

# Development of an Instrument to Measure the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers

**Andrew Rudd**

Florida State University

**Susan Mullane**

University of Miami

**Sharon Stoll**

University of Idaho

The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument to measure the moral judgments of sport managers called the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (MJSMI). More specifically, our intention was to measure moral judgment on a unidimensional level given past research suggesting moral judgment is a unidimensional construct (Hahm, Beller, & Stoll, 1989; Kohlberg, 1984; Piaget, 1932; Rest, 1979, 1986). The MJSMI contains 8 moral dilemmas/stories in the context of sport management. Sport managers respond to the dilemmas on a four-point Likert scale. Three pilot studies were undertaken to develop the MJSMI. Exploratory factor analysis and internal consistency analysis were the primary methods for assaying reliability and validity. Results consistently showed that sport managers' responses vary depending on the nature of the moral scenario and thus do not indicate a unidimensional construct. The reasons for inconsistent responses are thoroughly discussed.

Hums, Barr, and Gullion (1999) noted that similar to the business world, "sport business" is also fraught with a variety of ethical problems. Consequently, sport managers are continually faced with ethical decision making. Others such as DeSensi and Rosenberg (2003), Malloy and Zakus (1995), and Rudd and Mondello (2008) have also emphasized the importance of ethical decision making in sport management. DeSensi and Rosenberg capture the issue well when they state

Sport managers, in particular, must be aware of and concerned about their own obligations, rights, and responsibilities, as well as those they influence directly and indirectly. As such, nothing short of sound ethical and moral reasoning must inform many of their managerial decisions and actions. (p. 2)

---

Rudd is with the Dept. of Sport and Recreation Management, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306. Mullane is with the Dept. of Exercise and Sport Sciences, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124. Stoll is with the Dept. of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.

However, unlike the business ethics field that has studied extensively the ethical decision making of managers (see review by O'Fallon & Butterfield, 2005), scant empirical research has been conducted on sport managers' ethical decision making. To our knowledge, Rudd and Mondello's qualitative exploration of the types of ethical issues faced by sport managers is the only published study. This study however provides little insight into the ethical decision making of sport managers. As a result little is known about sport managers' ethical decision making abilities.

Considering the pressures many sport managers may be under to make money and succeed at all costs (DeSensi & Rosenberg, 2003; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 2003), it is important to learn more about sport managers' ethical decision making. To do so, reliable and valid instrumentation is needed to measure the moral judgment of sport managers. However, currently, there are no moral judgment instruments specifically in the context of sport management. Although there are other available instruments for measuring moral judgment (e.g., the Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987), Sociomoral Reflection Measure (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982), Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (Hahm, Beller, & Stoll, 1989), Managerial Moral Judgment Test (Loviscky et al., 2007), Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1974), and Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987), studies have shown that one's level of moral reasoning changes depending on the nature and context of the moral dilemma (Bredemeier & Shields, 1984, 1986; Fritzsche & Becker, 1983; Rest, 1979; Weber, 1990). Thus, it is proposed that a valid instrument (i.e., one that is situated in the context of sport management) is needed to measure the moral judgments of sport managers. Such an instrument may be used not only to assess the general state of sport managers' moral judgments, but also as a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of ethics training that may be needed to improve the ethical decision making of sport managers in various sport management settings (e.g., professional sport organizations, athletic departments, and event management companies).

The purpose of this article, then, is to describe the development process of the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (MJSMI) as well as some preliminary findings from a sample of sport managers. Before describing the specific development process along with reliability and validity evidence, we present the theoretical foundation of the instrument as well as clarify the moral judgment construct. The article concludes with a discussion of findings and future directions.

## **Theoretical Foundation of the Instrument**

The MJSMI is patterned after a combination of two prominent instruments to measure moral judgment/moral development; the Defining Issues Test (DIT; Rest, 1974, 1979) and the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI; Hahm et al., 1989). However, before explaining the nature of these instruments and how they support the development of the MJSMI, we first describe some of the moral judgment research (from a cognitive moral development perspective) by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1981, 1984) that has significantly influenced the study of moral judgment/moral development and ultimately the development of instruments like the DIT and HBVCI.

## Cognitive Moral Development Theory

Piaget (1932) is generally considered the first to develop a theory concerning moral judgment. Focusing his research on children (mostly boys 4–13 years-old), Piaget used two major assessment methods to study moral judgment. First, he interviewed children about their understanding of the rules of marbles and how they go about upholding such rules. Specifically, he asked about such questions as where the rules come from, if it would be okay to add new rules, and whether the rules had changed over time. Second, Piaget interviewed his young participants using a variety of short moral stories involving issues such as clumsiness, stealing, and lying.

From the extensive interview data, Piaget hypothesized that a moral reasoning structure underlies children's moral judgments, suggesting that one's understanding of morality is cognitively constructed (i.e., cognitive moral development). Piaget found that children's moral reasoning structures advance through two major stages (heteronomous and autonomous) of development as children mature in age. In the heteronomous stage, younger children (generally under the age of 10) uphold moral rules based on conformity to adults and older peers. Moral rules are considered sacred and unchangeable. However, as children grow older (approximately 10–12 years old), they begin to realize that morality is not dictated by adult authority, but rather moral rules are mutually agreed upon among all members of a particular group. Following moral rules is a freely decided, cooperative arrangement and therefore autonomous.

A number of years later, Kohlberg's (1958) dissertation study extended Piaget's (1932) theory of moral judgment/moral development by studying the moral development of adolescence (10–16 year-old boys). Kohlberg used a similar method, posing moral dilemmas to his subjects. For clarification, a moral dilemma or issue is when one must make a choice between competing values (Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 2003). Conflicting values may occur between moral values, a moral value and a nonmoral value, or moral values and social values (Lumpkin et al., 2003).

In Kohlberg's study, subjects were asked primarily what they thought the protagonist in the story should do and why. For example, one dilemma entitled, *Heinz and the Drug* involves a man named Heinz whose sick wife is dying of cancer. The only way to save her is to steal an expensive drug that he cannot afford (Kohlberg, 1984). Dissimilar from Piaget (1932), data from Kohlberg's interviews suggested that adolescent-aged boys advanced through six different moral stages rather than two (or three to four stages depending on which part of Piaget's theory one considers; Kohlberg, 1984; Rest, 1979).

Following his initial dissertation work, Kohlberg spent many years revising and refining his moral development theory as well as his stage assessment methods. He eventually postulated that his six stages could be grouped into three major levels: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional (Kohlberg, 1984). At the preconventional level, moral decisions are made from an egocentric perspective. What is right is based on obedience to rules and avoidance of punishment (stage 1) or by considering the importance of meeting the needs of others so that one's own needs can be met (stage 2). Individuals' reasoning at the conventional level has moved beyond their own self-interests and is more concerned with their membership within a group or larger society. For persons at stage 3, what is right is based on meeting the expectations of others (e.g., friends, family members, and people of authority).

Moral decision making at stage 4 hinges on one's obligation to uphold the law and contribute to the well being of society. Those reasoning at the postconventional level are not only committed to their membership of society but more importantly, believe every individual must be committed to moral principles. Stage 5 moral reasoning is based on one's sense of obligation to uphold a contract with society. At stage 6, the highest stage, what is right is based on moral principles even if it means breaking certain laws. In addition to his six stages, Kohlberg argued that the moral principle of justice is at the core of moral decision making.

Kohlberg's moral development theory also postulated that individuals advance through stages in an invariant sequence. That is, individuals progress through stages one step at a time in an upward fashion; there is no regression or skipping of stages (Kohlberg, 1984; Rest, 1979). Kohlberg also found that stage advancement was highly related to age. Use of higher, postconventional moral reasoning does not typically occur until adult age (i.e., the twenties; Kohlberg, 1984).

Despite the enormous influence of Kohlberg's (1981, 1984) research, his moral judgment theory and assessment methodology has not been without criticism. Some of the more notable contestations have been concerned with a) male gender bias in what constitutes higher levels of moral judgment (Gilligan, 1982), b) the meaning and existence of the six stages of development (Gibbs, 2003), c) stage consistency, i.e., the use of the same moral development stage regardless of the situation (Locke, 1979; Rest, 1979), d) the invariance of stage sequencing (Locke, 1979; Rest, 1979), e) the use of a verbal production-based assessment (Rest, 1979), f) cultural universality (Boyes & Walker, 1988; Locke, 1979), and g) a too restricted view of moral judgment (i.e., that moral judgment is primarily concerned with the moral principle of justice; Walker et al., 1995).

In response, those such as Nunner-Winkler, (1984), Snarey (1985), and Walker (1984), as well as Kohlberg, Levine, and Hower (1983) have refuted many of these criticisms including culturally universality, gender bias, stage variance, the existence of the actual stages, and the justice perspective. These rejoinders do not necessarily resolve all of the criticisms; however, they do seem to provide a reasonable amount of supportive validity to Kohlberg's moral judgment theory.

## The Defining Issues Test

From personal experience using Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview, Rest (1979) found it difficult to accurately link people's verbal moral reasoning with the various stage development criteria. Rest was concerned that less articulate individuals were not able to provide moral reasoning rationales that fit the more sophisticated sounding stage criteria. As a result, a given individual may mistakenly be categorized in stage 2 development when in actuality he/she was reasoning at stage 4. In addition, Rest had concerns that some individuals may create spurious moral rationalizations to match their initial moral judgments and thus be inaccurately stage typed.

As an alternative, Rest (1974) developed a moral judgment measure that is evaluative rather than production based. Instead of requiring subjects to verbally explain the reasons behind their moral judgment (production oriented), Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT), asks subjects to rate (evaluative) in written form the importance of a variety of issue statements that relate to one's moral judgments of six different moral scenarios. Each issue statement (different ways of considering

the most important issue in the moral dilemma) is associated with one of Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. However, stage 1 issue statements are excluded because one must read at a minimum of an eighth grade level to take the DIT (usually only children reason at stage 1). Subjects are also asked to rank the four most important issue statements that are believed to represent their moral judgment rationale for each moral scenario (Rest, 1974, 1979). A variety of indices have been developed based on both the ratings and rankings (Rest, 1979). The most widely reported index is the P score which is an indication of how much a person's moral reasoning is represented at stages 5 and 6 (Loviscky et al., 2007; Rest, 1979). However, more recently, a variety of new scoring methods have been devised (see Rest, Navarez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999).

Through a rigorous validation process, Rest showed that moral judgment can be measured with a paper and pencil, group-administerable, instrument. Furthermore, Rest's DIT can be easily and objectively scored which removes the extensive training one must complete to use Kohlberg's interview method (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982). Rest's evaluative instrument also alleviates stage typing errors that can result from stage typing people's responses during interviews (Gibbs, Widaman, & Colby, 1982; Rest, 1979). These qualities have resulted in the DIT being used or referenced in hundreds of studies (Loviscky et al., 2007; Rest, 1986).

## The Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory

Another highly used instrument developed from moral judgment research as well as moral philosophy is the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI; Hahm et al., 1989). To date, developers of the HBVCI have amassed a database of over 80,000 subjects ("Study Sheds," 2005; Wolverton, 2006; see also examples of studies, Beller & Stoll 1992, 1995; Beller, Stoll, & Rudd, 1997; Penny & Priest, 1990; Rudd, Stoll, & Beller, 1997; Stoll, Beller, Cole, & Burwell, 1995). The instrument consists of 16 items involving various moral issues or gamesmanship strategies that occur in competition. To clarify, gamesmanship has been defined as, "pushing the rules to the limit without getting caught, using whatever dubious methods possible to achieve the desired end" (Lumpkin et al., 2003, p. 57). Concomitant with each gamesmanship/moral issue is at least one of three moral values: honesty, fairness, and responsibility. These moral values are pitted against the nonmoral value of winning. To clarify, nonmoral values are concerned with the relative worth we place on things or objects (e.g., money, a nice car, winning a championship; Frankena, 1973). Responding on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*), athletes choose between endorsing the particular gamesmanship/unethical practice or supporting the moral value. For example, consider the following item on the HBVCI:

During a volleyball game, player A hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazed off player B's fingers and landed out of bounds. However, the referee did not see player B touch the ball. Because the referee is responsible for calling rule violations, player B is not obligated to report the violation.

In this scenario, subjects must decide whether they agree or disagree that it is the referee's responsibility rather than the player's to call a rule's violation. Respondents who disagree are suggesting they support the moral value of honesty over

winning and taking advantage of the referee's mistake. The more frequently one supports the use of moral values over the nonmoral value of winning, the higher one's score on the HBVCI.

The HBVCI is supported theoretically by deontological ethics which holds that right and wrong decisions should be based on one's obligation to uphold moral values regardless of the consequences or obtainment of nonmoral good (DeSensi & Rosenberg, 2003; Frankena, 1973). In theory, an athlete who supports moral values over competing unethically to win is acting as a deontic and would receive a higher score. Conversely, a low score on the HBVCI implies that the individual may be using a different ethical approach such as teleological ethics.

Teleological ethics maintains that right and wrong is concerned with achieving the greatest amount of good over evil. Right decisions are based on an appeal to the amount of nonmoral good (e.g., money, power, or winning) that can be obtained rather than the upholding of moral values (Frankena, 1973). In other words, achieving good consequences is prioritized over moral principles. Applied to the above scenario, an athlete who agrees that it is the referee's responsibility to make the call, may take a teleological stance rationalizing that a greater good over evil will be achieved by being dishonest with the referee and moving closer toward winning the match. The main point here is that an ethical perspective other than deontology may be taken by respondents. However, alternative decision-making frameworks will likely result in a low score on the HBVCI.

## Explication of Moral Judgment

Before describing the nature and development process of the MJSMI, it is important to be more explicit about how "moral judgment" is defined. For Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1958, 1984), moral judgment is concerned with making decisions about what is fair (justice). Furthermore, both theorized that individuals advance through varying levels of justice reasoning. Piaget's and Kohlberg's theories of justice reasoning are quite extensive and thus beyond the scope of this article. In brief, the notion of justice reasoning can be elucidated by the following thinking from Kohlberg (1984): "Moral situations are ones of conflict of perspectives or interest; justice principles are concepts for resolving these conflicts, for giving each his or her due. ... A person's sense of justice is what is most distinctively and fundamentally moral" (p. 184).

We agree with Kohlberg's (1981, 1984) position that the principle of justice often is involved in moral conflicts, however, we also concur with Walker, Pitts, Hennig, and Matsuba (1995) that Kohlberg's focus on justice is too restrictive of a perspective on morality and moral decision making. Making moral judgments or reasoning about what is right and wrong may involve a broader moral domain. Such an idea was supported in Walker et al.'s study where they found participants frequently cited the moral value of honesty as the most important moral value in interpersonal relationships. Other moral values mentioned included compassion, love, and respect. Similarly, Lumpkin et al. (2003) posited that moral dilemmas can involve a variety of moral values such as justice, honesty, respect, responsibility, and beneficence. As well, Kohlberg and his colleagues later acknowledged that moral judgment involves not only the moral principle of justice but also the moral principles of respect and benevolence (Kohlberg, Boyd, & Levine, 1990).



Given the notion that moral judgment is not necessarily restricted to any one particular moral principle, we prefer a more general definition of moral judgment as defined by Rest, Thoma, and Edwards (1997). They state, "Moral judgment is a psychological construct that characterizes the process by which people determine that one course of action in a particular situation is morally right and another course of action is wrong" (p. 5). A definition as such, is in line with the purpose of the MJSMI, which is to determine if sport managers judge various types of moral actions in the context of sport management to be morally right or wrong. In addition, we add to Rest et al.'s (1997) definition by borrowing from Kohlberg's (1981, 1984) thinking that moral judgment is guided by moral principles (e.g., justice, respect, and beneficence). Therefore, we consider the theoretical construct of moral judgment to involve making decisions about what is morally right or wrong in relationship to moral principles. This definition is also in line with deontological ethics which is a supporting foundation of the HBVCI as well as the MJSMI.

## **Description of the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument**

The MJSMI is a hybrid combination of the DIT and the HBVCI. Similar to the DIT, the MJSMI uses weighty or substantive moral dilemmas to stimulate moral judgment. Dissimilarly, the MJSMI does not attempt to measure the underlying moral reasoning structure supporting moral judgment. This approach is akin to the HBVCI which is delimited to measuring moral judgments without the assessment of individuals' moral reasons and associated moral development stages.

The final version of the MJSMI (after three pilot studies) contains eight moral dilemmas/stories in the context of sport management including professional athletics, college athletics, facility management, health and fitness, and recreation as identified by Hums et al. (1999). There is also one item in the more general context of sport marketing. Within each dilemma, a character has violated a moral value to achieve a nonmoral value (primarily money). Specifically, each dilemma contains at least one of four moral values: honesty, responsibility, justice, and beneficence. These values were chosen because they are believed to be universal across most cultures around the world. It is commonly acknowledged that without these four moral values, morality cannot exist (Lumpkin et al., 2003).

Individuals are asked to make a deontic judgment of the character's actions (what is right or wrong) by responding on a four-point Likert-type scale (from agree to disagree). In theory, higher scores (by summing the items) on the MJSMI scale are associated with stronger use of morally-principled thinking and a deontological framework which is similar to the HBVCI. Those operating from a different ethical perspective (e.g., teleological ethics) will likely earn a lower score (see Appendix A for example items on the final version of the MJSMI).

Readers may ask why a deontological perspective should be favored over a teleological perspective. That is, a greater concern for the adherence to moral principles rather than a primary concern for the consequences of one's ethical decisions (i.e., the achievement of nonmoral good). Presumably, the authors of the HBVCI should be a good reference point. However, it is difficult to find a clear explanation of why a deontological perspective should be favored over a teleological perspective

in any of their published or unpublished writings (albeit, somewhat of an explanation can be found in Beller, 1990). As a result, we rely primarily on the work of Kohlberg to support our use of a deontological framework. It is argued that such reliance is warranted given the influence of his moral development theory in moral judgment research (Loviscky et al., 2007; Rest, 1979; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

As mentioned, Kohlberg (1981, 1984) posited that moral principles are at the core of moral judgment. Supportively, Kohlberg found in his empirical research that as individuals advance in moral development, moral principles are applied on an increasingly sophisticated level. At stage 6, the highest level, individuals believe it is their moral obligation to apply moral principles universally to all people regardless of the consequences (Kohlberg, 1981). Hence, Kohlberg advocated a deontological perspective toward moral judgment.

It is important to note that Kohlberg (1984) did not believe moral judgments should be guided by moral principles alone. Rather, he acknowledged that the consequences to one's moral decisions may also deserve consideration (i.e., a teleological orientation). However, Kohlberg held that moral judgments motivated by a concern for the consequences or greater good may degenerate into immoral decision making. For example, former college pitcher, Ben Christensen purposely threw at, and seriously injured, an opposing player who was waiting in the on-deck circle because he thought the player was trying to time his pitches ("A Purpose," 1999). Christensen likely reasoned that he was achieving a good consequence by helping his team win.

Kohlberg's point then is that decisions based on consequences may provide a means to ignore moral principles and justify immoral actions. Furthermore, consequentialist decision making according to Kohlberg cannot be universalized which is believed by some to be an important part of the moral judgment process (Frankena, 1973; Kant, 1959; Kohlberg, 1981, 1984; Lumpkin et al., 2003). Consequentialist moral reasoning is not always universalizable because it is difficult to universalize moral decisions that may involve harmful consequences. Moral principles on the other hand are believed to serve as a general guide to moral decision making for all people in all situations, i.e., they are universal (Frankena, 1973; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin et al., 2003). For example, nobody desires to be treated unfairly (justice) or harmfully (beneficence).

A convincing argument can therefore be made that the application of moral principles are critical to moral judgment. Further, Kohlberg's theory suggests that dutifully and universally applying moral principles to ethical decision making is associated with higher levels of moral judgment. We reasoned therefore that a valid measure of moral judgment must involve the assessment of people's ability to apply moral principles to moral decision making.

## **Instrument Development Process**

In this section, we present the development process of the MJSMI including evidence of reliability (internal consistency) and validity (content and construct). Such evidence was obtained by conducting three pilot studies which are described below. First, however, we note compliance with the Human Subjects Committee as well as an explanation of how the items on the MJSMI were created.



## Item Development—Moral Dilemmas

To adequately represent the moral domain in sport management, items were developed within the context of the five sport segments (professional sport, intercollegiate athletics, recreational sport, health and fitness club management, and facility management) identified by Hums et al. (1999). Creating dilemmas across a variety of sport segments is consistent with Rest's (1979) guidelines for creating moral dilemmas. Further, the number of dilemmas is generally consistent with Rest's DIT that also uses fairly lengthy moral dilemmas. The DIT contains six moral dilemmas. The most recent version of the MJSMI contains eight dilemmas/items.

Development of items were derived from a variety of sources including sport ethics literature (DeSensi & Rosenberg, 2003; Eitzen, 1999; Hums et al., 1999; Lumpkin et al., 2003; Rudd & Mondello, *in press*), moral dilemmas experienced by the authors, and real-life moral dilemmas experienced by members of the NASSM listserv. To clarify the latter method, an e-mail was sent out to the NASSM listserv asking those with sport industry experience to confidentially share examples of personally experienced ethical dilemmas. A total of 8 out of 784 list members responded to the request.

It is important to note that item development was an iterative process. Items were removed and new ones developed based on reliability and validity analyses from the pilot studies. Therefore, the derivation of items as described above pertains to three different versions of the instrument. The first version of the MJSMI contained 5 moral scenarios. Accompanied with each scenario was a response scale with the options ranging from very appropriate to not appropriate. A score on the higher end of the response scale was associated with favoring moral values over nonmoral values. Respondents were also asked to indicate the area in which they work in college athletics (the first pilot study consisted of managers in college athletics) including general athletic administration, facilities event management, athletic communications, ticket operations, marketing or "other." This information was collected to have a general sense of who comprised the sample.

Before administering the instrument, the MJSMI was assessed for content validity. This was ascertained through expert review (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). Four scholars in the field of sport ethics and moral psychology were asked to comment on the authenticity of the moral dilemmas. The reviewers concurred that items were valid moral dilemmas in the context of sport management.

Although expert review affirmed content validity of the items, results from the following pilot studies suggested that certain items should be removed and new ones created. Newly developed items in the second and third version (final version) of the MJSMI were not submitted for expert review. However, it is important to point out that all three authors are well versed in the study of ethics and are therefore capable of developing legitimate moral scenarios.

In closing this section, it is important to acknowledge some potential limitations of a scenario-based approach. First, hypothetical scenarios may stimulate responses that are different from responses that are more realistic or practical (Higgins, Power, & Kohlberg, 1984; Walker et al., 1995). In addition, as mentioned in the discussion section, Weber (1990) found managers exhibited a higher level of moral development when responding to one of Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemmas (outside the context of work) than when responding to real life scenarios in the

context of management. This phenomenon can make it difficult to obtain a general understanding of a person's moral judgment (Weber, 1992). Second, respondents may give socially desirable answers if they suspect that there is a more favorable answer than another (1992). Third, too many long, complicated scenarios may cause respondents to fatigue and provide unreliable responses; or they may not complete the entire instrument (Weber, 1992). Fourth, although Blasi (1980) and Kohlberg and Candee (1984) found support for a relationship between moral judgment and moral action, Blasi specifically cautioned readers to consider his findings tentatively given the methodological shortcomings of some of the studies he reviewed. In addition, Rest (1979) suggested that a variety of additional variables may interact or mediate the relationship between moral judgment and moral action. Therefore, one should not assume that one's moral judgment of a given moral dilemma (on paper) will be fully predictive of their actual moral action. Consequently, how one responds to scenarios on the MJSMI and how one responds in real life may be incongruent.

We believe however, that the majority of these potential weaknesses have been addressed. First, the scenarios were created based on real-life experiences. Second, social desirability does not appear to be a problem given the variability of responses across the scenarios. Third, we took great care in creating scenarios that are not overly complicated and we did not include too many scenarios within the instrument. The fourth point concerning the relationship between moral judgment and moral action is more difficult to overcome. However, as mentioned, there has been some research to support a relationship between moral judgments elicited from scenario based instruments and how people actually respond in real-life (Blasi, 1980; Kohlberg & Candee, 1984). In addition, Rest (1979) argued that simply assessing moral judgment provides useful information. "Moral judgment scores tell us something about the general interpretive frameworks that a person brings to a moral problem, and presumably the way a person interprets a problem has a bearing on his decision-making" (Rest, 1979, p. 260). Thus, there is arguable utility in assessing respondents' moral judgments of various written scenarios.

## Pilot Studies

**Pilot Study #1.** The first pilot study was conducted with a convenience sample of 27 sport managers from a variety of sport segments in Divisions I-A and I-AA college athletics (general athletic administration, facilities management, communications, ticket operations, and marketing). The sport managers were identified by searching college athletics websites that contained e-mail addresses for staff members. A total of 50 sport managers were targeted to participate. The managers were then contacted using an electronic survey software program and asked to complete the MJSMI. Of the 50 contacted, 22 responded to the instrument. In an effort to obtain the targeted number, an additional 50 sport managers working in college athletic departments were identified and administered the MJSMI electronically. A total of 20 more sport managers responded. Of the total 42 responses, 27 sport managers provided completed and useable questionnaires.

Although the sample size was somewhat small, internal consistency was assessed to acquire an initial indication of reliability and construct validity. The MJSMI is intended to measure moral judgment as a unidimensional construct and thus it was important to assess the homogeneity of items. Exploratory factor analysis

can also be useful for ascertaining unidimensionality. However, such an analysis was not used as a result of the small sample size (cf. Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988; Osborne & Costello, 2004).

Results from the analysis revealed poor internal consistency among items—Cronbach's  $\alpha = .25$ . A frequency distribution of responses to items also indicated that sport managers were inconsistent in their responses. Overall, the analyses indicated low correlations among items and weak item discrimination between high and low scorers (see Tables 1 and 2).

Based on the initial analyses, a decision was made to remove two items and create new ones in their place (items #4 and #5). Deciding on the replacement of particular items was difficult given item-total correlations (an indication of item discrimination) were low for all five items. Nonetheless, it was decided to remove items #4 and #5. It should be noted that these two items actually had the highest item-correlations (but still relatively low at .292 and .258 respectively). However, we felt there were other important considerations for item removal. Specifically, in the case of item #5, 93% indicated "not appropriate" which strongly suggested poor item discrimination and a major inconsistency with how individuals responded to the other items. On the other hand, the majority of responses to item #4, were clustered around the lower end of the scale (i.e., very appropriate and somewhat appropriate). Given the polarity of these two items, it was decided that they should be removed and replaced.

**Table 1 Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #1)**

Items	Question #1	Question #2	Question #3	Question #4	Question #5
Q#1	1.00	-.252	-.054	.203	.161
Q#2	-.252	1.00	.055	.242	.149
Q#3	-.054	.055	1.00	.046	.021
Q#4	.203	.242	.046	1.00	.263
Q#5	.161	.149	.021	.263	1.00

*Note.* The word "question" is abbreviated with the letter "Q" for all tables.

**Table 2 Item-Total Statistics for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #1)**

Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted
Q#1	-.017	.160	.279
Q#2	.096	.169	.194
Q#3	.037	.007	.300
Q#4	.292	.166	-.068
Q#5	.258	.098	.173

Items #4 and #5 were replaced with newly created items in the areas of facility management (#4) and recreational management (#5) and added to the three original items. For clarification, the new facility management scenario is similar to the first facility management scenario; both scenarios involve a conflict over the use of a field. However, it was decided that the first version of item #4 was too wordy and complicated which may result in some not fully understanding the scenario and hence unwanted measurement error. Consequently, the scenario was shortened and the main character was changed from a coach to an athletic director. In addition, some of the details in the scenario are different from the first one. We hoped this would stimulate responses more consistent with the other scenarios. The new recreation management scenario was adapted from a real-life moral problem that one of the authors had experienced.

In addition, a few wording changes were made to items #2 and #3 in an attempt to make the moral issue more salient to the respondents. The rationale supporting the change was to see if managers would feel more justified in firing the coach if his record had only improved to 7–5 after a second season record of 5–7. In the first version of the MJSMI, many were not supportive of firing the coach which suggested that we had not created a strong enough moral conflict (i.e., fan and booster expectations of winning versus character development and graduating players).

Concerning item #3, some language was added to make it more explicit to respondents that Jenny, the salesperson, was telling a “small white lie” about a one-day special offer. Responses to item #3 in the first pilot study were split—approximately half were in favor of Jenny’s sales strategy and the other half were not. We wanted to be sure that respondents noticed the moral value of honesty pitted against the desire to earn sales and money.

In addition, the response scale was changed. The scale ranging from very appropriate to not appropriate was changed to agree to disagree. This change was made because of a concern that one’s sense of “appropriate” may vary from person to person more than one’s desire to “agree” or “disagree.”

Lastly, some basic demographic information was added including year in school (the second pilot study used a sample of sport management students), gender, and title of sport management position, in the event that some students held internships or worked in the sport industry. The demographic information collected in the first pilot study was removed given the nature of the second pilot study’s sample.

**Pilot Study #2.** The second version of the MJSMI was administered to a convenience sample of  $N = 78$  undergraduate sport management students (juniors and seniors) across two classes. These students were selected because they were accessible and because it was believed that as sport management majors, the students would provide a reasonable representation of managers in the sport industry and thus have familiarity with the types of scenarios contained in the MJSMI.

All 78 students completed the instrument. Given the larger sample size, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to assess the unidimensionality of the instrument with the caveat that the sample was still somewhat small. Principal axis factoring was chosen as the extraction method along with an orthogonal factor rotation (Varimax).

Principal axis factoring with an orthogonal rotation (Varimax) extracted two factors based on the Kaiser Criterion (i.e., selecting factors with eigenvalues greater

than 1.00; Henson & Roberts, 2006). However, these factors were not interpretable given the majority of items contained low factor loadings. Overall, the analysis suggested weak relationships among items (see Table 3 for factor analysis results). Common practice is to accept loadings greater than .30 (Thorndike, 1997) or greater than .40 (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). There were two items that met these criteria (items #4 and #5) in the first rotated factor and one item in the second rotated factor (item #3). However it was difficult to interpret the meaningfulness of these items in relationship to the overall construct.

The general lack of homogeneity among items was corroborated in the internal consistency analysis in which the interitem and item total correlations were low as well as the overall alpha of .32 (see Tables 4 and 5). In addition, an inspection of the frequency distribution of responses for each item also suggested inconsistency in responses. For example, approximately 75% responded "tend to disagree" or "disagree" to item #1 whereas approximately 76% responded "agree" or "tend to agree" to item #4.

**Table 3 Rotated Factor Matrix for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #2)**

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Communalities
Q#1	.232	.097	.063
Q#2	.025	.184	.034
Q#3	.084	.752	.573
Q#4	.865	-.201	.788
Q#5	.305	.189	.129

**Table 4 Correlation Matrix for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #2)**

Items	Question #1	Question #2	Question #3	Question #4	Question #5
Q#1	1.000	-.002	.122	.203	.021
Q#2	-.002	1.000	.137	-.017	.067
Q#3	.122	.137	1.000	-.088	.174
Q#4	.203	-.017	-.088	1.000	.242
Q#5	.021	.067	.174	.242	1.000

**Table 5 Item-Total Statistics for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #2)**

Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted
Q#1	.146	.064	.287
Q#2	.088	.021	.332
Q#3	.156	.085	.274
Q#4	.143	.122	.285
Q#5	.248	.102	.173

In an attempt to improve the reliability and validity of the MJSMI, three additional items were added for a total of eight items. Although, originally it was hoped that fewer items could be used to capture the moral judgment construct, increasing the length of a test or attitude scale can improve reliability and validity (Henerson, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987; Hinkin, 1995). Specifically, more items can increase the ability to fully capture the theoretical construct (Henerson et al., 1987; Hinkin, 1995). Longer tests or scales can also decrease the effects of measurement error (Black, 1999; Thorndike, 1997).

Thus, for the third pilot study it was decided to add items rather than remove items and replace them with new ones. We thought perhaps adding more items would give us a clearer understanding of sport managers' moral judgments and a better sense of internal consistency (i.e., how items correlate with each other and the total test score). This was done with the understanding that certain items may still need to be removed following the third pilot study (e.g., items #1 and #4 mentioned above). In addition, we wanted to determine if responses to pilot 1 and 2 were partly due to sampling error in which case creating new items may be unnecessary. Notably, pilot 1 had a very small sample of only 27 subjects and pilot 2 was also relatively small ( $N = 78$ ). Further, the pilot 2 sample was comprised of undergraduate sport management students rather than sport managers working in the sport industry (those in the pilot 3 sample). Thus, we wanted to assay the consistency of responses across the pilot samples before removing any more items.

The development of the three new scenarios/items was based on a combination of personal moral experiences shared by some of the individuals who responded to our request on the NASSM listserv and the sport ethics literature (Eitzen, 1999; Lumpkin et al., 1999). The three new items are in the areas of college athletics and general sport marketing. Thus, the number of items in relationship to sport management segments is as follows: professional athletics (1 item), college athletics (3 items), recreation (1 item), health and fitness (1 item), facility management (1 item) and general sport marketing (1 item).

In addition to increasing the length of the instrument, some minor wording changes were made to maintain consistency across all of the items and ultimately increase the internal consistency of responses. Added to all of the scenarios is an ending declarative statement indicating that the character's actions or decisions are "appropriate." Respondents then agree or disagree at varying levels. This is different from the second version in which three of the scenarios included a declarative statement with the word "appropriate" and two did not. The first version of the MJSMI did not use a declarative statement. Rather, the word "appropriate" was used in the response scale.

**Pilot Study #3.** A third pilot study was conducted with the revised 8-item version of the MJSMI. A convenience sample of  $N = 100$  sport managers completed the MJSMI. These managers were employed in a variety of sport segments including the National Football League (NFL), Major League Baseball (MLB), the National Hockey League (NHL), USA Volleyball, Grand Slam Tennis Tours, IMG Media and Entertainment Company, Entertainment and Sports Programming Network (ESPN), a Division I college athletics conference, a minor league baseball team, a Division I-A college athletics department, a university recreation and fitness center, and a National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR) race track.



More specifically there were 59 males (59.6%) and 39 females (39.4%; one subject did not complete that part of the instrument). The educational levels included high school graduates (1%), some college (4%), bachelor's (49.5%), master's (39.4%), doctoral (2%), law (4%; one missing). Ages ranged from under 30–60 and over; most were under 30 (53.5%) or 30–39 (31.3%; one missing). Organization levels included executive (14.3%), senior (7.1%), middle-management (48%), entry level (30.6%; two missing). Years of work experience ranged from under 3 to over 20 (one missing). The majority possessed under 3 (26.3%) or 4–10 years of work experience (52.5%). Lastly, data were collected on the type of position held. The question was asked on an optional basis given some managers may be concerned about revealing their identity. A total of 91 out of 100 chose to identify their positions which were categorized into the following areas: marketing (8.8%), sales (13.2%), community and media relations (8.8%), fitness/recreation (11%), tickets (6.6%), Administrative (general manager, athletic director, president, executive, and commissioner; 26.4%) and other (those that were difficult to categorize; 25.3%).

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to assess the unidimensionality of the moral judgment construct. Principal axis factoring was used as the extraction method along with an orthogonal factor rotation (Varimax). Four factors were extracted based on the Kaiser Criterion (i.e., selecting factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00; Henson & Roberts, 2006). Factors were then examined in the rotated factor matrix. With the first factor, there were three items (#3, #5, and #7) with loadings higher than .40. The second factor also contained three items (#2, #5, and #8) higher than .40. The third and fourth factors contained single item loadings (items #1 and #6 respectively) that were each higher than .40 (see Table 6). These factors, however, were not consistent with our theory to measure moral judgment on a unidimensional basis. Furthermore, the identified factors, particularly factors 1 and 2 do not make sense conceptually. For example, there is no reason to believe that the loadings on items #3, #5, and #7 in factor 1 should represent an underlying theoretical construct any more than the combinations of other items. This belief is based on what we know about the nature of the items as well as the patterns in responses across the moral scenarios. For example, concerning factor 1 (items #3, #5, and #7), the frequency distribution of responses to item #3, is greatly different from the distribution for item #7. On item #3, 81% “tend to disagree”

**Table 6 Rotated Factor Matrix for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #3)**

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Communalities
Q#1	-.046	.129	.736	.116	.574
Q#2	-.046	.604	.083	-.011	.374
Q#3	.417	-.008	-.128	.003	.190
Q#4	.278	.278	.138	-.030	.174
Q#5	.631	.412	.028	.173	.598
Q#6	.021	.098	.093	.727	.547
Q#7	.521	-.168	.371	-.045	.440
Q#8	.068	.411	-.023	.177	.205

or “disagree” whereas on item #7, the responses are spread across the response scale—52% “agree” or “tend to agree” while an additional 48% “tend to disagree” or “disagree.” Thus, there is little reason to believe that items #3 and #7 form any kind of latent construct related to moral judgment.

The internal consistency of the items improved from  $\alpha = .32$  to  $\alpha = .51$ . However, the increased alpha may be the result of adding three items. An internal consistency analysis of the first five items from the third version of the MJSMI exhibited an increased alpha of .42 suggesting little change in responses from pilot #2 to pilot #3 for the first five items. This is also evidenced by the frequency distributions in which responses from the two samples (pilots #2 and #3) were highly similar and in one case identical (item #1). The similar responses across items 1–5 suggest that there is a consistent phenomenon being measured (see discussion for an explanation).

Overall, the improved alpha level of .51 still does not indicate good internal consistency among items. This lack of consistency is more clearly evidenced by the low interitem correlations and the item-total correlations (see Tables 7 and 8). The frequency distribution of responses also helps illuminate the lack of consistency. It is clearly evident that certain items cause a dramatic change in responses. For example, on item #3, 81% “tend to disagree” or “disagree.” In contrast, 90% “agree” or “tend

**Table 7   Correlation Matrix for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #3)**

Items	Q#1	Q#2	Q#3	Q#4	Q#5	Q#6	Q#7	Q#8
Q#1	1.00	.155	-.116	.113	.068	.169	.229	.036
Q#2	.155	1.00	-.007	.124	.220	.046	-.095	.269
Q#3	-.116	-.007	1.00	.019	.265	-.009	.202	.048
Q#4	.113	.124	.019	1.00	.333	.008	.151	.147
Q#5	.068	.220	.265	.333	1.00	.193	.237	.198
Q#6	.169	.046	-.009	.008	.193	1.00	-.005	.184
Q#7	.229	-.095	.202	.151	.237	-.005	1.00	-.024
Q#8	.036	.269	.048	.147	.198	.184	-.024	1.00

**Table 8   Item-Total Statistics for Responses to the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot Study #3)**

Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Q#1	.186	.144	.497
Q#2	.204	.154	.493
Q#3	.131	.127	.519
Q#4	.273	.142	.467
Q#5	.481	.278	.368
Q#6	.165	.101	.505
Q#7	.200	.175	.494
Q#8	.254	.125	.474

to agree” on item #6. Similarly, 76% “tend to disagree” or “disagree” on item #1 whereas 79% “agree” or “tend to agree” on item #4. Consequently, it is unwise at this time to aggregate the items into a total score which was our original intention.

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument to measure the moral judgments of sport managers. More specifically, our intention was to measure moral judgment on a unidimensional level given past research suggesting moral judgment is a unidimensional construct (Hahm et al., 1989; Kohlberg, 1984; Piaget, 1932; Rest, 1979, 1986). Theoretically, the instrument is grounded in deontological ethics which holds that a moral decision should appeal foremost to moral values rather than consequences or the nonmoral good (Frankena, 1973).

Three pilot studies were undertaken to develop the MJSMI. Ultimately, an 8-item version was tested in the third and final pilot study with a sample of 100 sport managers. Results showed a lack of homogeneity among items as well as a lack of a clear unidimensional factor (nor were there clear subfactors). This lack of consistent responses may be explained by a phenomenon called situational ethics which refers to “changing the ethical guidelines whenever a good or better reason exists to change them” (Lumpkin et al., 2003, p. 42). Applied to how sport managers responded in the third pilot study (as well in the previous pilot studies), it is clear from the frequency distributions that responses changed depending on the ethical situation. One must consider the specific nature of the items to better understand the shifting distributions. For example, item #3 is concerned with a sales representative named Jenny who works at a fitness club. Jenny is under pressure to increase club membership and consequently decides to lie to customers about a one-day reduced membership cost. In response, 81% “tend to disagree” or “disagree” with Jenny’s dishonest sales strategy. Most of the respondents apparently believe that Jenny has clearly acted in an unethical manner and hence there is an appeal to the moral value of honesty and perhaps a deontological position.

On the other hand, item #6 involves a standout high school football player named Billy who is accepted into a major Division IA university despite not meeting its academic standards. Billy is admitted to the university under a special policy that allows a certain number of athletes with subpar academics to be admitted if the coaching staff will explain how Billy will be given the necessary academic support. In response, 90% “agree” or “tend to agree” with Billy’s admission to the university. The responses suggest that the large majority do not see an ethical problem with allowing a student with a poor academic background into the university. Yet, from a morally-principled perspective, it could be argued that despite all the academic support, Billy does not have the necessary academic skills to succeed at the college level. Therefore, it may be irresponsible of the coaches and university to allow Billy admittance; he may suffer psychological harm by being in a situation in which he cannot succeed. Furthermore, such practice may be unfair to other students who were admitted to the university based on legitimate academic abilities.

Responses to items #3 versus #6 suggest that managers may be switching from deontological to teleological decision making. The former suggests a greater concern for moral principles (Jenny has been dishonest) whereas the latter item

seems to stimulate an appeal to the nonmoral good. That is, allowing Billy to enter into the university will provide Billy an opportunity to play college football, earn an education, and help the team win. Moral values such as beneficence (harm could come to Billy if he does not have the necessary academic skills) or fairness to other students may have not been considered in many of the sport managers' reasoning. On the other hand, it is possible that many could have reasoned it is benevolent to provide Billy an opportunity to play football and receive a college degree. This is a potential shortcoming of the instrument's use of a close-ended scale. Further instrumentation may need to be developed that allows deeper insight into an individual's moral decision making.

Previous research using moral scenarios to study moral judgment may also explain the inconsistent responses relative to the items. Some have found that one's level of moral reasoning may change depending on the nature of the moral scenario. Weber (1990) for example, found corporate managers employed a lower level of moral reasoning (stage 3 moral development) when confronted with an ethical dilemma in a business context compared with a dilemma outside of business (stage 4 moral development). In addition, Fritzsche and Becker's (1983) study showed that the type of ethical dilemma and its perceived level of severity influenced marketing managers' ethical decision making. The managers acted more ethically when they perceived more serious consequences of their actions. As well, Bredemeier and Shields (1986) observed that athletes (high school and college) and non athletes (same levels) employed a lower level of moral reasoning when confronted with sport moral dilemmas compared with life moral dilemmas (see also Rest, 1979).

There are a few reasons why responses may change depending on the type of moral scenario. First, one's moral values may be overpowered by other values (e.g., nonmoral values). As Rest (1979) states, "Sometimes moral values can be compromised by other values (success in a career, the promotion of the Third Reich, etc.), and sometimes moral values are completely set aside" (p. 178). For example, in the case of dramatically different responses to item #3 versus item #6, most of the managers hold to the moral value of honesty whereas values other than moral ones may be more appealing in item #6.

Second, Rest (1979, 1986) has noted that there may be individual differences in the ways people interpret a moral situation. Rest (1979) claimed, "Some people seem to find a moral dilemma almost everywhere; others recognize a moral issue only after the most blatant signs of human suffering" (p. 170). In a similar vein, Jones (1991) theorized that people perceive moral issues with varying degrees of moral intensity which refers to the amount of severity a moral or ethical issue is perceived to carry. Therefore, in the case of item #6, the majority of sport managers may have not interpreted Billy's special admittance to the university as a moral issue. Or, the situation was perceived to carry low moral intensity. Other items however, such as item #3, may have been more readily interpreted as a moral issue (i.e., Jenny, the sales representative).

Third, one's level of moral reasoning or decision making may fluctuate in relationship to one's familiarity with a given moral scenario. Weber (1990) theorized that managers may use a lower level of moral reasoning in the context of business versus everyday life as a result of the way many businesses/corporations are structured. A particular corporation may encourage certain types of unethical behavior, e.g., loyalty to the corporation rather than honesty with consumers. Simi-

larly, Bredemeier and Shields (1986) hypothesized that male athletes (high school and college) and college male non athletes may use a lower level of moral reasoning in the context of sport moral dilemmas versus everyday life as a result of the way competitive sport is structured. They suggested that the moral atmosphere of sport may encourage or require athletes to suspend their normal sense of morality.

Both Weber (1990) and Bredemeier and Shields' (1986) studies suggest that certain contexts may have a negative influence on how one reasons morally. Applied to how sport managers responded to moral scenarios on the MJSMI, it is possible that their level of moral reasoning and decision making fluctuated in relationship to their familiarity with the specific context. For example, the large majority (90%) may have agreed with admitting Billy to the university (item #6) because most of the sport managers in the third pilot study work in the context of college athletics or professional sport. Thus, they may have been socialized into believing there is nothing morally wrong with such a practice. However, there is also evidence to contradict this theory. Many of the sport managers (76%) "disagree" or "tend to disagree" with the owner of the National Basketball Association (NBA) team who is raising ticket prices to increase players' salaries. More research is needed to more clearly understand how certain types of sport management contexts may influence moral reasoning.

In sum, we can only speculate why sport managers' responses were variable across the items on the MJSMI. A limitation of the MJSMI is that it does not measure the underlying moral reasoning structure of one's decision making which is considered an important part of studying moral judgment (Kohlberg, 1984; Piaget, 1932; Rest, 1979). The moral reasons supporting one's moral judgment do indeed play an important role in defining a person's sense of morality (Kohlberg, 1984; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). On the surface, a person's moral decision or action may appear moral, yet in reality, the individual's supporting reasons that drove the decision could be morally neutral or immoral. For example, in the context of athletics, a professional athlete may display good sportsmanship to establish good media relations and improve his or her marketability. In this case, the athlete was motivated by something other than a sincere desire to respect opponents or compete fairly. Thus, it would be incorrect to claim the person acted morally or with moral character (Arnold, 1999; Kohlberg, 1984; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). As Shields and Bredemeier (1995) aptly state, "Morality entails reasons" (p. 50). Therefore, the MJSMI does not allow us to gain a complete understanding of managers' decision making.

Despite the importance of considering the underlying reasons supporting moral judgment, it was decided not to assess the underlying reasoning or structural aspect. This decision was made partly based on practical reasons. Developing instrumentation that is able to measure moral development requires much greater instrument complexity and more reading time from the respondents. The DIT, for example, contains six rather lengthy moral scenarios that are accompanied with 12 issue statements per moral scenario. As mentioned, respondents are required to rate each issue statement as well as rank the top four most important issue statements for each scenario. As a result, the DIT requires a considerable amount of reading and thinking. The average completion time of the DIT is about 30 min (Loviscky et al., 2007).

We were concerned about sport managers' willingness to respond to an extensive assessment like the DIT. Generally, research methodologists acknowledge the importance of developing questionnaires or instruments that are not too lengthy regardless of the population being studied (e.g., Black, 1999; Gay & Airasian, 2000; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). "If the questionnaire appears too long, there is a tendency not to complete it" (Black, 1999, p. 231). Thus, even though the DIT has been used in hundreds of studies (Loviscky et al., 2007), we felt it was important to develop a new instrument that would be relatively easy to complete by sport managers.

There are many instruments in the sport context that assess moral judgment or related constructs without assessing moral reasoning structures (e.g., Duda, Olson, & Templin, 1991; Dunn & Dunn, 1999; Hahm et al., 1989; Stephens, Bredemeier, & Shields, 1997; Stuart & Ebbeck, 1995). These efforts suggest researchers have deemed it worthwhile to study aspects of moral judgment that do not include moral structures or stage development and we concur. Much may still be learned from simply studying individuals' moral judgments without knowing their supporting reasoning. For instance, in the case of the volleyball scenario described earlier, studies with the HBVCI clearly show that athletes (high school and college level) do not believe it is their responsibility to identify an incorrect call made by the referee. To put it another way, in the athletes' moral judgments, it is not unethical to allow referees to miss penalty calls. Even though the HBVCI does provide insight into the athletes' underlying reasoning, obtaining information en masse about how athletes morally judge various types of moral issues/gamesmanship practices has been useful to character development researchers and sport practitioners. We argue that the MJSMI can provide information similar to the HBVCI but in a different context (i.e., sport management). However, unlike the HBVCI which has demonstrated strong internal consistency among items (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .86$ ; Hahm et al., 1989), the MJSMI has not (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .51$ ).

Although internal consistency does not automatically imply reliability and validity, an instrument should demonstrate a strong degree of internal consistency if one intends to measure any given construct on a unidimensional level (or at least the subscales should be internally consistent). It is not possible to use summative scaling if the items do not yield consistent responses. Good item discrimination is needed to clearly interpret scores. Furthermore, internal consistency can provide some evidence of construct validity if the theoretical construct (in this case moral judgment) is believed to yield consistent responses across scenarios (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). However, the results from this study suggest that there are certain elements of the various scenarios within the MJSMI that caused one's decision, or moral reasoning, to fluctuate. One possibility may be that moral judgment cannot be measured on a unidimensional level. Or, it may be that additional work is needed to improve the wording contained in the MJSMI scenarios to evoke more consistent responses across scenarios.

On the other hand, we argue that the MJSMI has value in its current form. As mentioned, the reality may be that many sport managers make moral decisions on a situational basis. Responses to the different MJSMI scenarios allow one to see the variability in ethical decision making and perhaps areas where managers lack moral reasoning skills. For example, it was previously discussed that many may not recognize the moral issue involved in item #6 which involves admitting a standout athlete into a university when they do meet the academic requirements. A similar



phenomenon was seen in item #4 involving a Division IA athletic director who makes a proposal to the university president to usurp a practice field away from the physical education program. The majority (79% “agree” or “tend to agree”) of sport managers agreed with the athletic director’s actions and thus ignored the moral value of fairness in relationship to the physical education program. Cases as such may suggest that some sport managers do in fact need additional training to better recognize moral issues and make morally principled decisions. This type of information can be obtained by simply analyzing the MJSMI items on an individual basis.

In conclusion, the MJSMI, to our knowledge, is the first instrument developed to specifically measure the moral judgments of sport managers. Given the importance of sound ethical decision making in sport management, it is hoped that this article stimulates more research on methods for measuring moral judgment as well more qualitative investigations. Doing so will allow the sport management field to reach a better understanding of managers’ ethical decision making and in turn, perhaps make a case for more ethics training.

## References

- A purpose pitch. (1999, May 17). *Sports Illustrated*, 90, 24.
- Arnold, P.J. (1999). The virtues, moral education, and the practice of sport. *Quest*, 51, 39–54.
- Beller, J.M. (1990). *A moral reasoning intervention program for Division I athletes: Can athletes learn not to cheat?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Idaho. Moscow.
- Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1992, Spring). A moral reasoning intervention program for Division I athletes. *The Academic Athletic Journal*, 43-57.
- Beller, J.M., & Stoll, S.K. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student athletes and general students: An empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 352–363.
- 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 for Exercise and Sport*, 68(Suppl.1), 72.
- Black, T.R. (1999). *Doing quantitative research in the social sciences: An integrated approach to research design, measurement, and statistics*. London: Sage Publications.
- Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 1–45.
- Boyes, M.C., & Walker, L.J. (1988). Implications of cultural diversity for the universality claims of Kohlberg’s theory of moral reasoning. *Human Development*, 31, 44–59.
- Bredemeier, B. J. & Shields, D. L. Shields. (1984). Divergence in moral reasoning about sport and everyday life. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 1, 348–357.
- Bredemeier, B. J. & Shields, D. L. Shields. (1986). Game reasoning and interactional morality. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 14, 257–275.
- Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *The Measurement of Moral Judgment.: Vol. 1. Theoretical Foundations and Research Validation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cronbach, L.J., & Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281–301.
- De George, R.T. (1995). *Business Ethics* (4th ed.). Englewood, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- DeSensi, J.T., & Rosenberg, D. (2003). *Ethics and morality in sport management*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.

- Duda, J., Olson, L., & Templin, T. (1991). The relationship of task and ego orientation to sportsmanship attitudes and the perceived legitimacy of injurious acts. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62, 79–87.
- Dunn, J.G.H., & Dunn, J.C. (1999). Goal orientations, perceptions of aggression, and sport-personship in elite male youth ice hockey players. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 183–200.
- Eitzen, D.S. (1999). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Frankena, W.K. (1973). *Ethics* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Fritzsche, D.J., & Becker, H. (1983). Ethical behavior of marketing managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2, 291–299.
- Gay, L.R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gibbs, J. C. *Moral development & reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg and Hoffman*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gibbs, J. C., Widaman, K. F., & Colby, A. (1982). Construction and validation of a simplified, group-administerable equivalent to the Moral Judgment Interview, 53, 895–910.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 3, 265–275.
- Hahm, C.H., Beller, J.M., & Stoll, S.K. (1989). *The Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory*. (Available from C. H. Hahm, J. M. Beller, and S. K. Stoll, the Center for Ethics, University of Idaho, Moscow).
- Henerson, M.E., Morris, L.L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1987). *How to measure attitudes*. London: Sage Publications.
- Henson, R.K., & Roberts, J.K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improvement practice. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 393–416.
- Higgins, A., Power, C., & Kohlberg, L. (1984). The relationship of moral atmosphere to judgments of responsibility. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 74–106). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hinkin, T.R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21, 967–988.
- Hums, M.A., Barr, C.A., & Gullion, L. (1999). The ethical issues confronting managers in the sport industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20, 51–66.
- Johnson, R.B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue contingent model. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 366–395.
- Kant, I. (1959). *Foundations of the metaphysic of morals* (Beck, L.W. (trans.)). New York: The Liberal Arts Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1958). *The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years 10–16*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development: The philosophy of moral development (Vol. 1)*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: The psychology of moral development (Vol. 2)*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Kohlberg, L., Boyd, D.R., & Levine, C. (1990). The return of Stage 6: Its principle and moral point of view. In T. Wren (Ed.), *The moral domain: Essays in the ongoing discussion between philosophy and the social sciences* (pp. 151–181). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kohlberg, L., & Candee, D. (1984). The relationship of moral judgment to moral action. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 52–73). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). *Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics*. New York: Karger.
- Locke, D. (1979). Cognitive stages or developmental phases? A critique of Kohlberg's stage-structural theory of moral reasoning. *Journal of Moral Education*, 8, 168–181.
- Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S.K., & Beller, J.M. (2003). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Malloy, D.C., & Zakus, D.H. (1995). Ethical decision making in sport administration: A theoretical inquiry into substance and form. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 36–58.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Nunner-Winkler, G. (1984). Two moralities? A critical discussion of an ethic of care and responsibility versus an ethic of rights and justice. In W. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 348–361).
- O'Fallon, M.J., & Butterfield, K.D. (2005). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, 375–413.
- Osborne, J.W., & Costello, A.B. (2004). Sample size and subject to item ratio in principal components analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation*, 9, 1–14.
- Penny, W.J., & Priest, R.F. (1990). *Deontological sport values choices of United States academy cadets and selected other college-aged populations*. Unpublished manuscript, Office of Institutional Research, United State Military Academy.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child* (Gabain, M. (trans.)). New York: The Free Press.
- Rest, J. (1974). *Manual for the Defining Issues Test: an objective test of moral judgment development*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Rest, J.R. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J.R. (1986). *Moral development: advances in research and theory*. New York: Praeger.
- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). A neo-Kohlbergian approach: The DIT and schema theory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11, 291–323.
- Rest, J., Thoma, S., & Edwards, L. (1997). Designing and validating a measure of moral judgment: Stage preference and stage consistency approaches. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 5–28.
- Rudd, A., & Mondello, M. (2008). Managers' ability to identify ethical issues in the sport industry. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 9(4), 441–459.
- Rudd, A., Stoll, S.K., & Beller, J.M. (1997). Expressed coaching behavior and its effect on athlete moral development. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 68((Suppl.1)), 114–115.
- Shields, D., & Bredemeier, B. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Snarey, J.R. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 202–232.
- Stephens, D.E., Bredemeier, B.J., & Shields, D.L. (1997). Construction of a measure designed to assess players' descriptions and prescriptions for moral behavior in youth sport soccer. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 370–390.
- Stoll, S.K., Beller, J.M., Cole, J., & Burwell, B. (1995). A comparison of moral reasoning scores of student athletes in Division I and Division III NCAA member collegiate/institutions. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66(Suppl.), 81.
- Stuart, M.E., & Ebbeck, V. (1995). The influence of perceived social approval of moral development in youth sport. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 270–280.
- Study sheds light on why athletes behave badly (2005, September 27). Retrieved January 26, 2006, from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/news/story?id=2172121>.
- Thorndike, R.M. (1997). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Walker, L. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. *Child Development*, 55, 677–691.
- Walker, L.J., Pitts, R.C., Hennig, K.H., & Matsuba, M.K. (1995). Reasoning about morality and real-life moral problems. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.), *Morality in everyday life: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 371–407). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, J. (1990). Managers' moral reasoning: Assessing their responses to three moral dilemmas. *Human Relations*, 43, 687–702.
- Weber, J. (1992). Scenarios in business ethics research: Review, critical assessment, and recommendations. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 2, 137–160.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2005). *Research methods in education*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Wolverton, B. (2006, August 4). Morality play: A U. of Idaho professor says college athletes are ethically impaired, but can be taught to think differently. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved August 15, 2006, from <http://chronicle.com/free/v52/i48/i48a03201.htm>

## Appendix

### Examples of Items from the Moral Judgments of Sport Managers Instrument (Pilot 3—Final Version)

Michael is the owner of a National Basketball Association (NBA) team in a blue collar city. Basketball is this city's only professional sport franchise. Over the years, the team has received a very loyal fan base. Through tax dollars, the fans also contributed to the building of a new arena. Michael's ownership has been highly profitable making millions of dollars. Recently, Michael and the other NBA owners received a percentage of a new multibillion dollar television contract. As a result of the increased revenue, Michael is pressured by players to be given larger salaries to get their fair share. To help pay for the increase in salaries and keep a healthy profit margin, Michael raises average ticket prices by \$15. These new prices result in many working class families no longer being able to attend the games. Given the increased revenue and the need to share it among players, Michael's raising of prices was appropriate

Daryl is the athletic director of a Division IA college athletic program that is known for making education and character development a priority in their mission and purpose while also establishing a history of strong success in college football. Fan expectations are always extremely high. Coach Campbell, the head football coach, is in his third year. Campbell did well his first year going 10–2, but slipped to 5–7 the second season. Nonetheless, he has developed a reputation for building character and stressing academics. Most players are graduating or are on track for graduation. In the third season, the team lost a number of critical games to conference rivals finishing 7–5. Although Coach Campbell has produced a winning record (22–14) and athletes with character, fans and boosters have become irritable about the team's inability to be in contention for a national title. Major boosters have threatened to terminate their financial support of the athletic department. After much thought and review of the budget, Daryl decides to fire Coach Campbell. This decision was appropriate.