
Citation:

Stanger, N and Kavussanu, M and Ring, C (2020) Linking facets of pride with moral behaviour in sport: the mediating role of moral disengagement. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. ISSN 1557-251X DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2020.1830825>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/7121/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* on 22 October 2020, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/1612197X.2020.1830825>

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Linking facets of pride with moral behaviour in sport: the mediating role of moral
disengagement

Nicholas Stanger¹, Maria Kavussanu² & Christopher Ring²

¹Leeds Beckett University; ²University of Birmingham

Manuscript Accepted: 25 September, 2020

Word Count: 5824

Address Correspondence to: Nicholas Stanger,
Leeds Beckett University
Carnegie School of Sport
Fairfax Hall, Headingley Campus
Leeds, LS6 3QS, UK
Telephone: (+44) 113 8123525
E-mail: N.Stanger@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Co-authors email addresses:

Maria Kavussanu: m.kavussanu@bham.ac.uk

Christopher Ring: c.m.ring@bham.ac.uk

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *International Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*

Abstract

Research has yet to examine how authentic and hubristic pride relate to moral behaviour toward teammates and opponents in sport. We investigated the extent to which authentic and hubristic pride are related to prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport directly and indirectly via moral disengagement. Team sport players ($N = 319$) completed measures of pride, prosocial and antisocial behaviour, and moral disengagement. Path analyses revealed that authentic pride was directly and positively associated with prosocial behaviour, while hubristic pride was positively associated with antisocial behaviour directly and indirectly via moral disengagement. Hubristic pride was also indirectly associated with prosocial behaviour toward opponents via moral disengagement. Overall, our findings suggest that interventions that promote authentic pride and deter hubristic pride may foster ethical conduct in competitive sport.

Key words: antisocial behaviour, authentic pride, hubristic pride, prosocial behaviour, self-conscious emotion.

Linking facets of pride with moral behaviour in sport: the mediating role of moral disengagement

Sport is a social context where athletes can engage in a range of prosocial behaviours, defined as actions intended to help or benefit others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998), such as congratulating other players and helping athletes off the ground. At the same time, athletes can engage in antisocial behaviours, defined as actions intended to harm or disadvantage others (Sage, Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006), such as intentionally fouling opponents or verbally abusing teammates. Given the consequences that prosocial and antisocial behaviours can have on others and the potential they can have on sport performance (e.g., Al-Yaaribi, Kavussanu, & Ring, 2016), sport practitioners (e.g., sport psychologists, coaches) may seek to promote prosocial, and deter antisocial, behaviour of their players.

Considerable efforts have been made to better understand correlates of moral behaviour in sport (see Kavussanu & Al-Yaaribi, 2019; Kavussanu & Stanger, 2017). One issue that is receiving recent research attention is the role played by self-conscious emotions (e.g., guilt, shame, pride) in the regulation of moral behaviour. Such emotions arise through self-evaluative processes, whereby attention is drawn to oneself and one's actions, and events are appraised in relation to one's self-representation (e.g., how we may be perceived by others) and identity goals (Tracy & Robins, 2004). For instance, people experience positive self-conscious emotions (e.g., pride when achieving something) when they behave in line, and negative self-conscious emotions (e.g., guilt for doing something wrong) when they behave out of line, with some actual or ideal self-representation or identity goal (Tracy & Robins, 2004). Accordingly, a propensity to experience self-conscious emotions may play a key role in motivating and regulating one's thoughts, feelings and actions, such as driving people to exert effort and perform well in achievement contexts and behave responsibly when interacting with others (e.g., Leith & Baumeister, 1998; Tracy & Robins, 2004). Although

researchers have extensively examined the regulatory role of negatively-valenced self-conscious emotions (e.g., guilt) in relation to moral action in sport (e.g., Kavussanu, Stanger, & Ring, 2015; Stanger, Kavussanu, Boardley, & Ring, 2013), the links between positively-valenced self-conscious emotions and moral behaviour has been neglected. In this study, we sought to address this gap in our understanding by examining the relationship between trait pride, a positively-valenced self-conscious emotional disposition, and moral behaviour in sport.

Pride and Moral Behaviour

Pride is an emotion experienced when attention is paid to oneself and events are appraised as being relevant and congruent to one's identity and goals (Tracy & Robins, 2004). It is a self-conscious emotion that is often experienced in achievement contexts (Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007). Pride comprises two independent facets that arise from different internal attributions and have differential links with moral conduct (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007). Although both facets can be considered at a state and trait level, we focus on trait forms of pride throughout this paper which reflects the dispositional tendency to experience each facet of pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). One facet is authentic pride, which is based on one's own accomplishments, reflects genuine feelings of self-worth, and arises from unstable and controllable attributions (e.g., "I was successful because I worked hard") (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Thus, when experiencing authentic pride, accomplishment is process-oriented (e.g., via effort), and adaptive achievement-related behaviours and feelings of confidence and fulfillment are more likely (Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007).

It has also been proposed that authentic pride is linked with achieving success because it is relationship-oriented (e.g., getting along with others), which may promote prosocial behaviours in the pursuit of success, such as helping and supporting others (Tracy & Robins,

2007). In contrast, engagement in antisocial behaviours may run counter to authentic pride because it does not align to being relationship-oriented and achieving success via antisocial behaviours may not reflect one's genuine effort or skills (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007). In line with these propositions, authentic pride has been positively associated with prosocial behaviour in high school and university students (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015), and respect for the rules and opponents in sport (Bureau, Vallerand, Ntoumanis, & Lafranière, 2013). Moreover, authentic pride has been negatively associated with antisocial behaviour (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015) and hostility (Carver, Sinclair, & Johnson, 2010) in students. However, authentic pride has also been weakly related with cheating in paintballing and immoral behaviour in sport (measured as antisocial behaviour toward opponents, cheating, and gamespersonship behaviours) (Bureau et al., 2013).

The second facet of pride is hubristic pride, which is an emotion based on beliefs about one's abilities, that arises from stable and uncontrollable attributions that are global in nature (e.g., "I am successful because I'm naturally talented") and that reflect superiority over others (Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007). Therefore, a defeat or failure to demonstrate success over others may threaten one's global sense of worth (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007). Hubristic pride also stems from egotistical feelings and arrogance (Tracy & Robins, 2007) reflective of negative traits, such as narcissism (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009). It has been suggested that hubristic pride can promote antisocial behaviour when seeking to demonstrate superiority and dominance over others, particularly if one's pride is threatened (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Accordingly, hubristic pride can foster aggression and hostility toward others, especially to those perceived to be opponents (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Hubristic pride has been positively associated with antisocial behaviour (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015) and aggression (Carver et al., 2010) in everyday life, and with cheating and immoral behaviour in sport (Bureau et al., 2013). It has also been weakly linked to prosocial

behaviour in everyday life (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015), and negatively linked with respect toward opponents and officials in sport (Bureau et al., 2013).

The aforementioned evidence suggests that the two facets of pride are distinct in terms of their causes and their cognitive, affective and behavioural consequences (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Authentic pride arises from self-evaluations of “doing” (e.g., process-oriented) whereas hubristic pride arises from self-evaluations of “being” (e.g., global ability) (Carver et al., 2010; Lewis, 2010). Moreover, authentic and hubristic pride exhibit different relationships with moral behaviour (e.g., Bureau et al., 2013; Krettenauer & Casey, 2015).

To date, only one study has examined whether facets of pride are linked with moral behaviour in sport, namely antisocial-related and respectful behaviours directed toward opponents or officials (Bureau et al., 2013). No study has investigated whether facets of pride are linked with antisocial (e.g., verbally abusing teammates) and prosocial (e.g., encouraging and supporting teammates) behaviours directed toward teammates in sport. Previous research has revealed that prosocial behaviour toward teammates and opponents, and antisocial behaviour toward teammates and opponents, have been positively associated with medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Graupensperger, Jensen, & Evans, 2018). However, from a social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), the competitive nature of sport could also result in athletes developing a stronger identity toward their in-group (i.e., teammates), that may lead them to behave differently toward them than toward their out-group (opponents) (e.g., Graupensperger et al., 2018; Kavussanu, Boardley, Sagar, & Ring, 2013). Indeed, studies have shown that players’ social identity with their team was associated with greater prosocial and less antisocial behaviour toward teammates, and less prosocial behaviour toward opponents (e.g., Benson, Bruner, & Eys, 2017; Bruner, Boardley, & Cote, 2014). Given that identities, goals and self-representations (which can reflect social influences, such as how others may perceive us and our reputation) are involved in the

elicitation of pride (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007), examining how the distinct facets of pride are linked with prosocial and antisocial toward both teammates and opponents is warranted.

The Role of Moral Disengagement

Research has also yet to examine variables that may account for the link between facets of pride and prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport. One potential variable is moral disengagement, which refers to a set of eight psychosocial mechanisms that justify or rationalise antisocial behaviour by stopping the perpetrator from experiencing negative self-evaluative emotional reactions, such as guilt, that normally regulate such conduct (Bandura, 1991). These mechanisms are moral justification, advantageous comparison, euphemistic labelling, diffusion of responsibility, displacement of responsibility, distortion of consequences, dehumanization, and attribution of blame (Bandura, 1991, 1999). Moral disengagement has been positively and moderately-to-strongly associated with antisocial behaviour in sport (e.g., Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009, 2010; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Stanger, Backhouse, Jennings, & McKenna, 2018; Stanger et al., 2013). Moreover, it has been proposed that moral disengagement may also be linked with reduced prosocial behaviour (e.g., Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996). For instance, dehumanisation and attribution of blame mechanisms may attenuate empathic feelings toward others, leading to less prosocial conduct (Bandura et al., 1996; Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009). Indeed, moral disengagement has been negatively associated with prosocial behaviour in sport, particularly toward opponents (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015), but also been more weakly associated or unrelated with prosocial behaviour, particularly toward teammates (e.g., Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Stanger et al., 2018). In general though, these links are not as strong as those with antisocial behaviour.

Given that trait authentic pride is a process-oriented emotional disposition, it is possible that it is associated with lower inclination to morally disengage. Individuals with a propensity to experience authentic pride attribute achievement through personal effort and self-direction (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007), which are reflective of self-regulatory processes associated with demonstrating higher personal responsibility for one's behaviour (e.g., Hellison, 2003). Accordingly, authentic pride may reduce moral disengagement via limiting the likelihood of one to diffuse or displace responsibility of one's action on to others. In contrast, as individuals prone to hubristic pride attribute achievement through one's global ability and failing to demonstrate superiority may threaten global self-worth (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007), trait hubristic pride could make it more likely to justify transgressive behaviour by making it more acceptable by deeming such conduct to serve a moral purpose, such as helping protect one's self-worth (e.g., moral justification). Indeed, it has been theorized that hubristic managers in organizations may have impaired moral awareness and are therefore more likely to morally disengage and commit unethical behaviours (McManus, 2018). Thus, the different relationships for authentic and hubristic pride with prosocial and antisocial behaviours may be due to their distinct relationships with moral disengagement. However, research has yet to address this possibility.

The Present Research

In sum, the two different facets of pride may have implications for our understanding of moral behaviour in sport. To date, only one study has examined the link between the two facets of pride and moral behaviour toward opponents in sport (Bureau et al., 2013). We don't know whether their findings also extend to moral behaviour toward teammates. In addition, no study has considered the mechanism through which facets of pride may be associated with moral behaviour in sport. We aimed to address these gaps in the literature and in this study we had two purposes. First, to examine whether authentic and hubristic pride

are associated with prosocial and antisocial behaviours in sport directed toward teammates and opponents. We expected that authentic pride would be positively associated with prosocial behaviour and negatively associated with antisocial behaviour toward teammates and opponents, while the reverse relationships were expected for hubristic pride (e.g., Bureau et al., 2013; Carver et al., 2010; Krettenauer & Casey, 2015).

Our second study purpose was to determine whether any pride-behaviour relationships are indirectly linked via moral disengagement. Similar to conceptual models involving moral disengagement (e.g., Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011), we also examined whether moral disengagement was associated with prosocial and antisocial behaviour directed toward both teammates and opponents. It was expected that hubristic pride would be positively, and authentic pride negatively, associated with moral disengagement. In turn, moral disengagement was expected to be positively associated with antisocial behaviours and negatively associated with prosocial behaviours (e.g., Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Stanger et al., 2018).

Method

Participants

Participants were 319 university team sport players¹ (204 men, 115 women) with an average age of 20.14 ($SD = 2.48$) years. They competed in soccer ($n = 157$), field hockey ($n = 64$), netball ($n = 43$), rugby ($n = 38$), basketball ($n = 9$), korfbal ($n = 5$), and lacrosse ($n = 3$) for an average of 9.18 ($SD = 3.97$) years. Their highest level of competition was international/national (10%), regional/ county (50%) and club (40%).

Measures

Prosocial and antisocial behaviour. The 20-item Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in Sport Scale (PABSS; Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009) was used to measure athletes' prosocial and antisocial behaviour towards both teammates and opponents in sport. The

PABSS comprises four subscales that measure: antisocial behaviour towards opponents (8 items; e.g., deliberately fouled an opponent), antisocial behaviour towards teammates (5 items; e.g., verbally abused a teammate), prosocial behaviour towards opponents (3 items; e.g., helped an injured opponent) and prosocial behaviour towards teammates (4 items; e.g., congratulated a teammate for good play). Participants were asked how often they engaged in each behaviour whilst competing in their team sport during the past 12 months on a 5-point Likert type scale anchored by 1 (*never*) and 5 (*very often*). Research has supported the validity of the PABSS, and all subscale scores had satisfactory internal consistency (alpha range: .73 to .86) (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013).

Moral disengagement. Moral disengagement in sport was measured using the 8-item Moral Disengagement in Sport Scale – Short (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2008). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement to statements on a 7-point Likert type scale, anchored by 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). An example item is “bending the rules is a way of evening things up”. Each item assesses one of the eight mechanisms of moral disengagement. Psychometric support for the scale has been provided with alpha coefficients ranging from .80 to .85 (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2008).

Pride. Pride in sport was measured using the 7-item scales assessing trait Authentic Pride and Hubristic Pride (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Consistent with previous research (e.g., Bureau et al., 2013; Fontana, Fry, & Cramer, 2017), we adapted the stem to assess how athletes generally feel in their sport. Specifically, participants responded to each item following the stem “When playing sport, I generally feel ...” on a 5-point Likert -type scale, with anchors of 1 (*not at all*) and 5 (*extremely*). Example items for authentic pride are “accomplished” and “successful”, and example items for hubristic pride are “smug”, and “arrogant”. Tracy and Robins (2007) provided psychometric support for the scales to measure

trait pride, with satisfactory internal consistencies for both authentic ($\alpha = .88$) and hubristic ($\alpha = .90$) pride subscales.

Procedure

Following ethical approval from the university ethics committee, participants were approached by the first author through university sport clubs at training or sporting events, or during academic sessions. Participants were provided with an information sheet informing them about the study purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, they were assured questionnaires were completed and securely stored anonymously, and they were reminded about their right to withdraw. After completing a consent form, participants completed the questionnaire comprising the measures described above. Once completed, participants returned it directly back to the researcher and were thanked for taking part.

Data Analysis

Data were first checked for missing data and normality. Then, correlational analyses were performed to examine relationships between variables. Subsequently, to test whether facets of pride were directly and indirectly linked with each type of prosocial and antisocial behaviour via moral disengagement, we used path analysis using Stata v14. Model fits were assessed using the chi-square test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and standardised root mean squared residual (SRMR). Values of CFI and TLI $> .90$, and RMSEA and SRMR $\leq .08$, were considered to reflect adequate model fit, whereas CFI and TLI $> .95$, and RMSEA and SRMR $\leq .06$, were considered to present excellent model fit (e.g., Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004). To examine for indirect effects we employed bootstrapping (e.g., Shrout & Bolger, 2002) with 1,000 bootstrap samples to calculate the estimate of the indirect effect and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Evidence of an indirect effect is provided when the CI for the indirect effect does not cross zero.

Results

Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Coefficients, and Correlations

Data screening revealed that 16 cases of data were missing (0.12%). Due to the small amount of data assumed to be missing at random, we calculated the mean of the remaining non-missing items from the respective subscale (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). No extreme outliers were identified, and univariate skewness and kurtosis values indicated no significant deviation from normality. The means and standard deviations for each variable, alpha coefficients and correlation coefficients are presented in Table 1. Alpha coefficients were acceptable for all scales. Authentic pride was positively associated with prosocial behaviour towards teammates and opponents, whereas hubristic pride was positively associated with moral disengagement and antisocial behaviour towards opponents and teammates. Moral disengagement was positively associated with antisocial behaviour towards teammates and opponents, and negatively associated with prosocial behaviour towards opponents. Also, as indicated in Table 1, men reported higher hubristic pride, ($M_{\text{men}} = 1.87, SD = 0.65; M_{\text{women}} = 1.48, SD = 0.50$), moral disengagement ($M_{\text{men}} = 3.59, SD = 0.98; M_{\text{women}} = 2.76, SD = 0.82$), and antisocial behaviour towards teammates ($M_{\text{men}} = 2.38, SD = 0.75; M_{\text{women}} = 1.87, SD = 0.51$) and opponents ($M_{\text{men}} = 2.68, SD = 0.75; M_{\text{women}} = 2.11, SD = 0.58$), than women. No other gender effects were found.

Path Analyses

As we found evidence of multivariate non-normality, we used Satorra-Bentler correction to χ^2 statistics and standard errors in the models using Stata v14. Due to the gender differences noted for some variables, we tested a model controlling for gender by freely correlating gender with both exogenous variables (i.e., facets of pride) and specifying paths with moral disengagement, antisocial teammate behaviour and antisocial opponent behaviour. The original model whereby authentic pride and hubristic pride had paths to moral

disengagement and both prosocial and antisocial behaviour toward teammates and opponents, and moral disengagement had paths to both prosocial and antisocial behaviour towards teammate and opponents had an excellent model fit, $SB\chi^2(4) = 5.77, p = .22$, RMSEA = 0.04, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.02.² Further inspection of the model revealed that pathways linking authentic pride with moral disengagement (standardised estimate = -.01, $p = .80$), antisocial teammate behaviour (standardised estimate = -.03, $p = .56$), and the pathway linking moral disengagement with prosocial teammate behaviour (standardised estimate = -.04, and $p = .54$) were very weak and not significant. Therefore, we removed these paths and ran a more parsimonious model (Figure 1), which had an excellent, and improved, model fit, $SB\chi^2(7) = 6.57, p = .47$; RMSEA = 0.00, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, SRMR = 0.02.^{3,4}

Bootstrapping analyses was performed to test for indirect and direct effects whereby the bootstrapped standardised parameter estimates are reported for the final model in Figure 1 to provide a robust assessment of parameter estimates for each path. The model revealed significant direct positive associations between authentic pride and prosocial behaviour towards both opponents and teammates. Moreover, hubristic pride had a positive direct link with antisocial behaviour towards both teammates and opponents as well as a marginal positive link with prosocial behaviour toward opponents. The indirect effects and confidence intervals (Table 2) revealed that the indirect effects via moral disengagement for the links for hubristic pride with prosocial opponent, and the two antisocial behaviours were all significant.⁵ Specifically, hubristic pride was positively associated with moral disengagement, which in turn, was negatively linked with prosocial opponent behaviour and positively linked with both antisocial teammate and opponent behaviour.

Discussion

In this research, we aimed to address the lack of research investigating the link between trait pride and moral behaviour in sport toward teammates and opponents, or

potential variables that may account for these relationships. Specifically, in the current study we examined; (a) the relationships between both authentic and hubristic pride with prosocial and antisocial behaviour toward opponents and teammates in sport, and (b) whether any pathways were indirectly linked via moral disengagement.

Authentic pride was positively associated with prosocial behaviour towards teammates and opponents, but we found no evidence that authentic pride was negatively associated with antisocial behaviour or moral disengagement. The findings for prosocial behaviour are aligned with previous research showing that authentic pride was positively linked with prosocial behaviour in everyday life (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015) and respect for rules, officials and opponents in sport (Bureau et al., 2013). In terms of the lack of association between authentic pride and antisocial behaviour, these findings run counter to our hypotheses and some previous research (e.g., Krettenauer & Casey, 2015), but are similar with research in sport contexts whereby authentic pride was unrelated or weakly associated with cheating and immoral behaviour directed toward opponents in sport (Bureau et al., 2013). These findings align with propositions that authentic pride with its focus on pursuing success, such as via effort and being relation-oriented, is likely to promote prosocial behaviours (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007).

As expected, hubristic pride was positively associated with antisocial behaviour towards teammates and opponents both directly and indirectly via moral disengagement. These findings align with theoretical suggestions that this facet of pride is associated with less adaptive behaviour (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2007) as well as empirical evidence showing that hubristic pride is positively associated with antisocial behaviour in high school and university students (Krettenauer & Casey, 2015) as well as cheating and immoral behaviour toward opponents in sport (Bureau et al., 2013). Our study highlights the positive link between hubristic pride and antisocial behaviour toward both teammates and

opponents as well as the indirect role of moral disengagement in these relationships. Because hubristic pride reflects feeling a sense of excessive self-belief, arrogance and superiority over others (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007), it may make people more likely to disengage their moral awareness (e.g., McManus, 2018) and justify or rationalise antisocial behaviour (via moral disengagement). In turn, this may increase the likelihood of engaging in antisocial conduct towards teammates and opponents to demonstrate dominance over others.

Hubristic pride was marginally associated with prosocial behaviours in this research. Specifically, the relationship was in the expected negative direction with prosocial behaviour toward teammates, but was in a positive direction toward opponents. It was also indirectly related with prosocial behaviour towards opponents through positively links with moral disengagement, which in turn, was negatively linked with prosocial opponent behaviour. Generally, hubristic pride being more strongly associated with more frequent antisocial behaviour provides further evidence that hubristic pride is linked with less adaptive behaviours (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007).

The marginal direct link between hubristic pride and prosocial behaviour toward opponents was somewhat unexpectedly in a positive direction. This finding is in contrast to the inverse relationship noted in previous research between hubristic pride and respect toward opponents, officials and rules in sport (Bureau et al., 2013), however, a similar weak correlation in a positive direction has also been noted in some research in student samples (e.g., Krettenauer & Casey, 2015). It should be noted that prosocial behaviours are not always performed for altruistic reasons; sometimes they are performed for self-representation reasons (e.g., aiming to be viewed favourably by others, such as being a fair and prosocial person) (e.g., Eisenberg, Eggum, & Di Giunta, 2010). Therefore, an explanation for our findings could be that hubristic pride may be linked with prosocial behaviour toward opponents via two pathways. Specifically, in some instances hubristic pride may lead athletes

to morally disengage, which, in turn, may lead to lower likelihood to behave prosocially toward opponents. In other instances, hubristic pride may be (weakly) associated with more frequent prosocial behaviours toward one's opponents during competition potentially for self-representation reasons (e.g., to demonstrate superiority over opponents and doing so in a way that is perceived favourably in the process). Future research examining these associations is warranted to confirm these findings and propositions.

The two facets of pride were weakly correlated in this study ($r = .11$). Their relationship was weaker than noted in most previous studies, which report coefficients corresponding to small-to-moderate effect sizes (e.g., Bureau et al., 2013; Tracy & Robins, 2007). However, the findings in the present study and previous research support the independent nature of these facets of pride by not being too highly correlated, and their proposed distinct cognitive, affective and behavioural outcomes (Tracy & Robins, 2007).

The stronger relationships for the links between authentic pride and prosocial behaviour, and between hubristic pride with moral disengagement and antisocial behaviour could also be compared to literature on achievement goal orientations and moral behaviours. Specifically, pride as a self-conscious emotion relevant to achievement contexts, appears to possess some conceptual link with achievement goal orientations which may contribute to explaining these findings. For instance, similar to findings for authentic pride in this study, task goal orientation which refers to defining success and evaluating competence through self-referenced criteria such as through via self-improvement, effort, and mastery of a skill (Nicholls, 1989), tends to be positively linked with prosocial behaviours (e.g., Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009), and unrelated or weakly related with moral disengagement (e.g., Boardley & Kavussanu, 2010) and antisocial behaviour (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2010; Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013). In contrast, similar to the findings in the present study for hubristic pride, ego-goal orientation which reflects defining success

through other-referenced criteria such as via demonstrating competence through outperforming or showing superiority over others (Nicholls, 1989), has been more closely and positively linked with antisocial behaviour (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013) and moral disengagement (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2010), but weakly or unrelated with prosocial behaviour (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013).

Although facets of pride and achievement goal orientations appear to present some conceptual links, these constructs are conceptually and theoretically distinct: Only pride is an emotion and is experienced when attention is focused on one's self-representation and identity goals (Tracy & Robins, 2007), whereas goal orientations reflect the criteria one uses to define competence (Nicholls, 1989). Therefore, our findings extend our knowledge about how trait pride is linked with moral behaviour in sport, and provides further support about how success is evaluated in achievement contexts may be linked with moral behaviour. Researchers may wish to test the conjunctive roles of achievement goals and facets of pride with moral behaviour in future research to help further examine their contributions in explaining moral behaviour in sport.

Based on the present study findings, some applied implications could be suggested. First, coaches, teachers and other sport practitioners would do well to try and promote authentic pride over hubristic pride. Two suggestions could be made to facilitate this. First, research has highlighted that a motivational climate that is task-involving and caring, and less ego-involving was associated with greater authentic and lower hubristic pride (Fontana et al., 2017). Accordingly, creating an environment that emphasises commitment and effort (task-involving climate), looking out for and respecting one-another (caring climate), and avoids over-emphasis on normative comparisons (ego-involving climate) may promote the pursuit of authentic pride, which in turn, could result in more positive moral behaviours. Second, as

pride arises as a result of attributions, applied sport practitioners could employ cognitive strategies such as attribution (re)training (e.g., Försterling, 1988) to help regulate moral conduct. For example, to deter hubristic pride and promote authentic pride, practitioners could aim to adapt attributions that reflect success being based purely on dominance and ability into attributions that reflect success being based more on effort, hard work and practice. Research has supported the use of attribution retraining programmes to reduce aggression in young people (Hudley, Britsch, & Wakefield, 1998). Therefore, such strategies could help regulate moral behaviour in sport.

Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

Although the present study has revealed some interesting findings, these need to be considered in light of the study's limitations. This study was cross-sectional and thereby we cannot make claims about the causal direction of the identified relationships. Although the sequencing of relationships are based on conceptual and empirical grounding (e.g., Bandura, 1991; Tracy & Robins, 2004, 2007), future research would benefit from adopting longitudinal and experimental designs. The present findings are also based on self-report data. Future research could combine self-report with observational measures, particularly for moral conduct. Researchers could also consider other potential mediators of the identified relationships. For instance, it is possible that hubristic pride with its association with demonstrating superiority over others (e.g., Tracy & Robins, 2007), may reduce the likelihood of adopting the perspective and empathizing with others, particularly in competitive or achievement contexts. Thus, empathy could be considered as a potential mediating variable in future research. Researchers may also wish to examine the mediating role of trait pride between other constructs and moral behaviours. For instance, given evidence linking self-aggrandizing aspects of narcissism with hubristic pride (e.g., Lewis, 2000; Tracy & Robins, 2007), and previous research has noted that narcissism is positively linked with antisocial

behaviour in sport (e.g., Jones, Woodman, Barlow, & Roberts, 2017), researchers could test whether hubristic pride mediates the link between narcissism and moral behaviour in sport. Research investigating the effectiveness of interventions that promote a mastery and caring climate, and testing strategies such as attribution retraining, in regulating moral behaviour in sport via changes in authentic and hubristic pride would also be fruitful and valuable additions to the literature.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study showed that authentic and hubristic pride have differential relationships with prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport and revealed the role of moral disengagement on the relationships between hubristic pride and moral action. Future research could consider testing a broader conceptual model involving other factors that may further explain the role of trait pride in moral behaviours in sport, as well as developing and testing whether interventions that promote authentic pride, and deter hubristic pride, can facilitate more adaptive moral behaviour in sport.

Endnotes

- (1) Data for moral disengagement and antisocial opponent behaviour from a sub-sample ($N = 251$) of participants in this study was also used in a previous study (Anonymous et al.).
- (2) As a recent meta-analysis (Graupensperger et al., 2018) found significant associations between prosocial opponent and prosocial teammate behaviour, antisocial opponent and antisocial teammate behaviour, antisocial opponent and prosocial teammate behaviour (in adults), and between antisocial teammate and prosocial opponent behaviour, we included correlated errors for these links in the model.
- (3) Additional analyses were conducted to explore model fits without controlling for gender. The initial model had an adequate-to-excellent model fit, $SB\chi^2(2) = 5.30, p = .07$, $RMSEA = 0.07$, $CFI = 0.99$, $TLI = 0.90$, $SRMR = 0.02$, and the final more parsimonious model, an excellent fit, $SB\chi^2(5) = 6.04, p = .30$, $RMSEA = 0.03$, $CFI = 1.00$, $TLI = 0.99$, $SRMR = .02$. However, as model fits improved when controlling for gender, we only report statistics controlling for gender in our main analyses. Paths in the model without controlling for gender are also reported in the Supplementary File for reference.
- (4) In the final model with gender as a covariate, pathways for gender to hubristic pride (estimate = $-.30, p < .001$), moral disengagement (estimate = $-.32, p < .001$), antisocial opponent behaviour (estimate = $-.14, p < .01$), and antisocial teammate behaviour (estimate = $-.18, p < .001$) were significant, but not to authentic pride (estimate = $-.05, p = .39$).
- (5) All three indirect effects were also significant when not controlling for gender in the model.

References

- Al-Yaaribi., A., & Kavussanu, M. (2019). Prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1674681>
- Al-Yaaribi., A., Kavussanu, M., & Ring, C. (2016). Consequences of prosocial and antisocial behavior for the recipient. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 26, 102-112.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.06.012>
- Bandura, A. (1991). *Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action*. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 45-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 3, 193-209. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3
- Bandura, A., Barberanelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 71, 364-374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364>
- Benson, A. J., Bruner, M. W., & Eys, M. (2017). A social identity approach to understanding the conditions associated with antisocial behaviors among teammates in female teams. *Sport, Exercise, & Performance Psychology*, 6, 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000090>
- Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2008). The moral disengagement in sport scale - short. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26, 1507-1517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410802315054>
- Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2009). The influence of social variables and moral disengagement on prosocial and antisocial behaviours in field hockey and netball. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27, 843-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410902887283>

- Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2010). Effects of goal orientation and perceived value of toughness on antisocial behavior in soccer: The mediating role of moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 32, 176-192. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.32.2.176>
- Bruner, M. W., Boardley, I. D., & Cote, J. (2014). Social identity and prosocial and antisocial behavior in youth sport. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 15, 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.09.003>
- Bureau, J. S., Vallerand, R. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Lafrenière, M-A, K. (2013). On passion and moral behavior in achievement setting: The mediating role of pride. *Motivation & Emotion*, 37, 121-133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9292-7>
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.219>
- Carver, C. S., Sinclair, S., & Johnson, S. L. (2010). Authentic and hubristic pride: Differential relations to aspects of goal regulation, affect, and self-control. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 698-703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.09.004>
- Eisenberg, N., Eggum, N. D., & Di Giunta, L. (2010). Empathy-related responding: Associations with prosocial behavior, aggression, and intergroup relations. *Social Issues & Policy Review*, 4, 143-180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2010.01020.x>
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 701-778). New York: Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Fontana, M. S., Fry, M. D., & Cramer, E. (2017). Exploring the relationship between athletes' perceptions of the motivational climate to their compassion, self-compassion,

- shame, and pride in adult recreational sport. *Measurement in Physical Education & Exercise Science*, 21, 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2017.1278698>
- Försterling, F. (1988). *Attribution theory in clinical psychology*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Graupensperger, S. A., Jensen, C. J., & Evans, B. (2018). Meta-analytic review of studies using the prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport scale: Associations among intergroup moral behaviors. *Sport, Exercise & Performance Psychology*, 7, 186-204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000121>
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd Ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hodge, K., & Gucciardi, D. F. (2015). Antisocial and prosocial behavior in sport: The role of motivational climate, basic psychological needs, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 37, 257-273. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2014-0225>
- Hodge, K., & Lonsdale, C. (2011). Prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport: The role of coaching style autonomous vs. controlled motivation, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 33, 527-547. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.33.4.527>
- Hudley, C., Britsch, B., Wakefield, W.D., Smith, T., DeMorat. M., & Cho, S. (1998). An attribution retraining program to reduce aggression in elementary school students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 35, 271-282. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199807\)35:3<271::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-Q](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199807)35:3<271::AID-PITS7>3.0.CO;2-Q)
- Jones, B. D., Woodman, T., Barlow, M., & Roberts, R. (2017). The darker side of personality: Narcissism predicts moral disengagement and antisocial behavior in sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 31, 109-116. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2016-0007>
- Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. D. (2009). The prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 31, 97-117. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.31.1.97>

- Kavussanu, M., Boardley, I. D., Sagar, S., & Ring, C. M. (2013). Bracketed morality revisited: How do athletes behave in two contexts? *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 35, 449-463. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.35.5.449>
- Kavussanu, M., Stamp, R., Slade, G., & Ring, C. (2009). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviors in male and female soccer players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21, S62-S76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200802624292>
- Kavussanu, M., & Stanger, N. (2017). Moral behavior in sport. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 16, 185-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.010>
- Kavussanu, M., Stanger, N., & Boardley, I. D. (2013). The prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport scale: Further evidence for construct validity and reliability. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31, 1208-221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.775473>
- Kavussanu, M., Stanger, N., & Ring, C. (2015). The effects of moral identity on moral emotion and antisocial behavior in sport. *Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology*, 4, 268-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000040>
- Krettenauer, T., & Casey, V. (2015). Moral identity development and positive moral emotions: Differences in involving authentic and hubristic pride. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory & Research*, 15, 173-187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2015.1023441>
- Lewis, M. (2000). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 623–636). New York: Guilford Press.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Wen, Z. L. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers of overgeneralising Hu & Bentler (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 11, 320-341. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1103_2

McManus, J. (2018). Hubris and unethical decision making: The tragedy of the uncommon.

Journal of Business Ethics, 149, 169-185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3087-9>

Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

Sage, L., Kavussanu, M., & Duda, J. (2006). Goal orientations and moral identity as

predictors of prosocial and antisocial functioning in male association football players.

Journal of Sports Sciences, 24, 455-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500244531>

Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 422–445.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.4.422>

Stanger, N., Backhouse, S. H., Jennings, A., & McKenna, J. (2018). Linking motivational

climate with moral behavior in youth sport: The role of social support, perspective taking

and moral disengagement. *Sport, Exercise & Performance Psychology*, 7, 392-407.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000122>

Stanger, N., Kavussanu, M., Boardley, I. D., & Ring, C. (2013). The influence of moral

disengagement and negative emotion on antisocial sport behavior. *Sport, Exercise &*

Performance Psychology, 2, 117-129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030585>

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA:

Pearson Education International.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel

& W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33– 48).

Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

Tracy, J. L. & Robins, R. W. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious emotions: A theoretical

model. *Psychology Inquiry*, 15, 103-125. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1502_01

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets.

Personality Processes & Individual Differences, 92, 506-525. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506)

[3514.92.3.506](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506)

Table 1*Alpha Coefficients, Descriptive Statistics, and Correlations for all Variables (N = 319)*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Authentic pride	3.56	0.59	(.85)						
2. Hubristic pride	1.73	0.62	.11	(.86)					
3. Moral disengagement	3.29	1.00	.03	.34***	(.82)				
4. PT behaviour	4.31	0.53	.22***	-.10	-.07	(.77)			
5. PO behaviour	3.31	0.76	.14*	.05	-.20***	.32***	(.78)		
6. AT behaviour	2.20	0.72	.01	.38***	.38***	-.05	.11	(.83)	
7. AO behaviour	2.48	0.75	.10	.36***	.56***	.09	.02	.51***	(.87)
8. Gender	-	-	-.05	-.30***	-.40***	.01	.03	-.34***	-.37***

Note. PT = Prosocial Teammate; PO = Prosocial Opponent; AT = Antisocial Teammate; AO = Antisocial Opponent. Bivariate correlations are presented below the diagonal. The facets of pride, as well as prosocial and antisocial behaviours were measured on scales from 1 to 5. Moral disengagement was measured on a scale from 1 to 7. Alpha coefficients are presented in parentheses on the diagonal. Men were coded as 0; women were coded as 1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 2*Indirect Effects of Pride on Behaviour via Moral Disengagement*

Path	Indirect effect	95% CI
Hubristic pride → MD → Prosocial opponent behaviour	-.07**	[-.12 to -.02]
Hubristic pride → MD → Antisocial teammate behaviour	.06*	[.01 to .11]
Hubristic pride → MD → Antisocial opponent behaviour	.13***	[.06 to .20]

Note: Standardised bootstrap estimates are reported. MD = Moral disengagement. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.





Figure 1. Path analysis with bootstrap standardised coefficients for the final model (including gender as a covariate). Solid lines represent significant paths and dashed lines represent paths that were not significant. Note: PT = Prosocial Teammate; PO = Prosocial Opponent; AT = Antisocial Teammate; AO = Antisocial Opponent. # $p < .06$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.



Supplementary Figure. Path analysis with bootstrap standardised coefficients. Coefficients reported before the slash are paths with no covariates in the model, and coefficients after the slash are for paths when including gender as a covariate in the model. Full lines represent significant paths and dashed lines represent paths that were not significant in either model. *Note:* PT = Prosocial Teammate; PO = Prosocial Opponent; AT = Antisocial Teammate; AO = Antisocial Opponent. # $p < .06$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.