

## Examining social identity and intrateam moral behaviours in competitive youth ice hockey using stimulated recall

Bruner, Mark W.; Boardley, Ian; Buckham, Sara; Root, Zack; Allen, Veronica; Forrest, Chris; Côté, Jean

DOI:

[10.1080/02640414.2016.1243797](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2016.1243797)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Bruner, MW, Boardley, I, Buckham, S, Root, Z, Allen, V, Forrest, C & Côté, J 2016, 'Examining social identity and intrateam moral behaviours in competitive youth ice hockey using stimulated recall', *Journal of Sports Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2016.1243797>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Journal of Sports Sciences* on 13th October 2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/02640414.2016.1243797>

Confirmed 24/10/2016

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1

2

3

**Examining Social Identity and Intrateam Moral Behaviours in Competitive Youth Ice**

4

**Hockey using Stimulated Recall**

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Bruner, M., Boardley, I. D., Buckman, S., Root, Z., Allen, V., Forrest, C., & Cote, J.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Date Accepted: September 27, 2016

22 **Abstract**

23 Social identity – identity formed through membership in groups – may play an important role in  
24 regulating intrateam moral behaviour in youth sport (Bruner, Boardley, & Côté, 2014). The aim  
25 of this study was to qualitatively examine this potential role through stimulated recall interviews  
26 with competitive youth-ice-hockey players. Twenty-three players ( $M_{age} = 13.27$  years,  $SD =$   
27  $1.79$ ) who reported engaging in high, median or low frequency of antisocial teammate behaviour  
28 (determined through pre-screening with the Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in Sport Scale  
29 [Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009]) were recruited from eight youth-ice-hockey teams in Canada.  
30 Interviews involved participants recalling their thoughts during prosocial/antisocial interactions  
31 with teammates, prompted by previously recorded video sequences of such incidents. Thematic  
32 analysis of interview data revealed all athletes’ – regardless of reported frequency of intrateam  
33 antisocial behaviour – felt prosocial interactions with teammates enhanced social identity. In  
34 contrast, the perceived influence of antisocial teammate behaviour on social identity differed  
35 depending on athletes’ reported frequency of intrateam antisocial behaviour; those reporting low  
36 and median frequencies described how such behaviour undermines social identity, whereas  
37 athletes reporting high frequency did not perceive this effect. The study findings highlight the  
38 potential importance of intrateam moral behaviour and social identity for youth-sport team  
39 functioning.

40 *Keywords:* group dynamics, prosocial behaviour, antisocial behaviour, team sport

**41       Examining Social Identity and Intrateam Moral Behaviours in Competitive Youth Ice****42                               Hockey using Stimulated Recall**

43               Approximately 21.5 million youth (aged 6-17 years) in the United States participate in a  
44 team sport (Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, 2011). Given this high participation rate,  
45 sport teams represent a promising context to facilitate the personal and social development of  
46 youth (Holt, Black, Tamminen, Fox, & Mandigo, 2008). Sport teams provide youth with rich  
47 environments for important interpersonal interactions with peers and opportunities to develop  
48 social bonds as their social realm expands beyond the family to peer groups (Allen, 2003;  
49 Wagner, 1996). Interactions with peers in a sport team setting also affords youth with vital  
50 opportunities to build their own personal identity. A central component of young athletes' self-  
51 concept is the identities they form through membership of sport teams, their social identities.  
52 However, despite the potential significance of athletes' social identities, minimal research has  
53 examined how such identities impact on athletes' moral development (Bruner, Boardley, & Côté,  
54 2014).

55               Social identity represents “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from  
56 his/her knowledge of his/her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value  
57 and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Social Identity  
58 Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) describes the processes through which people identify with  
59 membership of particular social groups, as well as the outcomes (individual and group) that  
60 result from the identification (Bruner, Dunlop & Beauchamp, 2014). Of particular importance to  
61 the current project is that perceptions of group identification can significantly influence moral  
62 behaviour towards group members (Horstein, 1976; Nezlek & Smith, 2005; Sherif, Harvey,  
63 White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961).

64           A considerable body of research in organizational and social psychology has examined  
65 social identity and moral behaviour. More specifically, such research has been conducted in  
66 contexts including gangs (e.g., Goldman, Giles, & Hogg, 2014), business organizations (e.g.,  
67 Tidwell, 2005), and political sectarian violence (e.g., Merrilees, Cairns, Taylor, Goeke-Morey,  
68 Shirlow, & Cummings, 2013). Although research has largely supported an effect of social  
69 identity on moral behaviour, there is also evidence to suggest this relationship may be  
70 bidirectional (e.g., Goldman et al., 2014). As an example, Goldman and colleagues (2014)  
71 examined antisocial behaviour such as violence (e.g., drive-by shootings) in youth gangs. The  
72 authors revealed increased perceptions of status, self-esteem and social identity in the group,  
73 particularly among new gang members who had engaged in violent and aggressive behaviours  
74 toward others. In a review of the literature concerned with prosocial behaviours, Penner and  
75 colleagues (2005) have also highlighted the need to look at consequences of moral behaviour on  
76 group outcomes – thus providing additional support for the moral behaviour-social identity  
77 relationship. Taken together, these findings indicate possible bidirectional effects between social  
78 identity and moral behavior in youth sport.

79           In the sport literature, moral behaviour is defined as a broad range of intentional acts that  
80 can result in positive or negative consequences for others (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2010), and is  
81 frequently subdivided into prosocial and antisocial behaviour. Prosocial behaviour is defined as  
82 voluntary acts intended to help or benefit another individual or group (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998),  
83 whereas antisocial behaviour signifies voluntary acts intended to harm or disadvantage another  
84 individual or group (Sage, Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006). As such, both types of behaviour have  
85 clear relevance to young athletes' social and moral development. Surprisingly, minimal research

86 has investigated the salient role social identity may play in regulating moral behaviour in sport  
87 (Bruner, Dunlop, & Beauchamp, 2014).

88         One exception to this is initial work by Bruner, Boardley and colleagues (2014) that  
89 investigated the interrelationships between social identity and moral behaviour in youth sport.  
90 This study prospectively examined whether social identity predicted prosocial (e.g., encouraging  
91 a teammate) and antisocial (e.g., verbally abusing a teammate) behaviour toward teammates in  
92 329 high school athletes from 26 teams (Bruner, Boardley, & Côté, 2014). This study  
93 investigated links between moral behaviour and two dimensions of social identity: (1) ingroup  
94 ties – perceptions of similarity, bonding, and belongingness with the group, and (2) ingroup  
95 affect – positive feelings resulting from group membership (Cameron, 2004). Importantly,  
96 results demonstrated adolescents' ingroup affect at the beginning of the season positively  
97 predicted prosocial teammate behaviour at the end of the season.

98         Further analyses by Bruner, Boardley and colleagues (2014) investigated the potential  
99 mediational role of task cohesion (individuals' perceptions of the level of unity possessed by the  
100 group around task aspects, e.g., team goals, objectives; Eys, Loughead, Bray & Carron, 2009a,  
101 2009b) and social cohesion (individuals' perceptions of the level of unity possessed by the group  
102 regarding social aspects, e.g., social relationships, friendships; Eys et al., 2009a, 2009b) in  
103 explaining the social identity-moral behaviour relationships. The mediational analyses showed  
104 ingroup affect had a negative effect on antisocial teammate behaviour mediated by task cohesion.  
105 Further, social cohesion mediated a positive effect of ingroup ties on antisocial teammate  
106 behaviour. This latter social cohesion finding is consistent with qualitative research indicating  
107 high social cohesion may be problematic for team functioning due to increased formation of

108 cliques and sub-groups within teams, as well as communication problems (e.g., greater tendency  
109 to start and continue verbal fights and bickering with teammates) (Hardy, Eys, & Carron, 2005).

110 The work of Bruner, Boardley and colleagues (2014) provided partial support for the  
111 relevance of Cameron's (2004) multidimensional model of social identity to youth sport. More  
112 specifically, Bruner, Boardley et al. (2014) found strong support for the relevance of two  
113 dimensions of social identity from this model (i.e., ingroup affect and ingroup ties). However,  
114 the relevance of a third dimension – cognitive centrality (i.e., the importance of being a group  
115 member) – was not supported due to poor internal consistency. As such, we constrain our  
116 research interests to the two dimensions of social identity (ingroup ties, ingroup affect) that the  
117 work of Bruner and colleagues (2014) found to be potentially important for moral behaviour in  
118 youth sport.

119 The study by Bruner, Boardley and colleagues (2014) offered initial evidence of a social  
120 identity-moral behaviour relationship in youth sport. However, there is currently an absence of  
121 qualitative research exploring *how* social identities that youth form through their sport team  
122 membership may influence moral behaviour toward teammates. Qualitative approaches have  
123 been shown to aid understanding of group dynamics constructs (e.g., Eys, et al., 2009b) and  
124 moral behaviour in sport research (e.g., Long, Pantaléon, Bruant & d'Arripe-Longueville, 2006;  
125 Traclet, Romand, Moret & Kavusannu, 2011). As such, the purpose of the current study was to  
126 qualitatively examine the potential role of social identity on intrateam moral behaviour in youth  
127 sport. The study was conducted in a sport associated with frequent antisocial behaviour – youth  
128 ice hockey (see Shapcott, Bloom, & Loughhead, 2007; Smith, 1979).

## 129 **Methods**

### 130 **Qualitative Methodology**

131           A social constructivist orientation guided the research investigating youth perceptions of  
132 social identity and moral behaviour toward team members. We adopted a relativist ontology and  
133 subjectivist epistemology conceiving that reality is socially constructed and multifaceted  
134 involving multiple subjective realities (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). In undertaking this approach,  
135 we acknowledged that the mind plays an important role in constructing reality through  
136 contextual meanings and interpretations and that knowledge is co-created by the interaction of  
137 participant and researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Sparkes & Smith, 2014).

138           One specific qualitative methodological approach suited to addressing the study aim is  
139 stimulated recall interviewing. Stimulated recall is an introspective research approach in which  
140 participants are invited to recall specific thought processes and memories when prompted by a  
141 video sequence (Lyle, 2003). This methodology that combines two forms of qualitative research,  
142 (interviews and observations) has been extensively used in the fields of education (e.g., Housner  
143 & Griffey, 1985), nursing (e.g., Skovdahl, Kihlgren, & Kihlgren, 2004) and counseling (e.g.,  
144 Martin, Martin, Meyer & Slemon 1986). More recently within sport, stimulated recall has been  
145 used in the context of examining coach decision-making (Lyle, 2003), and thought processes of  
146 coaches in coach-athlete interactions (Buckham Erickson & Côté, 2012; Lorimer & Jowett,  
147 2009). Further work in sport has used stimulated recall to examine athletes' antisocial behaviour  
148 (Shapcott et al., 2007; Traclet et al., 2011). An identified strength of the unique methodological  
149 approach in comparison with standard interviewing are improvements in memory recall (i.e.,  
150 reductions in fade and bias) when responses are informed and stimulated by video (Dempsey,  
151 2010).

## 152 **Criterion-Based Sampling and Participants**



153 Patton (1990) identified a number of categories of purposeful sampling. One such  
154 category is criterion-based sampling, which involves the researcher predetermining a set of  
155 criteria for selecting participants (e.g., specific characteristic or experience; Sparkes & Smith,  
156 2014). To provide potentially unique perspectives on social identity and teammate-directed  
157 moral behaviour, criterion-based sampling (Sparkes & Smith, 2014) was used to recruit athletes  
158 with high, median, and low frequencies of reported antisocial behaviour from each of eight  
159 competitive youth ice hockey teams.

160 **Pre-Screening.** Three (i.e., one high, one median and one low frequency) athletes per  
161 team were invited to participate in a stimulated recall interview. To identify these athletes,  
162 players from eight competitive youth ice hockey teams ( $N = 111$ ) completed the five item  
163 antisocial behaviour toward teammates (e.g., “criticized a teammate”) subscale from the  
164 Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS; Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009) prior  
165 to a scheduled practice. Participants were asked to think about their experiences while playing  
166 for their team this season and indicate how often they had engaged in the five antisocial  
167 teammate behaviours this season. The five items were preceded by “While playing for my team  
168 this season, I...”. Items were answered using a 5-point scale, anchored by 1 (*Never*) and 5 (*Very*  
169 *Often*). Evidence supporting the construct validity and reliability of the measure with samples  
170 including youth athletes has been reported (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; 2010; Kavussanu &  
171 Boardley, 2009; Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014). The mean score for the antisocial teammate  
172 behaviour subscale was then calculated. Athletes’ who scored the highest and lowest mean score  
173 on this subscale, along with athletes who scored along the median frequency, were then invited  
174 to participate in a stimulated recall interview. All invited athletes volunteered to participate.

175           The initial sample included 24 athletes from eight competitive Northeastern Ontario  
176 youth ice hockey teams. One of the male youth participants classified as high in antisocial  
177 teammate behaviour did not show up for the scheduled stimulated recall interview and the  
178 interview could not be rescheduled within the 24 hours of observation as stipulated by the study  
179 procedure. The final sample included 23 participants (13 male; 10 female<sup>1</sup>; 7 high [4 male, 3  
180 female], 8 median [5 male, 3 female], 8 low [4 male, 4 female] in reported antisocial teammate  
181 behavior), with ages ranging from 11 to 17 years of age ( $M_{\text{age}} = 13.27$  years,  $SD = 1.79$ ).  
182 Participants represented three levels of competitive hockey: peewee (11-12 years of age;  $n = 9$ ),  
183 bantam (13-14 years of age;  $n = 12$ ) and midget (15-17 years of age;  $n = 3$ ).

#### 184 **Procedure**

185           Prior to conducting the study, ethical approval was obtained from the first author's  
186 institutional ethics review board and the four participating hockey associations. Coaches from  
187 the participating hockey associations were invited to participate through presentations at  
188 coaches' meetings. Participants were then recruited from the teams of interested coaches.  
189 Informed consent was then obtained from the coaches, athletes, and parents.

190           **Observation.** For each team, two training sessions were videotaped and audio recorded  
191 midseason to capture athletes' prosocial and antisocial behaviours toward teammates. In  
192 videotaping the training sessions, two cameras were used. The first camera focused on athletes  
193 to capture athletes' behaviours and athlete-athlete interactions in detail. The second camera was  
194 used to capture the entire play area. A parabolic microphone operated by trained research  
195 assistants recorded athletes' verbalizations and was synced to the video recordings. Each training

---

<sup>1</sup>The bantam boys' team included one female player. During pre-screening this female player was classified as low in antisocial behaviour toward teammates and was therefore invited to participate in the study. This explains why there was one more female and one less male player in the sample than would be expected.

196 session lasted between 1 to 2 hours, resulting in approximately 20 hours of athlete video/audio  
197 recording. The first videotaped session served two purposes: (1) to acclimate the athletes and  
198 coaches to the presence of the research team and equipment, and (2) to serve as pilot video to  
199 ensure that all of the equipment was in good working order and that the sound settings were  
200 appropriate for a hockey arena. The footage from the subsequent practice session was then  
201 analyzed and used for the stimulated interview.

202         The video from each recorded training session was uploaded, reviewed and coded for  
203 prosocial and antisocial behaviour by one of three trained research assistants. Prosocial  
204 behaviours were identified as behaviours intended to help or benefit another individual (e.g.,  
205 helping an injured teammate off of the ice, or sharing a water bottle during a break; Kavussanu,  
206 2006; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989). Antisocial behaviours were  
207 defined as behaviours intended to harm or disadvantage another individual (e.g., pushing or  
208 tripping a teammate; Kavussanu, Stamp, Slade & Ring, 2009; Sage, Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006).  
209 The final clips were purposefully selected to exemplify the prosocial and antisocial behaviours  
210 that were demonstrated within each team. Only those clips that met the operational definitions of  
211 the two types of moral behaviour were included; however, the maximum number of clips  
212 selected for each team was limited to four clips per prosocial and antisocial behaviour category.  
213 While some teams exemplified a variety of prosocial and antisocial behaviours from which to  
214 choose, other teams demonstrated less than four clips for one or both moral behaviour categories.  
215 For those teams with less than four clips demonstrating either prosocial or antisocial behaviours,  
216 all available clips were included in the interview protocol. The selected video clips were  
217 compiled chronologically into one continuous filmstrip using iMovie'11 with each clip being  
218 separated by blank footage.

**219 Stimulated Recall Interviews**

220           The stimulated recall interviews took place within 24 hours of the teams' last videotaped  
221 session (i.e., session in which the behaviours were coded), and occurred before the teams' next  
222 practice session or competition. Interviewing the participants within 24 hours of the practice  
223 session was conducted to align with previous boundaries of stimulated recall interviews (i.e.,  
224 within 48 hours, Shapcott et al. 2007; Tracelet et al., 2011) to minimize recall bias and situate  
225 participants within a similar circumstance/context during the interview procedure. Interviews  
226 lasted between 30-45 minutes in duration and took place at a mutually agreed upon time and  
227 location (e.g., after hockey practice at the ice hockey rink). The interviews followed a semi-  
228 structured open-ended format, which is similar in style to an ordinary conversation with the  
229 interviewees doing most of the talking (Patton, 2002). This allowed the trained research  
230 assistants to focus on the topic of discussion but also allowing the interviewees the freedom to  
231 answer openly without restrictions.

232           Over the course of each interview, the video clip was stopped during the blank footage  
233 and athletes were asked a series of questions. Those questions expanded on their perceptions of  
234 the prosocial or antisocial behaviours displayed through the video footage, and how it may affect  
235 specific aspects of their social identity. Sample interview guide questions included aspects of  
236 ingroup affect (e.g., Do interactions such as this influence how you feel towards being a part of  
237 the team?), and ingroup ties (e.g., Do interactions such as this influence how you think about  
238 being a part of the team?). Following the initial questions regarding the athlete's perceptions of  
239 the prosocial and antisocial video clips, the research assistant further probed athletes' on past  
240 experiences of prosocial and antisocial behaviours they have observed during the present season.  
241 In doing so, the research assistant systematically went through the previous sequence of

242 interview questions expanding on the athletes' perceptions of their discussed behaviour in their  
243 past prosocial and antisocial experiences and how it may affect their social identity. Throughout  
244 the interview athletes were able to stop and replay the current video clip whenever needed.

#### 245 **Data Analysis**

246         The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. A research assistant  
247 verified each transcript by playing the audiotape of each interview in its entirety and following  
248 along with the transcript. This technique highlighted any errors that required correction from the  
249 initial transcription. Identifying and personal information was removed from the transcripts to  
250 ensure participant anonymity. A thematic analysis (see Braun & Clarke, 2006; Sparks & Smith,  
251 2014) was conducted involving six phases: (1) immersion in the transcripts, (2) generating initial  
252 codes relating to social identity and moral behaviour based on definitions from the literature, (3)  
253 searching for and identifying themes relating to these definitions, (4) reviewing these themes, (5)  
254 defining and naming these themes, and (6) writing a report. The thematic analysis implemented  
255 through the first five phases identified what participants were saying about their social identities  
256 and moral behaviour when viewing the selected prosocial and antisocial video clips (Braun and  
257 Clark, 2006; Sparks and Smith, 2014). More specifically, the transcription and initial reading  
258 (immersion in the transcripts) facilitated the generation of initial codes. After codes were  
259 gathered, the process allowed for potential themes to emerge, which were further compared in  
260 relation to individual transcripts and to the entire data set.

261         Highlighting and coding of the transcripts was done using NVivo (version 10.0.638.0  
262 SP6 (64-bit); QSR International) computer software. Two coders (third and fourth authors) were  
263 involved in the initial coding of the transcripts. The coders met with one another and the lead  
264 author to achieve consensus and check one another's biases (i.e., analytical triangulation)

265 throughout the coding process (e.g., Mathison, 1988). Participant coding incorporated  
266 information on team number (e.g., Team #1, Team #2,), level of participation (i.e., Peewee =  
267 PW, Bantam = BTM, Midget = MGT), gender (i.e., Male or Female), identifying characteristic  
268 (i.e., High in antisocial behaviour towards teammates = High, median in antisocial behaviour  
269 towards teammates = Median, low in antisocial behaviour towards teammates = Low); and  
270 participant number (e.g., P01, P02, etc.). Through this process identifier codes were created for  
271 the participants (e.g., Team #2, Peewee level, High in antisocial behaviour towards teammates,  
272 Participant #03= Team #2, PW, Female, High, P03). When required, square brackets [ ] have  
273 been used to add additional words to clarify quotes.

#### 274 **Quality of the Research**

275 Grounded ontologically in relativism and epistemologically in subjectivism, a list of  
276 criteria was developed and implemented to enhance the rigor and trustworthiness of the data  
277 collection, analyses, and findings (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). The list of criteria should be viewed  
278 as characterizing traits intended to guide evaluations of quality with respect to the process and  
279 outcomes associated with this research (Smith, 1993; Sparkes & Smith, 2014). In the context of  
280 this study, the following criteria have been selected: (1) importance of the research, (2)  
281 appropriate, thorough, and thoughtful methods, (3) credibility, (4) negotiated verification, and (5)  
282 reflexivity.

283 The importance of the research was established through the application of social identity  
284 theory to a new context of youth sport, using a new methodological approach of stimulated  
285 recall, with a goal of providing implications to practitioners and suggestions for future research  
286 (e.g., Cohen & Crabtree, 2008; Zitomer & Goodwin, 2014). The use of appropriate, thorough,  
287 and thoughtful methods are described as a necessary standard and key component of conducting

288 qualitative research (Tracy, 2010). In keeping with the recommendations of Sparkes and Smith  
289 (2014) and others (Seale, 1999; Tracy, 2010), we aimed to provide transparency of the  
290 methodological decisions made throughout the process of data collection and analysis. To  
291 achieve this criterion, detailed records of the methods and methodological decisions were  
292 recorded including the rationales for these decisions.

293 Credibility for the findings was achieved through triangulation between investigators (use  
294 of multiple investigators) and peer debriefing between the first author and second and sixth  
295 authors (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Field notes and analysis notes were kept to ensure a continuous  
296 audit trail for dependability of the findings. Finally, the analysis notes were utilized in the  
297 confirmability audit conducted by first and fourth author following the analyses (Lincoln & Guba,  
298 1985). Several of the techniques used to achieve credibility also contributed to appropriate,  
299 thorough, and thoughtful methods, as well as the process of negotiated verification. In this  
300 context, negotiated verification has been defined as a process in which readers are allowed to  
301 discern for themselves the dependability of the data, based on the information provided by the  
302 researcher (Cohen & Crabtree, 2008).

303 Negotiated verification was provided through thick description of decision-making  
304 processes, including an audit trail and meetings to achieve consensus among multiple coders.  
305 Finally, in keeping with suggestions of Sparkes and Smith (2014) and aligning with a subjective,  
306 relativist perspective, we acknowledged the futility of objectivity and sought to be reflexive. In  
307 doing so, we employed a critical friend (the second author) to discuss and reflect on the findings.

## 308 **Results**

309 Data analyses resulted in the identification of three over-arching themes. A common  
310 theme across all three groups (i.e., high, median, low antisocial behaviour) was that prosocial

311 teammate behaviours positively influence social identity. The two other themes represented  
312 differing perspectives of teammate antisocial behaviour based on the reports of athletes classified  
313 as high in antisocial behaviour and those who fell into the low or median antisocial behaviour  
314 groups. More specifically, the theme specific to the high antisocial behaviour group was  
315 characterized by *justification and acceptance* of antisocial behaviours in the team sport  
316 environment. Alternatively, the theme specific to the median/low antisocial behaviour groups  
317 encompassed *acknowledgement of social harms* stemming from antisocial behaviours in this  
318 context. Importantly, throughout the analysis it was evident that all three members of each team  
319 (i.e., high, median, and low in self-reported antisocial behaviours) were in general agreement on  
320 the overall environment within their team, but provided a unique perspective of each  
321 scenario/clip in relation to social identity and moral behaviour in their team. During data analysis  
322 some gender-specific sub-themes also emerged. In the following sections we begin by  
323 overviewing the three over-arching themes before discussing these gender-specific sub-themes.

#### 324 **Prosocial Behaviour and Social Identity**

325 A prominent theme was that was all participants conceived prosocial teammate behaviour  
326 as positively influencing social identity. For example, one athlete described how prosocial  
327 behaviours such as cheering for one another during practice elicited pride, "*Makes me proud of*  
328 *being part of the team because they are cheering and they're saying "go", "good job" and stuff"*  
329 (Team #3, PW, Female, Low, P09). The athlete went on to discuss the ingroup ties and ingroup  
330 affect that prosocial behaviour fostered, "*I like seeing my teammates cheer for each other. It*  
331 *makes me feel good because it means they care about you and you're getting better and not just*  
332 *them getting better by themselves"* (Team #3, PW, Female, Low, P09). Another athlete  
333 highlighted how observing a simple prosocial act such as a teammate patting another team



334 member on the head at the end of practice influenced their ingroup affect or feelings toward the  
335 team, *“It is just good to see that we are all proud of each other and we know that we did good  
336 and we have to keep working. It just feels good to have someone come up to you and tell you,  
337 “you did good” and just feels good inside”* (Team #6, MGT, Male, High, P16). While reflecting  
338 on enhanced ingroup affect after watching a clip of some teammates celebrating a player who  
339 skillfully passed an opponent and scored a goal, one athlete stated *“That makes me feel good  
340 about being on the team that makes me think that we are all friends and everything. That’s more  
341 what our team is about”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, High, P01).

342 Athletes commonly discussed the importance of prosocial intrateam behaviour and how it  
343 affects one another in relation to their teammates’ feelings. Athletes described behaviours such  
344 as helping with equipment malfunctions (helmet clips) or working as a team to pick up pucks  
345 helped to build ingroup affect. When asked about a prosocial interaction that occurred during the  
346 season, an athlete reflected on the end of practice when team members work together to put away  
347 the pucks and clear the equipment off the ice for the Zamboni [ice cleaner], *“It makes me feel  
348 happy because it’s always nice that you can have that kind of relationship with your team. It  
349 makes me feel like I’m a part of the team because we’re all working together; you’re all having  
350 fun putting away the pucks”* (Team #2, PW, Female, Low, P06). Stronger feelings of group  
351 membership from one’s teammate’s prosocial behaviours also led to stronger perceptions of  
352 ingroup ties, stronger sense of connectedness and bonds between the athletes. For instance, a  
353 player described how interactions such as a teammate passing out water bottles to one’s  
354 teammates during a break influences his perceptions of ingroup ties and being on the team, *“I  
355 feel part of a team. Instead of just having guys I play hockey with, I have teammates that are like  
356 your family because that’s the kind of bond you gain with them over the year”* (Team #6, MGT,

357 Male, Low, P18). Another clip of an athlete pouring water through a teammate's facemask for  
358 him to drink while in discussion with his coach elicited a parallel response, "*I feel good and I am*  
359 *glad that he is helping other teammates and helping other people... because it seems that*  
360 *someone is going around like caring and wants to be part of this team* (Team #7, PW, Male,  
361 High, P19).

362 Athletes also identified the importance of including injured teammates within activities  
363 and how it can positively affect their feelings and how they may perceive with being a part of the  
364 team. This sentiment was evident in watching a clip of the team interacting and speaking with an  
365 injured team member watching practice, "*I think this is a good thing because just seeing that*  
366 *even when he [teammate] is not really playing anymore he's still part of the team...It would*  
367 *definitely make that player feel like he's part of the team just seeing that all these people are still*  
368 *talking to him, like, "oh, what happened?" It's definitely a positive feeling, happy just seeing*  
369 *people getting along and caring about each other"* (Team #6, MGT, Male, Median, P17).

### 370 **Social Harms Stemming from Antisocial Behaviour**

371 A second overarching theme was that only athletes who reported median or low levels of  
372 antisocial behaviour identified antisocial behaviour as harmful to the team and also to athletes'  
373 social identity (ingroup affect, cognitive centrality, ingroup ties). Athletes described how  
374 intrateam antisocial interactions negatively impact cognitive centrality (perceived importance of  
375 the team to the athlete) and ingroup affect (how the athletes feel about team membership). For  
376 example, athletes frequently identified how antisocial behaviour such as physically joking  
377 around with one another influenced how they think they are perceived from those watching, thus  
378 negatively affecting their cognitive centrality, "*I mean I feel like if someone else was watching*  
379 *they kind of think we were just a bunch of random people. Not like a really good team, which is*

380 *kind of important to me*” (Team #1, BTM, Female, Median, P02). The athlete then went on to  
381 discuss how the interaction impacted the athlete’s ingroup affect, *“It’s not a good feeling, some*  
382 *of my athletes aren’t getting along. If someone else was watching I’d be kind of ashamed* (Team  
383 #1, BTM, Female, Median, P02).

384 Athletes also described how these negative interactions can influence and disrupt their  
385 team by affecting their perceptions of ingroup ties towards each other. As an example, one  
386 athlete described how physically pushing each other can negatively affect cohesion amongst the  
387 team, *“I wouldn’t want that at all, I would want that to stop cause it’s just not nice. Even that*  
388 *could hurt someone, then they wouldn’t feel good and then they wouldn’t be a part of the team*  
389 *anymore because of that one person. I don’t think it’s good for the team it could break us up”*  
390 (Team #2, PW, Female, Low, P06). This physical mode of antisocial behaviour was evident on  
391 one of the bantam teams, as one of the athletes described a situation of one athlete deliberately  
392 hitting and concussing another teammate. These actions were described as unacceptable and  
393 separated team members from this individual, *“I didn’t like that at all like I was watching and I*  
394 *saw it all perfectly and it just made me feel like he shouldn’t, I don’t know he shouldn’t be doing*  
395 *that kind of stuff especially to your own team. He should of known better. It just made me like*  
396 *that player a little bit less because he like he didn’t care about the other player’s feelings”*  
397 (Team #4, BTM, Male, Medium, P11).

### 398 **Justification and Acceptance of Antisocial Behaviour**

399 Athletes who were identified as high in antisocial behaviour towards teammates  
400 frequently reported less of an impact of antisocial teammate behaviour on social identity. This  
401 finding was in contrast to the harmful perceptions of the role of intrateam antisocial behaviour on  
402 social identity by athletes who reported median or low antisocial teammate behaviour. High

403 antisocial athletes often justified or ‘excused’ intrateam antisocial behaviour as having fun or just  
404 fooling around with each other with minimal mention of its impact on the team, “*I guess they*  
405 *were just fooling around or let’s just say chirping each other, a lot of people do that on our team*  
406 *just for fun*” (Team #6, MGT, Male, High, P16). Acceptance of antisocial behaviours was  
407 displayed when athletes viewed physical antisocial behaviours between team members (e.g., play  
408 fighting) as “faking fighting” or “dropping the gloves”, “*They’re just chirping each other and*  
409 *they dropped the gloves, they’re just fooling around. I guess they just wanted to show to each*  
410 *other who would win in a fight. I guess it’s for fun so you have to cheer the guys on*” (Team #6,  
411 MGT, Male, High, P16).

412 In some instances athletes perceived intrateam antisocial behaviour as strengthening  
413 bonds on the team. For instance when watching a clip of a teammate skating up and engaging  
414 another team member in a fight a high antisocial athlete reported, “[*We*] *just pick on each other*  
415 *it’s kind of fun, It kind keeps you entertained. You have your place in the social part of the team*  
416 (Team #5, BTM, Male, High, P13). A similar sentiment of antisocial behaviour being viewed as  
417 positively influencing the team was highlighted by the same athlete when watching an athlete  
418 squirt another athlete in the face with water, “*It’s actually more positive, it makes you feel like*  
419 *you’re part of the team. I think that it just makes it’s good and now you know that you’re part of*  
420 *the team. It’s good that we like to make people feel welcome*” (Team #5, BTM, Male, High,  
421 P13).

## 422 **Gender and Antisocial Teammate Behaviour**

423 Two gender-specific sub-themes emerged within each of the broader themes associated  
424 with how antisocial behaviours occurred and were commonly perceived in relation to social  
425 identity (i.e., justification and acceptance of antisocial behaviour and social harms stemming

426 from antisocial behaviour). Specifically, these sub-themes related to: (1) physical aggression  
427 contributing to negative affect on male teams, and (2) “two-faced” athletes and cliques  
428 negatively impacting ingroup ties on female teams. In addition to these themes, one negative  
429 case emerged from the interviews. A negative case is “a case that doesn’t fit the pattern” (Strauss  
430 & Corbin, 2010, p. 84). In this instance, a female goalie on a male team shared how antisocial  
431 teammate behaviour directed toward her impacted her social identity.

432         **Physical aggression contributing to negative affect on male teams.** For the male  
433 teams, antisocial behaviour was commonly stated as being verbally and physically overt and  
434 directed towards their teammates. Similar to the overall findings, there was a range in male  
435 athlete responses toward antisocial teammate behaviour based on the player’s frequency of  
436 antisocial behaviour. Couched within the *justification and acceptance of antisocial behaviour*  
437 theme, high antisocial males were more accepting and approving of the behaviour in comparison  
438 with median and low antisocial team members. High antisocial male athletes often rationalized  
439 the antisocial interactions such as picking on team members and slashing one another as means  
440 of making fun and joking around with team members. For example, when viewing an antisocial  
441 clip of two athletes pushing each other and firing a puck at each other, a high antisocial male  
442 athlete commented, “...it seems kind of friendly, that they are not trying to kill each other (Team  
443 #7, PW, Male, High, P19).

444         On the other hand, median and low antisocial behaviour males were less accepting and at  
445 times expressed frustration and decreased ingroup affect associated with the antisocial teammate  
446 behaviour – representing males’ perspectives within the *social harms stemming from antisocial*  
447 *behaviour* theme. For instance, when viewing two teammates fighting in practice, one medium  
448 antisocial behaviour team members shared the following, “Kind of anger and just worrying

449 *about the status and the kind of relationship that could end up hurting the team. If I was part of*  
450 *one (a fight) it would definitely make me feel like I was less part of the team”* (Team #6, MGT,  
451 Male, Median, P17). As another example, when recalling an instance in practice in which a  
452 player concussed a team member the athlete expressed his disapproval, *“I didn’t like that at all, I*  
453 *was watching and I saw it all perfectly and it just make me feel like he shouldn’t be doing that*  
454 *kind of stuff especially to your own team... He should have known better, it just made me like*  
455 *that player a little less because he didn’t care about the other player’s feelings”* (Team #4, BTM,  
456 Male, Median, P11).

457 **“Two-faced” athletes and cliques negatively impacting ingroup ties on female teams.**  
458 Female athletes reported antisocial behaviour as more verbal and covert than the male athletes  
459 particularly for off-ice behaviour away from the rink. Although the stimulated recall clips were  
460 of on-ice incidents, the conversations often moved to off-ice antisocial teammate behaviour. For  
461 the female athletes, this covert, verbal antisocial intrateam behaviour was often described as  
462 “two-faced” and negatively influenced social identity. This was highlighted by one female  
463 athlete who stated, *“You’ll be on the ice you know you have that face where everyone is your*  
464 *friend, but as soon as you’re out of it they’ll be girls talking bad about other girls on their team.*  
465 *There were just some girls that were saying to her like, not to her face. To her face they were*  
466 *totally nice and then off from her face they were kind of like a different person like they aren’t on*  
467 *the same team”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, Low, P03). Concerning the *justification and*  
468 *acceptance of antisocial behaviour* theme, all female athletes – not only athletes reporting high  
469 levels of antisocial behaviour toward teammates – inadvertently excused the covert nature of  
470 antisocial behaviour among team members by expressing the general sentiment that ‘it just  
471 happens’. For example, a female athlete describes the two-faced nature of team members using a

472 similar phrase: *“It happens; it’s pretty much like most girls that live a second life. Like they talk*  
473 *bad about girls outside of hockey and then in hockey it’s like it never happened...I don’t think it*  
474 *is good at all because I don’t get how they can act like it’s all good at the arena, but as soon as*  
475 *you’re out of school you know cause that girls is at a different school you can just say whatever*  
476 *you want”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, Low, P03).

477 Female athletes reported more cliques and instances of exclusion than males as illustrated  
478 here, *“Well our team is like there is a little bit of cliques here and there. There’s one group it’s*  
479 *kind of like the older kids, none of the younger kids so it’s kind of a little scary sometimes. They*  
480 *think they’re too good for our team.”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, Median, P02). In addition to age,  
481 the perceived thought of why athletes formed cliques on their team was highlighted by another  
482 athlete that focused more on athletes being segregated by skill level, *“They think they’re too*  
483 *good for our team, if they think that then they think “why do I have to be friends with all these*  
484 *people, I’m never going to play with them again cause I’m always going to be on a higher team”*  
485 (Team #1, BTM, Female, Median, P02). A third interpretation was offered by one athlete who  
486 felt that some athletes just don’t know each other well enough: *“There are certain people on our*  
487 *team that don’t get along. It’s just because they barely know each other so they just judge each*  
488 *other I guess”* (Team #2, PW, Female, High, P04).

489 Additionally, female athletes reporting low or median levels of intrateam antisocial  
490 behaviour identified a number of social harms related to antisocial behaviour among teammates.  
491 The covert antisocial intrateam behaviour was found to affect ingroup ties, particularly  
492 perceptions of bonding away from the rink. It was difficult for females to understand why team  
493 members would act prosocially at the rink and then antisocially off ice away from the rink. *“As*  
494 *soon as we step into the arena you feel it immediately like I’m there with my girls and were just*

495 *going to have fun on the ice. Cause as soon as you walk out the doors of the arena it totally just*  
496 *disappears.”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, Low P03). In a similar vein, the notion of teammate  
497 exclusion emerged in the female athlete interviews. As an example, a female athlete discussed  
498 the frustration from a team member being excluded. *“We have a couple people that try and ruin*  
499 *things I guess you can say. People don’t usually include her in very many things. And she just*  
500 *kind of gets frustrated and [retaliates]”* (Team #1, BTM, Female, Median, P02). Interestingly  
501 “cliques” were also uncovered when female athletes observed coded positive teammate  
502 interventions. When presented a clip of two teammates high fiving each other after a goal in  
503 practice, one female athlete described how it was a clique of girls on the team that kept to  
504 themselves. Thus, from an outside perspective what appeared to be prosocial was actually  
505 antisocial in nature. *“They’re like one group, and it’s kind of the older kids, none of the younger*  
506 *kids...they usually do that [celebrate/high five]. It’s only with their friends”* (Team #1, BTM,  
507 Female, Median, P02).

508 **Negative Case: Female goalie on a male team.** On one of the male bantam teams there  
509 was a female goalie that played throughout their season. When interviewing her and her  
510 teammates, there appeared to be difficulty associated with being a lone female athlete amongst a  
511 male team that brought upon intrateam antisocial behaviour that negatively affected her social  
512 identity. For instance the female goalie highlighted how team members would question her  
513 ability and place on the team through chirping and poking fun at her, which produced a feeling of  
514 sadness and a desire to prove herself to the team. These antisocial behaviours being targeted at  
515 her by her male teammates also created a feeling of isolation from the rest of the team and  
516 created low feelings of team connectedness, *“Made me feel, like I wasn’t part of the team and*



517 *they were excluding me. I felt, like less a member of the team because I didn't feel a part of it*  
518 *because it was mostly all of them teaming up on me.”* (Team #4, BTM, Female, Low, P12).

519 Interestingly, although the antisocial verbal behaviours were often viewed by the female  
520 athlete and some of her male team members as harmful to her social identity, the female athlete  
521 revealed that she felt some of the antisocial behaviours directed towards her made her feel more  
522 like a part of the team (e.g., being treated like any other player on the team). *“In some ways it's*  
523 *like a negative influence but, I feel part of the team when that (negative chirping) happens. I*  
524 *know that they do that to each other, and that if they are going to do it to each other I would*  
525 *rather them do it to me as well, 'cause then it is no different for anyone else no matter who they*  
526 *are”* (Team#4, BTM, Female, Low, P12). Taken together, the contrasting views both negative  
527 and positive of teammate antisocial behaviour on social identity differentiated the female athlete  
528 from the rest of the data.

## 529 **Discussion**

530 The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the social identity and  
531 intrateam moral behaviour relationship in youth competitive ice hockey. The study findings  
532 extend previous empirical research on social identity and intrateam moral behaviour in youth  
533 sport (Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014) by providing an in depth understanding of the relationship  
534 between intrateam moral behaviour and social identity. Athletes uniformly perceived prosocial  
535 teammate behaviour as increasing athletes' perceptions of social identity. However, the influence  
536 of antisocial behaviour was found to vary based on the frequency of antisocial behaviour of the  
537 athlete. Median and low antisocial behaviour team members perceived antisocial teammate  
538 behaviour as harmful toward the thoughts (i.e., cognitive centrality), bonds (i.e., ingroup ties),  
539 and feelings (ingroup affect) toward the team. In contrast, high antisocial behaviour team

540 members didn't perceive their antisocial actions as detrimental to the team and other athletes'  
541 perceptions of social identity often viewing them as joking and fooling.

542 A key finding consistent with a proactive morality was that all athletes conceived prosocial  
543 behaviour toward team members as positively impacting social identity. From a theoretical  
544 perspective, this result aligns with Bandura's (1999) Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) indicating  
545 that prosocial behaviour toward teammates may be motivated by the pleasant emotions (e.g.,  
546 pride) that would be anticipated to result from engaging in prosocial acts toward teammates.  
547 Empirically, the finding supports social identity research in sport which found ingroup affect,  
548 positive feelings toward the team, to be associated with prosocial behaviour toward teammates in  
549 a sample of youth engaged in a variety of high school sports (Bruner, Boardley et al., 2014). The  
550 finding also supports key tenets of SIT theory indicating the prosocial behaviour toward group  
551 members may in part be driven by an individual's motivation to create and maintain a positive  
552 self-concept including the social groups they are a part of (Tajfel, 1981).

553 Unlike the uniform perceptions of prosocial teammate behaviour on social identity, athletes'  
554 perceptions of the effects of antisocial behavior toward teammates on social identity differed  
555 depending on the frequency with which they reported engaging in such behaviour. To elaborate,  
556 athletes reporting median or low frequencies of antisocial behaviour toward teammates viewed  
557 antisocial teammate behaviour as harmful to social identity. Similar to the prosocial behaviour  
558 finding, this is consistent with SIT and SCT theories. For SCT, the result is consistent with  
559 Bandura's (1999) suggestion that people refrain from engaging in activities that have negative  
560 emotional outcomes (i.e., socially and/or personally). For SIT, the finding supports Tajfel's  
561 supposition that individual's may be motivated to refrain from antisocial behaviour toward group  
562 members for fear of diminishing the positive self-concept of the group.

563 In contrast to the athletes who reported engaging in median and low frequencies of intrateam  
564 antisocial behavior, the athletes who reported engaging in a high frequency of antisocial  
565 behaviour justified and downplayed the negative outcomes of such conduct. In terms of how  
566 athletes justified such behaviours, numerous statements reflected mechanisms of moral  
567 disengagement (see Bandura, 1991; Boardley & Kavussanu, 2011). Moral disengagement is a  
568 collective term representing eight psychosocial mechanisms through which people can justify  
569 and rationalize harmful acts and prevent anticipating negative emotions (e.g., guilt, shame) that  
570 should normally deter such behavior (Bandura, 1991, 2002). Three mechanisms that were  
571 evident in athletes who reported high frequency of antisocial behavior toward teammates when  
572 discussing such conduct were moral justification, euphemistic labelling, advantageous  
573 comparison, and diffusion of responsibility.

574 Moral justification involves cognitive reconstrual of transgressive behavior as achieving  
575 social or moral purposes thus rendering it personally and socially acceptable (Bandura, 1991).  
576 Athletes who engaged frequently in antisocial teammate behaviours evidenced this mechanism  
577 by portraying beneficial and positive outcomes for social identity stemming from intrateam  
578 antisocial behaviour. For example, one athlete morally justified engaging in a fight with another  
579 teammate *“It’s actually more positive, it makes you feel like you’re part of the team. I think that  
580 it just makes it’s good and now you know that you’re part of the team. It’s good that we like to  
581 make people feel welcome”* (Team #5, BTM, Male, High, P13).

582 As evidenced by the previous example, athletes who engaged in moral justification to  
583 rationalize the antisocial teammate behaviours also used euphemistic labelling, involving the  
584 selective use of language to cognitively disguise the transgressive acts as less harmful (Bandura,  
585 1999). In this instance, the athlete described how fighting with a team member was a part of

586 ‘making the athlete feel welcome’. Use of another moral disengagement mechanism –  
587 advantageous comparison – was also evident. This mechanism involves comparing a harmful act  
588 with one perceived to be more heinous, thus making make the former behavior appear trivial in  
589 comparison. For example, one male antisocial athlete indicated “..it [shooting pucks at each  
590 other] seems kind of friendly that they are not trying to kill each other” (P19). Through use of  
591 advantageous comparison, the athlete is implying firing pucks at one another is inconsequential –  
592 or could even be deemed friendly – when - or even.

593 A final mechanism – diffusion of responsibility – was also apparent. Diffusion of  
594 responsibility involves diminishing person accountability for harmful behaviour and/or its  
595 outcomes through the division of labor, group decision-making or group action (Bandura, 1991).  
596 In sport, group decision making (i.e., collective decisions relating to engagement in transgressive  
597 acts) or group action (i.e., collective engagement in a harmful action) are most often seen (see  
598 Boardley & Kavussanu, 2011). Of the two, group action was manifested here. An example of  
599 this is seen in one player who said, “*I guess they were just fooling around or let’s just say*  
600 *chirping each other, a lot of people do that on our team just for fun*” (Team #6, MGT, Male,  
601 High, P16). As seen earlier, euphemistic labelling is again evident here, with the athlete  
602 sanitizing the nature of antisocial behavior by describing it as ‘just fooling around’. As such, the  
603 current findings support Bandura’s (1991) theory in that athletes who engaged frequently in  
604 antisocial behaviour evidenced moral disengagement when discussing such actions. As such, the  
605 current findings are consistent with the developing body of literature highlighting the importance  
606 of moral disengagement for our understanding of antisocial behaviour in sport (e.g., Boardley, in  
607 press).

608 Gender-specific themes relating to antisocial behaviour toward teammates and social identity  
609 made unique contributions to the extant literature. More specifically, our findings showed how  
610 male athletes reported more verbal and physically overt antisocial behaviour while females  
611 reported more covert, verbal antisocial intrateam behaviour. This discovery adds to current  
612 findings that show males engage more frequently than females in antisocial behavior toward  
613 teammates (e.g., Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu et al., 2009). Gender also appeared to  
614 play a role in how antisocial teammate behaviour influenced social identity. More specifically,  
615 median and low antisocial male athletes reported how physical antisocial teammate behaviour  
616 was a source of frustration for the athletes decreasing ingroup affect. The impact of off-ice  
617 antisocial verbal behaviour by females (e.g., two faced, covert, verbal behaviour behind athletes  
618 backs) on ingroup ties of the team was observed. Collectively, the findings contribute to the role  
619 of gender in understanding antisocial behaviour toward team members and social identity.

620 The presence of greater covert, verbal antisocial behaviour and cliques in females  
621 particularly in off-ice settings and cliques was also particularly notable in conjunction with  
622 recent work on the facilitative and debilitating consequences of subgroups in sport (Martin,  
623 Evans, & Spink, 2016; Martin, Wilson, Evans, & Spink, 2015). In their discussion of coaches'  
624 and athletes' perceptions of subgroups, Martin and colleagues (2015) identified both positive  
625 (e.g., motivation, support) and negative outcomes associated with subgroups. The authors also  
626 reported the connotation of cliques as negative subgroups. Based on the previous findings  
627 identifying the potential for subgroups to be inclusive or problematic demonstrating exclusionary  
628 behaviours resulting in the debilitating outcomes to the individual and team (Martin et al., 2015),  
629 the off-ice and clique findings reported by the female athletes in the present study were  
630 problematic decreasing ingroup ties.

631 During the analysis, a negative case (i.e., a case that did not fit in with the pattern of the data)  
632 was revealed when a female goalie revealed conflicting feelings associated with antisocial  
633 behaviours from her all-male teammates. This player shared feelings of isolation and decreased  
634 social identity, but also indicated that negative verbal comments or ‘chirps’ from team members  
635 made her feel like a part of the team. At first glance, a negative case may appear to negate the  
636 main findings; however, the inclusion of such a case offers richness and complexity in exploring  
637 the social identity construct (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Research in the physical education context  
638 has also used negative cases to help fully explain teachers’ perceptions of enhancers and  
639 inhibitors to physical education curriculum change (Bechtel & Sullivan, 2007).

640 The use of stimulated recall combining observation and qualitative interviews provided  
641 novel insight into perceptions of social identity and teammate behaviour in youth sport. As a  
642 concrete benefit of the method, a female athlete watching teammates high five, which was  
643 categorized as a prosocial behaviour was perceived to be an antisocial behaviour due to the team  
644 members acting as a clique and only congratulating themselves after a good play. Without the  
645 use of stimulated recall as a method, the connection and richness of the observation data and  
646 athlete’s interpretations would be lost. The findings support the utility of the method to examine  
647 moral behaviour in sport (Shapcott et al., 2007; Traclet et al. 2011).

648 As with any study, this one is not without its limitations and the findings should therefore  
649 be interpreted with these in mind. First, the research involved the lone perspective of the athletes  
650 on the observed teammate behaviour. It may be beneficial to gain alternate perspectives of the  
651 athlete moral behaviours from coaches and parents. Second, the video observation sessions were  
652 taped during two practices midseason. To address this limitation, future research may examine  
653 teammate interactions in competition as well as off-ice settings given the noted off-ice issues

654 particularly for females (see Rutten, Deković, Stams, Schuengel, Hoeksma, & Biesta, 2008 for  
655 an example of such an approach). A third limitation of the study was that athletes were not  
656 separated by gender prior to data analysis, which may have led to some gender-specific themes  
657 not being identified. Although gender-specific themes emerged (i.e., greater off-ice issues and  
658 cliques for females, more physical, overt behavior in males), the identification of such themes  
659 was not the primary focus of the study. However, it may be interesting in future research to  
660 analyze data from males and females separately to see if any further on-and off-ice gender-  
661 specific themes relating to moral behavior and social identity become apparent.

662         Beyond those already identified when discussing study limitations above, there are  
663 number of additional avenues of future research stemming from the current work. For example,  
664 based on the rationalizations offered by athletes reporting high frequencies of antisocial  
665 behaviour (e.g., goofing around, having fun), it would appear constructive to more in-depthly  
666 examine the moral disengagement mechanisms used by athletes to justify antisocial behaviour  
667 (e.g., Traclet et al., 2011). It may also be beneficial to examine the role of gender in the social  
668 identity-moral behaviour relationship in a larger sample using advanced statistics to account for  
669 the nested nature of the participants on intact teams (e.g., multi-level analyses) and explore the  
670 efficacy of a coaching intervention to improve social identity and intrateam behaviour in youth  
671 sport. Finally, researchers could also investigate social identity and moral behaviour in other  
672 sport settings beyond the competitive youth hockey environment, such as interdependent sport  
673 settings in which athletes train together but compete separately (Evans, Eys, & Bruner, 2012).

674         In addition to the conceptual and empirical contributions of the study to the extant  
675 literature, the findings have practical implications for coaches and sport practitioners. The results  
676 offer support for coaches and practitioners to allocate time with their athletes to establish a team

677 social identity and promote prosocial teammate behaviour and dissuade antisocial teammate  
678 behaviour in practice, competition and social settings. The reported differences in perceptions of  
679 antisocial behaviour by high antisocial team members is a finding for coaches to be cognizant of  
680 with their teams. Furthermore, the gender findings provide additional considerations for coaches  
681 of male (e.g., to watch for overt, physical antisocial teammate behaviour) and female (e.g., to  
682 watch for covert, verbal antisocial teammate behaviour and cliques at the rink and at social  
683 settings) teams.

#### 684 **Conclusion**

685         Since Tajfel and Turner's early research in the 1970s, laboratory and field research  
686 highlights how ones' group identification may have important implications for moral behaviour  
687 (Horney, 2008). The results from the present study support and extend the salient role that social  
688 identity may play on teammate behaviour in youth sport and vice versa. Youth sport coaches and  
689 practitioners should aim to build a sport team environment to foster social identity and prosocial  
690 behaviour toward team members.



691

**References**

- 692 Allen, J. B. (2003). Social motivation in youth sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise*  
693 *Psychology, 25*(4), 551-567.
- 694 Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines, & J.  
695 L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Theory, research and*  
696 *applications* (pp. 71-129). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- 697 Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and*  
698 *Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193–209. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303\_3
- 699 Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of*  
700 *Moral Education, 31*(2), 101-119.
- 701 Bechtel, P. A., & Sullivan, M. O. (2007). Enhancers and inhibitors of teacher change among  
702 secondary physical educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*, 221–235.
- 703 Boardley, I. D. (in press). Moral behavior in sport and physical activity. In T. Horn & A. Smith  
704 (Eds.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Champaign, IL: Human  
705 Kinetics.
- 706 Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2009). The influence of social variables and moral  
707 disengagement on prosocial and antisocial behaviours in field hockey and netball. *Journal*  
708 *of Sports Sciences, 27*(8), 843-854. doi:10.1080/02640410902887283
- 709 Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2010). Effects of goal orientation and perceived value of  
710 toughness on antisocial behavior in soccer: The mediating role of moral  
711 disengagement. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 32*(2), 176-192.
- 712 Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2011). Moral disengagement in sport. *International Review of*  
713 *Sport and Exercise Psychology, 4*(2), 93-108. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2011.570361

- 714 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
715 *Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- 716 Bruner, M. W., Boardley, I., & Côté, J. (2014). Social identity and prosocial and antisocial  
717 behaviour in youth sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15(1), 56-64.  
718 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.09.003
- 719 Bruner, M. W., Dunlop, W., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2014). A social identity perspective on group  
720 processes in sport and exercise. In M. R. Beauchamp & M. A. Eys (Eds.), *Group Dynamics*  
721 *in Exercise and Sport Psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 38-52), New York, NY: Routledge.
- 722 Buckham, S., Erickson, K., & Côté, J. (2012). Intentions and thought processes behind coach-  
723 athlete interactions. *Eastern Canada Sport and Exercise Psychology Symposium*  
724 *(ECSEPS)*. London, Ontario.
- 725 Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity*, 3(3), 239-262.  
726 doi:10.1080/13576500444000047
- 727 Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 728 Cohen, D. J., & Crabtree, B. F. (2008). Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in health care:  
729 Controversies and recommendations. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 6(4), 331-339.  
730 doi:10.1370/afm.818
- 731 Dempsey, N. P. (2010). Stimulated recall interviews in ethnography. *Qualitative*  
732 *Sociology*, 33(3), 349-367. doi:10.1007/s11133-010-9157-x
- 733 Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, & W. Damon  
734 (Eds.) (5th ed.). *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Social emotional and personality*  
735 *development* (pp. 701-778) New York: Wiley.

- 736 Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behaviour in children*.  
737 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 738 Evans, M. B., Eys, M. A., & Bruner, M. W. (2012). Seeing the 'we' in 'me' sports: The need to  
739 consider individual sport team environments. *Canadian Psychology*, 53(4), 301-308.  
740 doi:10.1037/a0030202
- 741 Eys, M., Loughead, T., Bray, S. R., & Carron, A. V. (2009a). Development of a cohesion  
742 questionnaire for youth: The Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport  
743 and Exercise Psychology*, 31(3), 390–408.
- 744 Eys, M., Loughead, T., Bray, S. R., & Carron, A. V. (2009b). Perceptions of cohesion by youth  
745 sport participants. *The Sports Psychologist*, 23, 330–345.
- 746 Goldman, L., Giles, H., & Hogg, M. A. (2014). Going to extremes: social identity and  
747 communication processes associated with gang membership. *Group Processes and  
748 Intergroup Relations*, 17(6), 813–832. doi:10.1177/1368430214524289
- 749 Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging  
750 confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*  
751 (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- 752 Hardy, J., Eys, M. A., & Carron, A. V. (2005). Exploring the potential disadvantages of high  
753 cohesion in sports teams. *Small Group Research*, 36(2), 166-187.  
754 doi:10.1177/1046496404266715
- 755 Holt, N. L., Black, D. E., Tamminen, K. A., Fox, K. R., & Mandigo, J. L. (2008). Levels of  
756 social complexity and dimensions of peer experiences in youth sport. *Journal of Sport and  
757 Exercise Psychology*, 30(4), 411-431.

- 758 Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review.  
759 *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 204-222.  
760 doi:10.1111/j.17519004.2007.00066.x
- 761 Hornstein, H. A. (1976). *Cruelty and kindness: A new look at aggression and*  
762 *altruism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- 763 Housner, L. D., & Griffey, D. C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and  
764 interactive decision making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. *Research*  
765 *Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 56(1), 45-53. doi:10.1080/02701367.1985.10608430
- 766 Kavussanu, M. (2006). Motivational predictors of prosocial and antisocial behaviour in football.  
767 *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 24, 575-588. doi:10.1080/02640410500190825
- 768 Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. D. (2009). The Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in Sport  
769 Scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 31(1), 97-117.
- 770 Kavussanu, M. & Boardley, I. D. (2010). Prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport. In G.  
771 Tenenbaum, R.Eklund, & A. Kamata (Eds.). *Handbook of measurement in sport and*  
772 *exercise psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 773 Kavussanu, M., Stamp, R., Slade, G., & Ring., C. (2009). Prosocial and antisocial behaviours in  
774 male and female soccer players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21 (Supp.1), S62-  
775 S76. doi:10.1080/10413200802624292
- 776 Lincoln S. Y., Guba E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 777 Long, T., Pantaléon, N., Bruant, G., & d'Arripe-Longueville, F. (2006). A qualitative study of  
778 moral reasoning of young elite athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 330-347.  
779 doi:10.3946/kjme.2006.18.1.41

- 780 Lorimer, R., & Jowett, S. (2009). Empathic accuracy, meta-perspective, and satisfaction in the  
781 coach-athlete relationship. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*(2), 201-212.  
782 doi:10.1080/10413200902777289
- 783 Lyle, J. (2003). Stimulated recall: A report on its use in naturalistic research. *British Educational*  
784 *Research Journal*, *29*(6), 861-878. doi:10.1080/0141192032000137349
- 785 Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, *17*(3), 13-17.
- 786 Martin, L. J., Evans, M. B., & Spink, K. S. (2016). Coach perspectives of “groups within the  
787 group”: An analysis of subgroups and cliques in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*  
788 *Psychology*, *5*(1), 52-66. doi:10.1037/spy0000048
- 789 Martin, J., Martin, W., Meyer, M., & Slemon, A. (1986). Empirical investigation of the cognitive  
790 mediational paradigm for research on counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*,  
791 *33*(2), 115–123. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.33.2.115
- 792 Martin, L. J., Wilson, J., Evans, M. B., & Spink, K. S. (2015). Cliques in Sport: Perceptions of  
793 Intercollegiate Athletes. *Sport Psychologist*, *29*(1), 82-95. doi:10.1123/tsp.2014-0003
- 794 Merrilees, C. E., Cairns, E., Taylor, L. K., Goeke-Morey, M. C., Shirlow, P., & Cummings, E.  
795 M. (2013) Social identity and youth aggressive and delinquent behaviors in a context of  
796 political violence. *Political Psychology*, *34*(5), 695-711. doi:10.1111/pops.12030
- 797 Nezlek, J. B., & Smith, C. V. (2005). Social identity in daily social interaction. *Self and Identity*,  
798 *4*(3), 243-261. doi:10.1080/13576500444000308
- 799 Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 800 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks,  
801 CA: Sage.

- 802 Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior:  
803 multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 365–92.  
804 doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141
- 805 Rutten, E. A., Deković, M., Stams, G. J. J., Schuengel, C., Hoeksma, J. B., & Biesta, G. J.  
806 (2008). On-and off-field antisocial and prosocial behavior in adolescent soccer players: A  
807 multilevel study. *Journal of Adolescence*, *31*(3), 371-387.  
808 doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.06.007
- 809 Sage, L., Kavussanu, M., & Duda, J. (2006). Goal orientations and moral identity as predictors of  
810 prosocial and antisocial functioning in male association football players. *Journal of Sports*  
811 *Sciences*, *24*(5), 455-466. doi:10.1080/02640410500244531
- 812 Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *5*(4), 465-478.  
813 doi:10.1177/107780049900500402
- 814 Shapcott, K. M., Bloom, G. A., & Loughhead, T. M. (2007). An initial exploration of the factors  
815 influencing aggressive and assertive intentions of women ice hockey players. *International*  
816 *Journal of Sport Psychology*, *38*(2), 145-162.
- 817 Sherif, O., Harvey, B., White, J., Hood, W., & Sherif, C. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and*  
818 *cooperation: The robbers cave experiment*. Norman (OK): University Book Exchange, 10.
- 819 Skovdahl, K., Kihlgren, A. L., & Kihlgren, M. (2004). Dementia and aggressiveness: Stimulated  
820 recall interviews with caregivers after video-recorded interactions. *Journal of Clinical*  
821 *Nursing*, *13*(4), 515–525. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2702.2003.00881.x
- 822 Smith, J. (1993). *After the demise of empiricism: The problem of judging social and educational*  
823 *inquiry* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- 824 Smith, M. D. (1979). Towards an explanation of hockey violence: A reference other approach.  
825 *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 4(2), 105-124. doi:10.2307/3339824
- 826 Sparkes, A., & Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health:  
827 From Process to Product*. London: Routledge.
- 828 Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association. (2011). *The state of the industry: SGMA's annual  
829 report on the U.S. sporting goods market*. Washington, DC: Sporting Goods Manufacturers  
830 Association.
- 831 Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (2010). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for  
832 developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 833 Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*.  
834 Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- 835 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin (Ed.),  
836 *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- 837 Tidwell, M. V. (2005). A social identity model of prosocial behaviors within nonprofit  
838 organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(4), 449-467.
- 839 Traçlet, A., Romand, P., Moret, O., & Kavussanu, M. (2011). Antisocial behaviour in soccer: A  
840 qualitative study of moral disengagement. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise  
841 Psychology*, 9(2), 143–155. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2011.567105
- 842 Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative  
843 research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121
- 844 Wagner, W. G. (1996). Facilitating optimal development in adolescence: Introductory  
845 remarks. *Counseling Psychologist*, 24(3), 357-359. doi:10.1177/0011000096243001

- 846 Zitomer, M. R., & Goodwin, D. (2014). Gauging the quality of qualitative research in adapted  
847 physical activity. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, *31*(3), 193-218.  
848 doi:10.1123/apaq.2013-0084



Table 1  
*Theme summary*

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Description of Theme</b>	<b>Gender-Specific Sub-Themes</b>	<b>Participant Characteristics</b>
Prosocial Behaviour & Social Identity	All participants conceived that prosocial teammate behaviour positively influences social identity.	Theme was evenly represented across male and female teams.	All three groups of participants (i.e., high median, low antisocial teammate behaviour).
Social Harms Stemming from Antisocial Behaviour	Athletes who reported median or low levels of antisocial behaviour towards teammates described such behaviour as harmful to the team and also to athletes' social identity.	Physical aggression contributed to negative affect on male teams.  "Two-faced" athletes and cliques adversely impacted ingroup ties on female teams.	Male participants who reported median and low antisocial teammate behaviour.  Female participants who reported median and low antisocial teammate behaviour.
Justification & Acceptance of Antisocial Behaviour	Athletes who reported high levels of antisocial behaviour towards teammates reported less of an impact of antisocial teammate behaviour on social identity often justifying or 'excusing' such behaviour.	Physical aggression accepted or approved as a means of "joking around" on male teams.  "Two-faced" athletes, cliques, and instances of exclusion reported more frequently on female teams.	Male participants who reported high antisocial teammate behaviour.  All three groups of female participants (i.e., high, median, low antisocial teammate behaviour).