

2005

# Differences Among Athletes and Non-Athletes in Sex Role Orientation and Attitudes Towards Women: Comparing Results from 1982 and 2005

Marcus D. Walton

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Walton, Marcus D., "Differences Among Athletes and Non-Athletes in Sex Role Orientation and Attitudes Towards Women: Comparing Results from 1982 and 2005" (2005). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 450.  
<http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd/450>

This Open-Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine.

**DIFFERENCES AMONG ATHLETES AND NON-ATHLETES IN SEX ROLE  
ORIENTATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS WOMEN:  
COMPARING RESULTS FROM 1982 AND 2005**

By

Marcus D. Walton

B.S. University of Maine, 2004

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

(in Human Development)

The Graduate School

The University of Maine

August, 2005

Advisory Committee:

Sandra L. Caron, Professor of Family Relations, Advisor

Robert Milardo, Professor of Family Relations

Phillip Pratt, Associate Director, Institutional Studies, and Cooperating Associate

Professor of Education

© 2005 Marcus D. Walton

All Rights Reserved

**DIFFERENCES AMONG ATHLETES AND NON-ATHLETES IN SEX ROLE  
ORIENTATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS WOMEN:  
COMPARING RESULTS FROM 1982 AND 2005**

By Marcus D. Walton

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Sandra L. Caron

An Abstract of the Thesis Presented  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Science  
(in Human Development)  
August, 2005

This study was intended to examine perceptions of male athletes and non-athletes attending the University of Maine, to verify if differences exist between them in their attitudes and values in regard to the place of women in our society, their attitudes toward women's and men's premarital sexual permissiveness, and their degree of masculinity. In addition to comparing male athletes and non-athletes, differences between the attitudes of team and individual athletes were examined. Finally, the results from this 2005 sample were compared to those found in an earlier study completed in 1982 to examine changes in attitudes over time.

Results did not support previous research findings that significant differences exist between athletes and non-athletes. There were no significant differences between the groups on measures of their attitudes toward women, attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior, or their degree of masculinity and femininity. The one significant difference was in the area of attitudes towards men's premarital sexual behavior, with male athletes having more traditional attitudes than the non-athletes.

In terms of differences between the 2005 sample and the 1982 sample, male non-athletes in the 2005 sample were found to be more traditional in their attitudes towards women's roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, male athletes (both individual and team athletes) were found to be significantly more conservative in their attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior when compared to the 1982 sample. Limitations and implications for future research are discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and for most I would like to thank God my Lord and Savior, for if it wasn't for him I would not have accomplished everything leading up to this point. I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Sandra L. Caron for all her hard work and determination in seeing that I graduate. I would like to thank Dr. Robert Milardo and Dr. Phil Pratt for their time and effort in seeing that I graduate as well. I would like to thank my mother, Irene Walton-LeFevre, my dad, Robert LeFevre, and my sister, Keisha Walton for all the love and support they have given me. Lastly, I would like to thank all my friends who supported me and were behind me along the way.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
1. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	1
Characteristics of Male Athletes.....	1
Athletes versus Non-Athletes .....	1
Team versus Individual Athletes .....	3
Characteristics of Males.....	4
Attitudes toward Women .....	4
Sexual Double Standard.....	6
Sex-Role Orientation .....	7
Purpose of Study and Research Questions.....	8
Research Question 1 .....	9
Research Question 2 .....	9
Research Question 3 .....	9
2. METHODOLOGY .....	11
Sample.....	11
Procedure .....	11
Survey Instruments .....	12
Data Analysis.....	13
3. RESULTS .....	14
Research Question 1 .....	14
Research Question 2 .....	16
Research Question 3 .....	19
4. DISCUSSION .....	22
Research Question 1 .....	22
Research Question 2 .....	24
Research Question 3 .....	25

Limitations .....	26
Implications.....	28
REFERENCES .....	30
APPENDICES .....	39
Appendix A: Survey Instrument .....	40
Appendix B: Recruitment E-Mail.....	46
Appendix C: Cover Letter/Informed Consent.....	47
BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR.....	48



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: T-Tests Between Male Athletes versus Non-Athletes on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI.....	15
Table 2: Analysis of Variance Between Male Non-Athletes, Individual Athletes, and Team Athletes on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI.....	17
Table 3: T-Tests Between Male Non-Athletes, Individual Athletes, and Team Athletes in the 1982 Sample versus the 2005 Sample on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI.....	21

## Chapter 1

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Over the past several decades, there has been debate and discussion about the effects of athletic participation on an individual's personality. The idea that athletes possess unique or definable characteristics different from non-athletes is a common one. Athletes have been compared to non-athletes, and participants in team sports have been compared to those in individual sports. The intention of this literature review is to discuss the major findings of empirical studies in this area, with special attention paid to research on male athletes versus non-athletes. In addition, research addressing men's attitudes toward women, the double standard and sex-role orientation will be reviewed.

#### Characteristics of Male Athletes

Athletes versus Non-Athletes. On both the high school and college level, there have been many reports and research studies suggesting the benefits of athletic participation, and that such participation leads to considerable differences between athletes and non-athletes. One such report was issued by the National Federation of State High School Association (NFHS) in 2002. This report summarized the existing research studies and stated that participation in high school athletics promotes citizenship, sportsmanship, lifelong lessons, teamwork, self-discipline, the physical development and the emotional development of our nation's youth (NFHS, 2002). Their report revealed that students who are athletes tend to have higher grade-point averages, better attendance records, lower dropout rates, and fewer discipline problems. According to NFHS, student-athletes learn self-discipline, build confidence, and develop the skills necessary to handle competitive situations. This report cited the results of such research studies as

Stegman (2000), Siliker and Quirk (1997), Snyder & Spreitzer (1990 and 1992), and Marsh (1992), which found that participation in high school athletics has a positive impact on academic achievement. Beyond academics, other studies have suggested that athletes tend to be more popular (Holland & Andre, 1995), happy (Serbu, 1997), have fewer behavioral problems (Whitley, 1999), exhibit greater leadership ability and possess higher on self-esteem (Dobosz & Beaty, 1999). Competitiveness has also differentiated athletes from non-athletes. Researchers have distinguished that competitiveness may be positively connected to achievement in athletics (Gill & Deeter, 1988; Gill, Dzewaltowski, & Deeter, 1988; Helmreich, Beane, Lucker, & Spence, 1978).

Not all research has found positive results for those participating in athletics. For example, while a study by Zaugg (1998) found that athletes tend to have fewer discipline problems, those athletes in the revenue producing sports (basketball and football) did not perform as well in the classroom as their non-athlete peers. A study by McNeal (1998) found athletes may intimidate other students, and a report by Chandler, Johnson and Carroll (1999) found that male athletes were more often involved in incidents of physical and sexual abuse than non-athletes.

In terms of the saying that “sports build character,” the research results appear mixed. While some studies (Beller, Stoll & Rudd, 1997; Rudd & Stoll, 2004) have found that participation in sports – especially team sports – builds social character (e.g., teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice), there is little evidence that sports builds moral character (e.g., honesty, fairness, and responsibility) in athletes (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Rudd, Stoll, & Beller, 1997).

Scholarships, alumni incentives, allowances, and leniency from professors are common and expected in college sports. Many male athletes feel entitled to take what they want, including sex, without being afraid of consequences (Clay, 1991; Eskenazi, 1990; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Moore, 1991; Nelson, 1994; Toufexis, 1990; Walsh, 1991; Warshaw, 1988). Male athletes may be used to having women flirt with them and may interpret these advances to mean that no woman is unattainable (Nelson, 1994; Warshaw, 1988).

Many male athletes are trained to use force to resolve conflict. Breaking the rules is sometimes an approach for winning, and fouls are highly praised by fans if they bring the desired result - a gain over the opponent (Nelson, 1994; Walsh, 1991). In a study by Young (1990), male student-athletes reported more criminal behavior than non-athletes and point to interest in taking part in risky activities.

Team versus Individual Athletes. While athletes are often treated as a single group of individuals, some researchers feel it is important to distinguish different groups of athletes. Individual athletes practice and compete independently; they have few required task interactions and communications with other athletes when compared to team athletes who compete and practice in a group. Team sports such as football, hockey and basketball command more physically aggressive behavior than do individual sports such as golf, swimming, or cross-country (Munson, 1990; Nelson, 1994; Walsh, 1991). Success in team sports are usually related with personality traits considered “traditionally” masculine, hostile, and destructive. As one study has shown, male athletes on competitive teams (e.g., football, hockey, basketball) exhibit higher scores on masculinity and are less egalitarian in their views toward women’s roles than are their

peers who are in individual sports, e.g., track swimming, golf, and non-athletes (Caron, Carter, & Brightman, 1985).

Winning is an important part of the team competition (Kang, Gill, Acevedo, & Deeter, 1990; Toufexis, 1990) and staying in control involves the team athlete to “view his body as a tool, a machine, or even a weapon that is used to defeat an objectified opponent” (Messner 1987, p.59). The most well-liked athletes have a tendency to be the most aggressive (Eskenazi, 1990).

Finally, given that fact that many universities and colleges have special residences reserved just for team athletes, it is important to recognize that camaraderie, solidarity, and exclusivity are encouraged (Johnson, 1991; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Moore, 1991). As some scholars have pointed out, covering for each other and keeping a tally of conquests to contend against each other is the norm for team members (Clay, 1991; Moore, 1991; Warshaw, 1988).

#### Characteristics of Males

Attitudes toward Women. Interest in attitudes towards women and in measuring such attitudes goes back many decades. In the early 1970s, Janet Spence and Robert Helmreich (1972) developed a 55-item instrument, the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), to measure attitudes about the rights and roles of women in society. Since the 1970s, the AWS has been used to examine a range of issues including generational differences (Slevin & Wingrove, 1983), personality correlates (Loo & Logan, 1982), women at work (Madill et al., 1988), occupational preferences (Haworth, Povey, & Clift, 1986), gender relationships (Smith, Resick, & Kilpatrick, 1980), culture (Bailey, Less, and Harrell, 1995), and change over time (Loo & Thorpe, 1998). Results for these studies

show that while attitudes toward women's roles in society have become more liberal since the 1970s, the gender gap in attitudes is still present when comparing men and women, with males holding more traditional or sexist views of women.

Several studies have looked specifically at athletes versus non-athletes in terms of attitudes toward women, and suggested that male athletes tend to have more traditional attitudes toward women (Andre & Holland, 1995; Colley, Roberts, & Chipps, 1985; Johnson & Morgan, 1981; Nation & LeUnes, 1983). Comparisons have also been made among athletes in different sports. Caron, Carter, and Brightman (1985) reported that male college athletes who participated in team sports held more traditional attitudes toward women than individual athletes. On the other hand, Houseworth, Peplow, and Thirer (1989) found no difference between athletes involved in team sports over those in individual sports and their attitudes toward women.

Research in the 1990s moved beyond simply measuring men's attitudes toward women, and examined the link between men's attitudes and violence toward women (Epps, Haworth, & Swaffer, 1993; White, Donat, & Bondurant, 2001). Studies measuring men's hostility toward women (Lonsbury & Fitzgerald, 1995; Malamuth et al., 1991), authoritarianism (Walker, Rowe, & Quinsey, 1993), and acceptance of rape myths (Brannon, 1999) found men with more traditional or sexist views of women were more likely to be sexually aggressive. Research findings focusing on male athletes have been contradictory in this area. While such studies as Koss and Gaines (1993) found a link between male athletes' attitudes toward women and higher levels of sexual aggression, Smith and Stewart (2003) did not find any association between male athletes' attitudes toward women and sexual aggression.

Sexual Double Standard. The sexual double standard has been the focus of considerable research since the 1960s. Ira Reiss (1960) defined the double standard as differing standards of sexual permissiveness for women and men, where women were traditionally stigmatized for engaging in any sexual activity outside of heterosexual marriage while such behavior by men was expected and rewarded. Reiss maintained that although the double standard was a minority attitude, egalitarianism had not yet been achieved. In 1964, he developed the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale (RPSP) consisting of two sets of 12 questions, one set relating to males and the other to females, to measure attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior (Reiss, 1964). The RPSP is one of the few instruments available for testing premarital sexual permissiveness and was widely used in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, Reiss (1965) found that in a liberal attitudinal setting there is a relationship between social class and permissiveness, the higher the social class, the more permissive. On the other hand, Reiss found that in a conservative setting there is a negative relationship where the lower the social class, the less permissive. Maranell, Dodder, and Mitchell (1970) failed to confirm Reiss's findings, but found a strong relationship between sex of the college student and degree of permissiveness, with males being more permissive. Middendorp, Brinkman, and Looman (1970) also found no relationship between social class and premarital permissiveness, but did find a positive relationship between education and permissiveness in which those with higher education were more permissive.

By the mid-1970s, research seemed to indicate that individuals had come to hold virtually the same sexual standard for men and women (Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977). Young people judged it equally acceptable for either sex to have premarital sex with

affection, and a majority of young people thought casual sex without affection was also acceptable (DeLamater & MacCorquodale, 1979). However, these conclusions did not end research on heterosexual double standards, which continued during the 1980s and 1990s, resulting in mixed findings (DeLamater, 1987; Oliver & Hyde, 1993). For example, a review of 30 studies published since 1980 found evidence for the continued existence of sexual double standards (Crawford & Popp, 2003),

Research on sexual behavior of men and women suggests that the double standard still influences both genders. Men have consistently reported sexual intercourse at earlier ages (Weinberg, Lottes, & Shaver, 1995), and a greater number of lifetime sexual partners than have women (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). And more recent studies have suggested that the number of sexual partners may influence one's attitudes toward the sexual double standard (Gentry, 1998; Milhausen & Herold, 1999).

Only one study was found to use the RPSP scale to compare athletes and non-athletes (Caron, Carter, & Brightman, 1985). Their findings indicated that male athletes participating in team sports were more liberal in their attitudes towards males' and females' premarital sexual behavior than were either individual athletes or non-athletes.

Sex-Role Orientation. Until the 1970s, masculinity and femininity were thought to be on two ends of a continuum. In 1974, Sandra Bem developed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), which lists 60 adjectives (20 masculine, 20 feminine, 20 neutral) used to measure masculinity and femininity as two separate dimensions (Bem, 1974). It is also able to yield a measure of androgyny (high masculinity and high femininity); Bem described individuals who score high on androgyny as those who are more adaptable and healthy because they are not bound by traditional gender roles. The BSRI is considered



among the most effective measures of existing gender stereotypes and has been widely used in a variety of ways (Harris, 1994). For example, one study examined the relationship between BSRI scores and peer-rated and self-rated leadership (Gurman & Long, 1992), whereas another assessed college students from the north versus south (Faulkender, 1987). Another study asked participants to complete the BSRI several times, each time thinking about themselves in a different role (Uleman & Weston, 1986).

Numerous studies have compared athletes and non-athletes on sex-role orientation, and suggested that male athletes have a more masculine sex role. Caron, Carter, and Brightman (1985) found that college male athletes - especially those participating in team sports - had higher masculinity scores on the BSRI than those who participated in individual sports and non-athletes. This is consistent with many research studies that have found significant relationships between male athletic participation and traditional masculine sex-role orientation. For example, Fletcher and Dowell (1971) found high school athletes were significantly more dominant than non-athletes. Henry (1965) found weightlifters, when compared to non-athletes, scored higher on masculinity, and Schendel (1965) found athletes at each educational level scored higher on masculinity when compared to non-athletes. In addition, Kirkcaldy (1982) found that athletes who played attacking positions were higher in dominance and aggression, two traits associated with masculinity, than were athletes who played non-attacking positions.

#### Purpose of Study and Research Questions

This study was intended to examine perceptions of male athletes and non-athletes attending the University of Maine, to verify if differences exist between them in their attitudes and values in regard to the place of women in our society, their attitudes toward

women's and men's premarital sexual permissiveness, and their degree of masculinity. In addition to comparing male athletes and non-athletes, differences between the attitudes of team and individual athletes were examined. Finally, the results from this 2005 sample were compared to those found in an earlier study completed in 1982 to examine changes in attitudes over time.

Specifically, male athletes and non-athletes completed three instruments: 1). the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), which is a measure of views of women's roles (Spence and Helmreich, 1972); 2). the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness scale (RPSP) which measures attitudes toward men's and women's premarital heterosexual behavior (Reiss, (1964); and 3). the Bem Sex -Role Inventory (BSRI) which is a measure of sex role orientation (Bem, 1974) (See Appendix A). These three instruments were completed by a sample of male athletes and non-athletes in 1982 at the University of Maine and those results were compared to the 2005 sample. The following research questions were developed:

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI between male athletes vs. male non-athletes?

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI of male non-athletes, male athletes in individual sports, and male athletes in team sports?

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI between the 1982 sample and the 2005 sample?

This third research question was of particular interest when one considers the societal changes in men's and women's roles that have occurred in the past 23 years. One

of the most notable changes as it relates to women has been their increased participation in the workforce (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999). As a result of Title IX, substantial increases in the budgets and resources for women and girls' education have occurred. Title IX has increased the numbers of women earning professional degrees and employment in previously male-dominated fields has grown (Shakib, Scalir, & Shakib, 2004). Title IX has also been instrumental in reducing the gender gap in athletics. In 1971, there were only about 250,000 girls compared to over 3 million boys participating in high school sports. Today, female participation has increased by 85% with over 2.7 million girls and 3.9 million boys participating in high school athletics; at the college level athletic participation has increased by 411% for females. There appears to be greater acceptance of women and girls' participation in traditionally male-dominated sports (Shakib, Scalir, & Shakib, 2004). In addition, men's roles have changed, including more men in female-dominated occupations (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999) and more men taking on day-to-day responsibility for their children and struggling to balance work with family responsibilities (Levine & Pittinsky, 1997).

## Chapter 2

### METHODOLOGY

#### Sample

Both male non-athletes and athletes enrolled at the University of Maine during the Spring 2005 semester who were between 18-24 years of age were recruited for the study. To sample athletes, all team athletes (n= 166) and individual athletes (n= 80) currently listed on the athletic rosters were invited to participate in the study. To sample non-athletes, a list of 300 male undergraduates between 18- 24 years of age were obtained from the Registrar's office. This list was compared to the athletic rosters to ensure that athletes were not included in this group before contacting these men.

The final sample consisted of 239 male undergraduate students attending the University of Maine (overall response rate of 49%). Of these males, 85 were non-athletes and 154 were athletes. Of the 154 athletes, 47 participated in individual sports (Cross-Country, Swimming, Track) and 107 were from team sports (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Ice-Hockey, Soccer). The response rates were as follows: 65% (107:166) for team athletes; 59% (47:80) for individual athletes; and 28% (85:300) for non-athletes.

#### Procedure

An e-mail was sent to each male student identified for the study explaining the research project and encouraging their participation (Appendix B). The e-mail was sent to each of the three groups of men (team athletes, individual athletes, and non-athletes) with a separate link to their specific cover letter explaining the research (Appendix C) and the survey. The survey was created using Frontpage and was available on the Internet. The three separate links allowed the researcher to determine which group the subject belonged

to when analyzing the responses. No names or other identifying information were collected.

### Survey Instruments

The Attitude toward Women Scale (AWS) is a measure of one's view of women's role (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). It consists of 55 items each having four response alternatives ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Each response is given a score from 1 to 4, with 1 reflecting the most conservative attitude, and 4 representing the most liberal response. The score for the AWS is obtained by summing the values for each item after reversing the scores for items 6-10, 12, 14, 17-21, 23-24, 29, 33-35, 40-41, 44-45, 49, 50, 52, and 54. Scores can range from 55 for the most conservative or traditional viewpoint to 220 representing the most liberal attitude (See questions #1-#55 on survey).

The Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness scale (RPSP) measures attitudes toward men's and women's premarital heterosexual behavior (Reiss, 1964). It consists of two sets of 12 questions, one set relating to men's behavior (questions #56-#67) and the other to women's behavior (questions #68-#79). Each question refers to one of three types of sexual behavior (kissing, petting, coitus) under specific conditions of affection for one's partner (engaged, in love, feeling strong affection, feeling no affection). The individual responds on a 4-point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Scores are reversed and summed. Each of the scales range from 12 for the most traditional viewpoint to 48 for the most liberal attitude toward premarital sex (See questions #56-#79 on survey).

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) was designed to measure sex-role orientation of masculinity, femininity and androgyny (Bem, 1974). It consists of 60 items (20 masculine, 20 feminine, 20 neutral). The individual indicates how well each of the items describes himself on a 7 point scale from 1 “never or almost never” to 7 “always or almost always.” The masculine score was obtained by totaling responses to items #80, 83, 86, 89, 92, 95, 98, 101, 104, 107, 110, 113, 116, 119, 122, 125, 128, 131, 134, and 137. The feminine score was obtained by totaling responses to items #81, 84, 87, 90, 93, 96, 99, 102, 105, 108, 111, 114, 117, 120, 123, 126, 129, 132, 135, and 138. Scores on these two sub-scales could range from a low of 20 points to a high of 140 points. Androgyny is calculated by comparing the difference in scores on these two scales. A small difference indicates greater androgyny. See questions #80-#139 on survey.

#### Data Analysis

Respondent’s answers to the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI were entered into an SPSS program. T tests and one-way analysis of variance with Scheffe’s post-hoc comparisons were used to investigate differences between the groups. Results for the 1982 sample were compared with the current sample and T-tests were done to determine if significant differences existed between the 1982 and 2005 samples on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI.

## Chapter 3

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if significant differences exist between athletes and non-athletes, and athletes participating in individual versus team sports, concerning their attitudes regarding woman and their own appropriate sex role behavior, as measured by the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), the Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale (RPSP), and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). In addition, analysis of the results for this 2005 study were compared to an earlier study completed in 1982 to determine if significant differences occur. Results are presented below for the three research questions.

#### Research Question 1

The first research question was, “Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI between male athletes vs. male non-athletes?” T-tests were done to determine if significant differences existed between these two groups on each of the measures. A significant difference was reported between these two groups of males on only one of the measures. Specifically, male non-athletes scored higher on the RPSP subscale for attitudes toward males’ premarital sexual behavior. Results are presented in Table 1 and below.

On the first scale, the AWS, scores can range from 55 for the most conservative or traditional viewpoint to 220 representing the most liberal attitude. The mean score for male athletes was 153.2, while the mean score for non-athletes was 154.3. No significant difference was reported between these two groups ( $t = -.344$ , ns).

Table 1

T-Tests Between Male Athletes versus Non-Athletes on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI

**AWS: Attitude toward Women Scale** (Range = 55 – 220 points)

	MEAN	SD	T-Value	SIG
Male Athletes (n=154)	153.2	26.2	-.344	p = .731
Male Non-Athletes (n=85)	154.3	22.4		

**RPSP: Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale** (Range = 12 – 48 points)

<b>Men's Premarital Sexual Behavior:</b>	MEAN	SD	T-Value	SIG
Male Athletes (n=150)	38.9	8.1	-2.138	p = .034
Male Non-Athletes (n=82)	40.8	5.8		

<b>Women's Premarital Sexual Behavior:</b>	MEAN	SD	T-Value	SIG
Male Athletes (n=147)	38.9	8.2	-1.789	p = .075
Male Non-Athletes (n=82)	40.5	5.7		

**BSRI: Bem Sex Role Inventory** (Range = 20 - 140 points)

<b>Masculinity:</b>	MEAN	SD	T-Value	SIG
Male Athletes (n=148)	83.5	8.2	.156	p = .876
Male Non-Athletes (n=82)	83.0	5.7		

<b>Femininity:</b>	MEAN	SD	T-Value	SIG
Male Athletes (n=148)	80.5	8.2	-.016	p = .988
Male Non-Athletes (n=82)	80.5	5.7		



The RPSP has two sub-scales. One measures attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior, while the other measures attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior. Each of the scales range from 12 for the most traditional viewpoint to 48 for the most liberal attitude toward premarital sex. While no significant difference was found between the two groups on the attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior sub-scale ( $t = -1.788$ , ns), there was a significant difference in the mean scores of these two groups on the attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior sub-scale ( $t = -2.138$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Specifically, the male non-athletes were significantly more liberal ( $M = 40.8$ ) on this measure as compared to male athletes ( $M = 38.9$ ).

The BSRI has two sub-scales measuring one's degree of masculinity and femininity. Scores on these two sub-scales range from a low of 20 points to a high of 140 points. There was no significant difference between these two groups on their measure of masculinity ( $t = .156$ , ns) or femininity ( $t = -.016$ , ns). In terms of masculinity, the mean score for male athletes was 83.5 and the mean score for non-athletes was 83.0. On femininity, the mean score for both groups was 80.5.

#### Research Question 2

The second research question was, "Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI of male non-athletes, male athletes in individual sports, and male athletes in team sports?" One-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between the three groups. Only one significant difference was found; male individual athletes scored significantly lower than non-athletes and team athletes on the RPSP sub-scale on attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior. Results for each of the measures are presented in Table 2 and below.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance Between Male Non-Athletes, Individual Athletes, and Team Athletes on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI

**AWS: Attitude toward Women Scale** (Range = 55 – 220 points)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	812.5	2	406.2	.654	p = .521
Within Groups	146490.8	236	620.7		
Total	147303.3	238			

	MEAN	SD
Non-Athletes (n=85)	154.3	22.4
Individual Athletes (n=47)	156.5	25.0
Team Athletes (n=107)	151.7	26.7

**RPSP: Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale** (Range = 12 – 48 points)

<b>Men's</b>	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	406.4	2	203.2	3.814	p = .023*
Within Groups	12201.1	229	53.3		
Total	12607.5	231			

<b>Men's Premarital Sexual Behavior:</b>	MEAN	SD
Non-Athletes (n=82)	40.8	5.8
Individual Athletes (n=46)	37.1	8.8
Team Athletes (n=104)	39.6	7.6

<b>Women's</b>	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	224.6	2	112.3	2.059	p = .130
Within Groups	12330.0	226	54.6		
Total	12554.7	228			

<b>Women's Premarital Sexual Behavior:</b>	MEAN	SD
Non-Athletes (n=82)	40.5	5.7
Individual Athletes (n=46)	37.8	8.7
Team Athletes (n=101)	39.3	7.9

Table 2 continued

**BSRI: Bem Sex Role Inventory** (Range = 20 - 140 points)

<b>Masculinity:</b>	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	77.7	2	38.8	.079	p = .924
Within Groups	111776.2	227	492.4		
Total	111853.9	229			

<b>Masculinity:</b>	MEAN	SD
Non-Athletes (n=82)	83.0	21.4
Individual Athletes (n=46)	82.5	19.6
Team Athletes (n=102)	84.0	23.8

<b>Femininity:</b>	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1171.3	2	585.6	1.560	p = .212
Within Groups	85202.1	227	375.3		
Total	86373.4	229			

<b>Femininity:</b>	MEAN	SD
Non-Athletes (n=82)	80.5	18.0
Individual Athletes (n=46)	84.7	19.7
Team Athletes (n=102)	78.6	20.3

The analysis of variance between the three groups on the AWS showed no significant difference in attitudes toward women between male non-athletes, individual athletes, and team athletes,  $F(2, 238) = .654$ ; ns. The mean scores for the male non-athletes ( $M=154.3$ ), individual athletes ( $M=156.5$ ), and team athletes ( $M=151.7$ ) indicated that all three groups held somewhat liberal attitudes toward women.

The RPSP measures men's views regarding premarital sexual permissiveness for both themselves and for women. The analysis of variance disclosed a significant difference between groups on attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior,  $F(2, 231) = 3.814$ ,  $p < .05$ . Post-hoc testing using the Scheffe procedure indicated that individual athletes had significantly less liberal attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior than non-athletes (mean difference =  $-3.71$ ,  $p < .05$ ). No significant differences were found between the three groups on attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior,  $F(2, 228) = 2.059$ , ns.

The third scale, the BSRI, measures sex role orientation. The ANOVA indicated that the groups did not differ significantly on masculinity,  $F(2, 229) = .079$ , ns. Masculinity scores for non-athletes, individual athletes, and team athletes ranged between 82.5-84. No significant differences were found between the groups on femininity, with scores ranging from 78.6 to 84.7 on this scale,  $F(2, 229) = 1.56$ , ns).

### Research Question 3

The third and final research question was, "Is there a significant difference in scores on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI between the 1982 sample and the 2005 sample?" T-tests were done to determine if significant differences existed between these two groups sampled 22 years apart on each of the measures. Unfortunately, the BSRI was not scored

the same way for the two time periods, and no clear information was available for how the BSRI was scored in the 1982 sample. Therefore, those results were not able to be compared and will not be reported. Results for the other measures (AWS and RPSP) are presented in Table 3 and reported below.

When comparing the mean scores on the AWS for non-athletes, individual athletes, and team athletes, significant differences were found between non-athletes in the 1982 sample versus the 2005 sample. Specifically, male non-athletes in the 1982 sample held significantly more liberal attitudes toward women ( $M = 165.6$ ) than those non-athletes in the current sample. No significant differences were found between individual athletes or team athletes in the 2 years.

When considering the RPSP, individual and team athletes in the 1982 sample were significantly different from their counterparts in the 2005 sample in terms of attitudes towards premarital sexual behavior. Specifically, individual and team athletes in the 1982 group were significantly more liberal in their attitudes toward both men's premarital sexual behavior ( $M = 41.4$  and  $42.8$ ) and women's premarital sexual behaviors ( $M = 40.7$  and  $42.0$ ) as compared to those responding in the 2005 sample. There were no significant differences between the male non-athletes in the 1982 and 2005 samples.

Table 3

T-Tests Between Male Non-Athletes, Individual Athletes, and Team Athletes in the 1982 Sample versus the 2005 Sample on the AWS, RPSP, and BSRI

**AWS: Attitude toward Women Scale** (Range = 55 – 220 points)

	1982 SAMPLE (N=365)			2005 SAMPLE (N= 239)			SIG
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	
Non-Athletes	96	165.6	19.6	85	154.3	22.4	p = .000*
Individual Athletes	106	154.6	19.3	47	156.5	25.0	p = .611
Team Athletes	163	149.9	15.4	107	151.7	26.7	p = .489

**RPSP: Reiss Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale** (Range = 12 – 48 points)

	1982 SAMPLE (N=365)			2005 SAMPLE (N= 232)			SIG
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	
<b>Men's:</b>							
Non-Athletes	96	40.7	6.1	82	40.8	5.8	p = .356
Individual Athletes	106	41.4	4.8	46	37.1	8.8	p = .001*
Team Athletes	163	42.8	4.6	104	39.6	7.6	p = .001*

	1982 SAMPLE (N=365)			2005 SAMPLE (N= 229)			SIG
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	
<b>Women's:</b>							
Non-Athletes	96	40.3	4.8	82	40.5	5.7	p = .739
Individual Athletes	106	40.7	5.1	46	37.8	8.7	p = .026*
Team Athletes	163	42.0	4.8	101	39.3	7.9	p = .001*

**BSRI: Bem Sex Role Inventory** (Range = 20 - 140 points)

	1982 SAMPLE (N=365)			2005 SAMPLE (N= 230)			SIG
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	
<b>Masculinity:</b>							
Non-Athletes	96	102.1	11.9	82	83.0	21.4	p = .000*
Individual Athletes	106	104.5	13.6	46	82.5	19.6	p = .000*
Team Athletes	163	109.4	13.1	102	84.0	23.8	p = .000*

	1982 SAMPLE (N=365)			2005 SAMPLE (N= 230)			SIG
	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	
<b>Femininity:</b>							
Non-Athletes	96	95.4	10.5	82	80.5	18.0	p = .000*
Individual Athletes	106	95.3	12.1	46	84.7	19.7	p = .001*
Team Athletes	163	94.8	11.9	102	78.6	20.3	p = .000*

## Chapter 4

### DISCUSSION

This research study was designed to investigate differences between male athletes and non-athletes, as well as between males participating in individual and team sports, with regard to their attitudes concerning the role of women in our society (as measured by the AWS), their attitudes towards men's and women's premarital sexual behavior (as measured by the RPSP), and their degree of masculinity and femininity (as measured by the BSRI). The findings are discussed below.

#### Research Question 1

The first research question asked if there were differences between male athletes and non-athletes on the three measures. The overall findings did not support previous research. In fact, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of their attitudes toward women, attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior, or their degree of masculinity and femininity. The one significant difference was in the area of attitudes towards men's premarital sexual behavior, with male athletes having more traditional attitudes than the non-athletes.

In terms of the results for the AWS, male athletes' attitudes toward women were found to be no different than those of male non-athletes. Scores for both groups revealed that men in this study hold more liberal attitudes toward women. Despite previous research suggesting that male athletes tend to have more traditional attitudes toward women (Andre & Holland, 1995; Colley, Roberts, & Chipps, 1985; Johnson & Morgan, 1981; Nation & LeUnes, 1983), this study did not support these previous findings.

When looking at the results for the BSRI, scores for both male athletes and non-athletes were similar. These findings contradict older studies from the 1960s and 1970s, as well as stereotypes of the male athlete as hyper-masculine or more likely to score very high on measures of masculinity (Fletcher & Dowell, 1971; Henry, 1965, Schendel, 1965). What is interesting to note is that scores on the BSRI could range from 20 to 120 points, with a higher score indicating greater adherence to a specific sex-role orientation. Males in both groups scored nearly as high on the measure for masculinity as they did for femininity (83 on masculinity and 80 on Femininity). In Bem's original article in 1974, she categorized individuals who score high on both measures as androgynous. She went on to describe androgyny as those who are more adaptable and healthy because they are not bound by traditional gender roles (Bem, 1974). The current findings suggest that male athletes are not more masculine in their sex-role orientation than other men who do not participate in college athletes.

Results for the two groups on the RPSP revealed that men in this study do not hold significantly different attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior. Both groups held fairly liberal attitudes about what is acceptable for women to do sexually before marriage (scores were around 40 for both groups out of a possible 48 points). Despite findings of a review of 30 studies published since 1980 revealing continued evidence for a sexual double standard (Crawford & Popp, 2003), this study did not support this when looking at the results about women's premarital sexual behavior. However, scores on the measure of attitudes toward men's premarital sexual behavior revealed differences between the male athletes and non-athletes in an unlikely direction. Male athletes scored significantly lower than non-athletes, suggesting that male athletes



hold more conservative attitudes toward what men do sexually as compared to non-athletes. Despite more liberal attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior, the athletes are less accepting of premarital sexual behavior for men. Although the research is limited in this area, these results are contrary to the one study that found male athletes were more sexually permissive (Caron, Carter, & Brightman, 1985).

#### Research Question 2

This study went further than others by distinguishing the athletes into two separate groups: individual athletes and team athletes. The reason to examine them as separate groups was based on the differing characteristics of their sports. Specifically, individual athletes practice and compete independently; and team sports such as football, hockey and basketball command more physically aggressive behavior than do individual sports such as golf, swimming, or cross-country. Success in team sports has been suggested to be related to personality traits considered "traditionally" masculine, hostile, and destructive (Munson, 1990; Nelson, 1994; Walsh, 1991).

When comparing the now three groups (non-athletes, individual athletes, and team athletes) on the three measures, the same results were found as in research question one. The findings did not support previous studies. There were no significant differences between the three groups in terms of their attitudes toward women, attitudes toward women's premarital sexual behavior, or their degree of masculinity and femininity.

The one significant difference was in the area of attitudes towards men's premarital sexual behavior, with individual athletes having more conservative attitudes than the non-athletes. The individual athletes scores indicate that they are less accepting of men's premarital sexual behavior than are team athletes and non-athletes. The one

explanation for this difference could be found in the sample itself. There was a very small number of individual athletes available to complete the survey, and perhaps those who did respond were those who knew the researcher. The researcher's association with many individual athletes came from their mutual involvement in *Athletes in Action*, a Christian athletes organization. It is speculated that those individual athletes who had a personal acquaintance with the researcher through this group may have been the ones most likely to complete the survey. Because of their association, and their more conservative views on sexuality and their own sexual behavior, their participation may have impacted the sampling and therefore the results.

### Research Question 3

The final question examined differences in the results for the 2005 study to results from a 1982 study to determine if significant differences existed between these two groups. On the AWS, the 1982 sample of non-athletes were found to be significantly more liberal than the more contemporary non-athletes. No difference was found for individual or team athletes in these two time periods. These results suggest that the time period of the 1970s and 1980s may have been more liberal in their attitudes toward women and that perhaps we have moved to more conservative times. In addition, male athletes have seen the enormous rise in women in sports since the 1970s and Title IX and have been exposed most directly to women's achievement; this may explain why there was not a decline in male athletes attitudes toward women's roles and responsibilities as measured by the AWS.

On the RPSP, athletes (both individual and team) in the 2005 sample scored significantly more conservatively on attitudes towards men's and women's premarital

sexual behavior as compared to the 1982 sample. This change to a more conservative view of premarital sex by athletes in the 2005 sample may be explained by the rise of Christian organizations within athletics generally, and in those willing to complete the survey for this particular researcher who had strong connections to *Athletes in Action*.

Differences in the group scores on the BSRI for the 1982 and 2005 group were unable to be determined. From the examination of the means for the two groups on masculinity and femininity, it appears that the scoring was conducted differently in 1982. It is not clear how the scoring was done for the earlier sample, so comparisons were not able to be made.

#### Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The sample was not random and had a poor response rate from non-athletes (28%). While the response rate for athletes was higher (59% individual athletes, 65% team athletes), those athletes who did respond may have been more likely to do so because of the nature of their association with the researcher. Specifically, the researchers close connection to *Athletes in Action*, a conservative Christian student-athlete organization, may have influenced who completed the survey and therefore the results.

The instruments used in this study are out-of-date and may have led to respondents not taking the survey seriously. For example, on the AWS, which measures attitudes toward women's roles and responsibilities, the questions may have seemed old and, in some case, ridiculous. Examples of such items include:

- #3. The satisfaction of her husband's sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.

- #22. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
- #39. A wife should make every effort to minimize irritation or inconvenience to the male head of the family.

The RPSP, which measure attitudes toward premarital sexual standards may have been perceived as outdated as well. Asking if it is okay for someone to kiss, pet, or have sexual relations (especially if in love or engaged) may have seemed ridiculous by today's standards. However, because the study was comparing results from a study using these measures 22 years ago, it was necessary.

Another limitation was how athletes and non-athletes were defined. In this study, being a current member of a varsity college team was used to define athlete. However, many men who were in the "non-athlete" group most likely played sports in high school, and some may currently be members of a club sport (e.g., lacrosse, rugby, tennis), yet they were put in the non-athlete sample. Specific questions should have been included to identify all levels and types of athletic participation and considered in the analysis.

The use of technology in the administration of the survey led to problems and raised some concerns. The researcher chose to use FrontPage to e-mail the survey to male students, rather than personally mail a hard copy of the survey to students. Since students receive so much Spam and anonymous e-mail, a low response (especially from non-athletes who may not have known the researcher by name) was not surprising. It is commonplace for students to delete e-mail from unknown sources. Perhaps a more personal approach, such as a personal note written on a paper copy of the survey mailed to students would have yielded a better response.

The length of the survey (139 questions), combined with the use of technology, also raised questions about the truthfulness of the responses. The survey was divided into three sections – one for each instrument (AWS, RPSP, and BSRI). Students had the ability to quickly click through the survey, and one has to wonder if, after a student completed the first two instruments and were faced with a long list of 80 personality characteristics (BSRI), they just clicked through to the end of the survey without giving each item much thought. The results of the BSRI became questionable when the researcher viewed the actual responses for various individuals and saw response “1” (not desirable) or “7” (extremely desirable) selected for an entire row of characteristics. For example, selecting “1” (not desirable) for all the characteristics, ranging from self-reliant, yielding, helpful, moody, secretive, sincere, jealous, and happy, raised serious questions about the reliability of that student’s responses for this last measure.

#### Implications

Despite all these limitations, this research study offers some important implications for future research. While the original study conducted in 1982 comparing athletes to non-athletes (Caron, Carter, & Brightman, 1985), found many significant differences between athletes and non-athletes, as well as between individual and team athletes, similar results were not found in this research project. Overall, the 1982 sample found male athletes (especially team athletes) to be less egalitarian, more liberal in their attitudes toward premarital sex, and to rate themselves higher on masculinity. The overriding finding in the 2005 sample is that male athletes and non-athletes are more similar on these measures than different.

More research in this area may be needed to determine how we define these two groups. Specifically, if we believe that athletic participation affects individual's personality, it is important to look at all athletic participation – not just assume that those who are currently playing varsity college sports are the only one's who are “athletes.”

In addition, one might speculate that the impact of Title IX has gone well beyond offering many more women the opportunity to participate in sports. Perhaps it has influenced the way males – especially male athletes – view women. Because male athletes associate so closely to female athletes by seeing each other in the field house, training room, weight room, and at athletic events, and reading about them in the same sports section of the newspaper, they have seen firsthand how competent women are. It is not surprising that male athletes in this study held liberal attitudes toward women, while non-athletes were significantly more traditional in the 2005 sample.

The degree of masculinity in college athletes was also a surprising finding in this study. Male athletes did not rate themselves significantly higher on masculine characteristics. Despite the stereotype and some previous research suggesting male athletes are hyper-masculine (and then linking this to violence or sexual assault), this area deserves more research to try to understand what creates hyper-masculinity.

## REFERENCES

- Andre, T., & Holland, A. (1995). Relationship of sport participation to sex role orientation and attitudes toward women among high school males and females. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 18*, 241-254.
- Bailey, W. T., Less, E. A., & Harrell, D. R. (1993). The attitudes toward women scale (AWS) and global attitudes toward women. *The Journal of General Psychology, 119*, 315-317.
- Beller, J. M., Stoll, S. K., & Rudd, A. (1997). The "great character experience." Assessing the effectiveness of a great books approach to teaching moral character with competitive populations. *Research Quarterly, 68*, 72.
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Brannon, L. (1999). *Gender: Psychological perspectives*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1985). Moral growth among athletes and non-athletes: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 147*, 7-18.
- Caron, S. L., Carter, D. B., & Brightman, L. A. (1985). Sex role orientation and attitudes towards women: Differences among college athletes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 61*, 803-806.
- Chandler, S., Johnson, D., & Carroll, P. (1999). Abusive behaviors of college athletes. *College Student Journal, 33*, 638-645.
- Clay, N. (1991). Ex-football player felt above the law. *USA Today*, (August 27) p. 8c, vol. 9, no. 243.

- Colley, A., Roberts, N., & Chipps, A. (1985). Sex role identity, personality and participation in team and individual sports by males and females. *International Journal of Sports Psychology, 16*, 103-112.
- Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: Review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Sex Roles, 40*, 13-26.
- DeLamater, J. (1987). Gender differences in sexual scenarios. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Females, males and sexuality: Theories and research*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- DeLamater, J., & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). *Premarital sexuality*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dobosz, R. P., & Beaty, L. A. (1999). The relationship between athletic participation and high school students' leadership ability. *Adolescence, 34*, 215-220.
- Epps, K. J., Haworth, R., & Swaffer, T. (1993). Attitudes toward women and rape among male adolescents convicted of sexual versus nonsexual crimes. *The Journal of Psychology, 127*, 501-506.
- Eskenazi, G. (1990). The male athlete and sexual assault. *The New York Times*, (June 3) pp. 1, 4; vol. CXXXIX, no. 48,255.
- Faulkender, P. (1987). Validity of using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory norms on other samples: Analysis of southern sample. *Psychological Reports, 60*, 399-406.
- Fletcher, R., & Dowell, L. (1971). Selected personality characteristics of high school athletes and non-athletes. *The Journal of Psychology, 77*, 39-41.



- Gentry, M. (1998). The sexual double standard: The influence of number of relationships and level of sexual activity on judgments of women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 505-511.
- Gill, D. L., & Deeter, T. E. (1988). Development of the sport orientation questionnaire. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 59, 191-202.
- Gill, D. L., Dzewaltowski, D. A., & Deeter, T. E. (1988). The relationship of competitiveness and achievement orientation to participation in sport and non-sport activities. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 139-150.
- Gurman, E., & Long, K. (1992). Gender orientation and emergent leader behavior. *Sex Roles*, 27, 391-400.
- Harris, A. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 31, 241-273.
- Haworth, G., Povey, R., & Clift, S. (1986). The attitudes toward women scale (AWS-B): A comparison of women in engineering and traditional occupations with male engineers. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 329-334.
- Helmreich, R. L., Beane, W. E., Lucker, G. W., & Spence, J. T. (1978). Achievement motivation and scientific attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4, 222-226.
- Henry, F. (1965). Personality differences in athletes and physical education students. *Psychological Bulletin*, 38, 745.
- Holland, A., & Andre, T. (1995). Prestige ratings of high school extracurricular activities. *High School Journal*, 78, 67-72.

- Houseworth, S., Peplow, K., & Thirer, J. (1989). Influence of sport participation upon sex role orientation of Caucasian males and their attitudes toward women. *Sex Roles, 20*, 317-325.
- Johnson, C. (1991). When sex is the issue. *U.S. News & World Report*. (October 27), pp. 34-35; vol. 111, no. 15.
- Johnson, R. W., & Morgan, W. P. (1981). Personality characteristics of college athletes in different sports. *Scandinavian Journal of Sports Science, 3*, 41-49.
- Kang, L., Gill, D. L., Acevedo, E. O., & Deeter, T. E. (1990). Competitiveness orientations among athletes and non-athletes in Taiwan. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21*, 146-157.
- Kirkcaldy, B. D. (1982). Personality and sex differences related to position in team sports. *International Journal of Sports Psychology, 13*, 141-153.
- Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 94-108.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *Sex in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levine, J., & Pittinsky, T. (1997). *Working fathers: New strategies for balancing work and family*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 704-711.

- Loo, R., & Logan P. (1982). Personality correlates of the attitudes toward women scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 3*, 329-330.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (1998). Attitudes toward women's roles in society: A replication after 20 years. *Sex Roles, 39*, 903-912.
- Madill, H. M., Brintnell, E. S. G., Macnab, D., Stewin, L. L., & Fitzsimmons, G. W. (1988). The delicate balance: Working and family roles. *International Journal of the Advancement of Counseling, 11*, 219-230.
- Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 670-681.
- Marsh, H. W. (1992). Extracurricular activities: Beneficial extension of the traditional curriculum or subversion of academic goals? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 553-562.
- McNeal, R. (1998). High school extracurricular activities: Closed structures and stratifying patterns of participation. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91*, 183-191.
- Messner, M. (1987). The life of a man's seasons: Male identity in the life course of the jock. In M. S. Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (pp. 53-67).
- Middendorp, C. P., Brinkman, W., & Kooman, W. (1970). Determinants of premarital sexual permissiveness: A secondary analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32*, 369-378.

- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (1999). Does the double standard still exist? Perceptions of university women. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 36, 361-368.
- Moore, D. L. (1991). Athletes and rape: Alarming link. *USA Today*, (August 27) pp. 1c-2c, vol. 9, no. 243.
- Munson, L. (1990). Against their will. *The National Sports Daily*, (August 17) pp. 37-39.
- Nation, J. R., & LeUnes, A. D. (1983). Personality characteristics of intercollegiate football players as determined by position, classification, and redshirt status. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 6, 92-102.
- National Federation of State High School Association (2002). The case for high school activities (On-line). Available: <http://www.nfhs.org/case.htm>
- Nelson, M. B. (1994). *The stronger women get, the more men love football: sexism and the American culture of sports*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Oliver, M. B., & Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 29-51.
- Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. T. (1977). Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33, 86-109.
- Reiss, I. L. (1960). *Premarital sexual standards in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Reiss, I. L. (1964). The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 26, 188-198.
- Reiss, I. L. (1965). Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness: A re-evaluation. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 747-756.
- Rudd, A., & Stoll, S. K. (2004). What type of character do athletes possess? An empirical examination of college athletes versus college non-athletes with the RSBH Value

- Judgment Inventory. *The Sport Journal* (On-line), 7. Available:  
<http://www.thesportjournal.org/2004Journal/Vol7-No2/RuddStoll.asp>
- Rudd, A., Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (1997). Expressed coaching behavior and its effect on athlete moral development. *Research Quarterly*, 68, 114-115.
- Schendel, J. S. (1965). Psychological differences between athletes and non-participants in athletics at three educational levels. *Research Quarterly*, 36, 52-67.
- Serbu, J. (1997). Effect of college athletic participation on later life satisfaction and job satisfaction. *College Student Journal*, 31, 261-271.
- Shakib, S., Scalir, K., & Shakib, K. A. (2004). Title IX: Facts, figures, myths and realities. *Sociologists for Women in Society* (On-line). Available:  
<http://newmedia.colorado.edu/~socwomen/socactivism/TitleIX.pdf>
- Siliker, S. A., & Quirk, J. T. (1997). The effects of extracurricular activity participation on the academic performance of male and female high school students. *School Counselor*, 44, 288-294.
- Slevin, K. F., & Wingrove, C. R. (1983). Similarities and differences among three generations of women in attitudes toward the female role in contemporary society. *Sex Roles*, 9, 609-624.
- Smith, A. D., Resick, P. A., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1980). Relationships among gender, sex-role attitudes, sexual attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 46, 359-367.
- Smith, D., & Stewart, S. (2003). Sexual aggression and sports participation. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, 26, 385-395.

- Snyder, E. E., & Spreitzer, E. (1990). High school athletic participation as related to college attendance among Black, Hispanic, and White males. *Youth & Society, 21*, 390-398.
- Snyder, E. E., & Spreitzer, E. (1992). Social psychological concomitants of adolescents' role identities as scholars and athletes. *Youth & Society, 23*, 505-523.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1972). The Attitude toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2* (66).
- Stegman, M. (2000). Athletics and academics. *High School Magazine, 7*, 36-39.
- Toufexis, A. (1990). Sex and the sporting life. *Time*, (August 6), pp. 76-77.
- Uleman, J., & Weston, M. (1986). Does the BSRI inventory sex roles? *Sex Roles, 15*, 43-62.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1999). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1999* (119<sup>th</sup> edition). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Walker, W. D., Rowe, R. C., & Quinsey, V. L. (1993). Authoritarianism and sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1036-1045.
- Walsh, C. (1991). Sports culture part of trouble. *USA Today*, (August 27) p. 8c, vol. 9, no. 243.
- Warshaw, R. (1988). *I never called it rape*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Weinberg, M. S., Lottes, I. L., & Shaver, F. M. (1995). Swedish or American heterosexual youth: Who is more permissive? *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26*, 409-437.

- White, J. W., Donat, P. L. N., & Bondurant, B. (2001). A developmental examination of violence against girls and women. In R. K. Unger (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychology of women and gender* (pp. 343-357). New York: John Wiley.
- Whitley, R. (1999). Those 'dumb jocks' are at it again: A comparison of the education performances of athletes and non-athletes in North Carolina high schools from 1993 through 1996. *The High School Journal*, 82, 223-233.
- Young, T. J. (1990). Sensation seeking and self reported criminality among student athletes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 70, 959-962.
- Zaugg, H. (1998). Academic comparison of athletes and non-athletes in a rural high school. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82, 63-72.

## APPENDICES



## Appendix A: Survey Instrument

### A SURVEY OF MEN'S ATTITUDES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

Over 20 years ago, the following survey was given to men attending the University of Maine. I would like to know how men's attitudes have changed since then. I am asking you to complete this survey and return it to me in the self-addressed envelope by April 1. Do not put your name on it. The survey focuses on three areas: attitudes toward women (questions #1-55), attitudes about acceptable sexual behavior for men and women (questions #56-79), and attitudes about masculinity (questions #80-139).

#### Attitudes toward Women

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. Please indicate your opinion for each question below by **circling** the answer which best describes your personal attitude:

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

SA   A   D   SD	1	Women have an obligation to be faithful to their husbands.
SA   A   D   SD	2	Swearing and obscenity is more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
SA   A   D   SD	3	The satisfaction of her husband's sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.
SA   A   D   SD	4	Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.
SA   A   D   SD	5	Under ordinary circumstances, men should be expected to pay all the expenses while they're out on a date
SA   A   D   SD	6	Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
SA   A   D   SD	7	It is all right for wives to have an occasional, casual, extramarital affair.
SA   A   D   SD	8	Special attentions like standing up for a woman who comes into a room or giving her a seat on a crowded bus are outmoded and should be discontinued.
SA   A   D   SD	9	Vocational and professional schools should admit the best qualified students, independent of sex.
SA   A   D   SD	10	Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
SA   A   D   SD	11	Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
SA   A   D   SD	12	Husbands and wives should be equal partners in planning the family budget.
SA   A   D   SD	13	Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding the door or helping them on with their coats.

SA A D SD	14	Women should claim alimony not as persons incapable of self-support but only when there are children to provide for or when the burden of starting new life after the divorce is heavier.
SA A D SD	15	Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
SA A D SD	16	The initiative in dating should come from the man.
SA A D SD	17	With women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
SA A D SD	18	It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
SA A D SD	19	There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
SA A D SD	20	A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
SA A D SD	21	Parental authority and responsibility for discipline of the children should be equally divided between husband and wife.
SA A D SD	22	Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
SA A D SD	23	Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
SA A D SD	24	Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
SA A D SD	25	A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
SA A D SD	26	Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
SA A D SD	27	It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
SA A D SD	28	It is childish for a woman to assert herself by retaining her maiden name after marriage.
SA A D SD	29	Society should regard the services rendered by the woman workers as valuable as those of men.
SA A D SD	30	It is only fair that male workers should receive more pay than women even for identical work.
SA A D SD	31	In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up of children.
SA A D SD	32	Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancé.
SA A D SD	33	Women should demand money for household and personal expenses as a right rather than as a gift.
SA A D SD	34	The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
SA A D SD	35	Wifely submission is an outworn virtue.

SA A D SD	36	There are some professions and types of businesses that are more suitable for men than women.
SA A D SD	37	Women should be concerned with childbearing and house tending, rather than with professional and business careers.
SA A D SD	38	The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
SA A D SD	39	A wife should make every effort to minimize irritation or inconvenience to the male head of the family.
SA A D SD	40	There should be no greater barrier to an unmarried woman having sex with a casual acquaintance than having dinner with him.
SA A D SD	41	Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set by men.
SA A D SD	42	Women should take the passive role in courtship.
SA A D SD	43	On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contribution to economic production than are men.
SA A D SD	44	The intellectual equality of women with men is perfectly obvious.
SA A D SD	45	Women should have full control of their persons and giving or withhold sexual intimacy as they choose.
SA A D SD	46	The husband has, in general, no obligation to inform his wife of his financial plans.
SA A D SD	47	There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
SA A D SD	48	Women with children should not work outside the home if they don't have to financially.
SA A D SD	49	Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
SA A D SD	50	The relative amounts of time and energy to be devoted to household duties on the one hand and to a career on the other should be personal desires and interest rather than by sex.
SA A D SD	51	As head of the household, the husband should have more responsibility for the family's financial plans than his wife.
SA A D SD	52	If both husband and wife agree that sexual fidelity isn't important, there's no reason why both shouldn't have extramarital affairs if they want to.
SA A D SD	53	The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family matters of law.
SA A D SD	54	The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.
SA A D SD	55	Most women need and want the kind of protection and support that men have traditionally given them.

**Male Standards of Sexual Behavior:**

**When is kissing, petting, and full sexual relations acceptable for men?**

Please indicate your opinion for each question below by **circling** the answer which best describes your personal attitude:

**SA** = Strongly Agree    **A** = Agree    **D** = Disagree    **SD** = Strongly Disagree

SA A D SD	56	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he is <b>engaged</b> to be married.
SA A D SD	57	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	58	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he <b>feels strong affection</b> for his partner.
SA A D SD	59	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage even if he <b>does not feel affection</b> toward his partner.
SA A D SD	60	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he is <b>engaged</b> to be marriage.
SA A D SD	61	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	62	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage when he <b>feels strong affection</b> for his partner.
SA A D SD	63	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the man before marriage even when he <b>does not feel affection</b> toward his partner.
SA A D SD	64	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the man before marriage if he is <b>engaged</b> to be marriage
SA A D SD	65	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the man before he is married when he is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	66	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the man before marriage when he <b>feels strong affection</b> for his partner.
SA A D SD	67	I believe that <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the man before marriage even if he <b>does not feel affection</b> toward his partner.

**Female Standards of Sexual Behavior:**

**When is kissing, petting, and full sexual relations acceptable for women?**

Please indicate your opinion for each question below by **circling** the answer which best describes your personal attitude:

**SA** = Strongly Agree    **A** = Agree    **D** = Disagree    **SD** = Strongly Disagree

SA A D SD	68	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she is <b>engaged</b> to be married.
SA A D SD	69	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	70	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she <b>feels strong affection</b> for her partner.
SA A D SD	71	I believe that <u>kissing</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage even if she <b>does not feel affection</b> toward her partner.

SA A D SD	72	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she is <b>engaged</b> to be marriage.
SA A D SD	73	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	74	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage when she <b>feels strong affection</b> for her partner.
SA A D SD	75	I believe that <u>petting</u> is acceptable for the woman before marriage even when she <b>does not feel affection</b> toward her partner.
SA A D SD	76	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the woman before marriage if she is <b>engaged</b> to be marriage
SA A D SD	77	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the woman before she is married when she is <b>in love</b> .
SA A D SD	78	I believe that full <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the woman before marriage when she <b>feels strong affection</b> for her partner.
SA A D SD	79	I believe that <u>sexual relations</u> are acceptable for the woman before marriage even if she <b>does not feel affection</b> toward her partner.

### Sex Role Inventory:

#### How desirable is it for a man to be.....

These are your choices (circle the number that describes how you feel):

- 1 Not at all desirable
- 2 Slightly desirable
- 3 Somewhat desirable
- 4 Moderately desirable
- 5 Quite desirable
- 6 Very desirable
- 7 Extremely desirable

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	80	Self-reliant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	81	Yielding
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	82	Helpful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	83	Defends own beliefs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	84	Cheerful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	85	Moody
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	86	Independent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	87	Shy
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	88	Conscientious
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	89	Athletic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	90	Affectionate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	91	Theatrical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	92	Assertive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	93	Flatterable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	94	Happy
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	95	Strong personality
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	96	Loyal

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	97	Unpredictable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	98	Forceful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	99	Feminine
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	100	Reliable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	101	Analytical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	102	Sympathetic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	103	Jealous
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	104	Has leadership abilities
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	105	Sensitive to needs of others
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	106	Truthful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	107	Willing to take risks
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	108	Understanding
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	109	Secretive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	110	Makes decisions easily
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	111	Compassionate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	112	Sincere
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	113	Self-sufficient
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	114	Eager to soothe hurt feelings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	115	Conceited
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	116	Dominant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	117	Soft-spoken
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	118	Likable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	119	Masculine
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	120	Warm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	121	Solemn
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	122	Willing to take a stand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	123	Tender
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	124	Friendly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	125	Aggressive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	126	Gullible
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	127	Inefficient
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	128	Act as a leader
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	129	Childlike
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	130	Adaptable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	131	Individualistic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	132	Does not use harsh language
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	133	Unsystematic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	134	Competitive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	135	Loves children
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	136	Tactful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	137	Ambitious
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	138	Gentle
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	139	Conventional

**Thank you for completing the survey.**

## **Appendix B: Recruitment E-Mail**

You have been randomly selected to participate in a research project I am conducting as part of my graduate program in Human Development and Family Relations at the University of Maine, under the supervision of my academic advisor Dr. Sandra L Caron.

The purpose of this research is to examine male students' attitudes toward women, sexual permissiveness, and their degree of masculinity. The results will be compared to a similar study conducted here at the University of Maine 20 years ago, in order to examine changes in attitudes over time.

I need your help!!!! Please take the time to fill out the survey. It only takes 15 minutes. Help me graduate by clicking on the link below.

Marcus Walton

**[http://www.umaine.edu/frontpage/Athletes\\_and\\_non/ConsentForm2.htm](http://www.umaine.edu/frontpage/Athletes_and_non/ConsentForm2.htm)**

## Appendix C: Cover Letter/Informed Consent

Congratulations!!! You have been randomly selected to participate in a Master's thesis project being conducted by Marcus D. Walton, a graduate student in Human Development and Family Relations at the University of Maine, under the supervision of his academic advisor Dr. Sandra L. Caron. The purpose of this research is to examine male students' attitudes toward women, sexual permissiveness, and their degree of masculinity. The results will be compared to a similar study conducted here at the University of Maine 20 years ago, in order to examine change in attitudes over time.

**What will you be asked to do?** If you decide to participate, complete the survey by April 1 by clicking on the link below. This will take you to the survey. The survey should not take more than 15 minutes to complete. Questions include topics about your attitudes toward women, your attitudes toward men's and women's premarital sexual permissiveness, and your gender role. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

**Risks.** Other than the possibility that you may become uncomfortable or emotional answering some of these questions, there are no foreseeable risks to participating in this research. You may decline to answer any of the questions with which you are not comfortable. If you experience emotional stress due to the topic of this study and need to further talk to someone, please contact the counseling center on campus at 581-1392 (days) or 581-4020 (crisis: nights and weekends) or visit them at 125 Cutler Health Center.

**Benefits.** While this study may have no direct benefit to you, this research will help us understand more about men's perceptions, and it will help us to learn more about the changes that have occurred in men's perceptions over the last 20 years.

**Confidentiality.** The completed surveys will be stored on my personal computer and will be destroyed after they are no longer needed. Only the investigators will have access to this information. Results of this study may be presented at a conference or workshop or submitted for publication.

**Voluntary.** Participation in this research is voluntary. If you choose to take part in this study, you may stop at any time during the study. You also have the choice to skip any questions you do not wish to answer.

**Contact Information.** If you have any questions/concerns, please contact the investigator: Marcus Walton on FirstClass: [marcus.walton@umit.maine.edu](mailto:marcus.walton@umit.maine.edu) or his academic advisor, Dr. Sandra Caron at 207-581-3138, or emailing at: [sandy.caron@umit.maine.edu](mailto:sandy.caron@umit.maine.edu).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Gayle Anderson, Assistant to the University of Maine's Protection of Human Subjects Review Board, at 207-581-1498 or email: [gayle.anderson@umit.maine.edu](mailto:gayle.anderson@umit.maine.edu).



## BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR

Marcus D. Walton was born on February 2, 1982 in White Plains, New York to Irene Walton. Marcus lived his formative years in White Plains, attending the schools of the White Plains City School District. He graduated from White Plains High School in June of 2000. Upon graduation he attended The University of Maine where he played football. Marcus was determined to graduate in four years and decided to pursue a Master of Science degree in Human Development. Marcus' accomplishments include accolades both on the football field and in the community. His freshman year of football he received the scout team player of the year award, and was designated as a scholar athlete in his sophomore, junior and senior years. In addition, Marcus was voted captain of the Varsity football team his senior year. Along with his accomplishments in athletics, Marcus involved himself in many campus activities including *Athletes for Sexual Responsibility*, a peer education program that trains student-athletes to present a variety of workshops including: Rape Awareness, Smart Sex and Drinking & Dating; *Impact Movement*, a movement of evangelism and discipleship on college campuses around the United States; *Athletes in Action*, a fellowship that exists to boldly proclaim the love and truth of Jesus Christ to those uniquely impacted by sport worldwide by winning, building, and sending athletic influencers; and *Peer Mediation*. Marcus' devotion to The University of Maine community led him to develop *Male Athletes Against Violence* with his advisor, Dr. Sandra Caron. Marcus received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology with a concentration in Crime, Law, and Deviance in August of 2004. He is a candidate for the Master of Science degree in Human Development from The University of Maine in August, 2005.