. *Social Development*, 2011, 20 (2), pp.294. 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00598.x . hal-00609004

HAL Id: hal-00609004

<https://hal.science/hal-00609004>

Submitted on 17 Jul 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Predictors of antisocial and prosocial behavior in an adolescent sports context

Journal:	<i>Social Development</i>
Manuscript ID:	SODE-09-0016.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Antisocial behaviour, Prosocial behaviour, Education, Social support, Moral development



Abstract

This study examined antisocial and prosocial behavior of $N = 439$ adolescent athletes between 14 and 17 years of age (67 teams). Multilevel analyses showed that team membership explained 20% and 13% of the variance in antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context, respectively. The team effects suggest that aggregating antisocial or prosocial adolescents within teams may partially explain differences in antisocial and prosocial behavior among athletes in the sports context. A trend was found towards a relation between higher levels of moral reasoning within teams and less antisocial behavior in the sports context. Favorable moral atmosphere was positively associated with more prosocial behavior in the sports context. Finally, supportive coach-athlete relationships were associated with both less antisocial and more prosocial behavior in the sports context.

Key words: prosocial and antisocial behavior; supportive coach-athlete relationship; moral atmosphere; moral reasoning; fair play attitude

Predictors of Antisocial and Prosocial Behavior in an Adolescent Sports Context

For many adolescents organized youth sport is an important part of the ecological context in which their development takes place. Of all Dutch adolescents no less than 72% (Breedveld & Tiessen-Raaphorst, 2006) participate in organized youth sport, a percentage that is similar to that for North America (NCYS, 2001). The sporting environment may, however, offer not only leisure and reward, but also social challenges and opportunities for adolescents. The social demands placed on young athletes may partly parallel those of other important life settings, such as the home and school environment. In the sports context, these demands pertain to the adequate regulation of adolescents' behavior in a competitive context that is determined by specific moral norms and values and in which coach-athlete relationships and relationships with fellow athletes further shape adolescents' behavior. The aim of the current study was to examine possible predictors of antisocial and prosocial behavior that may vary within the sports context, and which may be amenable to intervention or choice at the level of individual athletes, the team, and adults who are involved as coaches. These predictors concern fair play attitude, moral reasoning, moral atmosphere and coach-athlete relationship quality. The present study is the first to examine the impact of these factors on adolescent athletes' behavior in the sports context while taking into account individual differences in the tendency to display antisocial and prosocial behavior.

Kavussanu (2008) argues that the social nature of sport provides ample opportunities for both prosocial behavior, designated as any voluntary act performed with the goal of benefiting or helping another person (e.g., helping an injured player), and antisocial behavior, designated as any voluntary act intended to harm or disadvantage another person (e.g., trying to injure another athlete). These prosocial and antisocial behaviors not only concern other peoples' rights and well-being and should therefore be considered as morally relevant, according to Kavussanu, but also refer to the proactive (doing good) and inhibitive (refraining from doing bad) aspects of

1
2
3 morality, respectively (Bandura, 1999). Kavussanu and Boardly (2009) emphasize that both
4
5 prosocial and antisocial behaviors should be examined in order to understand social behavior in
6
7 sport, not only because antisocial and prosocial behavior in sports constitute two largely
8
9 independent dimensions, but also because young athletes show high rates of both prosocial and
10
11 antisocial behaviors (Shields, Bredemeier, LaVoi, & Power, 2005).
12
13

14
15 The empirical evidence regarding the potential influences of sports on the behavior of
16
17 athletes has recently been summarized in a meta-analytic review. Stams et al. (2009) conducted
18
19 a meta-analysis of 54 studies examining the relation between sport participation and
20
21 adolescents' deviant behavior, including antisocial (non-prohibited by law) and delinquent
22
23 (prohibited by law) behavior. In this review, greater extent of sport participation showed a small
24
25 but significant positive association with antisocial behavior ($r = .09$), and a small but significant
26
27 negative association with delinquent behavior ($r = -.05$). It should be noted, however, that the
28
29 included prospective longitudinal studies consistently showed negative effects of greater sport
30
31 participation, whereas the cross-sectional studies did not show any relation between sport
32
33 participation and deviant behavior. Interestingly, much depends of the context in which sports
34
35 are performed. Sporting activity in the context of the school was associated with positive
36
37 outcomes, indicating that the social context in which the activities take place may play an
38
39 important role. This might not come as a surprise, as sports in schools are ideally designed and
40
41 monitored to serve an overarching educational goal (Maher, 2005). In many countries, including
42
43 the Netherlands, school-organized sport activities are limited, and as a result most sport
44
45 activities are conducted in clubs or volunteer organizations that vary in the amount of explicit
46
47 policy with respect to prosocial and antisocial behaviour. Consequently, sports may be a
48
49 relatively benign and protective environment for some adolescents, whereas it may be an
50
51 unpleasant environment for others, or even an environment that may contribute to
52
53 developmental risk (Endresen & Olweus, 2005).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Given the important role of rules as well as conflict inherent to competition, sports
4 participation has been studied from the perspective of moral development. According to
5 Kavussanu and Boardly (2009), most studies have focused on inhibitive morality, while less is
6 known about the possible role of proactive morality, despite the efforts that have been taken to
7 promote proactive morality in sports through concepts such as 'fair play'. The fair play concept
8 refers to a set of sport specific behavior codes, rules, and values that are considered to be
9 constitutive of sport, such as respect for one's opponents, mutuality, fairness, and equal
10 opportunities (Arnold, 1994, 2001). Aziz (1998) as well as Stephens and Bredemeier (1996)
11 examined fair play attitude in soccer players, and found team values of fair play to predict
12 prosocial behavior in terms of fair play tactics. Notably, fair play attitude has also been related
13 to less antisocial behavior in at least two studies. A positive team attitude toward fair play was
14 associated with less antisocial behavior among adolescent soccer players in a study conducted
15 by Reference to Author (2008), while Junge et al. (2000) found that a negative attitude toward
16 fair play predicted aggressive tendencies among football players.

17
18 Proactive morality may manifest itself not only in attitudes, but also in moral reasoning
19 about actions taken in concrete situations. Bloom and Smith (1996), Coakley (1984), and Van
20 Bottenburg and Schuyt (1996) have emphasized proactive morality by showing that
21 participation in sport may foster the development of cooperation, discipline, social
22 responsibility, and social-cognitive competencies, including role-taking ability, which is an
23 important prerequisite for attaining higher levels of moral reasoning. Reference to Author
24 (2007) found that higher levels of moral reasoning about sport dilemmas were positively
25 associated with more prosocial behavior in adolescent athletes. Shields and Bredemeier (1995),
26 however, showed that in itself, sport is a social context that pulls for lower levels of moral
27 reasoning: "A moral pause or "bracketed morality" (p.113) is characteristic of sport, referring to
28 a temporary suspension of the usual moral obligation to equally consider the needs and desires
29 of others. Shields and Bredemeier (1995) and Bredemeier and Shields (1986a; 1986b) found that

1
2
3 sport specific dilemmas were solved at lower levels of moral reasoning (more egocentric and
4
5 instrumental, and less empathic and prosocial) than general daily dilemmas, predicting
6
7 aggressive tendencies among athletes (Bredemeier, 1994). Negative associations between sport
8
9 participation and moral reasoning in general were also found by Beller and Stoll (1995),
10
11 showing that organized youth sport might have a negative influence.
12
13

14
15 An important contextual factor is the teams' sociomoral atmosphere, which refers to the
16
17 sense of community, and the degree to which norms are created, shared, and justified through
18
19 dialogue (Higgins-D'Alessandro & Sath, 1998; Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). A positive
20
21 sociomoral atmosphere has been shown to predict moral behavior both in schools (Høst,
22
23 Brugman, Tavecchio, & Beem, 1998; Power et al., 1989) and in organized youth sport (e.g.,
24
25 Guivernau & Duda, 2002; Kavussanu, Roberts, & Ntoumanis, 2002; Kavussanu & Spray, 2006;
26
27 Reference to Author, 2008, Stephens, 2000). Furthermore, Nucci and Kim (2005) conducted a
28
29 review of the literature on aggression and sportpersonship, and concluded that the competitive
30
31 sport context can lead to unethical and aggressive behaviors, having a negative impact on the
32
33 well-being of young athletes, when it is dominated by a win-at-all-costs philosophy.
34
35
36
37

38
39 Nucci and Kim (2005) identified the sports coach as an important person within the sports
40
41 context, who is in the position to influence antisocial behavior. The coach can serve as a natural
42
43 mentor by providing relational support, and by acting as an important role model (Beam, Chen,
44
45 & Greenberger, 2002). Many studies refer to the positive influence of natural mentoring on
46
47 adolescent behavior (Scholte, Van Lieshout, & Van Aken, 2001; Zimmerman, Bingenheimer, &
48
49 Notaro, 2002). Furthermore, Duquin and Schroeder-Braun (1996, p. 354) also mention that
50
51 “coaches can play an important role in developing prosocial behavior by the way they structure
52
53 the moral climate of the sport context, by modeling empathic relations, and by guiding youth
54
55 toward prosocial responsibilities”. They refer to the model-function that coaches can have for
56
57 their teams, the discipline they instill, and the values coaches convey.
58
59
60

1
2
3 From an attachment-theoretical perspective, coaches may be considered as secure base
4 figures of convenience, providing some limited attachment-related support without actually
5 being considered attachment figures per se (Waters & Cummings, 2000). Their sensitivity
6 towards adolescents and acceptance of their signals of need and distress may foster positive
7 relational concepts. There is empirical evidence showing that these positive expectations,
8 incorporated in positive working models of relationships with others, predict positive outcomes,
9 especially prosocial behavior (see for example Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Kochanska & Murray,
10 2000; Weinfeld, Ogawa, & Sroufe, 1997). The support itself may, furthermore, promote
11 adaptive regulation of emotion and behavior in times of stress. Research in the sports context
12 shows that mutual trust, care, open communication, and acceptance of individual differences
13 (e.g., in ability) and emotions (e.g., sadness and joy during the game) are core elements of
14 coach-athlete relationships that are based on relational support (Poczwardowski, Barott, &
15 Henschen, 2002; Vanden Auweele & Rzewnicki, 2000; Wylleman, 2000). These supportive
16 coach-athlete relationships have been shown to be associated with less antisocial and more
17 prosocial behavior in adolescent athletes (Reference to Author, 2007, 2008).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 There are only few studies that examine both antisocial and prosocial behavior, and there
39 are even less studies that examine both types of behavior in a specific context. A previous study
40 by Reference to Author (2007) showed that factors in soccer and competitive swimming that are
41 amenable to intervention, such as positive coach-athlete relationships and exposure to high
42 levels of sociomoral reasoning in the immediate context of sporting activities, predicted less
43 antisocial and more prosocial behavior outside the sports context, respectively. Another study by
44 Reference to Author (2008) showed that positive coach-athlete relationships, high levels of
45 sociomoral reasoning about sports dilemma's and also positive attitude toward fair play were
46 associated with antisocial and prosocial behavior in the context of sport, but this study only
47 focused on soccer and did not control for general tendencies to behave in antisocial or prosocial
48 ways. It is important to control for these tendencies, especially at the team level, as aggregation
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of individual athletes with similar tendencies to behave antisocial or prosocial could have a
4
5 substantial impact on the degree to which adolescents show antisocial and prosocial behavior in
6
7 the context of sport (e.g., Dishion & Dodge, 2005; Dishion, McCord, & Poulin, 1999). The
8
9 current study is the first to examine antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context
10
11 controlling for individual differences in adolescents' tendency to show antisocial behavior
12
13 (aggression and delinquency) and prosocial behavior.
14
15

16
17 In the current study, multilevel analyses were used to simultaneously examine the degree to
18
19 which individual characteristics of athletes (individual level) and team characteristics
20
21 (contextual level) contributed to the athletes' behavior in the sports context, including four types
22
23 of sport. We expected that favorable moral atmosphere, higher levels of moral reasoning about
24
25 sport dilemmas, more positive fair play attitude, and supportive coach-athlete relationships
26
27 would contribute to less antisocial and more prosocial behavior in the sports context. Because
28
29 self-selection in sports and teams may (partly) account for team-level effects, we controlled for
30
31 the athletes' age, cultural background, socioeconomic status, level of education, extent of sport
32
33 participation, and most importantly externalizing behavior in general in the case of antisocial
34
35 behavior in the context of sport, and prosocial behavior in general when examining prosocial
36
37 behavior in the context of sports. Moreover, we controlled for type of sport and, because the
38
39 measures were based on self-report, the tendency to give socially desirable answers.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Athletes were included from two individual sports (athletics and taekwondo) and two team
46
47 sports (soccer and basketball) that have high participation rates in the Netherlands. These sports
48
49 may attract different youth populations, trigger different behaviors, show different frequencies
50
51 and diversity in antisocial and prosocial behaviors (Kavussanu, Seal, & Phillips, 2006), and may
52
53 be organized in teams differently. Therefore, the moderating effects of type of sport on the
54
55 associations between the potential predictors (moral reasoning, moral atmosphere, fair play
56
57 attitude, and supportive coach-athlete relationships) and antisocial en prosocial behavior in the
58
59 context of sport were also tested. Finally, we explored whether levels of antisocial behavior
60

Predictors of adolescents' behavior in sports 8

1
2
3 differ between the four types of sport, as factors that might directly influence antisocial behavior
4
5 in sport – such the degree of physical contact, the competitive nature of the sport, and the degree
6
7 to which one's efforts to achieve goals are blocked – may vary between sports, but have not
8
9 been examined extensively in empirical research.
10

Method

Participants

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 The sample consisted of $N = 439$ male competition level athletes, active in team or
18
19 individual sports, who were recruited from $N = 67$ teams of $N = 33$ sports clubs: $n = 8$ soccer
20
21 clubs ($n = 17$ teams, $n = 161$ adolescents), 8 basketball clubs ($n = 16$ teams, $n = 93$ adolescents),
22
23 9 athletics clubs ($n = 18$ teams, $n = 100$ adolescents), and $n = 8$ taekwondo clubs ($n = 16$ teams,
24
25 $n = 73$ adolescents). Teams were represented by 3 to 12 athletes ($M = 6.55$, $SD = 2.49$), and
26
27 sports clubs by 8 to 32 athletes ($M = 13.72$, $SD = 5.38$). The clubs were randomly drawn from
28
29 the population of these types of sports clubs in urbanized areas of the Netherlands. All clubs that
30
31 were asked to participate agreed. The participants of the study were 14 to 17 years of age ($M =$
32
33 15.3 , $SD = 1.4$) and they all provided informed consent. The response percentage was high, that
34
35 is, more than 90%. Among the participants of each team a 12 euro CD-token was raffled.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Socioeconomic status of the athletes was determined by combining the educational and
42
43 occupational background of both parents (Van Westerlaak, Kropman, & Collaris, 1990) and was
44
45 computed on the basis of sample-specific factor loadings and standard deviations. Mean scores
46
47 correspond to socioeconomic strata in the following way: 3 to 9, lower class; 9 to 12, middle
48
49 class; and 12 to 16, upper class (Bernstein & Brandis, 1970). The internal consistency reliability
50
51 of the scale for socioeconomic status was good, $\alpha = .83$ (4 items). The mean score was 8.9 ($SD =$
52
53 2.9), which indicated that the sample could be considered as lower class. The adolescents' level
54
55 of formal education was low, and correlated significantly with the socioeconomic status of their
56
57 parents, $r = .30$, $p < .001$.
58
59
60

The mean family size was 2.7 children. The percentage of single parent families was 16.1%

1
2
3 and the percentage of divorced parents was 19.9%. The percentage of Caucasian white
4
5 adolescents was 65.0%. The remaining 35.0% were adolescents with an ethnic minority
6
7 background, that is, at least one of their parents had been born in a country that is or was part of
8
9 the ethnic minority or integration policy of the Dutch government. At the time of the data
10
11 collection the adolescents had been active in competitive sports for 8.0 years ($SD = 2.9$) on
12
13 average.
14
15

16 17 *Measures*

18
19 The athletes completed questionnaires assessing the outcome variables antisocial and
20
21 prosocial behavior in the sports context, and the explanatory variables moral atmosphere of the
22
23 sporting environment, moral reasoning about sport dilemmas, fair play attitude, and coach-
24
25 athlete relationship quality in terms of both relational support and attachment-related support
26
27 from the coach in the sense of psychological availability of and reliance on the coach. The
28
29 participants also had to complete questionnaires assessing the control variables externalizing and
30
31 prosocial behavior in general and social desirability. For the purpose of interpretation, all scores
32
33 were keyed to the names of the scales. For instance, a high score on the scale for prosocial
34
35 behavior is indicative of a high level of self-reported prosocial behavior. Scales that were
36
37 significantly skewed, such as externalizing problems, were transformed to normal with a
38
39 quadratic or logarithmic transformation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 *Outcome variables*

47
48 *Antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context.* Antisocial behavior and prosocial
49
50 behavior in the context of sport were measured with the Sports Behavior Inventory (SBI), which
51
52 is an adaptation of the Antisocial Behavior Inventory for the Context of Sport (ASBI-Sport) and
53
54 the Prosocial Behavior Inventory for the Context of Sport (PSBI-Sport) (Reference to Author,
55
56 2008). These instruments were based upon the Anti Social Behavior Inventory (ASBI) by
57
58 Wouters and Spiering (1990; Reference to Author, 2007; Tavecchio, Stams, Brugman, &
59
60 Thomeer-Bouwens, 1999) and the Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire (PBQ) from Weir and

1
2
3 Duveen (1981; Reference to Author, 2007), respectively. Reference to Author (2008)
4
5 constructed the SBI in order to measure behavior in the sports context, assessing on- and off-
6
7 field behavior. They found internal consistency reliabilities of $\alpha = .85$ for antisocial behavior
8
9 and $\alpha = .71$ for prosocial behavior, respectively. On 4-point Likert-type scales the athletes
10
11 indicated for 18 items the degree to which they behave in a certain way (varying from 1 “never”
12
13 to 4 “often”). Examples of items for antisocial behavior are “I shout abuse to others during
14
15 matches” and “I get disqualified for fouling opponents”. Examples for prosocial behavior are “I
16
17 help others when they are not that good at something yet” and “I like to compliment another
18
19 player when he or she is very good at something”. Internal consistency reliabilities were $\alpha = .92$
20
21 and $\alpha = .89$ for antisocial and prosocial behavior, respectively.
22
23
24
25

26 27 *Explanatory variables*

28
29 *Moral atmosphere of the sporting environment.* The moral atmosphere of the sporting
30
31 environment was measured with an adaptation of the Dutch translation (Veugelers & De Kat,
32
33 1998) of the School Culture Scale (SCS; Higgins, 1995, 1997). The translated SCS showed
34
35 internal consistency reliability and factorial validity (Veugelers & De Kat, 1998). The adapted
36
37 version was created for use in the sports context by Reference to Author (2007, 2008), who
38
39 demonstrated internal consistency ($\alpha = .86$ and $.84$, respectively) and divergent validity. In the
40
41 2007 study they found no correlation with social desirability, and in the 2008 study the
42
43 association with social desirability was weak, with $r = .26$, $p < .001$. There was no significant
44
45 association with verbal intelligence (2008). The instrument is a 19-item self report measure that
46
47 purports to assess the moral climate of the sporting environment in terms of normative
48
49 expectations, social conduct, quality of communication, and opportunities for youth
50
51 participation. Athletes indicate on 5-point Likert-type scales the degree to which statements
52
53 regarding the moral climate of their sporting environment apply to them by using answer
54
55 categories varying from 1 “false” to 5 “totally true”. An example of a statement is: “At this club
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the athletes trust each other". We found an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .85$.

4
5 *Moral reasoning about sport dilemmas.* The Practical Sociomoral Reflection Objective
6 Measure - Sport (PSROM-Sport) (Reference to Author, 2007, 2008) was developed to assess
7 practical moral reasoning in the context of organized youth sport, and was derived from the
8 Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure-Short Form, the SROM-SF (Basinger & Gibbs, 1987;
9 Høst, Brugman, Tavecchio, & Beem, 1998), which is a multiple choice questionnaire containing
10 two moral dilemmas and twelve question arrays focusing on moral norms. Each question
11 includes a response option representative of Kohlberg's moral stages 1 through 4. The first two
12 stages, indicative of unilateral (concrete consequences) and instrumental (pragmatic deals or
13 exchanges) reasoning, respectively, constitute the immature level. The third and fourth stage,
14 mutual-prosocial and systemic reasoning respectively, constitute the mature level (Gibbs,
15 Basinger, & Fuller, 1992).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The PSROM-Sport assesses the level of moral reasoning in a similar way. In the studies of
Reference to Author (2007, 2008), internal consistency reliabilities ranged from $\alpha = .68$ to α
=.63, respectively. We used the original twelve question arrays about situations in the context of
organized youth sport and only made some small textual changes to increase the
comprehensibility of some items [(e.g., "You decide to help the best player in the team to get fit
after an injury, so that he might be ready in time for the most important match of the year"),
tapping the type of moral norms the person uses (e.g., "Without this player you might lose the
important match" (stage 1), "Because this player might help you too" (stage 2), "If you don't,
you're not acting as a real friend" (stage 3), and "It shows that you feel responsible for your
team" (stage 4)]. The internal consistency reliability of the PSROM-Sport was sufficient, that is,
 $\alpha = .62$.

Reference to Author (2007) found evidence for convergent validity by comparing moral
scores on the PSROM-Sport with scores on semi-structured interviews assessing moral
reasoning competence (Gibbs, Basinger, & Fuller, 1992) and fair play attitude (Junge et al.,

2000; Loland & McNamee, 2000; Tamboer & Steenbergen, 2000). The PSROM-Sport moral reasoning scores were positively and moderately associated with both moral reasoning competence and fair play attitude. In the current study an open moral interview, based upon the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF) (Basinger & Gibbs, 1987; Basinger, Gibbs, & Fuller, 1995; Gibbs, Basinger, & Fuller, 1992) was conducted in a sub sample of $n = 100$ athletes in order to assess convergent validity. The interview was designed to provoke the athletes' highest levels of moral reasoning competence (four items) and practical moral reasoning about sport dilemmas (nine items). The correlations between the PSROM-Sport questionnaire on the one hand and moral reasoning competence and practical moral reasoning as measured with the interview on the other hand, were significant and in the expected directions, with $r = .23, p < .01$ and $r = .36, p < .001$, respectively.

Discriminant validity of the PSROM-Sport was established in a study by Reference to Author (2008), who used nine of the original twelve questions. They found no significant relations with social desirability or verbal intelligence. Also in the current study the association with social desirability was non-significant.

Fair play attitude. Fair play attitude of the athletes was assessed with a self developed theoretically derived instrument, measuring the extent to which the athlete has respect for the opponent and the formal and informal rules of the game (Junge et al., 2000; Loland & McNamee, 2000; Tamboer & Steenbergen, 2000). Reference to Author (2008) found evidence for internal consistency ($\alpha = .76$) and divergent validity of the instrument, that is, no significant correlations were found with social desirability and verbal intelligence. A 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 "not important" to 5 "very important", was devised to assess the attitude toward fair-play (twelve items). Two examples of items are: "Respect for one's opponent", and "Equal opportunities to perform well". The fair play scale demonstrated a satisfactory internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .80$. Fair play was weakly associated with social desirability, $r = .19, p < .001$.

1
2
3 *Relational support from the coach.* The Athlete-Coach scale of the Sport Interpersonal
4 Relationships Questionnaire, the SIRQ-AC (Wylleman, 1995, 2000), was used to measure the
5 degree to which athletes experience the interpersonal relationship with their coach as supportive.
6
7 The scale proved to have good psychometric properties concerning construct, content, and
8 concurrent validity, and both internal and external reliability (Wylleman, 1995). Four out of six
9 SIRQ-AC scales were completed: closed attitude from the athlete toward the coach (e.g. "I
10 avoid having contact with my coach"); acceptance of the coach by the athlete (e.g. "I'm very
11 attentive when my coach explains something to me"); caring behavior of the coach (e.g. "The
12 coach is willing to give extra help"); and criticizing by the coach (e.g. "My coach only runs
13 down on me"). The answers to the 44 questions were given on 5-point Likert-type scales,
14
15 varying from 1 "never agree" to 5 "always agree". The following internal consistency
16 reliabilities were found: closed attitude, $\alpha = .86$; acceptance, $\alpha = .83$; caring behavior, $\alpha = .91$;
17 and criticizing, $\alpha = .79$. As these scales intercorrelated highly, they were combined into one
18 scale designated as relational support from the coach. The internal consistency reliability of this
19 scale was $\alpha = .78$.

20
21
22 *Attachment-related support from the coach in terms of psychological availability of and*
23 *reliance on the coach.* The PARA questionnaire (Psychological Availability and Reliance on
24 Adult) (Zegers & Schuengel, 2006) was developed to tap the adolescents' perception of
25 psychological availability (sample item from the version for athletes: "My coach is warm and
26 understanding") and reliance ("Whenever I am distressed I will ask my coach for support or
27 advice"). The questions had to be completed on 4-point Likert-type scales, varying from 1
28 "disagree" to 4 "agree". In research on institutionalized adolescents, the working models of the
29 relationship with the individual mentors of these adolescents, as assessed with the PARA, were
30 predicted over time by the generalized attachment representations of the adolescents as well as
31 the mentors (Zegers, Schuengel, Van IJzendoorn, & Janssens, 2006), indicating that the
32 questionnaire taps into the perception that a particular non-parental adult may be relied upon as

1
2
3 a “secure-base figure of convenience” (Waters & Cummings, 2000, p. 168) in times of need.

4
5 The PARA scale was also associated with observed support seeking and support providing
6
7 between these adolescents and their mentors (Zegers & Schuengel, 2006). The items tapping
8
9 psychological availability of and reliance on the adult were highly interrelated, and were
10
11 combined in an overall availability and reliance score representing perceived attachment-related
12
13 support from the coach. The internal consistency reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .89$.

14 15 16 *Control variables*

17
18
19 *Externalizing behavior in general.* The scale for externalizing behavior of the Youth Self
20
21 Report, the YSR (Achenbach, 1991; Verhulst, Van der Ende, & Koot, 1997) was used in order
22
23 to measure externalizing behavior, or more specifically aggressive (19 items) and delinquent (11
24
25 items) behavior. The scale proved to be valid for measuring this type of behavior (Verhulst, Van
26
27 der Ende, & Koot, 1997). The adolescents indicated whether statements such as: “I fight a lot”,
28
29 applied to them during the last six months, using a three-point Likert-type scale: 1 “not at all”, 2
30
31 “a little or sometimes”, and 3 “obviously or often”. The internal consistency reliability was $\alpha =$
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

52
53 *Prosocial behavior in general.* In order to assess prosocial behavior in general, the
54
55 Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire (PBQ; Weir & Duveen, 1981) was adapted (see also
56
57 Reference to Author, 2007). Validity and internal consistency of the adapted PBQ has been
58
59 established by Stams et al. (2008), who used it for research among $n = 75$ juvenile delinquents
60
61 and adolescents from low socioeconomic backgrounds and cultural minority groups. The

1
2
3 instrument proved to be internally consistent ($\alpha = .71$). Evidence for concurrent validity of the
4
5 PBQ was found in positive associations with empathy and victim-based moral orientation, and
6
7 negative associations with norm-trespassing, delinquent, and aggressive behavior. Divergent
8
9 validity was demonstrated by low to moderate correlations with verbal intelligence, $r = .10$, $p <$
10
11 $.05$, and social desirability, $r = .32$, $p < .001$. The adapted 20-item PBQ was based on a 4-point
12
13 Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 “never” to 4 “always”. The items represent positive social
14
15 behaviors, such as helping, sharing and supporting others. An example is: “I take the
16
17 opportunity to praise the work of those who are less able”. We found an internal consistency
18
19 reliability of $\alpha = .88$. The scale proved to be moderately associated with social desirability, $r =$
20
21 $.35$, $p = .001$.

22
23
24
25
26
27 *Social desirability.* The social desirability scale (Reference to Author, 2007, 2008) purports
28
29 to measure the tendency to give socially desirable answers. The scale showed satisfying internal
30
31 consistency reliabilities, with $\alpha = .83$ and $\alpha = .82$, respectively. The scale consists of
32
33 dichotomous items describing socially desirable attributes that are based upon the 11-item
34
35 Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Nederhof (1981)
36
37 validated this scale for the Netherlands. To increase the reliability, 4 items have been added by
38
39 Reference to Author (2001). Examples from the 15-items scale are: “I am always honest”, and “I
40
41 never boast”. Adolescents indicate whether statements apply to them by using the answer
42
43 categories “true” and “false”. In the current study, the internal consistency reliability was $\alpha =$
44
45 $.79$.

50 *Statistical analysis*

51
52
53 The separate contribution of the individual athletes' characteristics and features of the
54
55 sports team to antisocial and prosocial behavioral in the sports context were determined by using
56
57 the MLwiN program (Goldstein et al., 1998) for multilevel modeling (Goldstein, 1995), a
58
59 technique for analyzing linear models in samples with a hierarchical or clustered structure.
60
Multilevel analysis enables variation to be explained across teams separate from individual

1
2
3 behavior, adjusting for the non-independence of observations within groups. This is of
4
5 importance because “contextual effects are consequences of emergent properties of groups or
6
7 social settings, and thus they cannot be accounted for at the individual-level” (Osgood &
8
9 Anderson, 2004, p. 522). Traditional analyses, such as ordinary regression analysis, would only
10
11 account for the individual athlete as the unit of analysis, thereby ignoring the fact that athletes
12
13 are grouped into teams.
14
15

16
17 Using multilevel analysis, control and explanatory variables were considered as both
18
19 characteristics of individual athletes (the perceptions, experiences or behaviors of the individual
20
21 athlete) and as team characteristics (the perception, experiences or behaviors of the team).
22
23 Group-mean centering was used to split explanatory variables into one variable at the individual
24
25 level and one at the team level (Snijders & Bosker, 1999). We calculated the mean score of the
26
27 team and subsequently subtracted these mean scores from the individual athletes' scores, which
28
29 resulted in uncorrelated explanatory variables representing the team level and the individual
30
31 level, respectively. By including both variables into the model, adjustments are made for
32
33 individual and team level effects.
34
35
36
37

38
39 A stepwise procedure was followed in analyzing the data. Firstly, it was examined whether
40
41 in a model without explanatory factors (the so-called null-model) team effects would be
42
43 significant, indicating team differences in antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context.
44
45 Then, in three consecutive steps, the control and explanatory factors were entered block wise in
46
47 order to test whether the more elaborate models would make a significant improvement over the
48
49 simpler models without control or explanatory factors and cross-level interactions. Improvement
50
51 of model fit was tested by the difference in deviance, which has a chi-square distribution and
52
53 can be used to test whether the more elaborate model fits significantly better than the simpler
54
55 model. Whenever an inserted block did not result in a significant improvement of the model, it
56
57 was removed. The resulting models were used as a reference for further comparison. The best
58
59 fitting multilevel regression models are presented, meaning that only the variables with
60

1
2
3 statistically significant effects are shown in the final models for antisocial and prosocial
4
5 behavior in the sports context.
6

7 8 Results

9 10 *Descriptive analyses*

11
12 Table 1 presents the correlations between age, cultural background (Caucasian white or
13 ethnic minority), socioeconomic status, level of education, extent of sport participation
14 (standardized summation of the number of hours and days per week spent in sporting activity),
15 type of sport (team or individual), social desirability, externalizing behavior and prosocial
16 behavior in general, coach-athlete relationship quality in terms of attachment-related support
17 and relational support, moral atmosphere, moral reasoning, fair play attitude, and antisocial and
18 prosocial behavior in the sports context. Only effects at $p < .001$ were considered significant in
19 order to adjust for multiple statistical tests.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 We found a number of significant correlations between control variables and explanatory
32 and outcome variables (see Table 1). Age correlated negatively with type of sport ($r = -.20$),
33 indicating that athletes performing individual sports were somewhat younger than athletes
34 performing team sports. Cultural background was negatively associated with both type of sport
35 ($r = -.24$) and relational support from the coach ($r = -.19$), which indicates that athletes from
36 cultural minority groups were slightly underrepresented in individual sports relative to team
37 sports. They also experienced less relational support from their coach than athletes with a
38 Caucasian white background. As expected, higher socioeconomic background was positively
39 associated with more advanced education ($r = .30$). A higher level of formal education was
40 associated with a weaker tendency to provide socially desirable answers ($r = -.18$). The extent of
41 sport participation proved to be higher in team sports than in individual sports ($r = -.31$), and
42 was positively related to antisocial behavior in the sports context ($r = .22$). Coach-athlete
43 relationship quality, moral atmosphere, and fair play attitude were more positive in individual
44 sports than in team sports ($.22 < r < .44$), while athletes performing individual sports rated
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 themselves favorably on antisocial ($r = -.38$) and prosocial behavior ($r = .28$) in the context of
4
5 sport. Finally, a stronger tendency to give socially desirable responses was associated with
6
7 stronger fair play attitude ($r = .19$), and more positive self-reports of externalizing and prosocial
8
9 behavior in general ($r = -.21$ and $r = .35$, respectively).

10
11
12 Correlations among the independent control and explanatory variables varied between $r = -$
13
14 $.17$ (externalizing and prosocial behavior in general) and $r = .65$ (relational support from the
15
16 coach and moral atmosphere). Finally, associations between explanatory and outcome variables
17
18 ranged from $r = .17$ (moral reasoning and prosocial behavior in the sport context) to $r = -.55$
19
20 (relational support from the coach and antisocial behavior in the sports context).
21
22

23 *Antisocial behavior in the sports context*

24
25
26 Table 2 depicts the results of the multilevel analysis of antisocial behavior in the sports
27
28 context, including unstandardized regression coefficients, standard deviations, t -values,
29
30 percentages of (explained) variance, the deviance, and χ^2 . The null-model indicates that 80% of
31
32 the variance in antisocial behavior in the sports context could be attributed to differences among
33
34 individual athletes within teams (individual level), and that the remaining 20% could be
35
36 attributed to differences between teams (team level). The best fitting multilevel regression
37
38 model [$X^2(10, N = 439) = 239.95, p < .001$] accounted for 46% of the variance in antisocial
39
40 behavior in the sports context. Most of the variance accounted for was distributed at the
41
42 individual level, namely, 28%. The explained variance at the team level was 18%.
43
44
45
46

47
48 Greater attachment-related support and relational support from the coach were associated
49
50 with lower levels of antisocial behavior in the sports context both at the individual and team
51
52 level. More externalizing behavior problems were associated with higher levels of antisocial
53
54 behavior in the sports context at both levels, which indicates that antisocial behavior in the
55
56 context of organized youth sport is not only related to the tendency of the individual athlete
57
58 himself to show externalizing behavior, but also related to the average tendency towards
59
60 externalizing behavior problems of his team members. At the team level, the relation between

1
2
3 moral reasoning and antisocial behavior just failed to reach significance ($p = .06$), showing that
4
5 there was a trend towards the reduction of antisocial behavior through high levels of moral
6
7 reasoning within teams. A significant interaction effect was found for type of sport and moral
8
9 reasoning, indicating that the relation between moral reasoning and antisocial behavior in the
10
11 sports context was different for athletes involved in team sports compared with athletes
12
13 practicing individual sports. Only in individual sports, in particular athletics, a higher level of
14
15 moral reasoning was related to less antisocial behavior in the sports context ($b = -.73, p < .001$).
16
17 The regression coefficient for soccer was $b = -.05$, for basketball $b = -.15$, and for taekwondo b
18
19 $= .15$ (all non-significant).
20
21
22
23

24 A main effect for type of sport indicated that athletes who were involved in individual
25
26 sports reported less antisocial behavior than athletes involved in team sports. A series of post-
27
28 hoc t -tests ($p < .05$) revealed that soccer players ($M = 1.94, SD = .68$) reported more antisocial
29
30 behavior in the sports context than basketball players ($M = 1.63, SD = .43$) and adolescents
31
32 involved in athletics ($M = 1.37, SD = .45$) or taekwondo ($M = 1.35, SD = .47$). Basketball
33
34 players reported less antisocial behavior in the sports context than soccer players, but more than
35
36 other athletes. No differences were found between the two individual sports.
37
38
39

40 *Prosocial behavior in the sports context*

41
42
43 Table 3 presents the results of the multilevel analysis of prosocial behavior in the sports
44
45 context. The null-model indicates that 87% of the variance in prosocial behavior could be
46
47 attributed to differences among individual athletes within teams, and that 13% of the variance in
48
49 prosocial behavior could be attributed to differences between teams. The best fitting multilevel
50
51 regression model [$\chi^2 (8, N = 439) = 199.54, p < .001$] accounted for 39% of the variance in
52
53 prosocial behavior among athletes. Most of this variance was distributed at the individual level,
54
55 namely, 27%; the remaining 12% was distributed at the team level.
56
57
58

59 Both at the individual and team level, greater relational support from the coach, a favorable
60
moral atmosphere, and more prosocial behavior in general were related to more prosocial

1
2
3 behavior in the sports context. More advanced moral reasoning was associated with more
4
5 prosocial behavior in the sports context, but only at the individual level.
6

7 8 Discussion

9
10 This study focused on factors amenable to intervention in organized youth sport that may
11
12 contribute to adolescent athletes' antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context. These
13
14 factors were examined both at the level of individual athletes and at the sports team level. The
15
16 individual effects proved to be substantially greater than the team or contextual effects. Team
17
18 effects are independent of the contribution the athlete makes to the team. As a consequence,
19
20 these effects may be used to estimate the impact of participating in organized youth sport on
21
22 social behavior in the context of sport. A total of 20% of the variance in antisocial behavior and
23
24 13% of the variance in prosocial behavior were distributed at the team level. These contextual
25
26 effects are substantial. As a comparison, multilevel research in the school context showed that
27
28 19% of the variance in academic performance among students could be attributed to
29
30 characteristics of the school environment (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). The effect of organized
31
32 youth sport on social behavior in the sports context, in the sense of belonging to a 'good' team
33
34 with a 'good' coach, seems to be comparable to the effect that attending a 'good' school has on
35
36 academic achievement.
37
38
39
40
41

42 43 *Relationship with the coach*

44
45 Supportive coach-athlete relationships proved to be associated with less antisocial and more
46
47 prosocial behavior in the sports context. Not only relational support was found to be important,
48
49 but also attachment-related support, indicating that coaches may have a positive impact by being
50
51 psychologically available and trustworthy. The effects were significant not only for supportive
52
53 coach-athlete relationships as perceived by the individual athlete, but also for the supportiveness
54
55 of the coach as perceived by the team, suggesting that coaches themselves might contribute to
56
57 these effects.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Findings from the present study are in line with studies emphasizing the mentoring role of
4 the coach (Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke, & Salmela, 1998; Miller, Salmela, & Kerr, 2002).
5
6 Coach-athlete relationship quality may not only be important for improving performance
7 (Philippe & Seiler, 2006), it may also play a role in the development of antisocial and prosocial
8 behavior in young athletes. The findings suggest that the positive or negative impact that
9 coaches may have on prosocial and antisocial behavior may partly depend on the extent to
10 which they are modeling positive relationship characteristics such as sociability, positive regard,
11 and constructive criticism. Perceived relationship quality showed a strong bivariate association
12 with moral atmosphere, as well as small but significant associations with moral reasoning and
13 fair play attitude. When coaches are perceived as secure base figures of convenience (Waters &
14 Cummings, 2000), they may engender a sense of emotional security among their pupils.
15 Emotional security supports more adaptive regulation of emotions and behaviors during times of
16 stress (e.g., Willemen, Schuengel, & Koot, 2009), reducing the likelihood of antisocial behavior
17 and increasing the likelihood of prosocial behavior.

35 *Moral atmosphere*

36
37
38 Moral atmosphere proved to be positively related to prosocial behavior in the sports
39 context. Comparable results for the school context were obtained by Power et al. (1989), who
40 found a relation between moral atmosphere and prosocial behavior. Notably, collective
41 responsibility, care, trust, and active participation make up a moral atmosphere that is conducive
42 to prosocial behavior both in the context of organized youth sport and at school. The moral
43 atmosphere in which human activity is embedded may be more important than the activity itself,
44 regardless of whether it concerns sporting activities or the acquisition of skills and knowledge at
45 school. In this sense, the findings provide support for the explanation Endresen and Olweus
46 (2005) offered for the effects of power sports participation on antisocial behavior, namely that
47 'macho' culture prevails in these sports, which might negatively affect behavior (see Nixon,
48 1997; Rees, Howell, & Miracle, 1990). When moral atmosphere is conceptualized in terms of
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the dichotomy between mastery and performance, moral atmosphere instead of the sporting
4
5 activity tends to be related to moral judgment and respect for opponents, as well as moral
6
7 behavior (see Gano-Overway, Guivernau, Magyar, Waldron, & Ewing, 2005; Miller, Roberts, &
8
9 Ommundsen, 2005; Ommundsen, Roberts, Lemyre, & Treasure, 2003).

10
11
12 Several studies have found a relation between moral atmosphere and antisocial behavior,
13
14 both in the context of organized youth sport (e.g. Guivernau & Duda, 2002; Stephens, 2000),
15
16 and in the context of the school (e.g., Brugman et al., 2003; Høst et al., 1998; Mancini, Fruggeri,
17
18 & Panari, 2006). The current study showed no significant multivariate association between
19
20 moral atmosphere and antisocial behavior, but only a bivariate association. It is possible that the
21
22 effect of moral atmosphere is accounted for by the other predictors, given that moral atmosphere
23
24 was strongly associated with relational support, attachment-related support, as well as
25
26 externalizing behavior problems of team members.
27
28
29
30

31 *Moral reasoning*

32
33 Athletes displaying higher levels of moral reasoning reported more prosocial behavior in
34
35 the sports context, but there was no significant effect of the average level of moral reasoning
36
37 within teams. A trend, however, was found towards a relation between higher levels of moral
38
39 reasoning within teams and less antisocial behavior in the sports context, which suggests that
40
41 more mature moral judgments that are shared by team members protect athletes from engaging
42
43 in antisocial behavior in the context of sport. Also higher levels of moral reasoning in individual
44
45 athletes were associated with less antisocial behavior in the sports context, but only among
46
47 adolescents participating in athletics, which is the most individual sport in the present study. For
48
49 that reason, differences in moral reasoning among individual athletes may translate more easily
50
51 into antisocial behavior than differences in moral reasoning among athletes performing
52
53 taekwondo or a team sport. Moreover, antisocial behavior tends to be highly regulated in martial
54
55 arts such as taekwondo (see Theeboom, 2001), which are characterized by a strict and specific
56
57 “moral code of behaviour” (p. 346). This might create a homogenizing effect on differences in
58
59
60

1
2
3 both moral reasoning and antisocial behavior among athletes within teams, which hampers to
4
5 possibility of finding effects at the individual level.
6

7
8 *Fair play attitude*

9
10 Although there was a moderate bivariate association between fair play attitude and
11
12 prosocial behavior, fair play attitude of the athletes was not associated with antisocial and
13
14 prosocial behavior in the context of sport in the multivariate analyses. This was unexpected, as a
15
16 previous study by Reference to Author (2008) showed a team effect of fair play on antisocial
17
18 behavior in the context of sport. Possibly, those prosocial behaviors in the sports context that are
19
20 most closely connected with the concept of fair play do not show much variation, because such
21
22 prosocial behaviors are constitutive of sport itself. We suggest that the very practice of
23
24 organized youth sport is made possible by prosocial behaviors that reflect values, such as respect
25
26 for the opponent and fair competition.
27
28
29

30
31 *Antisocial and prosocial behavior in the sports context*

32
33 Soccer players reported the highest level of antisocial behavior in the sports context,
34
35 followed by basketball players. Athletes performing individual sports (athletics and taekwondo)
36
37 displayed the lowest levels of antisocial behavior, even after controlling for background
38
39 variables, such as socioeconomic status and educational level, social desirability and
40
41 externalizing and prosocial behavior in general. Notably, teams showing relatively high rates of
42
43 externalizing behaviors in general did also report high levels of antisocial behavior in the sports
44
45 context, which suggests that aggregation of antisocial youth might partly explain increases of
46
47 antisocial behavior in the context of organized youth sport. Such negative effects of aggregation
48
49 have also been found in peer-group interventions targeting behavior change in at-risk youth, and
50
51 was explained by deviancy training that involves positive reinforcement from antisocial peers
52
53 for aggressive talk and deviant behavior (Dishion et al., 1999). As we also found a team effect
54
55 of prosocial behavior in general on prosocial behavior in the context of sport, it is possible that
56
57 an aggregation of prosocial athletes might have a positive effect, which might result from
58
59
60

1
2
3 reinforcement of prosocial behaviors. As there is also evidence showing that peer contagion can
4
5 occur in natural environments (Dishion & Dodge, 2005), sports clubs that risk attracting youth
6
7 with antisocial behavior may attempt to avoid composing teams with a majority of adolescents
8
9 with such tendencies. These findings also suggest that attempts to reduce antisocial behavior
10
11 among youth at risk by organizing sports activities run the risk of only displacing antisocial
12
13 behavior and perhaps even stimulating the rate of this behavior (cf. Dodge, Dishion, &
14
15 Lansford, 2006).
16
17

18
19 A possible explanation for the differences in antisocial behavior between the four types of
20
21 sports could be that the perceived legitimacy of aggressive behavior is greater in contact sports
22
23 than in non-contact sports (Conroy, Silva, Newcomer, Walker, & Johnson, 2001). Another
24
25 explanation is that team athletes may show a lower level of concern for the opponent compared
26
27 to individual athletes (Vallerand, Deshaies, & Cuerrier (1997). The relatively low level of
28
29 antisocial behavior in youth performing taekwondo might be somewhat surprising in light of
30
31 Endresen and Olweus' (2005) longitudinal study of power sports, showing highly negative
32
33 effects of power sports, which they attributed to repeated contacts with 'macho' attitudes,
34
35 norms, and ideals in the sports context. The positive results for taekwondo, however, might be
36
37 explained by the particular philosophy regarding discipline and emotional self-regulation that is
38
39 inherent to most martial arts (Theeboom, 2001), and which may prevent antisocial behaviors in
40
41 the context of sport. The relations between type of sport and degree of antisocial behavior
42
43 suggest an effect of either sporting activities itself, or environmental factors that may be related
44
45 to distinctions between contact and non-contact sports, team and individual sports (see
46
47 Kavussanu et al., 2006), and/or the degree to which "frustration occurs due to the blocking of
48
49 one's efforts to achieve goals", which explanation is consonant with the frustration-aggression
50
51 hypothesis (Nucci & Kim, 2005, p.124). Compared to taekwondo in which the goal is to beat the
52
53 opponent physically, opponents in soccer are more an obstacle for reaching the goal of the game
54
55 (scoring a goal). The role of the opponent is therefore substantially different in soccer compared
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to taekwondo. As a consequence, the role of opponents in soccer is likely to cause more
4
5 frustration and may therefore evoke more antisocial behavior. Moreover, since in basketball the
6
7 rules are more stringent with regard to physical contact, soccer is thought to inflict most
8
9 antisocial behavior.
10

11 *Limitations*

12
13
14
15 There are some limitations to the current study. First of all, there is a limitation to the causal
16
17 interpretation of the findings, as the study design was non-experimental, cross-sectional and not
18
19 longitudinal. Because only youth self-reports were used and no data from the coaches, it is
20
21 impossible to tell to what extent personal perceptions of the athletes colored their reports of
22
23 antisocial and prosocial behavior. Self-report instruments assessing antisocial and prosocial
24
25 behavior, though, have been shown to produce valid and reliable data on antisocial (Junger-Tas
26
27 & Haen Marshall, 1999; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000) and prosocial behavior (Carlo & Randall,
28
29 2002). Kavussanu et al. (2006) found that self-report of antisocial and prosocial behavior by
30
31 adolescent soccer players was significantly related to the independent observation of their
32
33 antisocial and prosocial behaviors in the context of sport. Moreover, we controlled for social
34
35 desirability because self-reports may be sensitive to socially desirable answering. Although the
36
37 role of team membership was examined statistically by means of multilevel modelling, no
38
39 instruments were used to assess team dynamics. It was therefore not possible to examine the role
40
41 of team mate relationships, the impact of explicit team norms regarding behavior on and off the
42
43 field, or the role attachment to peers might have. The team level effects that were found in the
44
45 present study, however, suggest that it is worthwhile to examine team functioning in a more
46
47 dynamic way, using instruments designed to tap team norms and values of on- and off-field
48
49 antisocial and prosocial behaviors and relationships between team mates. Finally, the assessment
50
51 of coach-athlete relationship quality might benefit from focusing on autonomy support from
52
53 coaches, in which also relational support expected to fulfil the need for social relatedness is
54
55 dealt with.
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusions

The current study uncovered factors explaining why the sporting context may contribute to antisocial and prosocial behavior in adolescent athletes. Apart from the behaviours that adolescents bring to the sporting context, behavior appeared to depend on the moral atmosphere of the sporting environment, the levels of moral reasoning about dilemmas that are salient to competitive sport participation and foremost, the relationship between coaches and their athletes. Because these factors are in principle amenable to intervention or rational decision making, future research may attempt to manipulate these factors as to test their causal role as well as to increase the promotive value of sports for social development and functioning in adolescence.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Manual for the Youth Self Report and 1991 profiles*. Burlington:
6
7 University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.
8
9
10 Arnold, P. J. (1994). Sport and moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 23(1), 75-89.
11
12 Arnold, P. J. (2001). Sport, moral development, and the role of the teacher: Implications for
13
14 research and moral education. *Quest*, 53, 135-150.
15
16
17 Aziz, S. A. (1998). *Aggressive tendencies in Malaysian youth soccer: An examination of*
18
19 *individual and contextual factors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa: University of
20
21 Iowa.
22
23
24 Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and*
25
26 *Social Psychology Review*, 3, 193-209.
27
28
29 Basinger, K. S., & Gibbs, J. C. (1987). Validation of the Sociomoral Reflection Objective
30
31 Measure-Short Form. *Psychological Reports*, 61, 139-146.
32
33
34 Basinger, K. S., & Gibbs, J. C. & Fuller, D. (1995). Context and the measurement of moral
35
36 judgment. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 18, 537-556.
37
38
39 Beam, M. R., Chen, C., & Greenberger, E. (2002). The nature of adolescents' relationships with
40
41 their "very important" nonparental adults. *American Journal of Community Psychology*,
42
43 30(2), 305-325.
44
45
46 Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student athletes and general
47
48 students: an empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 352-
49
50 263.
51
52
53 Bernstein, B., & Brandis, W. (1970). Social class differences in communication and control. In
54
55 W. Brandis (Ed.), *Social class, language, and communication* (pp. 93-124). London:
56
57 Routledge.
58
59
60 Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of
mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport
Psychology*, 29, 267-281.

- 1
2
3 Bloom, G. A., Smith, M. D. (1996). Hockey violence: A test of cultural spillover theory.
4
5 *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13, 65-77.
6
7 Bredemeier, B. J. L. (1994). Children's moral reasoning and their assertive, aggressive, and
8
9 submissive tendencies in sport and daily life. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16,
10
11 1-14.
12
13 Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1986a). Game reasoning and interactional morality. *Journal*
14
15 *of Genetic Psychology*, 147(2), 257-275.
16
17 Bredemeier, B. J. L., & Shields, D. L. L. (1986b). Moral growth among athletes and non-
18
19 athletes: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 147(1), 7-18.
20
21
22 Breedveld, K., & Tiessen-Raaphorst, A. (red.) (2006). *Rapportage sport 2006* [Sport report
23
24 2006]. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
25
26
27 Brugman, D. Podolskij, A. I., Heymans, P. G., Boom, J., Karabanova, O., & Idobaeva, O.
28
29 (2003). Perception of moral atmosphere in school and norm transgressive behaviour in
30
31 adolescents: An intervention study. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*,
32
33 27(4), 289-300.
34
35
36 Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for
37
38 late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44.
39
40
41 Coakley, J. J. (1984). *Mead's theory on the development of the self: Implications for organized*
42
43 *youth sport programs*. Paper presented at the Olympic Scientific Congress, Eugene, Or.
44
45
46 Conroy, D. E., Silva, J.M., Newcomer, R.R., Walker, B.W., & Johnson, M.S. (2001). Personal
47
48 and participatory socializers of the perceived legitimacy of aggressive behavior in sport.
49
50 *Aggressive Behavior*, 27, 405-418.
51
52
53 Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of
54
55 psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dishion, T. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2005). Peer contagion in interventions for children and
4
5 adolescents: moving towards an understanding of the ecology and dynamics of change.
6
7 *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(3), 395-400.
8
9
10 Dishion, T. J., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and
11
12 problem behavior. *American Psychologist*, 54, 755-764.
13
14
15 Dodge, K. A., Dishion, T. J., & Lansford, J. E. (2006). Deviant peer influences in intervention
16
17 and public policy for youth. *Social Policy Report*, 20(1), 3-19.
18
19
20 Duquin, M. B., & Schroeder-Braun, K. (1996). Power, empathy, and moral conflict in sport.
21
22 *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2(4), 351-367.
23
24
25 Endresen, I. M., & Olweus, D. (2005). Participation in power sports and antisocial involvement
26
27 in preadolescent and adolescent boys. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(5),
28
29 468-478.
30
31
32 Gano-Overway, L. A., Guivernau, M., Magyar, T. M., Waldron, J. J., & Ewing, M. E. (2005).
33
34 Achievement goal perspectives, perceptions of the motivational climate, and
35
36 sportpersonship: individual and team effects. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 6, 215-
37
38 232.
39
40
41 Gibbs, J. C., Basinger, K. S., & Fuller, D. (1992). *Moral maturity: Measuring the development*
42
43 *of sociomoral reflection*. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
44
45
46 Goldstein, H. (1995). *Multilevel Statistical Models (2nd ed.)*. London: Edward Arnold.
47
48
49 Goldstein, H., Rasbach, J., Plewis, I., Draper, D. B. W., Yang, M., Woodhouse, G., & Healy, M.
50
51 (1998). *A user's guide to MLwiN*. London: University of London.
52
53
54 Guivernau, M., & Duda, J. L. (2002). Moral atmosphere and athletic aggressive tendencies in
55
56 young soccer players. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(1), 67-85.
57
58
59 Higgins, A. (1995). *Dimensions of the School Culture Scale: Measuring attitudes, norms and*
60
values in educational settings. Fordham: Fordham University.

Higgins, A. (1997). Research using the school culture scale. *International Journal of*

- 1
2
3 *Educational Research*, 27, 558-564.
- 4
5 Higgins-D'Alessandro, A., & Sath, D. (1998). The dimensions and measurement of school
6
7 culture: Understanding school culture as the basis for school reform. *International Journal*
8
9 *of Educational Research*, 28, 553-569.
- 10
11 Høst, K., Brugman, D., Tavecchio, L., & Beem, L. (1998). Students' perception of the moral
12
13 atmosphere in secondary school and the relationship between moral competence and moral
14
15 atmosphere. *Journal of Moral Education*, 27(1), 47-71.
- 16
17
18 Junge, A., Dvorak, J., Rösch, D., Graf-Baumann, T., Chomiak, J., & Peterson, L. (2000).
19
20 Psychological and sport-specific characteristics of football players. *The American Journal*
21
22 *of Sports Medicine*, 28(5), 22-28.
- 23
24
25 Junger-Tas, J., & Haen Marshall, I. (1999). The self-report methodology in crime research. In:
26
27 M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice. A review of research*, vol. 25 (pp. 291-367). Chicago:
28
29 University of Chicago Press.
- 30
31
32 Kavussanu, M. (2008). Moral behavior in sport: a critical review of the literature. *International*
33
34 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1(2), 124-138.
- 35
36
37 Kavussanu, M., & Boardly, I. D. (2009). The Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport scale.
38
39 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 31, 97-117.
- 40
41
42 Kavussanu, M., Roberts, G.C., & Ntoumanis, N. (2002). Contextual influences on moral
43
44 functioning of college basketball players. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 347-367.
- 45
46
47 Kavussanu, M., Seal, A.R., & Phillips, D. R. (2006). Observed prosocial and antisocial
48
49 behaviors in male soccer teams: Age differences across adolescence and the role of
50
51 motivational variables. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 18, 326-344.
- 52
53
54 Kavussanu, M., & Spray, C. M. (2006). Contextual influences on moral functioning of male
55
56 football players. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 1-23.
- 57
58
59 Kobak, R. R. & Sceery, A. (1988). Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect
60
regulation, and representations of self and others. *Child Development*, 59, 135-146.

- 1
2
3 Kochanska, G. & Murray, K. T. (2000). Mother-child mutually responsive orientation and
4
5 conscience development: From toddler to early school age. *Child Development*, 71, 417-
6
7 431.
8
9
10 Loland, S., & McNamee, M. (2000). Fair play and the ethos of sports: An eclectic philosophical
11
12 framework. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 27, 63-80.
13
14
15 Maher, C. A. (2005). Framework for School Sport Psychology. *Journal of Applied School*
16
17 *Psychology*, 21(2), 1-7.
18
19
20 Mancini, T., Fruggeri, L. & Panari, (2006). An extension of the school moral atmosphere
21
22 construct, and its association with aggressive behaviors in secondary school. *European*
23
24 *Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21, 209-228.
25
26
27 Miller, P. S., Roberts, G. C., & Ommundsen, Y. (2005). Effect of perceived motivational
28
29 climate on moral functioning, team moral atmosphere perceptions, and the legitimacy of
30
31 intentionally injurious acts among competitive youth football players. *Psychology of Sport*
32
33 *and Exercise*, 6, 461-477.
34
35
36 Miller, P. S., Salmela, J. H., & Kerr, G. (2002). Coaches' perceived role in mentoring athletes.
37
38 *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 33, 410-430.
39
40
41 Nederhof, A. J. (1981). *Beter onderzoek. Bestrijding van foutenbronnen in*
42
43 *sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek* [Better research. Combatting sources of error in social
44
45 scientific research]. 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands: Vuga.
46
47
48 NCYS (National Council of Youth Sports) (2001). *Market Research. NCYS Membership Survey*
49
50 *– 2001 Edition*. Stuart, FL: NCYS.
51
52
53 Nixon, H. L. (1997). Gender, sport, and aggressive behaviour outside sport. *Journal of Sport*
54
55 *and Social Issues*, 21, 379–391.
56
57
58 Nucci, C., & Kim, Y. (2005). Improving socialization through sport: an analytic review of
59
60 literature on aggression and sportsmanship. *Physical Educator*, 62(3), 123-129.

- 1
2
3 *applied multilevel modeling*. London: Sage.
- 4
5 Stams, G.J.J.M., Deković, M., Brugman, D., Rutten, E.A., Van den Wittenboer, G.L.H.,
6
7 Tavecchio, L.W.C., Hendriks, J., & Van Schijndel, M. (2008). The relation of punishment-
8
9 and victim-based moral orientation to prosocial, externalizing, and norm trespassing
10
11 and victim-based moral orientation to prosocial, externalizing, and norm trespassing
12
13 behavior in delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents: A validation study of the Moral
14
15 Orientation Measure. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 4 (10), 41-60.
- 16
17 Stams, G. J. J. M., Rutten, E. A., Prinzie, P., Deković, M., Schuengel, C., & Van Vugt, E. S.
18
19 (2009). *The relation between sport participation and adolescents' deviant behavior: A*
20
21 *meta-analysis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- 22
23
24 Stephens, D. E. (2000). Predictors of likelihood to aggress in youth soccer: An examination of
25
26 coed and all-girls teams. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 23, 311-325.
- 27
28
29 Stephens, D. E., & Bredemeier, B. J. L. (1996). Moral atmosphere and judgments about
30
31 aggression in girls' soccer: Relationships among moral and motivational variables. *Journal of*
32
33 *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18, 158-173.
- 34
35
36 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics (3rd ed.). Northridge:
37
38 California State University, Harper Collins College Publishers.
- 39
40
41 Tamboer, J., & Steenbergen, J. (2000). Sportfilosofie [Philosophy of Sport]. Leende, The
42
43 Netherlands: Damon.
- 44
45 Tavecchio, L. W. C., Stams, G. J. J. M., Brugman, D., & Thomeer-Bouwens, M. A. E. (1999).
46
47 Moral judgement development and delinquency in homeless youth. *Journal of moral*
48
49 *education*, 28, 63-79.
- 50
51
52 Theeboom, M. (2001). Martial arts and children. In J. Steenbergen, P. de Knop, & A. H. F.
53
54 Elling (Eds.). *Values and norms in sport. Critical reflections on the position and meanings*
55
56 *of sport in society* (pp. 337-353). Aachen: Meyer & Meyer Sport.
- 57
58
59 Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency
60
and crime. *Criminal Justice*, 4, 33-83.

- 1
2
3 Vallerand, R.J., Deshaies, P., & Cuerrier, J.P. (1997). On the effects of the social context on
4 behavioral intentions of sportsmanship. *International Journal Sport Psychology*, 28, 26-
5 140.
6
7
8
9
10 Van Bottenburg, M., & Schuyt, K. (1996). *De maatschappelijke betekenis van sport* [The
11 societal meaning of sport]. Arnhem: NOC*NSF.
12
13
14 Vanden Auweele, Y., & Rzewnicki, R. (2000). Putting relationship issues in sport in
15 perspective. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 573-577.
16
17
18
19 Van Westerlaak, J. M., Kropman, J. A., & Collaris, J. W. M. (1990). *Beroepenklapper* [Standard
20 educational and occupational classification guide]. Nijmegen: ITS.
21
22
23
24 Verhulst, F. C., Van der Ende, J., & Koot, H. M. (1997). *Handleiding voor de YSR* [Manual for
25 the YSR]. Rotterdam: Erasmus University, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,
26 Sophia Children's Hospital.
27
28
29
30
31 Veugelers, W., & De Kat, E. (1998). *Opvoeden in het voortgezet onderwijs: Leerlingen, ouders*
32 *en docenten over de pedagogische opdracht en de afstemming tussen gezin en school*
33 [Education in middle and high school: Students, parents, and teachers about their
34 educational tasks in the attunement between family and school]. Assen: Van Gorcum.
35
36
37
38
39
40 Waters, E., & Cummings, E. M. (2000). A secure base from which to explore close
41 relationships. *Child Development*, 71, 164-172.
42
43
44
45 Weinfield, N. S., Ogawa, J. R., & Sroufe, L. A. (1997). Early attachment as a pathway to
46 adolescent peer competence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 7, 241-265.
47
48
49
50 Weir, K., & Duveen, G. (1981). Further development and validation of the prosocial behaviour
51 questionnaire for use by teachers. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 22, 357-
52 374.
53
54
55
56
57 Willemen, A. M., Schuengel, C., Koot, J. M. (2009). Physiological regulation of stress in
58 referred adolescents: the role of the parent-adolescent relationship. *Journal of Child*
59 *Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 482-490.
60

1
2
3 Wouters, L., & Spiering, W. (1990). *Vragenlijst ongewenst gedrag* [Antisocial behavior
4
5 questionnaire]. Amsterdam: GG & GD Amsterdam.

6
7 Wylleman, P. (2000). Interpersonal relationships in sport: uncharted territory in sport
8
9 psychology research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 555-572.

10
11 Wylleman, P. (1995). *Talented young athletes and the interpersonal relationships in the athletic
12
13 triangle*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Brussel: Vrije Universiteit Brussel.

14
15 Zegers, M. A. M., & Schuengel, C. (2006). *Assessing working models of attachment
16
17 relationships in adolescence: Psychological availability and reliance on adults within and
18
19 outside the family*. Unpublished manuscript, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

20
21 Zegers, M. A. M., Schuengel, C., Van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Janssens, J. M. A. M. (2006).
22
23 Attachment representations of institutionalized adolescents and their professional
24
25 caregivers: Predicting the development of therapeutic relationships. *American Journal of
26
27 Orthopsychiatry*, 76, 325-334.

28
29 Zimmerman, M. A., Bingenheimer, J. B., & Notaro, P. C. (2002). Natural mentors and
30
31 adolescent resilience: a study with urban youth. *American Journal of Community
32
33 Psychology*, 30(2), 221-243.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1.

Individual Athlete Level Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations between Control Variables, Explanatory Variables, and Outcome Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<u>Control variables</u>																		
1. Age (years)	15.3	1.4	1.00															
2. Cultural background ^a	0.34	.47	.08	1.00														
3. SES	8.9	2.9	.04	-.03	1.00													
4. Level of education	2.2	.78	-.01	-.08	.30*	1.00												
5. Extent of sport participation	10.0	6.3	.01	.10	-.06	.02	1.00											
6. Type of sport ^b	0.42	.49	-.20*	-.24*	.04	.00	-.31*	1.00										
7. Social desirability	1.41	.24	-.07	.10	-.08	-.18*	.00	.07	1.00									
8. Externalizing behavior in general	12.76	8.50	.06	.10	-.02	.02	.03	-.08	-.21*	1.00								
9. Prosocial behavior in general	2.65	.47	.04	-.02	.04	-.02	.12	.17*	.35*	-.17*	1.00							
<u>Explanatory variables</u>																		
10. Relational support	.80	.60	.02	-.19*	.12	.15	-.13	.39*	.01	-.31*	.22*	1.00						
11. Attachment-related support	2.46	.66	-.04	-.01	-.04	-.08	.05	.24*	.12	-.17*	.46*	.39*	1.00					
12. Moral atmosphere	3.61	.59	-.09	-.15	.08	.06	-.05	.44*	.12	-.25*	.42*	.65*	.44*	1.00				
13. Moral reasoning	2.89	.42	.09	-.06	.07	.07	-.03	.08	-.14	-.08	.04	.20*	-.04	.11	1.00			
14. Fair play attitude	3.92	.62	.00	-.02	.08	-.06	-.02	.22*	.19*	-.15	.45*	.23*	.29*	.32*	.08	1.00		
<u>Outcome variables</u>																		
15. Antisocial behavior in the sports context	1.63	.60	.04	.13	-.06	-.12	.22*	-.38*	-.08	.41*	-.06	-.55*	-.04	-.39*	-.22*	-.16	1.00	
16. Prosocial behavior in the sports context	2.92	.57	.07	-.15	.01	.02	.03	.28*	.06	-.12	.47*	.46*	.36*	.52*	.17*	.27*	-.07	1.00

Note. *N* = 439 athletes.^a Caucasian white = 0; Ethnic minority = 1.^b Team sport = 0; Individual sport = 1.* *p* < .001.

Table 2.

Multilevel Analysis of Antisocial Behavior in the Sports Context

	Null-model	Explanatory model		
		<i>b</i>	<i>s.e.</i>	<i>t</i>
Intercept	1.57 (0.04)			
Individual level				
Relational support		-.47	.05	9.40***
Attachment-related support		-.21	.04	5.25***
Moral reasoning		.02	.07	0.29
Externalizing problems		.59	.08	7.38***
Team level				
Relational support		-.40	.10	4.00***
Attachment-related support		-.21	.08	2.63**
Moral reasoning		-.30	.16	1.88
Externalizing problems		.67	.20	3.35***
Type of sport (team vs. individual)		-.29	.06	4.83***
Interactions				
Type of sport*moral reasoning		-.32	.12	2.67**
Variance components				
Individual level	.281 (80%)	.182		
Team level	.071 (20%)	.007		
Explained variance				
Individual level		28%		
Team level		18%		
X^2		239.95***		

Note. Team level: $N = 67$ teams; Individual level: $N = 439$ athletes.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Predictors of adolescents' behavior in sports 38

Table 3.

Multilevel Analysis of Prosocial Behavior in the Sports Context

	Null-model	Explanatory model		
		<i>b</i>	<i>s.e.</i>	<i>t</i>
Intercept	2.95 (0.04)			
Individual level				
Relational support		.19	.06	3.17**
Moral atmosphere		.19	.06	3.17**
Moral reasoning		.14	.06	2.33*
Prosocial behavior		.42	.06	7.00***
Team level				
Relational support		.28	.11	2.55*
Moral atmosphere		.26	.12	2.17*
Moral reasoning		.01	.15	0.17
Prosocial behavior		.33	.13	2.54*
Variance components				
Individual level	.285 (87%)	.197 (60%)		
Team level	.042 (13%)	.003 (1%)		
Explained variance				
Individual level		27%		
Team level		12%		
X^2		199.54***		

Note. Team level: $N = 67$ teams; Individual level: $N = 439$ athletes.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.