UNIVERSITYOF BIRMINGHAM

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

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

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

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, & Loughead, 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[1]; 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_{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

---

[1]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 forth 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 Sparks 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 Tafjel'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 debilitative 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 debilitative 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* (4th 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., & Loughead, 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   Traclet, 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

Theme	Description of Theme	Gender-Specific Sub-Themes	Participant Characteristics
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.	Male participants who reported median and low antisocial teammate behaviour.
		"Two-faced" athletes and cliques adversely impacted ingroup ties on female teams.	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.	Male participants who reported high antisocial teammate behaviour.
		"Two-faced" athletes, cliques, and instances of exclusion reported more frequently on female teams.	All three groups of female participants (i.e., high, median, low antisocial teammate behaviour).

849