



1974

A comparison of authoritarian and resentient attitudes among high school coaches, college physical education majors, and other college students

Roger L. Brautigan
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Health and Physical Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brautigan, Roger L.. (1974). *A comparison of authoritarian and resentient attitudes among high school coaches, college physical education majors, and other college students*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1848

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

A COMPARISON OF AUTHORITARIAN AND RESENTIENT ATTITUDES
AMONG HIGH SCHOOL COACHES, COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION MAJORS,
AND OTHER COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis
Presented to the Graduate Faculty
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Roger L. Brautigan

May 1974

This thesis, written and submitted by

Roger L. Brautigan

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific.

Department Chairman or Dean:

Cedric W. Dempsey

Thesis Committee:

Allen R. Albough Chairman

Douglas W. Matheson

James P. Santonuci

Dated May 1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my wife Arvie for her patience, devotion, assistance, and support.

To Dr. Cedric Dempsey for providing me with the opportunity to pursue graduate study.

To Dr. Glen Albaugh for his invaluable guidance and encouragement for which I will always be grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
DEFINITION OF TERMS	3
Authoritarianism	3
Dogmatism Scale	4
Institutional Press	4
Ressentiment	4
Ressentient and Ressentience	5
Specific Factors of Ressentiment	5
Egalitarianism	5
Obedience	6
Denigration	6
Rule Orientation	6
Moralizing	6
Distrust	6
Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index	7
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	7
EXPERIMENTAL HYPOTHESES	10
SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS	11

Chapter	Page
2. RELATED LITERATURE	13
AUTHORITARIANISM	13
RESSENTIMENT	15
STUDIES IN AUTHORITARIANISM	18
STUDIES IN RESSENTIMENT	21
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	25
SUBJECTS	25
PROCEDURES	25
THE TEST INSTRUMENTS	27
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	30
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	31
CONCLUSIONS	38
5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIXES	
A. ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE	49
B. PARSONS-KREUTER REVISED RESSENTIMENT INDEX	53
C. QUESTIONNAIRE COVER SHEET.	57
D. LETTER OF EXPLANATION TO COACHES	59
E. RAW SCORES	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs. Ressentiment - Group II - Coaches	32
2. Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs. Ressentiment - Group I - College Physical Education Majors	33
3. Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs. Ressentiment - Group III - College Non-Physical Education Majors	33
4. Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs. Ressentiment - Groups I, II, and III	34
5. Analysis of Variance - Authoritarianism - Groups I, II, and III	35
6. Analysis of Variance - Ressentience - Groups I, II, and III	35
7. Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Authoritarianism - .05 Level of Significance	36
8. Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Ressentience - .05 Level of Significance	37
9. Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Ressentience Groups II and III - .01 Level of Significance	37

Chapter 1

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Organized athletics have been subject to increased criticism from many segments of our society. Recently, even some athletes and ex-athletes have openly expressed their dissatisfaction with organized sport. In many instances this criticism has been directed at oppressive teaching methods used by coaches rather than at the athletic institution.

Ogilvie and Tutko contended that the athletes of today "no longer accept the authoritarian structure of sports, nor do they accept the supreme emphasis on winning."¹ Shecter stated that athletes in general "are beginning to rebel against what they consider to be a depersonalizing, dehumanizing, paramilitary system as destructive to the American democratic ideal as it is to them personally."²

Scott felt that the authoritarian coach dominated the sport culture, and that coaches, in general, were one of the most authoritarian groups in our society.³ Players must strictly adhere to the

¹Bruce C. Ogilvie and Thomas A. Tutko, "Sport: If You Want to Build Character, Try Something Else," Psychology Today, Oct. 1971, p. 60.

²Leonard Shecter, "The Coming Revolt of the Athletes," Look, 34:43, July 28, 1970, p. 43.

³Jack Scott, The Athletic Revolution (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 133.

rules, regulations, and philosophy of the coach in order to be successful athletes. Albaugh suggested that the obedient athlete was the best disciplined and most efficient in the eyes of most coaches despite the fact that it was difficult to see a relationship between discipline and obedience.⁴ Obedience involved submission or doing what was ordered, while discipline encompassed the development of self-control or self-management, which was not necessarily developed by learning to obey.⁵ Discipline was a quality that was necessary for athletic success, but when coaches talked about discipline they actually meant obedience.⁶ Consequently, athletes that did not bend to conform to the coaches' dogma were termed uncoachable, and were either expelled from the athletic society or remained and conformed.

Participation in organized athletics has been purported to be a valuable and important educational experience. Coaches claimed that competition built character, prepared young men for life in the future, and that sport environments were microcosms of life in the real world; however, it was difficult to find support for these claims. Ogilvie and Tutko, who for eight years have been studying the personalities of athletes at all levels of competition, found no support for the traditional claim that participation on athletic teams built character; in fact, they found that athletic competition actually limited growth in some areas.⁷

⁴Glen Albaugh, "The Influence of Ressentience as Identified in College Basketball Coaches," A paper presented to the National Convention of the Physical Education Association for Men, New Orleans, 1972, p. 10.

⁵Id B. Guralnik and Joseph H. Friend, Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, College Edition (New York and Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 416 & 1010.

⁶Scott, op. cit., p. 127.

⁷Ogilvie and Tutko, op. cit., p. 61.

Albaugh, in his study of college basketball coaches, aptly interpreted the writings of both Scott⁸ and Meggyesy⁹ when he stated:

Scott and Meggyesy suggest that attitudes of coaches often nurture learning environments that inhibit all but the obedient, and foster mechanized, robot-like athletic performances.¹⁰

Statements and criticisms of coaches and athletics, such as the one's presented in the introduction, prompted this study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. To determine the relationship between authoritarianism and resentment among high school coaches employed within San Joaquin County, California.

2. To compare authoritarianism and resentment among high school coaches within San Joaquin County, California, a sample of college students majoring in physical education, and a sample of college students majoring in a subject area other than physical education attending the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Authoritarianism

A term used to describe an individual who is closed-minded, dogmatic, rigid in his thinking, intolerant, inflexible, demands obedience, and rejects or accepts others according to their agreement or disagreement with his own belief system. Authoritarianism exists

⁸Scott, op. cit., 1971.

⁹Dave Meggyesy, Out of Their League (Berkeley: Ramparts, 1970).

¹⁰Albaugh, op. cit., p. 1.

on a continuum ranging from low to high.¹¹

Dogmatism Scale

A scale developed by Rokeach for the purpose of measuring general authoritarianism.¹²

Institutional Press

The rules, regulations, and modes of conduct of a system devised to insure that individuals participating in the system meet the demands of the system.¹³ Applying resentment to school environments, Friedenberg, et. al., stated:

The existence of any social system implies the existence of an institutional press. A school is such a system. This press is a unique set of modes by which the system seeks to bend the individuals participating in the system to its demands. And, to the degree that an individual adjusts to the pressures of an institutional press leads to the development of his character, which can be good or bad.¹⁴

Ressentiment

Repressed feelings of hatred, spite, malice, revenge, and envy are the core emotions of this attitude. It has been characterized as a kind of "free floating ill temper" that is "usually rationalized, covert" and is less conscious in contrast to ordinary resentment.¹⁵

¹¹Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1960), pp. 8-20.

¹²Ibid., pp. 71-72.

¹³Edgar Z. Friedenber, Carl Nordstrom, and Hilary A. Gold, Society's Children: A Study of Ressentiment in the Secondary School (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 12.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 12-13.

¹⁵Friedrich Nietzsche, The Genealogy of Morals (New York; Random House, 1967), translated by Walter Kaufman, pp. 8-9.

Friedenberg et. al., the first to define and study resentment in educational environments, described this attitude as an insidious evil that ultimately devitalizes youth, distorts values, and interferes with character development.¹⁶ When resentment is present in a system, such as a school, it is a formidable evil; masked as understanding and affection, hatefulness is its true meaning and its primary intent is to damage.¹⁷

Ressentient and Ressentience

Ressentient is the adjective form of resentment, describing the condition of resentment; ressentience is the noun form, describing the condition of a resentient person.¹⁸

Specific Factors of Resentment

Parsons and Kreuter described some specific factors of resentment in their research that characterized resentient methods of rule enforcement.¹⁹ Albaugh defined these specific factors as they apply to the sport environment in his research.

Egalitarianism. A forced equality which does not allow for individuality. An example of egalitarianism could be look-alike

¹⁶Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., pp. 8, 10 & 14.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 12-13.

¹⁸Marshall Kreuter, "Study of Ressentient Attitudes as Measured in Selected Sixth Grade Teachers," Unpublished Dissertation, University of Utah, 1971.

¹⁹Marshall Kreuter and Michael Parson, "Continued Research on Ressentient Attitudes," Faculty Research Grant, University of Utah, 1971.

teams where individuals would not be allowed to explore movement applicable to their own neuro-muscular functions.²⁰

Obedience. When coaches demand obedience, players learn that the coaches' dogma must be obeyed before any meaningful communication can take place.²¹

Denigration. This factor of resentment is defamation of an individual's character, which is opposite to raising the self concept. This form of resentment is most demeaning when no allowances are made for retort, as when sarcasm exists on a one-way street.²²

Rule Orientation. This factor is present when inflexible and unrealistic rules are imposed that do not consider individual differences, and do not include team members in determination of the rules.²³

Moralizing. When a coach feels that he builds character by emphasizing his own belief system, he is moralizing. This takes place through subtle innuendo, or more overtly, by the use of liberal punishment.²⁴

Distrust. When coaches do not trust their athletes, they would continually be on the alert for athletes taking short cuts, cheating, or any other behavior that opposes the status quo.²⁵

²⁰Albaugh, op. cit., p. 3. ²¹Ibid. ²²Ibid.

²³Ibid. ²⁴Ibid., p. 4. ²⁵Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index

The Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index (P-KR Index) was developed by Albaugh for the purpose of measuring resentment in coaches.²⁶

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

A history of athletics in the United States revealed that their acceptance as an integral part of the educational process was a difficult and problem laden event. In fact, it was not until the middle of the twentieth century that the contribution of athletics to education was formally recognized. In 1954, the Educational Policies Commission issued a comprehensive statement outlining the educational values of athletics. The first and last paragraphs of this statement are presented below to illustrate the Commissions' profound, yet cautious, sentiments about school athletics.

We believe in athletics as an important part of the school physical education program. We believe that the experience of playing athletic games should be a part of the education of all children and youth who attend school in the United States.

We believe that school athletics are a potential educative force of great power that is not used so much as it should be and that is too often misused. We believe that concerted efforts should be made by school personnel and by other citizens to capitalize more effectively on the potential values in school athletics.²⁷

This statement represented a highly significant step in the growth and development of high school athletics in the United States.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 5-6.

²⁷Educational Policies Commission, School Athletics (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954), pp. 3-4.

However, even the Educational Policies Commission suggested that athletes may not experience the potential values of athletic competition by stating that athletics were "too often misused." The recent criticisms of organized athletics presented in the introduction and directed at the authoritarian structure of sport and at oppressive coaching methods tended to speculate that participation in organized athletics, under certain circumstances, may be detrimental to a person's development.^{28,29,30,31} Limited research existed in sport directed toward proving or disproving these contentions. However, the effects of oppressive teaching methods on learning have been subject to numerous investigations and comments. Two attitudes that represented oppressive teaching methods were examined extensively in this study. These attitudes, authoritarianism and resentment, were amenable to research and applicable to the sport environment.

Athletics, at least at the high school level, can only be justified when the participants derive the wholesome educational values associated with competition and participation on athletic teams. As educators, coaches must promote these values and concentrate on developing and educating youth. In light of the recent criticisms, it appeared that coaches may have neglected this task. Needless to say, these criticisms did not apply to all coaches, nor were they unanimously agreed upon by athletes and ex-athletes. However, to the extent that these criticisms may have merit, they cannot be ignored.

²⁸Albaugh, op. cit., 1972. ²⁹Scott, op. cit., 1971.

³⁰Meggyesy, op. cit., 1970.

³¹Ogilvie and Tutko, op. cit., 1971.

It has been suggested that organized athletics appeared to attract the authoritarian personality, and the social role demanded from sport, at least traditionally, appeared to predispose the emergence of authoritarian coaches.^{32,33} An authoritarian coach by definition demanded obedience, was inflexible, and relied on strict rule orientation so that his players would follow his directions.³⁴ At the high school level, the rules and regulations governing athletic participation were generally more rigid than were those for other students, and the demands placed upon the individual participants to conform were usually greater. These rules, regulations, and demands constituted an institutional press, and according to Friedenberg et.al., existed in the form of resentment in educational environments.³⁵ This institutional press in the athletic environment was dependent upon the existence of the specific factors of resentment, ie., distrust, egalitarianism, denigration, obedience, moralizing, and rule orientation.³⁶ However, it could not be readily conjectured that authoritarian coaches, simply by defining authoritarianism, were resentient, nor could it be said that an institutional press, as dictated by authoritarian coaches, facilitated resentment. Friedenberg, et. al., stated:

³²Scott, op. cit., 1971.

³³Glen Albaugh, "Authoritarian Personality in Athletics," Unpublished Paper, University of Utah, 1968.

³⁴Rokeach, op. cit., pp. 8-20.

³⁵Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., p. 12.

³⁶Kreuter, op. cit., 1971.

Although the rules and practices of a school may have been deliberately framed to facilitate resentment,³⁷ they are not in themselves a sufficient cause of resentment.

This statement could be applied to the rules and practices of an athletic environment, and this was where the coach became the primary factor in the process. In theory, a resentient coach could be either philanthropic or authoritarian because it was the method employed in enforcing an institutional press rather than the enforcement itself that was resentient.³⁸ Everyone recognizes the need for rules in our society and its' institutions, and these rules must be enforced if they are to have any value. Albaugh stated:

To require is not a resentient act; the style of the enforcement is the key and can definitely be resentient. If the coach enforces a rule in an inflexible and demeaning fashion, and does not allow for the player to retain his dignity, then that is resentment.³⁹

In light of the recent criticisms directed toward sport, it is imperative that some pertinent research be directed toward establishing whether or not authoritarianism and resentment were prevalent in the sport environment. The primary purposes of this study were: 1) to determine if there was a significant relationship between authoritarianism and resentment among high school coaches; and 2) to determine if coaches perceived these two attitudes more significantly than other groups.

EXPERIMENTAL HYPOTHESES

Two experimental hypotheses' were proposed by the researcher:

³⁷Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., p. 14.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 9-10.

³⁹Albaugh, "Resentience in College Basketball Coaches," p. 4.

1. There will be a significant relationship between coaches' authoritarian scores, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and resentient scores, as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index.
2. There will be significant differences among scores for coaches, college physical education majors, and college non-physical education majors for authoritarianism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and resentment, as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index.

SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited to high school coaches within San Joaquin County, California, and male college students attending the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California. Fifty high school coaches, fifty-two male college physical education majors, and fifty male college students majoring in a subject area other than physical education were included.

Subjects given the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index were assured anonymity. Male college physical education majors were coded into Group I, the high school coaches into Group II, and the college students majoring in a subject area other than physical education into Group III.

Only authoritarian and resentient attitudes of these groups were measured, and no generalizations were made outside of these designated attitudes. The data utilized pertinent to this study consisted of: 1) authoritarianism scores derived through administration

of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale*, and 2) resentment scores derived through administration of the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index (P-KR Index)**.

*Appendix A

**Appendix B

Chapter 2

RELATED LITERATURE

Relatively few studies have been attempted dealing with authoritarian and resentient attitudes and their effect on learning. In order to provide the reader with a more complete understanding of these two attitudes as they relate to this research, Rokeach's concept of general authoritarianism, and Nietzsche's and Scheler's developmental concepts of resentment were presented in addition to existing pertinent research.

AUTHORITARIANISM

Rokeach viewed personality as an organization of belief systems which can be identified and measured. How a person believed rather than what a person believed was what mattered; therefore, it was the structure rather than the content of beliefs that was of concern.⁴⁰ Rokeach contended:

The relative openness or closedness of a mind cuts across specific content; that is, it is not uniquely restricted to any one particular ideology, or religion, or philosophy, or scientific viewpoint. A person may adhere to communism, existentialism, Freudianism, or the "new conservatism" in a relatively open or in a relatively closed manner. Thus, a basic requirement is that the concepts to be employed in the description of belief systems must not be tied to any one particular belief system; they must be

⁴⁰Rokeach, op. cit., p. 7.

constructed to apply equally to all belief systems.⁴¹

How a person thought, remembered, and perceived, and the way a person accepted or rejected new ideas, people, and authority, were the constituents of Rokeach's belief-disbelief system.⁴²

Rokeach's belief-disbelief system led to fundamental distinctions between open and closed systems. He stated:

A basic characteristic that defines the extent to which a person's system is open or closed is, namely, the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside.⁴³

Examples of irrelevant internal pressures were irrational ego motives, power needs, the need for self-aggrandizement, and the need to allay anxiety. Irrelevant external pressures were the pressures of reward and punishment arising from external authority.⁴⁴

In an open system, the acceptance of a particular belief did not depend on irrelevant internal drives, and the more open the system, the more the person was able to resist irrelevant reinforcement pressures from external authority. In a closed system, a person's acceptance of a particular belief depended upon irrelevant internal drives and external reinforcements from authority.⁴⁵ Furthermore, a person's belief in absolute authority was greater in a closed system, and other people would be evaluated according to the authorities they believed in and according to their agreement with his own system. In an open system, a person accepted others without evaluating them at all.⁴⁶

⁴¹Ibid. ⁴²Ibid., p. 8. ⁴³Ibid., p. 57.

⁴⁴Ibid. ⁴⁵Ibid., p. 61. ⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 62-63.

Another characteristic which determined the extent to which belief systems were open or closed involved two opposing sets of motives. These motives were the need to know, and the need to ward off threat. When threat was absent, open systems resulted, but when threat was present, the need to ward off threat became stronger and the cognitive need to know became weaker, resulting in a more closed belief system.⁴⁷ Threat led to dogmatism in individuals and institutions, and dogma insured the continued existence of the institution and its belief-disbelief system upon which it was founded.⁴⁸

Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale was the end product of his belief-disbelief system theory. The questions measured the openness or closedness of an individual's belief-disbelief system. As a result, it was a more general measure of authoritarianism, dogmatism, and intolerance than previous instruments, primarily the California F Scale, which measured only right or Fascist authoritarianism.⁴⁹

RESSENTIMENT

Friedrich Nietzsche, in The Genealogy of Morals (1887), was the first to introduce the concept of resentment. His discovery of resentment as the source of moral value judgements was one of his major contributions to psychology.⁵⁰

Nietzsche's resentment, in moralistic terms, developed out of specific social conditions between the "haves" and the

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 67. ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 68. ⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 71-72.

⁵⁰Nietzsche, op. cit., p. 7.

"have nots," "masters" and "slaves," and was also called slave morality.⁵¹ The slave revolt began when resentment itself became creative and produced values which were not active, true reactions, but rather were passive and involved imaginary revenge.⁵² Nietzsche's concept of slave morality was based on resentment. Individuals that were not resentient were basically happy and did not have to artificially establish their happiness by examining their enemies, as those who were resentient did. In contrast to happiness, those who possessed resentment were weak, impotent, oppressed, and their minds were continually filled with hatred and inimical feelings.⁵³

The spirit of resentment was essentially vengefulness of the impotent consisting of submerged feelings of hatred, envy, jealousy, distrust, rancor, and revenge.⁵⁴ Nietzsche felt that the noble man lived in openness with himself, while the resentient man was neither honest nor upright with himself. His soul squinted, his spirit loved hiding places, and everything covert enticed him.⁵⁵

Max Scheler (1874-1928), in his book Ressentiment, elaborated on Nietzsche's concept of resentment. Scheler's concept of resentment involved an attitude which developed from a cumulative repression of feelings of hatred, revenge, and envy. When these repressed feelings could be actively released, resentment did not develop, but when a person was not able to release these feelings against the persons causing them, a feeling of impotence developed. Ressentiment developed when these feelings were continuously

⁵¹Ibid., p. 36. ⁵²Ibid. ⁵³Ibid., p. 38.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 74. ⁵⁵Ibid. p. 38.

re-experienced over a long period of time.⁵⁶ Scheler developed the concept of resentment further by describing his notion that certain social roles, social situations, or specific positions in the social structure, were prone to producing resentment. He contended that specific recurrent situations in which a person found himself in the social structure may lead to the development of resentment.⁵⁷ Situations that he depicted as possible producers of resentment included: the feminine role, the role of the spinster, the role of the aged, familial roles, the role of priests, and the role of bourgeoisie classes.⁵⁸

Describing the social-structural variables within social classes which evolved around social identity, Scheler was able to identify further the role-model theory of resentment as it applied to social rank in free societies. Social identity was related to competitive success or failure, and identity was achieved by comparing one's own life with all others who were similarly striving for success. Scheler felt that in free societies where social mobility was possible, people strived for success and compared their success with people above their own status rather than their equals. Even though access to all social positions was available, barriers existed, which appeared illegitimate, and this was the reason why resentment was apt to develop among groups who were alienated from the social order.⁵⁹ It was most probable to find resentment present among those who were frustrated in their strivings. These persons or groups developed a sense of impotence, they hated the

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 23-23. ⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 24-25. ⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 26-28.

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 29-30.

existing situation but felt incapable of acting out their hatred because of a feeling of being bound to the existing scheme of things.⁶⁰ If a person was in a position in the social structure that minimized his chances to be successful and limited his ability to develop active countervalues, then he was apt to engage in behavior motivated by resentment.⁶¹

STUDIES IN AUTHORITARIANISM

Lambert, using the California F Scale, selected 15 high authoritarian school principals, 15 low authoritarian school principals, 20 low authoritarian teachers, and 20 high authoritarian teachers from a large sample of each group. Three-man discussion teams were headed by either a low or high authoritarian principal with no plan for controlling the other members of the groups. From the information gathered from this research, Lambert developed thirteen judgement areas which reflected high or low authoritarian leadership actions. Eleven of these thirteen categories were found significant at either the one or two percent level. From these findings, Lambert depicted authoritarians as being rigid, time-oriented planners that were more sensitive to organization than to pupil needs and interests. High authoritarians demonstrated their insensitivity to pupils by treating them as objects to be manipulated to fit the organization. They relied heavily on set routines and tended to resist change. Nonauthoritarians were also organized and planned their time but did

⁶⁰Ibid. ⁶¹Ibid., p. 31.

not feel a compulsion to adhere rigidly to plans if the pupils were not profiting. They were more sensitive to student feelings, respected their personal rights, and were generally more flexible. Authoritarians regarded the environment as being highly competitive, that a hierarchy existed in society, and that hard work was the only means of advancement in the hierarchy. They believed highly in absolute values; they relied completely on unquestioned authority; and they were unimaginative, noncreative, traditional thinkers. High authoritarians also tended to be pessimistic. Nonauthoritarians, on the other hand, were optimistic, introspective, imaginative, creative, and continually sought clarification. They also were more concerned with intrinsic values of group activities, realizing and understanding individual potential.⁶²

Gregory, in his article summarizing authoritarian works, felt that authoritarian leaders tended to seek highly structured environments. He characterized these environments as being similar to those found in the military. He also felt that authoritarian individuals had little or no insight into personality and surrounded themselves with other authoritarian types.⁶³

Wright and Harvey's study of authoritarianism indicated that authoritarians were more receptive of criticism and willing to change their beliefs when confronted by individuals of high status. These same authoritarians were less likely to change their beliefs when

⁶²Philip Lambert, Condensed Doctoral Dissertation at the University of California, Berkeley, Genetic Psychology Monographs, 58:167-203, 1958.

⁶³W. Edgar Gregory, "Authoritarianism and Authority," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 5:641-643, 1955.

confronted by individuals of a lower status.⁶⁴

Haythorn et. al., using the California F Scale, conducted a study of nonauthoritarian and authoritarian group behavior. Their findings indicated that nonauthoritarian group leaders were more open and sensitive in their attitude toward other group members than authoritarian group leaders. Nonauthoritarian group leaders were also found to display a higher degree of leadership, greater effective intelligence, and less striving for group approval than high authoritarian group leaders. Furthermore, nonauthoritarians, in group behavior, were found to be significantly more likely to make proposals subject to group discussion, and significantly less likely to tell another group member to do something. These findings supported the general hypothesis that nonauthoritarian leaders were more effective in dealing with the problems presented, and that they engaged in behavior conducive to a democratic group atmosphere.⁶⁵

Ogilvie and Tutko, in a study of personality characteristics of coaches, found them to be highly success driven, highly organized, dominant, future oriented, strong in leadership qualities, and strong in psychological endurance as described by the Athletic Motivation Inventory. Coaches were also found to be extremely conservative, inflexible, rigid, incapable of utilizing new learning, and generally were not capable of showing understanding or of giving emotional

⁶⁴Jack Wright and O. J. Harvey, "Attitude Change as a Function of Authoritarianism and Punitiveness," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2:177-181, 1965.

⁶⁵William Haythorn et. al., "The Behavior of Authoritarian and Equalitarian Personalities in Groups," Human Relations, 9:57-74, 1956.

support.⁶⁶

In a later study, Ogilvie and Tutko confirmed their original findings and discovered some new personality traits of coaches. In general, they discovered that coaches scored high on those traits which determined succeeding, but they scored low on those traits requiring personal involvement. They scored lowest on those traits which contributed most to being sensitive and supported close inter-personal relationships.⁶⁷

STUDIES IN RESENTMENT

Friedenberg, Nordstrom, and Gold were the first to identify and examine resentment in educational environments. The central purpose of their investigation was to determine whether there might be an unrecognized process by which schools, as the sponsors of institutional presses, actually interfered with student development.⁶⁸ This process was thought to be resentment as defined by Nietzsche and Scheler.

The study was divided into two phases: phase I was designed to measure resentment in the schools; and phase II was designed to measure its impact on the students. Random samples of students and teachers from nine secondary schools of varying socio-economic backgrounds were tested. The general results indicated that

⁶⁶Bruce Ogilvie and Thomas Tutko, Problem Athletes and How to Handle Them (London: Pelham Books, 1968), pp. 21-24.

⁶⁷Bruce Ogilvie and Thomas Tutko, "Self-perception as compared with measured personality of selected male physical educators," In proceedings of the second international congress of sport's psychology, Gerald Kenyon (ed.), (Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1970), pp. 73-77.

⁶⁸Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., p. 12.

ressentiment was present in most areas of the education environment.

Gold, in his final project evaluation report, stated:

There existed an omnipresent and inexorable compulsion shaping events in the schools, instituting a depressing sameness everywhere. School-by-school variation was found to be minor, with such distinctions that existed emerging in shades of gray, not in stark contradictions of black and white.⁶⁹

Kreuter conducted a similar study at the elementary school level. The purpose of his research was to determine the extent of ~~ressentiment at the elementary school level as sixth grade teachers~~ and their classes were studied. Kreuter found that individual teacher scores for ressentience correlated significantly with the composite mean scores of their own classes at the .01 level. The classes perceived a higher incidence of ressentience when the teacher of that class scored high in ressentience as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Ressentiment Index. These findings indicated that resentient attitudes might be transferable through teacher-pupil interaction. He also found that the sixth grade teachers who were perceived to be highly resentient were also highly authoritarian, as measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale. The relationship between these two variables was found to be significant at the .01 level; however, only 27 per cent of the variance was accounted for by this coefficient.⁷⁰

Albaugh's study of college basketball coaches was the first attempt to identify ressentiment in the athletic environment. The central purpose of his research was to assess the influence of ressentience and to study resentient personalities as identified in college basketball coaches. Ressentient attitudes of coaches and

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁷⁰Kreuter, op. cit., 1971.

players from 17 university, college, and junior college basketball teams were measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index and the Friedenbergnordstrom Revised Resentiment Index respectively. The personalities of the coaches and players were assessed as measured by the Athletic Motivational Inventory. No significant relationship was found between coaches' and players' assessments of resentment. Black players' perceptions of resentment were significantly higher than that for white players. A comparison of substitutes' and starters' assessments of resentment was not found to be significant.

Differences on the personality traits as measured by the Athletic Motivational Inventory were not found to be significant when compared to the scores assessing resentient attitudes. Therefore, the personalities of coaches and athletes as measured by the Athletic Motivational Inventory had no influence on the degree of resentment they perceived.⁷¹

Gunther, using the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index, studied resentment in college baseball coaches and players. The purpose of his study was to determine if a relationship existed between coaches' and players' perception of resentment, and between coaches' resentment scores and player dissidence as rated by the coaches. Players and coaches from 19 college and university baseball teams served as subjects in the study. The results indicated a wide discrepancy in the manner in which team members and coaches perceived the total team environment with regard to resentment. No significant relationship was found between coaches' and players' perceptions of resentment, and the same was found to be true when coaches'

⁷¹Albaugh, op. cit., pp. 4, 5, 11.

resentiment scores were compared to their ratings of player dissidence.⁷²

⁷² John Gunther, "Player Dissidence as Related to Rresentient Attitudes of College Baseball Coaches," Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of the Pacific, 1972.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

SUBJECTS

One hundred and fifty-two male subjects divided into three groups participated in this comparative analysis study. College physical education majors attending the University of the Pacific (N = 52), San Joaquin County high school coaches (N = 50), and University of the Pacific college students majoring in a subject area other than physical education (N = 50), made up the groups.

PROCEDURES

The test instruments pertinent to the study, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and Parson-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index, were combined into one questionnaire. Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale was placed first in the questionnaire with the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index following. In addition, a cover sheet*** was attached to the questionnaire containing a brief explanation of the contents of the questionnaire, directions for completion of items, and required personal information vital to statistical analysis. Test administration for Groups I and III was handled by the researcher. Arrangements were made with instructors in the physical education

***Appendix C

department for Group I testing and with the University of the Pacific psychology department for Group III testing. Three separate classes were tested to render the required number of subjects for the research. The questionnaires were administered during class time. Two upper division physical education classes provided the subjects for the physical education major group, and one lower division beginning psychology class provided the subjects for the non-physical education major group. The psychology class consisted primarily of freshman and sophomore students. Female students, students majoring in physical education, and students participating on university sponsored athletic teams enrolled in the psychology class were isolated and removed from the class prior to administering the questionnaire. No special information was given the subjects prior to testing. Pretest procedure consisted of reading the cover sheet and completing the required personal information. Care was taken to insure that each testing session was as consistent as possible.

After receiving approval of the various school district administrations, personal contact was made with each high school principal and athletic director for Group II testing. The researcher was unable to administer the questionnaires personally because of time and varying work schedules. As an alternative, the athletic directors agreed to test their respective coaches and to collect the questionnaires. To assist the athletic directors, a letter of explanation**** was provided for the coaches in each questionnaire packet. A sealable manilla envelope was also provided for their

****Appendix D

convenience and privacy. Anonymity was insured for both the coaches and the schools participating in the study, and coaches were asked not to discuss their responses to the questionnaire items with their colleagues.

All testing was completed in one week. Group II questionnaire packets were hand carried to each high school's athletic director on a Tuesday and were picked up, testing completed, on Friday of the same week. Group I testing was completed on Wednesday and Group III on Thursday.

THE TEST INSTRUMENTS

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was selected to measure authoritarianism; since, unlike other instruments for measuring authoritarianism, it provided the researcher with the most complete general measure of authoritarianism. It afforded the best measure of general authoritarianism as it exists at either end of the political continuum. In numerous tests of reliability, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale was found to have reliability coefficients ranging from .68 to .93.⁷³ In a validation test of the scale that compared a group of preconceived high and low authoritarian individuals, the results displayed a t test significance of ($p = .01$).⁷⁴

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale contained the same number of test items as the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index developed by Albaugh. In addition, the same scoring procedure could

⁷³Rokeach, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 101-108.

be used on the two instruments by the subjects.

The Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index was selected as it was specifically designed to measure resentient attitudes existing in the athletic environment. Albaugh conducted a pilot study to test the reliability of the P-KR Revised Index at Western Washington State College. The test - retest method for determining reliability resulted in a reliability coefficient of .85. Construct and content validity were supported by the high reliability found in the test - retest samples, and by expert opinion from Parsons and Kreuter, and Nordstrom and Friedenberg.⁷⁵

The questionnaires were hand scored by the researcher. Both the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index provided the same six response alternatives ranging from I strongly agree, to I strongly disagree. A respondent's score could range from a possible 1 to 7 points on each question depending upon the degree to which a person agreed or disagreed with the statement. Authoritarian and resentient answers received either 5, 6, or 7 points, while nonauthoritarian and nonresentient answers were awarded 1, 2, or 3 points. If a statement was unanswered 4 points were assigned. Sample statements and scoring procedures for both instruments were as follows:

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

3 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

⁷⁵Albaugh, op. cit., p. 6.

3 45. Using good judgement as to time and place, coaches should advise players about their styles of appearance and dress.

If a coach strongly agreed (numeral 3) with question number two, it indicated a highly authoritarian response and the coach was assigned 7 points. If the coach's response was numeral 6 (I strongly disagree), a highly nonauthoritarian response, he received 1 point.

A coach's response of three (I strongly agree) on the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index to question number forty-five indicated a highly resentient response and the coach was assigned 7 points.

A response of I agree a little (numeral 1) also indicated a resentient response but to a lesser degree and resulted in a score of 5.

Twenty-two of the forty statements comprising the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index were agree - resentient statements such as statement forty-five displayed above. The remaining eighteen were disagree - resentient statements. An example of a disagree - resentment statement is presented below:

Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index

3 55. Lack of player enthusiasm and learning most likely means that the material or coaching method used was inappropriate.

If a coach strongly agreed (numeral 3) with question number fifty-five, it indicated a highly nonresentient response and was assigned 1 point. A response of I agree a little (numeral 1) indicated a nonresentient response but to a higher degree and received 3 points.

Authoritarian and resentment scores could range from a low total of 40 points to a high of 280. A low score was representative of a nonauthoritarian or nonresentient individual, and a high score was indicative of a person that was highly authoritarian or highly

ressentient. All responses to the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index were assigned a numerical rating and a total authoritarian and ressentient score was given to each subject.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

A Pearson r was used to determine if any relationship existed between coaches' scores for authoritarianism and ressentiment. Analysis of variance was used to determine if any significant differences occurred, with respect to the authoritarianism and ressentiment scores, among the three groups of subjects. It was followed by Scheffe's post hoc test to determine where significant group differences were located.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ David R. Lamb and Jerome C. Weber, Statistics and Research in Physical Education (St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Company, 1970), pp. 111-112.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Fifty high school coaches were administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index, and a Pearson r was used to determine if any significant relationship existed between the resulting authoritarian and resentient scores. An r of .464 was found which was statistically significant at the .01 level. For a more complete interpretation of the correlation between authoritarianism and resentment, the Group II r was squared to obtain a coefficient of determination, and the squared value was subtracted from 1 to obtain the coefficient of nondetermination. This process, as described by Lamb and Weber⁷⁷, determined the proportion of the variance in resentment that was related to the variance in authoritarianism, and the proportion of the variance not related to authoritarianism. These coefficients explained why only a modest correlation was indicated by the r of .464 as only 22 per cent of the total variance between resentment and authoritarianism could be accounted for while 78 per cent of the variance in resentment was not related to the variance in authoritarianism.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 63

Table 1

Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs Ressentiment
Group II - Coaches

	N	Mean	S.D.	r
Authoritarianism	50	135.320	27.894	*.464
Ressentiment	50	156.320	17.358	

*For significance at the .01 level with 48 degrees of freedom r must be .3721 or greater.⁷⁸

The results indicated that a person who was authoritarian also tended to reflect a resentient attitude. In this instance, the experimental hypothesis was accepted as there existed a statistically significant relationship between authoritarianism and ressentience as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index, although only 22 per cent of the variance was accounted for in the correlation.

Pearson r coefficients of correlation were computed between authoritarianism and ressentiment for Group I (the college physical education group), Group III (the college non-physical education major group), and for the three groups combined.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 222.

Table 2

Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs Ressentiment
Group I - College Physical Education Majors

	N	Mean	S.D.	r
Authoritarianism	52	146.058	26.961	*.278
Ressentiment	52	146.538	19.974	

*For significance at the .05 level with 50 degrees of freedom r must be .2732 or greater.⁷⁹

As illustrated in Table 2, the college physical education major group displayed a very weak but significant correlation ($r = .278$) between authoritarianism and resentment as the r was statistically significant at the .05 level. Eight per cent of the variance was accounted for in the Group I correlation.

Table 3

Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs Ressentiment
Group III - College Non-Physical Education Majors

	N	Mean	S.D.	r
Authoritarianism	50	130.760	20.331	*.383
Ressentiment	50	136.100	20.209	

*For significance at the .01 level with 48 degrees of freedom r must be .3721 or greater.⁸⁰

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid.

Group III results were similar to those exhibited by the coaching group as the r of .383 was statistically significant at the .01 level. Fourteen per cent of the variance was accounted for in the Group III correlation.

Table 4

Pearson r Summary Table - Authoritarianism vs Ressentiment
Groups I, II, and III

	N	Mean	S.D.	r
Authoritarianism	152	137.493	25.961	*.352
Ressentiment	152	146.467	20.874	

*For significance at the .01 level with 150 degrees of freedom r must be .2540 or greater.⁸¹

As indicated in Table 4, the composite group (I, II, and III) was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level. The results were all inclusive that a significant relationship does exist between authoritarianism and resentment as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentment Index, even though only 12 per cent of the variance between resentment and authoritarianism could be accounted for as established by the coefficient of determinism.

Analysis of variance along with Scheffe's post hoc test was used to determine differences in authoritarianism and resentment scores among coaches, college physical education majors, and college

⁸¹Ibid.

students majoring in a subject area other than physical education. A one-way analysis of variance was computed for the three groups for authoritarianism (Table 5) and resentment (Table 6) respectively.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance - Authoritarianism
Groups I, II, and III

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between groups	6317	2	3158.5	*4.9303479
Within groups	95453	149	640.68416	
Total	101770	151		

*For significance at the .01 level, the F ratio had to be 4.61 or better.⁸²

Table 6

Analysis of Variance - Resentment
Groups I, II, and III

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between groups	10671.2	2	5335.6	*14.42245
Within groups	55122.7	149	369.951	
Total	65793.9	151		

*For significance at the .01 level, the F ratio had to be 4.61 or better.⁸³

⁸²Ibid., p. 232. ⁸³Ibid.

Both the F ratio of 4.93 for authoritarianism (Table 5) and 14.42 for resentment (Table 6) were statistically significant at the .01 level, with the F ratio of 14.42 significant well beyond the .01 level. Since one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) only determined that differences existed among the three groups, it was necessary to utilize Scheffe's post hoc test to determine the specific location of the between group differences.⁸⁴

Table 7

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Authoritarianism
.05 Level of Significance

Group	Comparison Means	Difference	S Value	Result
I P.E. Majors	146.1	(I & II) <u>10.8</u>	12.277	NS
II Coaches	135.3	(II & III) <u>4.5</u>	12.397	NS
III Non-P.E. Majors	130.8	(I & III) <u>15.3</u>	12.277	.05*

Scheffe's test found a significant difference between the physical education major group and the non-physical education major group (Table 7) for authoritarianism as measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale.

⁸⁴Ibid., pp. 111-112.

Table 8

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Ressentience
.05 Level of Significance

Group	Comparison Means	Difference	S Value	Result
I P.E. Majors	146.5	(I & II) <u>10.3</u>	9.3298	.05*
II Coaches	156.8	(II & III) <u>20.7</u>	9.4210	.05*
III Non-P.E. Majors	136.1	(I & III) <u>10.4</u>	9.3298	.05*

Scheffe's test indicated that significant differences in ressentience existed between all three groups at the .05 level of significance (Table 8). Table 9 displayed significance beyond the .01 level for ressentience between the coaches' group and non-physical education major group.

Table 9

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test - Ressentience Groups II and III
.01 Level of Significance

Group	Comparison Means	Difference	S Value	Result
II Coaches	156.8	(II & III) <u>20.7</u>	11.679	.01*
III Non-P.E. Majors	136.1			

The second hypotheses stated there was a significant relationship among the scores for coaches, college physical education majors, and college students majoring in a subject area other than physical education, in authoritarianism and resentment. As the statistical analysis indicated, (illustrated in Tables 5 through 9),

significant differences were found among the groups for both variables. Therefore, the experimental hypothesis was accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limitations of this study and the statistical methods used, the following conclusions were indicated:

1. A statistically significant correlation ($p = .01$) was found for the coaching group with respect to authoritarianism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and resentment as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index.
2. The college physical education major group (mean score of 146.1) scored significantly higher than the college non-physical education major group (mean score of 130.8) at the .05 level for authoritarianism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The difference for authoritarianism between the college physical education major group and the coaching group (mean score of 135.3) approached significance at the .05 level.
3. The coaching group (mean score of 156.8) scored significantly higher for resentment than the college physical education major group (mean score of 146.5) at the .05 level, and significantly higher than the college non-physical education major group (mean score of 136.1) at the .01 level as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Resentiment Index.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to determine the relationship between authoritarianism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and ressentience, as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index, and to determine whether or not these two variables were perceived differently by three groups of subjects: a high school coaching group (N = 50), a college physical education major group (N = 52), and a college non-physical education major group (N = 50). A review of the literature suggested that both authoritarianism and ressentience could be considered to negatively affect learning, and when possessed by individuals in positions of authority, could be detrimental to a person's development.^{85,86}

The test instruments were hand scored by the researcher, and the resulting data was analyzed by a hand calculator and by the University of the Pacific computer center. A Pearson r was used to determine if any significant relationship existed between authoritarianism and ressentience, and analysis of variance followed by Scheffe's post hoc test was used to determine differences among the three groups tested.

⁸⁵Rokeach, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

⁸⁶Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., p. 12.

The first hypothesis, which stated that there would be a significant relationship between authoritarianism, as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Revised Ressentiment Index, was supported. The coaching group correlation was significant at the .01 level. Further analysis showed the college physical education major group to be significant at the .05 level, the college non-physical education major group to be significant at the .01 level, and the composite group (I, II, and III combined) to be significant at the .01 level. These findings supported the findings of Kreuter,⁸⁷ who found a similar relationship between authoritarianism, as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and ressentience, as measured by the Parsons-Kreuter Ressentiment Index, in sixth grade teachers to be significant at the .01 level. Twenty-seven per cent of the variance was accounted for in Kreuter's research, while twenty-two per cent of the variance was accounted for in the present study.

On the basis of this study's sample, the significant relationship between authoritarianism and ressentience could have been due to the similar characteristics included in the two attitudes. According to Rokeach, authoritarian individuals demanded obedience, were inflexible, and relied on strict rule orientation.⁸⁸ Kreuter felt that these characteristics in the authoritarian personality were also present in ressentience.⁸⁹ These specific factors of ressentience were rule orientation and obedience. An additional

⁸⁷Kreuter, op. cit., 1971.

⁸⁸Rokeach, op. cit., pp. 8-20.

⁸⁹Kreuter, op. cit., 1971.

similarity could be inflexibility, as described by Albaugh,⁹⁰ as was characteristic of ressentient styles of rule enforcement. These similarities between authoritarianism and resentment could have been the variance accounted for in the significant correlation. This relationship could also have been attributed to the make-up of the samples.

The results further showed that the only significant difference for authoritarianism occurred between the college physical education major group and the college non-physical education major group. This difference was statistically significant at the .05 level. A review of the literature suggested that coaches would score significantly higher in authoritarianism than the other groups, with the possible exception of the college physical education major group.^{91,92} On the basis of this sample, the coaching group did not score highest in authoritarianism. No credible explanation of these findings was available to the researcher with respect to the coaches' perception of authoritarianism. However, it should be pointed out that the criticism directed toward the authoritarian structure of sport was not substantiated by research supported data, with the exception of Ogilvie and Tutko's comments which were based on their findings of coaches' personality traits as assessed by the Athletic Motivation

⁹⁰Albaugh, op. cit., p. 4.

⁹¹Scott, op. cit., pp. 127-133.

⁹²Ogilvie and Tutko, op. cit., "Sport," p. 60.

Inventory.^{93,94}

In the measurement of resentient attitudes, statistically significant differences were found to exist among all three groups ($p = .05$); while a statistically significant difference ($p = .01$) was found between the coaches' group and college non-physical education group. The mean score for the coaches' group was highest at 156.8; the college physical education group was next at 146.5; the college non-physical education group had a mean score of 136.1. On the basis of this sample, these findings suggested that individuals directly involved with sport environments could have been more resentient than individuals not directly involved. The results indicated that the sample of coaches created environments which could have been more conducive to the existence of the specific resentient factors. The coaches could have had more distinct notions concerning the necessity for strict player control and methods for attaining that control, which facilitated resentient styles of rule enforcement, when compared to the college physical education group and the college non-physical education major group.⁹⁵ Coaches, in this sample, may have felt that it was necessary to stifle creativity, may have engaged in the liberal use of punishment, and may have felt it necessary to totally control players' behavior and activities during the season, all of which could be characteristic of resentment.⁹⁶

⁹³Ogilvie and Tutko, op. cit., Problem Athletes, pp. 21-24.

⁹⁴Ogilvie and Tutko, op. cit., "Self-perceptions," pp. 73-77.

⁹⁵Albaugh, op. cit., "Influence of Resentience," p. 12.

⁹⁶Ibid.

On the basis of this sample, the control that coaches extended over players could have involved coach-defined values and beliefs which engaged moralizing and was manifested in dress and hair regulations which, according to Friedenber~~g~~ et. al., were "essentially negative and defensive and based on distrust," and could be considered resentient.⁹⁷

It was the intention of the researcher to examine two attitudes, authoritarianism and resentment, in an attempt to determine their prevalence in the sport environment. To imply that these attitudes were responsible for the widespread discontent with athletics should not even be conjectured on the basis of the study.

From the results found in the present study, recommendations arise for further research into coaching attitudes and athletic environments.

1. A similar study should be conducted comparing coaches with other groups in positions of authority who are not directly involved with the sport environment while attempting to examine the variables under controlled conditions.
2. A study should be conducted comparing coaches of team sports to coaches of individual sports to determine if differences exist in coaching attitudes.
3. More research should be directed toward determining whether or not resentient attitudes are capable of being transmitted through individual interaction; the research of Albaugh⁹⁸ and Kreuter⁹⁹ indicated that resentment is transferable.

⁹⁷Friedenberg et. al., op. cit., pp. 134-135.

⁹⁸Albaugh, op. cit., 1972.

⁹⁹Kreuter, op. cit., 1971.

4. A study should be conducted comparing high school coaches and their teams to other teachers and their classes in authoritarianism and resentment.
5. A longitudinal study should be conducted of young athletes to determine the growth chart of authoritarian and resentient attitudes.
6. A study should be conducted attempting to determine if authoritarian and resentient attitudes can be effectively changed through special training programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Baller, Warren and Don Charles. The Psychology of Human Growth and Development. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Beisser, Arnold. Madness in Sport. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Campbell, William G. Form and Style in Thesis Writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.
- Educational Policies Commission. School Athletics. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1954.
- Guralnik, Id B. and Joseph Friend. Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, College Edition. New York and Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1966.
- Holdheim, William W. (trans.). Ressentiment, by Max Scheler. New York: Glencoe Free Press, 1961.
- Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Delta Books, 1964.
- Kaufman, Walter (trans.). The Genealogy of Morals, by Fredrich Nietzsche. New York: Random House, Inc., 1967.
- Meggyesy, Dave. Out of Their League. Berkeley: Ramparts, 1970.
- Nordstrom, Carl, Edgar Friedenber, and Hilary Gold. Society's Children. New York: Random House, Inc., 1967.
- Ogilvie, B.C., and T. A. Tutko. Problem Athletes and How to Handle Them. London: Pelham Books, Ltd., 1966.
- Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Russell, Bill. Go Up for Glory. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1966.
- Scott, Jack. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Slusher, Howard. Man, Sport, and Existence. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1967.
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Weber, Jerome C. and David R. Lamb. Statistics and Research in Physical Education. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Co., 1970.

B. PERIODICALS

Axthelm, Pete. "Athletics for Athletes?" Newsweek, 74:62, August 11, 1969.

Christie, R. and P. Cook. "A Guide to Published Literature Relating to the Authoritarian Personality through 1956," Journal of Psychology, 45:171-199, 1958.

Gregory, Edgar W. "Authoritarianism and Authority," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 5:641-643, 1955.

Haythorn, William et. al. "The Behavior of Authoritarian Personalities in Groups," Human Relations, 9:57-74, 1956.

Lambert, Philip. Condensed Doctoral Dissertation at the University of California, Berkeley, Genetic Psychology Monographs, 58:167-203, 1958.

Mudra, Darrell. "The Coach and the Learning Process: A Perceptual Approach to Winning," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 41: 26-29, 1970.

Ogilvie, Bruce C. and Thomas A. Tutko. "Sport: If You Want to Build Character, Try Something Else," Psychology Today, October 1971. pp. 59-61.

Ogilvie, Bruce C. and Thomas A. Tutko. "Self-perceptions as compared with measured personality of selected male physical educators," In proceedings of the second international congress of sports psychology, 1970.

Pine, Gerald and Peter Horne. "Principles and Conditions for Learning in Adult Education," Adult Leadership, October 1969. pp. 110-133.

Shecter, Leonard. "The Coming Revolt of the Athletes," Look, 34:43-47, July 28, 1970.

Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach," Part I, Sports Illustrated, August 25, 1969. pp. 66-71.

Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach," Part II, Sports Illustrated, September 1, 1969. pp. 21-27.

Underwood, John. "The Desperate Coach," Part III, Sports Illustrated, September 8, 1969. pp. 29-39.

Wright, Jack and O. J. Harvey. "Attitude Change as a Function of Authoritarianism and Punitiveness," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2:177-181, 1965.

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Albaugh, Glen. "The Influence of Ressentience as Identified in College Basketball Coaches," Paper read at the 1972 Meeting of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, New Orleans.

Albaugh, Glen. "Authoritarian Personality in Athletics," Unpublished Paper, University of Utah, 1968.

Gunther, John. "Player Dissidence as Related to Ressentient Attitudes of College Baseball Coaches," Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of the Pacific, 1972.

Kreuter, Marshall. "Study of Ressentient Attitudes as Measured in Selected Sixth Grade Teachers," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Utah, 1971.

Kreuter, Marshall and Michael Parsons, "Continued Research on Ressentient Attitudes," Faculty Research Grant, University of Utah, 1971.

APPENDIX A

ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

Mark each statement in the left hand margin in the space provided according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, depending on how you feel in each case. Attempt to be just as honest as you can with each response.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1: I agree a little | 4: I disagree a little |
| 2: I agree on the whole | 5: I disagree on the whole |
| 3: I agree very much | 6: I disagree very much |

- ___ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- ___ 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- ___ 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- ___ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
- ___ 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- ___ 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- ___ 7. Most people just don't give a damn for others.
- ___ 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- ___ 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- ___ 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- ___ 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- ___ 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- ___ 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

- 1: I agree a little 4: I disagree a little
2: I agree on the whole 5: I disagree on the whole
3: I agree very much 6: I disagree very much

- ___ 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- ___ 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- ___ 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- ___ 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- ___ 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- ___ 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- ___ 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- ___ 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- ___ 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- ___ 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty wishy-washy sort of person.
- ___ 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- ___ 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- ___ 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- ___ 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same things he does.
- ___ 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

- 1: I agree a little 4: I disagree a little
2: I agree on the whole 5: I disagree on the whole
3: I agree very much 6: I disagree very much

- ___ 29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- ___ 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- ___ 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- ___ 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- ___ 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- ___ 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- ___ 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- ___ 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- ___ 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- ___ 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble all or nothing at all.
- ___ 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- ___ 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX B

PARSONS-KREUTER REVISED RESENTMENT INDEX

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1: I agree a little | 4: I disagree a little |
| 2: I agree on the whole | 5: I disagree on the whole |
| 3: I agree very much | 6: I disagree very much |

- ___ 41. One of the strengths of a good coach lies in his ability to teach obedience.
- ___ 42. Coaches should actively discourage the existence of cliques on the team.
- ___ 43. The concept of equal treatment of all players need not be a primary concern of a good coach.
- ___ 44. Some of the most successful athletes here are those with the best physical skills.
- ___ 45. Using good judgement as to time and place, coaches should advise players about their styles of appearance and dress.
- ___ 46. There is no question that team members can gain great value from meeting and practicing in small groups by themselves.
- ___ 47. Punishing a player, i.e., running extra laps because of misconduct, is a reasonable way of helping him recognize his social responsibility.
- ___ 48. One of the coach's most important tasks is seeing that team members get along with each other.
- ___ 49. The creative abilities of athletes continue to impress one even after several (or less) years in the profession.
- ___ 50. If the dress codes of an athletic team were left to the discretion of the team, quality standards for many teams would decline.
- ___ 51. A good coach will use wit and sarcasm, if necessary to control showoffs and attention getters.
- ___ 52. Enlisting personal opinion from the players in regards to team strategy could inhibit the efficiency of the team.
- ___ 53. A great pleasure in coaching is when you have a talented team that is truly creative during its performances.
- ___ 54. A coach may have good reason to allow privileges to one player that are not allowed to all.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1: I agree a little | 4: I disagree a little |
| 2: I agree on the whole | 5: I disagree on the whole |
| 3: I agree very much | 6: I disagree very much |

- _____ 55. Lack of player enthusiasm for learning most likely means that the material or coaching method used was inappropriate.
- _____ 56. This rule is foolish: players must be in bed by 10:30 on all week day nights and by 12:30 on weekends.
- _____ 57. After observing an athlete's performance in practice for a short time, a perceptive coach can easily judge how the player will perform in a game situation.
- _____ 58. A good coach doesn't concern himself with out of season regulations and controls over his athletes.
- _____ 59. Athletics is a good place to impress upon young men that most meaningful learning is hard work.
- _____ 60. Teachers in other subject areas who make a practice of allowing students to follow their own interests frequently end up with a less than adequate program.
- _____ 61. Repetition is the key to successful learning in athletics.
- _____ 62. For team functions, the individual athlete should be able to choose his own seat, roommate, table at which to eat, etc.
- _____ 63. Talking and whispering during the practice sessions is usually a sign that appropriate learning is not taking place.
- _____ 64. Coaches should not expect a player to inform on a teammate who is breaking the rules.
- _____ 65. The appearance of some of our professional sport stars is a disgrace to what athletics really stand for.
- _____ 66. High school or college age athletes should participate in the establishment of their own governing rules and regulations.
- _____ 67. It is more important for a player to have faith in himself than it is for him to be obedient to the structure of the team.
- _____ 68. Allowing players to participate too openly in the planning of team activities may cause a coach to lose his authority.
- _____ 69. When a player adjusts to the rules and guidelines of the team, it is an indication of positive change in his character development.

1: I agree a little

4: I disagree a little

2: I agree on the whole

5: I disagree on the whole

3: I agree very much

6: I disagree very much

____70. Coaches should be ready to jump on those who take short cuts or slack off in practice.

____71. Allowing for imaginative behavior is as important an educational objective in athletics as learning fundamentals basic to the specific sport.

____72. The gifted athlete probably needs less praise than the average or below average athlete.

____73. Parents, administrators, and fellow teachers should be able to visit a practice at any time without announcement.

____74. Athletes should be allowed to make their own decisions on matters that affect them regarding activities outside of their sports environment.

____75. One of the dangers of being a permissive coach is that you might become overly friendly with the athletes.

____76. For the good of the team, it is pretty important to keep the players under wraps in regards to individual behavior on and off court.

____77. Laughing and boisterous behavior during practice sessions are acceptable as long as it does not interfere with the objectives of the practice.

____78. Individual development for athletes is generally best accomplished through equal treatment at all times.

____79. Good coaches are never concerned with a racial quota system.

____80. Team meetings generally are lectures, and if any discussion does exist it should be directed by the coach.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER SHEET

The following 80 statements are concerned with two separate environments. The first 40 statements (1-40) deal with what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The second 40 statements (41-80) deal with the coaching environment. The best answer to each statement is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do. There are no right or wrong answers; the purpose of this questionnaire is simply to get your general and honest opinion about each statement.

PERSONAL INFORMATION SECTION

COACHING GROUP - GROUP II

1. Age
2. Race
3. Sport(s) Presently Coaching
4. Years Coaching Experience
5. Undergraduate Major

COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION MAJOR GROUP - GROUP I, AND THE COLLEGE NON-PHYSICAL EDUCATION MAJOR GROUP - GROUP III

1. Age
2. Year in School (Freshman, Soph, etc.)
3. Race
4. Proposed Major Subject
5. Do you Participate On Any Intercollegiate Athletic Teams At This School?

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF EXPLANATION TO COACHES

Dear Coach,

I would like to begin by thanking you for volunteering to participate in this study. My name is Roger Brautigan and I am a graduate student at the University of the Pacific. The questionnaire that you are about to complete will assist me in completing my master's degree requirements, as my thesis research involves coaching and the athletic environment. Complete anonymity to you and your school is assured in any publication of this research.

Before filling out the questionnaire, I would like to make a few suggestions which I hope you will follow:

1. The questionnaire will take less than an hour to complete, and it is important that you complete the questionnaire on your own, and at a time when you will have no interruptions.
2. Begin by reading the cover sheet and filling in the required personal information. Then read the directions on the first page of the questionnaire and complete the questionnaire.
3. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the sealable manilla envelope which has been provided and return it to your athletic director.
4. Please do not discuss any of the statements with your colleagues.

If you have any questions or comments please feel free to write them down or to contact me in person at the University. Again, thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Roger Brautigan

APPENDIX E

AUTHORITARIANISM (A)*			RAW SCORES		RESSENTIMENT (R)*	
	(A) GROUP I	(R)	(A) GROUP II	(R)	(A) GROUP III	(R)
1.	105	130	153	182	134	160
2.	136	109	107	147	129	129
3.	137	161	122	160	98	134
4.	136	141	169	177	166	159
5.	134	139	194	140	110	146
6.	121	132	156	165	140	189
7.	179	116	145	183	186	165
8.	159	155	165	161	140	160
9.	122	149	102	149	128	162
10.	155	174	133	176	93	113
11.	135	169	97	146	126	146
12.	129	139	93	122	114	113
13.	145	159	85	145	130	133
14.	171	161	79	160	128	131
15.	133	160	132	135	107	124
16.	183	146	97	124	130	135
17.	116	144	130	149	139	150
18.	127	131	144	153	126	144
19.	136	116	116	149	146	145
20.	169	158	118	176	147	139
21.	126	155	164	182	122	138
22.	140	142	134	172	153	134
23.	150	150	127	159	145	149
24.	154	103	143	165	126	107
25.	153	165	127	149	141	139
26.	190	159	149	166	159	147
27.	202	168	164	147	116	156
28.	173	168	128	151	129	130
29.	134	163	173	187	128	123
30.	130	130	161	146	124	158
31.	113	150	96	144	157	90
32.	150	108	111	142	132	115
33.	107	121	125	148	109	132
34.	160	159	147	112	128	152
35.	175	145	131	164	118	126
36.	202	143	187	157	113	157
37.	75	148	156	144	112	111
38.	118	118	188	187	173	159
39.	147	121	152	157	177	134
40.	129	125	86	145	99	86
41.	153	179	137	161	137	163
42.	191	162	119	136	94	106
43.	192	169	141	149	122	131
44.	137	146	171	185	119	121
45.	155	157	136	171	127	123
46.	137	183	152	173	132	135
47.	136	180	116	143	150	129
48.	133	125	141	164	112	143
49.	104	140	157	181	141	121
50.	153	133	110	152	126	113
51.	164	173	---	---	---	---
52.	184	143	---	---	---	---

N = 52

N = 50

N = 50