

Sport Advocacy: Challenge, Controversy, Ethics & Action

John Heil

Psychological Health Roanoke

This is an expanded version of an article which originally appeared in Heil, J. (2016). Sport advocacy: Challenge, controversy, ethics, and action. Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 5(4), 281-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000078>. Copyright © 2016 American Psychological Association. Adapted with permission.

Abstract - Professional

Sport psychologists should consider advocating for athletes' rights and responsible organizational practices. There is demonstrated need, solid science, and clear direction through the American Psychological Association's ethical principles. Yet the voice of psychology is conspicuously absent in the public discourse in sport on issues such as hazing, bullying, gender equity, sexual violence, doping, and athlete safety, perhaps because speaking out is often fraught with challenge and controversy. The author shares a number of his experiences encountering and addressing advocacy and offers lessons learned. The sample issues include: unrecognized and unfilled training needs for professionals; potentially misapplied rules; inadequately defined and applied safeguards for training and competition; helping institutions and athletes both achieve important goals that might seem to conflict; and even a situation where all the psychologist's expertise was unable to bring a wholesome resolution. Not all interventions succeed, and this last receives the most extensive analysis of all. It provides the opportunity to review some of the dilemmas facing would-be advocates in sport. In addition to discussing his own advocacy, the author reviews relevant studies and reports—not all from sport.

Keywords: advocacy, sport, hazing, institutional betrayal, ethics

Abstract – Popular/Media

Sport is a juggernaut of a social institution putting a spotlight on societal issues and modeling a standard of behavior. As goes sport, so goes society. It is said that sport builds character. Yet, there are so many contrary examples. Rather, sport is like a ship that goes where it is steered, whether that be to the moral high ground or the rocky shoals of tragedy. When sport stays on course, society benefits. Hence, the critical role of advocacy. This paper is an implicit plea for the sport-minded psychologist to embrace the role of advocate. If sport in society is to be the best it can be, it will require sentinels alert to transgressions, willing to act on behalf of athletes' rights and responsible organizational practices, and prepared to subject issues to reasoned public discourse. The paper provides a broad view of the landscape of advocacy through personal anecdotes as well as contemporary and historic events, examines hazing in detail, presents a case study and encourages action by psychologists.

Introduction

In the end we will remember not the words of our enemies but the silence of our friends

Martin Luther King

The goal of this paper is to make the readers more sensitive to advocacy related matters and more willing to act on behalf of athletes' rights and responsible organizational practices. As such, it is more of a call to action than a scholarly discourse. This paper is composed of four interrelated essays which collectively function as a primer on advocacy. Part A offers a broad brush view of the landscape of advocacy in sport through a series of brief personal anecdotes. The collective lessons learned from these experiences speak to the role of sport as a social institution and its potency as an arbiter of cultural mores. Part B focuses specifically on hazing, identifying it as a problem of our time. It serves as an exemplar for any advocacy initiative, in

that there are similar underlying psychological dynamics driving behaviors and rendering them resistant to change. In Part C, a case study presents hazing and other problem behaviors common in sport. It illuminates the mechanisms by which empowered institutions resist accountability and the sense of helplessness experienced by those caught in a skewed power dynamic. Part D follows from the case study, examining advocacy in the public domain, means of last resort available to the advocate when reasonable measures fail, and the critical role of the coach, as well as, offering insight into the ethical and practical constraints faced by the psychologist. Contemporary and historic events are referenced, with the hope that the reader will reexamine these through the frame of advocacy and in so doing gain a fresh perspective. A deliberate effort to include personalized anecdote and commentary follows from the belief that when advocacy has a face, action is more likely to follow.

Part A: About Advocacy

In sport, advocacy is about fair play. Advocacy is in the public interest, often in the vein of social justice. Advocacy on behalf of principles has long been a part of the landscape of sport, with notable successes in gender equity via Title IX legislation (Anderson, 2012) and in head injury management (Taylor, 2015). Advocacy on behalf of athletes and other stakeholders may be prompted by situations deemed inappropriate, where an issue is driven by a skewed power dynamic, and is outside the ability of the individual to effect change. The behavior in question may be arguably dangerous (e.g., head injury risk) or outright illegal (e.g., sexual encounters with children). The course of action is influenced by whether the behavior arises from an individual (e.g., bullying), a group (e.g., hazing), or an organization (e.g., institutional betrayal), or some combination of these. Psychologists are uniquely positioned to serve in the role of advocate, following from the deliberate ethical foundations of practice, expertise in human behavior, a core

focus on mental health, and the likelihood that relevant issues will arise in the course of their work. Yet the voice of psychology is conspicuously absent in the public discourse in sport on issues such as hazing, bullying, gender equity, sexual violence, doping, and athlete safety.

Personal case studies offer a sampling of settings, roles, constraints, lessons learned, and their meaning within the context of sport as a social institution. A narrative style offers a mix of fact and feeling, personal and professional, idealism and pragmatism that render such situations challenging. The case studies reveal the breadth, scope and complexity of advocacy, not only as an objective application of science but also as an action imperative that is potentially volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous.

Case Study #1: An Anti-Doping Dilemma. Doping in sport is enigmatic, with practices that are long standing, deeply entrenched and resistant to remedy. Failure to provide constraints on doping, not only undermines fair play but also threatens athlete health. As a friend suggested decades ago – sport makes a rule, and we find a way around it (Athlete A, personal communication, May, 1976). Home run hero, Mark McGwire’s fall from grace during what is now referred to as the steroid era of baseball is testament to the profound impact of doping on sport and society (Leach, 2010). The systematic doping by Russia’s track and field program demonstrates that this continues as a significant and entrenched problem (Campanile, Bast, Radutzky, & Keteyian, 2016). That sports heroes’ behavior has a far-reaching impact on society is poignantly reflected in the steroid-related death of adolescent athlete Taylor Hooten (Taylor Hooten Foundation, n.d.).

Situation. Chris had medaled in an Olympic sport national event, and was awaiting doping testing. In casual conversation, she disclosed missing a plane flight, having had little sleep and

consuming large amounts of caffeine to stay awake, apparently unaware of the risk of a positive drug test for caffeine use.

Role. Serving as a National Governing Body (NGB) consultant at the event, I was present in an official capacity in the anti-doping area. I was aware of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Guidelines, having reviewed and provided critical comment on the WADA draft document.

Analysis. Caffeine guidelines were faulty and unfair, in that they allowed use, but did not provide clear guidance on safe limits.

Action. An initial inquiry to clarify guidelines for proper use was met with a vague response. I transparently and directly encouraged the athlete to delay production of urine to the last moment and consume fluids copiously. I was advocating action, within allowable guidelines, to circumvent an unfair practice. The athlete passed the drug screen, and would go on to an exceptionally successful career.

The lesson is that it is important not to lose sight of fair play in the effort to enforce it. Clearly, anti-doping regulation and enforcement are in the interest of the athlete. However, it is essential that this be sensibly implemented and fairly applied because of the remarkably adverse effects of a failed drug screen. Transparent rules and regulations are critical. With the first publication of the List of Prohibited Substances and Methods, caffeine was no longer prohibited (World Anti-Doping Agency, 2004).

Case Study #2: Death in the Weight Room. Sadly, fatal injury occurs in sport with predictable regularity (National Center for Catastrophic Sport Injury Research, n.d.). Despite the profound impact of catastrophic and fatal injury on teammates, family and friends, a psychological intervention protocol for sport-related incidents was absent.

Situation. A true freshmen football player at the University of Utah, suffered a fatal cardiac event while weight lifting with teammates, while the remainder of the team was away at a game. The sport psychologist was summoned to the hospital, where he received the news of the player's death with the remaining freshmen. There was no specific psychological intervention provided to help the fellow freshmen or other team mates cope with the loss. Coincidentally, a stress-injury study was underway with the team.

Role. As an injury researcher, while reviewing data, a sharp upward trend in injuries was noted in the week following the player's death.

Analysis. The psychological impact on the team following the incident was significant, apparently resulting in increased injury report, perhaps as a means of coping with distress, albeit an indirect one. That the full team was not informed of the death until after the game, suggests the injury rates were psychologically driven.

Action. Keith Henschen and I (1992) conducted a qualitative research study examining the impact of the death on the freshman teammates during their senior year. Functioning both as a research study and as a team intervention, it provided a window into the significant and enduring impact of the event, and offered players the opportunity to express and address their feelings. Recognizing the void in critical incident response, this study was followed by workshops on critical incident response at Sport Psychology Conferences, and the development of a guide to critical incident intervention in sport (Athey & Heil, 2011).

Case Study #3: Love of the Game. Athletes' right to participate is an enduring theme in sport. Jackie Robinson's success in breaking the color barrier in professional baseball in 1947 opened the door to generations of athletes. A new narrative about race emerged, changing not only sport but also society (Cronin, 2013). This tradition is continued by Title IX whose ongoing evolution

supports an expanding gender equity agenda and has brought scrutiny to interpersonal violence including sexual assault (Anderson, 2012).

Situation. A competitor at an adult age group national competition in fencing, suffering a terminal illness alerted the sports medicine staff to her condition. The sports medicine staff member, personally distressed by the dilemma, was reluctant to allow her to compete, but was unclear if it were his right to prevent her from doing so. The athlete articulated a clear understanding of the potentially dire risks of competing and the desire to do so despite the risks.

Role. As the NGB Sports Medicine & Science Chair, I had a fiduciary relationship, which assumes a responsibility to protect the welfare of the NGB. As a sport psychology consultant, I was present to support athlete performance and well-being.

Analysis. The situation presented the need to simultaneously address athletes' rights, responsible organizational practices and NGB liability, in a time urgent manner.

Action. Prior to competing, I prompted the athlete to complete a waiver stating her personal assumption of risk, which was subsequently reviewed and approved by the NGB attorney. The athlete competed, doing so without a catastrophic health event.

As a possible last chance opportunity to compete, her actions reveal the profound personal value of sport in her life. The NGB could have chosen a risk-averse path and refused her this opportunity. In allowing her to compete, the NGB honored its mission to offer the benefits of sport to a wide range of athletes. This action is consistent with longstanding interest in providing access to sport for those who suffer medical conditions as is reflected in the Paralympic movement ("International Paralympic," n.d.) and the Special Olympics ("Special Olympics," n.d.).

Case Study #4 – Dance with Death. At the peak of the HIV/AIDS crisis, unrealistic fears of contagion were rampant and a related pervasive social anxiety abounded. A turning point in sport came as basketball superstar, Magic Johnson, revealed he was HIV positive, leaving the NBA over what appeared to be fears of transmission during competition (Aldridge, 2011).

Situation. Phillip Sweatman was a professional ballet dancer, who had left his company due to HIV-related declining health. Returning to his home community, he was to be a guest artist performing with a local developmental dance company, but was then excluded, creating a controversy.

Role. As a member of the local health care community, I was in a position to bring a reasoned look at the situation.

Analysis. Whether Phillip was excluded from performing due to an unrealistic fear of HIV transmission or because his declining health rendered him unable to perform effectively appeared to be a question without a clear answer. Nonetheless, Phillip was explicit in his gratitude for the opportunity to speak out, regaining a sense of purpose, as his physical prowess declined.

Action. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with Phillip and the dance company director, providing each the opportunity to tell their story, which was presented at the Association for Applied Sport Psychology Conference to generate dialogue about HIV and athletes' rights. (Heil & Lanahan, 1992).

The experience of Magic Johnson in the national spotlight initially paralleled that of Phillip Sweatman locally. However, Johnson's status as a well-respected athlete combined with his ability to bring a popular face and a positive attitude to the disease, coinciding with advances in treatment, created a sense of hope and acceptance. He later reprised his career as an Olympian,

illuminating the role of sport as a social institution, which provides a lens through which a culture can examine itself and drive social change.

Case Study #5-Violence on the Playing Field. Concerns about safety and violence in sport are longstanding, ranging from injury risk inherent in participation, to spontaneous on-field player and spectator violence. In 1976, my hometown Flyers were arrested in Canada for on-ice behaviors during a hockey game (McMurtry, 2013). While in Roanoke, where I now live, I witnessed parents arrested for fighting during a youth sport event. As a check on the inherent dangers of sport, the rules of play place a burden on the officials to enforce limits on dangerous play, and on governing bodies to create a system of checks and balances to deter gratuitous violence.

Situation. I was witness to years of repeated failures of the local soccer system to maintain a safe and respectful playing environment, with behaviors ranging from poor officiating to coaches' support of violent rule-violating play, to a breakdown in decorum (e.g., criticism of officials via the game's public address system).

Role. As a parent, I attempted to leverage my leadership role in a state-wide sport organization and standing as an internationally recognized authority on sport injury (e.g., Heil, 1993).

Analysis. As a certified soccer official, I was aware of weak links in the local system of referee training and oversight, with minimal systematic review of on-field referee performance after initial classroom training.

Action. With a group of colleagues, a consensus-styled document was developed and presented to the Virginia High School League (VHSL), offering an in-depth analysis and recommendations for change (Heil, Johnson, Soter, Antozzi, Heil, & Wiita, 2012). Although led by a well-

respected and ethical referee supervisor, we argued that he lacked the support needed from the VHSL.

Situation. After significant delay in acknowledging the report, no action was taken. A prior invitation to me to join the VHSL Sports Medicine Committee was no longer available. Failure to start a conversation with the state governing body, despite status as a recognized authority and a professional relationship with key VHSL members, speaks to the entrenched power of organizations, and the high hurdle to change. In response to similar events, governing bodies ranging from youth to professional sports are coming under increasing public criticism regarding failure to advocate for athletes rights and responsible practices (Strauss, Haverstick, Johnson & Silver, 2016). In an excoriating critique of the Ray Rice domestic assault video, *Sports Illustrated* suggests this as not just “a wake-up call to the problem of domestic violence” but also a reminder that “the NFL faces its moral responsibilities only when it has to” (Taylor, 2014, p.12).

Role. Failing at systemic change, I initiated research examining tolerance for violence on the field of play.

Analysis. The reluctance to address player safety locally, paralleled by events nationally, raises question of whether there is a different standard for violence in sport than in other settings. If so, it raises question as to the underlying cultural forces driving this?

Action. During employment interviews, law enforcement applicants were presented a multi-tiered scenario which included the following: “During a stop in play, after being penalized for aggressive play, an athlete strikes another player from behind rendering him unconscious” - with the question of “arrest or not arrest” posed to each applicant. The results revealed a 62% response favoring arrest, although this increased to 88% if requested by the parent of the injured

athlete (Heil, Wiita, Johnson & Staples, 2009). That the arrest rate escalates at parent request reveals the ambivalence of those who would be tasked with this decision.

A subsequent study examined the response to an assault on the referee, showing a notably higher arrest rate, and suggesting a line of unacceptable on-field violent behavior (Heil & Wiita, 2012). Standing in stark contrast to the criticism by some that this was an unrealistic scenario, soccer referee John Bieniewicz was subsequently killed under circumstances similar to those in the study (Seidel, 2015).

Evidence of tolerance for dangerous rule violating behaviors in sport that would otherwise be considered criminal suggests that there is a different standard in sport. To the extent this is true, our games move away from the Olympic ideal and toward the gratuitous violence of the Roman gladiatorial contests (Grout, n.d.). This also raises question as to whether tolerance for dangerous rule violating behavior in sport contributes to diminished accountability and disinhibited violence more broadly in society. This theme was examined in the futuristic science fiction film *Rollerball* (Jewison, 1975) in which escalating violence in sport was enabled to appeal to the baser instincts of human nature, as a distraction from the economic and political problems of the time. Although the idea of sport violence as an opiate for the masses seems implausible, *Rollerball* exists as a cautionary tale.

Case Study #6: Coach v Athlete. The sport organization potentially holds great sway over the athlete, with a particularly potent role played by the coach. That the coach has a far reaching and enduring impact is reflected in the NCAA Quadrennial *Growth, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Learning of Students in College* (GOALS) Survey (Yukhymenko-Lescroart, Brown & Paskus, 2014). This survey administered to 19,920 student-athletes on 1,321 teams at 609 member institutions reveals that coaches' influence spans retention and graduation rates, players'

willingness to cheat, and how they coach future generations. The power and influence a coach wields over the athlete, for good or bad, is without parallel.

Situation. A professional-prospect quarterback suffered a significant but recoverable injury. When forced to play hurt, his injury was compounded, resulting in an enduring negative impact on his athletic ability, undermining his career. The University initially took no corrective action, prompting the athlete to leave the school and initiate legal proceedings.

Role. Retained by the plaintiff as an expert witness, I had access to a detailed view of events via legal depositions.

Analysis. The legal documents led me to believe the player was forced to compete against his wishes, being compelled to do so by his coach and the sports medicine staff, under threat of adverse consequences.

Action. The case settled out of court. The attorney suggested that the decision to hear the case in a notably coach-friendly community evoked concern of bias in the jury, and reduced expectation for a fair and favorable verdict.

The iconic status of the coach in contemporary culture is reflected in a comment from the APA SEPP listserv: “If you took the coach’s behavior and moved it to ANY OTHER environment – the classroom, the boardroom, your living room – would it be OK? If it’s not OK in any other environment then why is it OK in sport?” (Psychologist A, personal communication, April 15, 2015). In the Team USA Newsletter, Gilbert (2015) comments on the tolerance accorded to coaching icons like baseball’s Billy Martin, football’s Woody Hayes, and basketball’s Bob Knight. This sentiment is echoed in the Sports Illustrated special report, “Abuse of Power” which characterizes negative coaching as a flawed method despite its deep roots in sport culture (Wolff, 2015).

Fortunately, there are many, many coaches who have been overwhelmingly positive in their approach and are much loved by their athletes. Take Jim Valvano, for example, who led North Carolina State University to a NCAA basketball championship against superior teams, while winning the love and respect of his players, and his opponents. The values that drove Coach Valvano's life, tragically cut short by cancer, has inspired others to honor his memory in the fight against cancer . (The V Foundation, n.d.).

Advocacy, Sport and Society

Collectively, the case studies illustrate that advocacy happens at the policy level and the personal level, on the large stage and locally, quietly and in the public eye. These anecdotes identify the challenge faced by the advocate, given the broad landscape of events, their emotionally provocative nature, varied paths of entry into the role of advocate, ethical and legal constraints, unanticipated consequences, and the often uncharted course toward a reasonable solution.

Sport is a powerful social institution, prominent in the public eye, reflecting society, providing a forum to examine behavior, setting cultural standards and serving as a force for change. Reflecting on the impact of both grassroots sports and a South African Rugby World Cup victory in the transition from apartheid, Nelson Mandela suggests:

Sport can create hope where once there was only despair. It is more powerful than governments in breaking down barriers. Sport has the power to change the world (Wolff, 2011, p.74).

This stands in stark contrast to the failed efforts of the Nazis during the 1936 Berlin Olympics to use the Games to support a racist agenda (The Nazi Olympics, n.d.). As a potentially potent influence on society, sport demands our attention, our analysis and our action.

Part B focuses specifically on destructive interpersonal and organizational dynamics, complementing the broad but cursory review of advocacy themes presented in Part A. It models the detailed analysis that is essential to informed and ethical advocacy.

Part B: Hazing, Bullying, Harassment & Organizational Response

Hazing, bullying and harassment are intersecting forms of personal aggression, characterized by a skewed power dynamic, potentially resulting in a hostile environment. The depth and breadth of these problems society-wide has led to substantial legislation and case law focused on the role of organizations in oversight and remediation (Cornell & Limber, 2015). This section examines the psychological dynamics which drive these behaviors in sport and the role of the organizations in assisting or resisting remediation. Hazing is examined in detail with attention to its unique place in team sport culture, its elusive definition, its potential confounding with team building, and the challenge to organizations in prevention and intervention.

Hazing or Team Building

Like bullying and harassment, hazing is difficult to precisely define. For a detailed review of harassment and bullying, see Cornell and Limber (2015). Hazing is defined as behaviors linked to group belonging and acceptance which humiliate, degrade, abuse or endanger, regardless of the person's willingness to participate. Prototypical examples include: forced alcohol consumption, destruction of property, physical brutality, and exclusion from social contact. However, hazing includes more subtle practices like systematic social isolation and exclusion from routine team functions, since ultimately hazing is driven by the desire to belong (e.g., "Pennsylvania Hazing Law" n.d.). Research by Van Raalte, Cornelius, Linder and Brewer (2007) with sports teams found that activities like swearing an oath and performing skits

resulted in group unity while negative practices like isolation and punishment can easily backfire.

Following a string of high profile incidents concerns about hazing reached a flash point. The highly publicized hazing turned bullying of College All-American and NFL lineman, Jonathan Martin by his Miami Dolphin team mates resulted in him leaving the team and attempting suicide (Victor, 2015). That an athlete with such an imposing physical presence could be traumatized demonstrated that any and all are vulnerable.

At Sayerville High School, football players subjected freshmen to sexual assault, excusing this as a tradition, which is a common justification of hazing (Petersen, 2014). At Florida A&M, a long-standing hazing tradition known as “crossing Bus C” resulted in the beating death of a band member, revealing the risk of unintended consequences (Alvarez, 2014; Queally, 2014).

At Franklin and Marshall College, a women’s team sprayed semen on freshmen while the team drank alcohol at a party-like gathering (Berman, 2012). Though there was no obvious physical danger in this stunt, it was traumatizing for some. In any group of female athletes, a significant percentage likely have experienced some form of sexual harassment or assault, and as a consequence could find a provocative sexual situation to be re-traumatizing, even absent physical contact.

Hazing is increasingly finding its way into social media, with an estimate of over 50% of incidents including posting of pictures on a public web space bringing a conspicuously public view to events (Allan & Madden, 2008). For example, the University of Maryland Baltimore County Women’s Lacrosse team frustrated with the first year teammates sent a barrage of text messages belittling them, even making death threats (Ritter, 2015).

The National Study of Student Hazing, conducted by the University of Maine, surveyed 11,482 undergraduate students enrolled at 53 colleges and universities. It revealed that hazing is widespread and that a gap exists between student experiences of hazing and their willingness to label it as such. (Allan & Madden, 2008). There is a similar gap between an organization's acknowledgement of this problem and the will to act on it. For example, a study examining nationally mandated harassment policies in Canadian Provincial and National Sport Organizations, revealed that only about 1/3 had policies specific to hazing or bullying, and that less than 1 in 15 provided such simple and essential contact information for the harassment officer (Donnelly, Kerr, Heron, & DiCarlo, 2014).

The current approach to anti-hazing is based on legislation introduced to Congress in 2012 (Wilson, 2012). Its author suggests "Hazing is not a university problem. It is not a Greek problem. It is not a student problem. It is an American problem." In response, Colleges have widely adopted anti-hazing policies. Anti-hazing laws have been established in 44 states, which define hazing as a crime and specify adverse consequences for institutions who enable it ("States with anti-hazing laws," 2015). Following the hazing related suicide death of Marine, Harry Lew, Representative Judy Chu introduced anti-hazing legislation specifically focused on the military (Chu, 2016). Even the U.S. Navy SEAL program, renowned for the physical hardship of its training has taken action against hazing (C. Williams, personal communication, August 28, 2015). Yet problems continue, with at least one hazing death on a college campus yearly since 1969 (Nuwer, 2015).

Statutes and policies have focused heavily on identifying hazing as a set of specific acts, perhaps because this is the most simple and straightforward way to do so. In an effort to be clear and inclusive, hazing guidelines and statutes may be overly inclusive and unintentionally

undermine legitimate team building. To understand hazing it is important to look beyond specific practices to the personal impact on the participants, and to the dynamics driving the behavior.

As a Sigma Chi fraternity member in college, I was subjected to actions commonly described as hazing, but these unfolded in a way that did not humiliate, degrade, abuse or endanger, an impression that continues to be shared by my fraternity brothers, whose friendships have endured the passage of decades. It worked well because it was done in the spirit of fun and never led us to question our sense of belonging or acceptance. The most stressful elements of the process were also the most thought-provoking and meaningful, in the style of a life lesson. This stands in stark contrast to the Sayreville High School behavior and other incidents described above.

The question “How do I engage in team building in an era of hazing?” asked by a coach in a hazing awareness seminar points to the challenge in distinguishing these two concepts (Coach A, personal communication, March 18, 2015). The answer begins with an appreciation of sport as a culture, with distinct language, clothing, customs, and practices (e.g., Sands, 2002). The meaning, intent and impact of group dynamics can be misinterpreted, especially by those lacking in this particular variant of cultural sensitivity.

Those familiar with the culture of competitive sport understand that it is exclusive by design in its membership, with new players subject to an out-group, in-group transition. When a team forms, ideally it strives to create a shared mission and purpose, which become its norm. That said, a sport team will go through a sometimes stormy team building process that typically includes on-field and off-field activities, some planned and supervised, and others of which may be inadvertent and spontaneous. From this process, a group dynamic will unfold, hopefully for the better, in that it is in the team’s interest for this process to be a positive and constructive

one. Actions that leverage sport's inherent opportunity for bonding, arising from overcoming shared adversity, builds better teams. As such, team building is essentially an inclusive endeavor, an element that is invariably lost in hazing.

Under the best of conditions in the hands of professionals, team building it is an imprecise and imperfect process. A group activity is team building when it is inclusive, purposeful, unfolds without undue harshness, is experienced as bonding and leads to a passage from out-group to in-group. Alternately, it is hazing to the extent it is exclusive, without authentic meaning or purpose, harsh or otherwise destructive, or divisive. Absent a passage from in-group to out-group, hazing tips into bullying, while hostility directed to members of a protected class is harassment.

Typically team building unfolds in a social context, where whatever positive performance effect it may have is indirect. Consider a scavenger hunt, which has been defined as hazing (StepUp!; Hazing,n.d.), but may also be just plain fun and result in increased cohesion, as argued by the Roanoke College Dean of Students during a hazing awareness seminar (A. Fetrow, personal communication, March 18, 2015). There is danger that in being overly restrictive in policy, the credibility of authority is compromised and those who might provide checks and balances on team building are excluded from the process. There is some risk in giving leeway to groups to explore and experiment with the team building process. However, when there is proper oversight this can be a valuable learning opportunity and provide a take-away lesson for life after sport.

Team building is more likely to have a positive impact when focused directly on performance. USA Fencing Olympic Team coach, Paul Soter and I led a team building process that focused on post-event analysis of performance and increased the athlete's share in decision

making about team management. It led to a set of team norms, a lexicon to facilitate communication during competition, and a team authored article in the organization's magazine and an historically successful outcome (Heil & Soter, 2009).

Given the vagaries of definition, the inherent complexities of group dynamics, the maturity of those directing the process, and the unique culture of sport, it can be difficult to distinguish hazing from team building. These factors points to a unique role for sport psychologists in hazing prevention and intervention, given their expertise in behavior, ethical foundations, and sensitivity to sport culture. It is the underlying dynamics that ultimately determine whether actions create team chemistry, are a lost opportunity, or at worst, a slide down the slippery slope to the dark side of human behavior. The critique that follows is focused on understanding the dynamics of group behavior in the worst of incidents, those that are most difficult to understand and most important to prevent.

Psychological Dynamics

Dynamics driving hazing and/or well-intended but poorly implemented team building include the essential, the innocent, and the sinister. In the *Farther Reaches of Human Nature*, Maslow (1971) identifies a hierarchy of needs essential to the human condition, ranging from survival to self-actualization. Among these needs, he identifies belongingness and esteem as motives that lead us to form groups, and by extension make us vulnerable to hazing. There is also innocence at work in hazing, in overlooking unintended consequences and underestimating risk. *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Ryan, 1973) estimates 1 accidental injury for each 300 unsafe acts, 1 disabling injury for each 29 accidental injuries, and 1 accidental death for every 100 disabling injuries, This calculus of risk captures both the unlikelihood of any given situation going terribly wrong, and the eventual inevitability that it will. "Crossing Bus C" went on for

years without notable problems, likely creating a false sense of safety. Social psychological research, some quite controversial, has sought to illuminate the dark side of human behavior, underlying practices ranging from hazing to the holocaust (Ganellen & Robbennolt, 2015).

The Dark Side of Human Behavior

The research that follows examines the misuse of power by in-groups over out-groups, the readiness to defer to the dictates of authority in opposition to fundamental values, and the failure to act when witness to injustice. These dynamics can turn a potentially positive group experiences into a negative, and in the worst case result in a catastrophic outcome.

In the Stanford prison experiment led by Zimbardo (1969), college students participated in a mock prison experiment, with one group assigned as guards and the others as inmates. Under pressures inherent in the design of the experiment, the guards' behavior became so demeaning and dangerous that the experiment was abruptly stopped. This study has endured as a cautionary tale about the potential abuse of power held by one group over another – even among those who do not seem predisposed to violence. The silver lining in the experiment is the power of one to take a stand and make a difference. With a clear and unambiguous statement of the obvious, that what was being done was terrible, psychology consultant Christine Maslach ended the experiment. Nearly 50 observers, including parents and clergy, had been witness to the same but had taken no action, all apparently falling into their implicitly scripted roles. In a bizarre twist, the researchers became so caught up in managing a prison uprising one day, they forgot to collect data. The power of the in-group over an out-group demonstrated here is a fundamental risk factor in hazing.

Milgram's (1975) obedience studies also drew public attention. In what was presented as a study of the effect of punishment on learning, subjects were directed to deliver electric shocks

to study participants – actually actors, who received no shock. Milgram constructed a series of experiments identifying one condition where approximately 2/3 of subjects shocked “learners” into a presumed state of unconsciousness, despite their vehement vocal protests. Factors driving the behavior included the rationale of a greater good (the advancement of science) and a sense of legitimate authority (affiliation with a prestigious institution). In contrast, behavior was inhibited when witnessing another subject refuse to deliver a shock, again reinforcing the power of one to disrupt the status quo and effect change.

Contemporary with the Milgram and Zimbardo studies is the murder of Kitty Genovese, who over an extended period, was publicly assaulted and ultimately died in an incident that continues to perplex and fascinate psychologists, the media and the public (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007). The New York Times headline declares: “37 Who Saw Murder Didn’t Call the Police” (Gansburg, 1964). Although the headline appears to be part fact and part urban legend, the lesson from this incident and related social psychological research is that when there is a diffusion of responsibility, inaction may follow (e.g., Darley & Latane, 1968).

Barriers to Reporting and to Change

The social and interpersonal dynamics described above drive hazing, making it less likely to be reported and remedied. Additional barriers include: a positive framing of inappropriate behaviors, a culture of acceptance, the consent dilemma, and the whistle blower and victim effects. Institutional response is a wild card, either seeking a solution or compounding the problem (Smith & Freyd, 2014).

Hazing behaviors are typically framed positively in a way that justifies practices, enabling behaviors that are harmful to be overlooked. Consider the following rationales: “tradition” (displaced responsibility), “she agreed” (attribution of blame), and “team activity”

(diffusion of responsibility) (“StepUp!: Hazing,” n.d.). The prosecuting attorney in the Florida A&M band hazing murder debunks this thinking claiming “tradition didn’t kill Robert Champion...you don’t get to break the law because those who came before you did it” (Alvarez, 2014).

Allan and Madden’s research (2008) reveals a campus culture of acceptance of hazing. Of documented incidents, about 25% occurred in a public space, about 25% were witnessed by coaches and alumni, with over 50% being reported on social media. That 80% say hazing bothers them, yet only 20% try to stop it suggests diffusion of responsibility is at work. A subject of hazing is unable to consent as a consequence of a “Catch 22” type dilemma, in which either choice has an unwanted consequence. Failure to comply with hazing results in the withdrawal of belonging and acceptance, while acquiescence can result not only in humiliation and abuse but also drives implicit acceptance of the culture of hazing.

The whistleblower who is also the victim experiences a “double bind,” a potential lose-lose situation, facing both the possibility their efforts will be in vain and the risk of retaliation (Pope, 2015). This may explain why 95% of the cases identified by students as hazing go unreported (Allan & Madden, 2008). This whistleblower-victim dilemma offers insight into why Hall of Fame NFL player Bart Starr remained silent for decades about his college hazing, covered-up by a lifetime of carefully crafted public statements (Goodman, 2016). His poignant end-of-life revelation speaks to the power of hazing over its victims, and the need for change.

The prototypical whistleblower-victim dilemma is seen in sexual assault. Report the incident, suffer shame and embarrassment, and the stress of a trial – or remain silent, failing to see justice done and leaving others at risk from the perpetrator, now emboldened by the absence of consequences. Lizzy Seeburg reported a sexual assault by a Notre Dame Football player, and

shortly after committed suicide. The failure of police to conduct a timely investigation, threatening texts from the football team and the esteemed status of the institution arguably contributed to the powerlessness and hopelessness that drives suicidal behavior. All too often, suicide is an unanticipated consequence of interpersonal violence (e.g., Nuwer, 2015). Sadly, in silencing the victim, suicide serves the perpetrator.

Smith & Freyd (2014) describe this as a secondary victimization, that unfolds as those who hold status within the organization are shielded from the consequences of their actions, denying justice and significantly exacerbating the initial offense. In like manner, the women who reported widespread problems with sexual abuse by members of the football team at Baylor University were subjected to harsh criticism from throughout the campus community (“Baylor Regents,” 2016; Watkins, 2015). The courageous and eloquent victim impact statement prepared by Emily Doe, following her sexual assault by All-American swimmer, Brock Turner has demonstrated the power of one to make change. With 11 million readings in 4 days, her efforts have given voice to the many sexual assault victims who succumb to shame and silence for fear of worse consequences, and encouraged others to come forward. For bringing light to the crushing impact of sexual assault, the dynamics that undermine reporting and recovery, and for empowering its victims, she has been recognized as the 2016 “Woman of the Year” by *Glamour Magazine* (Mettler, 2016).

Organizational Response

Organizational response is the tipping point in any incident where social justice is in question. It is critical for both victim and accused that institutions be transparent in inquiry, fair in adjudication and just in punishment. Not all accused are guilty, as evidenced by the false accusations of sexual assault directed at the Duke University Men’s Lacrosse team (Zenovich,

2016). Undeserved adverse consequences can function as a kind of bullying in itself. Penn State sport psychologist, Dave Yukelson (personal communication, March 4, 2016) notes the impact of the Sandusky sexual assaults on players enrolled long after the incident, with criticism directed from varied sources toward athletes, as if they were complicit. The primary goal of the process is not punishment per se, but to focus the institution on its mission, and to provide a correction if it has gone off course.

Institutional betrayal happens when a trusted and powerful organization acts in a way that brings harm to those whose safety and well-being its mission is to protect (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Betrayal may be isolated or systemic, and may be a consequence of direct action, failure to respond to transgressions, or neglecting to inform constituents of their rights when offended. The expectation of trust implicit in its mission, in conjunction with a heavily skewed power dynamic, renders its stakeholders particularly vulnerable. When the organization fails to act, the victim faces a double bind: leave the organization, or accept institutional betrayal as a condition of continuing membership, in the process committing to a kind of psychological blindness, pretending as if all is well (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Reflecting on his experiences in Berlin during the Holocaust, Lemkin has described the zeitgeist as a twilight between knowing and not knowing where unethical practices were widely recognized but nonetheless routinely left unaddressed (Smith & Freyd, 2014)

In *Moral Disengagement*, Bandura (2016) details the process of denial, misdirection, absolution from blame and dehumanizing the victim by which organizations do harm and live comfortably with themselves. When used collectively and systematically, these behaviors lay the foundation for institutional betrayal. The power of such strategies are redoubled when a highly

esteemed institution uses its prestige to assuage doubt, as is suggested by the Zimbardo (1969) and Milgram (1975) studies.

Denial is a widely used term in psychological and popular literature with nuanced variations in meaning (Bandura, 2016). In Freudian theory, denial is a defense mechanism, a coping method that pushes events out of awareness to prevent feeling overwhelmed emotionally. Denial may follow from cognitive dissonance, a state of psychological tension when encountering conflicting beliefs and behaviors. When unable to reconcile an offense reported with the status of the accused, denial may present as a form of moral disbelief that manifests itself as a psychological blindness to events (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Perhaps this explains what transpired in the Penn State sex scandals, as those in authority failed to allow themselves to see the reality of what had happened. When used deliberately and with awareness, denial is synonymous with lying.

Misdirection comes in many forms. Pope (2015) describes the ethical placebo as an endemic means of misdirection whereby individuals and organizations seek to avoid accountability. Pope and Vasquez (2001) detail eight tricks of language, twenty two justification strategies and twenty two logical fallacies, which may be used to spin ethically questionable options into seemingly acceptable choices. Ethical placebos often work by deconstructing a situation, examining elements of behavior as if they were unrelated events, and subjecting them to convenient reinterpretation. Ethical placebos methodically misdirect attention from problems, and sabotage steps toward a solution. The double bind is a particularly insidious and vexing form of misdirection poignantly illustrated by R.D. Laing in *Knots*, a blending of poetry, psychology and social commentary

They are playing a game. They are playing at not playing a game.

If I show them I see they are, I shall break the rules and they will punish me.

I must play their game, of not seeing I see their game. (1972, p.1)

Part C: Advocacy in Action

The psychological dynamics of hazing, bullying, harassment and organizational response identified in Part B are applied in a case study format, illuminating the challenges faced by the psychologist who takes on the role of advocate. As the scenario unfolds, the Sport Psychologist (SP) first focuses on helping the athlete cope with the stress of a hostile environment, then prepares the athlete to act as an advocate on her own behalf, and eventually steps fully into the role of advocate, acting for the athlete. With each step forward, risk rises and hopes fall on the institution willingness to be accountable.

Season 1: Maureen is a widely-recruited first year basketball player who starts the first several games. She misses a game for a family religious celebration, which the team loses. At the next practice, Maureen discovers she has lost her starting position. No one on the team will speak with her, subjecting her to hazing in the form of social exclusion. Although team mates eventually resume communication by the next game, she does not play for the next several games. In a team van accident, multiple players are injured and Maureen suffers a concussion. With a reduced roster, the coach tries to force Maureen to play against medical advice, but she refuses. Now recovered medically, she is distressed that she is receiving no playing time at all. Feeling helpless and fearful of acting on her own behalf, she presents to the SP.

Season 2: As the second season unfolds, Maureen re-contacts the SP noting that the coach has been complaining about her weight, suggesting she could be starting again if she were lighter and faster, even though she weighs the same as her first year. Maureen continues to be seen periodically in counseling through the season, typically after slights from the coach. She is

increasingly distressed, with which she copes alternately by “comfort” eating and by restricting food intake. At the conclusion of her second season, Maureen considers transferring. She is encouraged by the SP to speak with the coach about her lack of playing time and comments about her weight. The coach minimizes her concerns, assuring her that things will be better next year, leading her to stay with the College.

Season 3: Maureen presents to the SP after becoming ill from laxative use to lose weight, reporting that criticism of her weight and other negative behaviors from the coach have escalated. With her permission, the SP registers a detailed complaint with the Dean of Students. The report from the Dean back to the SP does not address the coach’s bullying at all, and offers the results of a superficial investigation of hazing, apparently limited to an end-of season evaluation for Season 2 (even though the hazing incident occurred during Season 1). The player is advised by the Dean to meet with the Athletic Director (AD), who cautions Maureen that her concerns could be pursued further, but would likely create such an awkward situation that she would no longer be able to remain on the team. The AD again suggests that she work things out with the coach. The Dean assures the SP that all are acting in accord with the College’s mission.

Analysis

The College’s tactics, which are designed to protect the institution at the expense of the athlete, include a sham investigation, use of ethical placebos and a double bind, resulting in institutional betrayal.

Sham Investigation. A sham investigation is carefully crafted to avoid an adverse finding. The full set of issues raised in the meeting apparently go uninvestigated and are not addressed in the report. For example, the question of being forced to play against medical advice is not mentioned, nor are the persistent comments critical of the athlete’s weight. The inquiry

into hazing was limited to review of evaluations at the end of Season 2, resulting in a reporting bias that was obviously to the advantage of the College. By asking only the Season 2 team, the reporting is both over-inclusive (i.e., including players not present at the time) and under-inclusive (failing to ask a group that was present), thus dramatically skewing the reported statistics. Excluding the senior class at the time of the hazing is particularly problematic because as leaders of the team the hazing could not have happened without their explicit support. There is no indication of an attempt to define hazing before asking the question, which is important in light of evidence that many hazing practices are not recognized as such (Allan & Madden, 2008).

Ethical Placebos and the Double Bind. The College uses ethical placebos to place itself in the best light possible. This begins with deconstructing the events as if they were unrelated, thus obscuring the overall pattern of behavior, by which an objective observer could discern the larger story and garner meaning and intent. Out of context, the events are more easily subjected to convenient reinterpretation. For example, the sham investigation sets up use of the “appeal to ignorance” ethical placebo (Pope & Vasquez, 2011) as the College spins its own intentionally inadequate investigation as indicating the absence of wrongdoing. The College creates a “double bind” presenting the illusion of choice, while setting up a lose-lose situation. The core of the double bind is conveyed in the AD’s comment to Maureen, that her concerns could be pursued, but that to do so would likely result in her being unable to remain on the team. The AD locks in the double bind by suggesting that the player speak to the Coach if there are other concerns. Directing the victim to seek relief from the person who has created the problems tightens the knot of the bind.

The Dean’s reply to the SP that says little directly, says much implicitly, revealing the College’s buy-in and leadership role in actions taken. This suggestion also puts the Dean’s

stamp of approval on the actions taken by the Coach and AD. That the Dean denies in a public written statement what the AD freely acknowledges openly in the meeting with the player, demonstrates the extent to which the College has fully leveraged the skewed power dynamic that is the hallmark of institutional betrayal. The Dean's statement that the program is in keeping with the college's institutional values and priorities speaks to the collective confidence of the Dean, AD and Coach that they were not at risk for consequences that might come from reasoned examination – as an ethical higher authority might potentially do.

Institutional Betrayal. A failed process is reflected in: tolerance of persisting abusive practices, a sham investigation, and systemic use of ethical placebos and the double bind. As a result, Maureen is betrayed by the college, while the institution reinforces a culture of organizational silence, with the veiled threat of additional adverse consequences for those who speak out. The Dean's claim of no harm done in her response to the SP reflects the boldness and false righteousness of those that employ the ethical placebo.

At the root of institutional betrayal is a failure of leadership, which is all the more disturbing in that it is from a would-be esteemed institution. Failure to address issues that are at the core of the College's mission demonstrates a "Helm's" effect (Heil, 2015). Like the trusted helmsman in Greek mythology who let the ship go adrift, the leader who allows the institution to veer off its true course is responsible for its wrecking on the rocky shoals of catastrophe. At the University of Missouri in 2015, President Wolfe ignored building evidence of racial injustice on campus. Simmering tensions sparked by a graduate student's hunger strike, culminated in a threatened boycott by the football team, leading to the president's resignation. This decisive remedy functions like a correction in course. It stands in stark contrast to the case study

presented above, raising the question of what to do when reasonable measures fail, and presenting a compelling example of advocacy in action.

Part D: Advocacy in Perspective

When the institutions that govern sport fail to provide an adequate resolution, the pursuit of advocacy may lead the psychologist into unfamiliar territory and entail interaction with an array of allies and adversaries, including: athletes, coaches and parents, other psychological and medical professionals, sports organizations and governing bodies, law enforcement and governmental agencies, and the media. The challenge is compounded when advocacy runs contrary to deeply entrenched history and tradition, and where a remedy is tantamount to a cultural change.

Advocacy in the Public Domain

The failure of the institution in the case study to make a reasonable effort to correct the problem begs the question “What else can be done?” In the ideal situation, there is the opportunity to appeal to a higher authority. Failing that, one is left with the courts, the court of public opinion and the media.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is the higher authority with its member institutions, empowered to investigate and sanction a wide range of athlete, coach and institutional behaviors. However, in the case study presented, the NCAA can only advise the college to conduct a self-investigation, the futility of which is apparent. Given the adversarial stance of the college, there is question whether further action might result in additional adverse consequences for the athlete, the sport psychologist or both. Lest observers naively think that the courts are a ready remedy, consider the comments of attorney Slade McLaughlin who represented both the plaintiff in a highly publicized hazing incident at Franklin and Marshall

College (Berman, 2012) and a Jerry Sandusky sexual assault victim (Personal communication, October 24, 2015). His comments point to the worst case scenario where all the power of the institution is formally and officially directed against the athlete (or coach or others wronged), as if the failure of institutional leadership can somehow be righted by a favorable court proceeding.

Educational institutions rarely admit wrongdoing, almost never apologize, and fight claims tooth and nail. Any legal process would necessarily be a long and drawn out one, and would involve ostracization of the athlete by other students, administrators, etc.

There is no easy road to success which invariably turns into a cut-throat, scorch and burn proceeding.

The court of public opinion is a fickle one, with a high risk to reward ratio for those who take the path of activism. Muhammed Ali's decision to resist induction into the Army as a conscientious objector, now widely respected, was met with vilification at the time (Muhammad Ali: Olympic.org, n.d.). The need to capture the attention of a soporific public is why activism has historically played a critical role in social justice in sport, notably the 1968 Mexico City Olympics black power salute and the 2015 racial discrimination protests at the University of Missouri (Edwards, 2016). Alternatively, a simple gesture at just the right time can be a tipping point. In Jackie Robinson's entry into baseball, a turning point came as he was embraced on the field by Dodger team captain, Pee Wee Reese, unequivocally communicating to the fans and players that Robinson was a full member of the team (Cronin, 2013).

To enter the court of public opinion, it is critical that psychologists speak effectively to the media and by extension the public. Ferguson (2015) notes problems with public perception of psychology emanating from its failure to differentiate science from pop psychology, naïve notions of psychology, and failure to present research in a way that resonates with the public and

with policy makers. In a venue where sensationalism and sound bites often trump substance and detailed analysis, psychologists are cautioned to craft a clear and compelling message (Kirshenbaum, 2015).

When focused on broad societal issues, advocacy must often overcome “cultural schema,” defined as embedded patterns of reasoning that are typically simplistic, easily misapplied, and often operate outside conscious awareness (Davey, 2015). Take mental toughness, for example, which is universally deemed a virtue in sport. When unchecked, mental toughness may result in and justify undue harshness and violence, influencing practices ranging from hazing to negative coaching to violence on the field of play.

Memorialized in the naming of the Super Bowl trophy, Vince Lombardi is an icon of mental toughness and a mythic figure in 20th century sport. But the myth does not match the man. Lombardi, a devout Catholic, prayed for control of his temper and was an ardent gay rights supporter (Maraniss, 2000). He is widely but incorrectly credited with originating the infamous quote “winning isn’t everything, it’s the only thing.” Lombardi would regret this, later saying “Winning isn’t the only thing, but wanting to win is” (Overman, 1999). Perhaps, better insight into his success as a coach are his comments on discipline, suggesting it be done in “the spirit of teaching...even love, like the discipline one gets from a father and mother” (Moore, 2014). The “winning” quote transcended sport as football became a lens through which Americans interpreted life in the 1960’s and 1970’s, when traditional American values were being challenged and the mainstream culture was searching for a voice. The penetration of sport-driven values into mainstream culture is reflected in a chilling foreshadowing of the Watergate scandal as the slogan, “Winning politically is not everything. It’s the only thing” found its way into the 1972 Nixon presidential campaign (Overman, 1999).

That hazing and other disruptive practice like negative coaching and on-field violence are driven by cultural schema, is suggested by their pervasiveness and persistence despite efforts at change, the transparency of rationalizations justifying behaviors, and their failure to stand to reasoned scrutiny.

Advocacy and the Coach

The power and influence a coach wields over the athlete, for good or bad, is without parallel. Many coaches are loved. Some are despised. I remain deeply grateful to my high school and college coaches, Paul Sanborn and John Covert – and to many coaches with whom I have worked as a sport psychologist. But negative impacts endure as well. A former college football player and entrepreneur, when approached by his alma mater for a donation offered the shocking reply, “Not until Coach XX dies” (Athlete b, personal communication, 2013).

There is a magic that can unfold when coach and athlete blend into a team. It can simultaneously create enduring personal resilience, lifelong bonds and outstanding performance. Take the USA Hockey team whose victory over the Soviet Union in the 1980 Olympics stands as an iconic moment of team over talent (Coffey, 2005). Yet there are undercurrents in sport which reveal a dark side of entitlement, interpersonal violence and a failure of intuitional accountability, which run counter to the esteemed values of sport that are widely espoused. Given the integral role of the coach within the team, such instances require coach buy-in whether it is a clear and present awareness or a murky kind of blindness to the obvious.

There is an abundance of evidence to suggest (e.g., University of Maine study; Allan & Madden, 2008) that the remediation of hazing and other forms of implicitly sanctioned interpersonal violence require no less than a change in culture. If the culture of sport is to

change, coaches will need to lead the way. No one is more heavily invested in sport than the coach. They know the game the best and feel its heartbeat. The executives' distant view from the "sky box" enables events to be too easily reduced to a calculated abstraction with focus to a fault on the bottom line. But change is challenging when the practices are deeply entrenched, driven by the momentum of tradition, and when the status quo brings tangible success to those who wield the power. Furthermore, the life of a coach is ephemeral, and subject to the whims of those who in turn hold power over them. In a culture where winning can seem like everything, building a winning record while building character is a formidable challenge. If coaches are to be advocates, their rights and protections are as essential as those provided to athletes.

Advocacy and the Psychologist

While sport psychologists are uniquely positioned to serve as advocates, the voice of psychology in the public discourse on sport is conspicuously absent. Given the bright light shed on social issues in sport, this is a lost opportunity. Instances of social, moral, ethical and legal injustice may be overlooked, because there are many factors that make it easy to do so. In the absence of a defined role or a clear sense of accountability, it is easy to fail to act. In a study by Darley and Batson (1973), seminary students were directed to move with haste to a nearby location to speak on the biblical parable of the Good Samaritan, encountering on the way a man slumped in an alleyway - with less than half stopping to help.

It is also difficult to move against established practices. Where "getting your bell rung" and getting back in the game is a sign of toughness, it can be difficult to effect change, as has been demonstrated -- but not impossible, as has also been demonstrated. Advocates may also be adversely affected personally and professionally, falling victim to the skewed power dynamic that is driving the need for advocacy. Consider the comments of Dr. Bennet Omalu on the NFL

response to his head injury research, “I was bruised and battered... I was ridiculed.” (Reiter, 2015, p.31).

The risks and responsibilities in advocacy raise difficult ethical questions regarding professional practice in sport. Myers, Sweeney and Wright (2002) suggested that although advocacy is essential to professional counseling practice it is often neglected. They point to the risks associated with taking action as an underlying cause for failure to embrace this essential responsibility. Much the same can be said for sport psychology. In suggesting that intervention in sport should strive for the greatest good, Aoyagi and Portenga (2010) identify the importance of social justice and advocacy. They emphasize the critical role of positive ethics which drives a proactive focus on doing the greatest good for clients, noting the contrasting and complementary role of the more typical principle ethics, which are reactive and focused on minimizing harm and risk management. They also encourage professionals to personally embrace the performance enhancement ethic that we expect of our clients. Because sport psychology potentially involves intervention simultaneously with individuals, teams and organizations, it will sometimes entail acting on behalf of one part of the system that is in conflict another. When the system fails to address individual rights or enforce responsible organizational practices, the question of social justice and advocacy arise along with the attendant risks and responsibilities. That sport has a broad social reach in setting standards of behavior, calls attention to the importance of taking action when facing apparent injustice.

Although focused on rural practitioners, Bradley, Werth and Hastings (2012) offer a look at advocacy within a community of which the psychologist is an integral part, and as such bears relevance to sport psychologists and other sport medicine providers. They provide a useful advocacy matrix as a reference point for planning action and for assessing risks and benefits. The

authors also present a balanced look at ethical constraints and examine the mandate to act when faced with social injustice.

Given the significant professional and personal risks faced in advocacy, it is prudent to critically and comprehensively examine decisions before acting. This process can be thought of an advocacy value proposition summarized as: “Advocacy Value = Benefits – Costs +/-

Unintended Consequences” (Heil & Etzel, 2016). The assessment should consider the positive and negative impacts on the advocate, and those who would be the benefactors, in addition to others who may be effected. For example, the Olympic Project for Human Rights signature black power salute at the 1968 Olympics had an extremely high set of costs associated with it, but the participants went forward believing that the hoped for benefits to the many justified the cost to the few. Unintended consequences represent a kind a wild card as is demonstrated in the enduring negative personal impacts on the Australian sprinter, Peter Norman, who joined in, and whose story is largely forgotten (Chen, 2016).

Recent actions, while falling short of a mandate, nonetheless encourage action by psychologists. The APA Public Interest Directorate has reinvigorated efforts at advocacy with its first leadership conference (Keita, 2015). The *NCAA Inter-Association Consensus Document: Best Practices for Understanding and Supporting Student-Athlete Mental Wellness (Best Practices)* clarifies roles and responsibilities for psychological providers and empowers them with autonomous authority to act on the athletes’ behalf (NCAA Sport Science Institute, 2016). The Graduate Coalition for the Advancement of Graduate and Training in the Practice of Sport Psychology has included advocacy language in consensus documents on training and professional practice (e.g, Aoyagi, M., Cohen, A., Appaneal, R., Carr, B., Carter, L., Herzog, T., Rhodius, A., & Van Raalte, J., 2014). The value of the psychologist in sport is implicit in other

initiatives across the sport enterprise, such as the Vatican's planned "Sports at the Service of Humanity" meeting (Ourand, 2016), and as initiatives from the Aspen Institute Sports & Society (2015) and the Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice. ("Muhammad Ali Center to host," 2016).

The Challenge

As goes sport, so goes society. Sport is a juggernaut of a social institution putting a spotlight on societal issues and modeling a standard of behavior. It is said that sport builds character. Yet, there are so many contrary examples. Sport is like a ship that goes where it is steered, whether to the moral high ground or the rocky shoals of tragedy. When sport stays on course society benefits. Hence the critical role of advocacy.

Why advocate for sport especially when the potential risks are high and the rewards are low? The answer lies in the critical role of sport in society and the potency of the athletic ideal. Sport is a cornerstone of Western Civilization. Ancient Greek culture gave the world the Olympic Games, a bloodless celebration of warrior skills that is the foundation of modern sport. In the legend of Pheidippides and his Marathon run, there is a view of heroism that eschews the power and dominance that is the hall mark of military conquest, for a model built instead on honor and service in a higher cause (Perseus Digital Library Project, n.d.). With Greek theatre as a reference point, Aristotle speaks to the transformative power of challenge and trial when played out in a public spectacle. His references to character and catharsis translate well to contemporary sport (McKeon, 2001).

At times of national catastrophe, sport as a shared public ceremony has demonstrated its capacity to memorialize and heal. Following the Virginia Tech shootings in 2007, sport played a critical role in the recovery process. The first sporting event, a collegiate baseball game 4 days

after the shootings, coincided with placement of baseballs at the victims' memorial. Attended by about 4,000 spectators, this was characterized as the start of return to normalcy. The opening football game the following fall, was described as feeling like a shared national memorial. (Heil, Bennett, Brolinson & Goforth, 2009).

The athletic ideal is revealed in the lessons of the 9/11 tragedy and United Flight 93 (Longman, 2002). The names Beamer, Burnett, Bingham and Glick are not familiar, although they should be. Their actions are a defining moment in contemporary sport and a model to emulate. These former college athletes teamed up to assault the hijackers of Flight 93, saving lives while hastening their own deaths. They showcased the skills honed through sport: to identify a challenge, work as a team, think pragmatically, convert idea to action, and act with courage and composure. Not all will be champions, but every athlete can grow in this skills set and in so doing leave the experience enriched and better prepared for life after. These positive models of the games we play and the skills we build speak to the value of sport.

The who, what, when and how of advocacy are complex questions with often elusive answers. When considering the challenge of advocacy, be reminded of the power of one, as demonstrated by rape survivor Emily Doe and fasting Missouri graduate student, Jonathan Butler, as well as, by Christine Maslach in the Stanford Prison experiment, and Jackie Robinson and Pee Wee Reese on the baseball field. Change begins with a personal decision to take action. Much remains to be done in society and in your town. Next time you see something troubling and ask "Why doesn't somebody do something about that?" - ask instead "Why not me?"

References

- Aldridge, D. (2011, November 7). 20 years ago, Magic took on challenge of HIV. Retrieved from http://www.nba.com/2011/news/features/david_aldridge/11/07/remembering-magic-johnson-hiv-announcement/
- Allan, E., J., & Madden, M. (2008, March 11). *Hazing in view: College students at risk: Initial findings from the national study of student hazing*. University of Maine. Retrieved from: http://www.stophazing.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hazing_in_view_web1.pdf.
- Alvarez, L. (2014, October 31). *Florida A&M band member is convicted in hazing death*. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/01/us/florida-am-band-member-is-convicted-in-hazing-death.html?_r=0
- Anderson, K. (2012, May 7). The legacy of Title IX. [Special section]. *Sports Illustrated*, 44-66.
- Aoyagi, M. W., & Portenga, S. T. (2010). The role of positive ethics and virtues in the context of sport and performance psychology service delivery. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 41(3), 253-259.
- Aoyagi, M., Cohen, A., Appaneal, R., Carr, B., Carter, L., Herzog, T., Rhodius, A., & Van Raalte, J. (2014). *Practicum and Supervision Competencies for Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Unpublished document created by the Coalition for the Advancement of Education and Training in the Practice of Sport Psychology. For a copy of this document contact John M. Silva (silva@live.unc.edu) Coalition Coordinator.
- Aspen Institute. (2015, January 26). *Sport for All, Play for Life: A Playbook to Get Every Kid in the Game*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute Sports & Society Program. Retrieved 1/12/16 from <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/sport-all-play-life-playbook-get-every-kid-game>

- Athey, A. B. & Heil, J. (2011). Responding to critical incidents in sport: The 6 “Cs” of Critical incident response in sport: A guide for parents, coaches, and administrators. *The Journal of Performance Psychology*, 1, 1-8.
- Bandura, A. (2016). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. New York: Worth publishers.
- Baylor regents: Art Briles failed to alert police of alleged assault. (2016, Oct 29). Retrieved from http://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/17912838/investigation-baylor-university-said-art-briles-failed-alert-police-allegations
- Berman, Z. (2012, July 6). Lacrosse program shaken by hazing inquiry. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/07/sports/womens-lacrosse-teams-future-unclear-in-wake-of-alleged-hazing.html?_r=1
- Bradley, J. M., Werth, J. L., & Hastings, S. L. (2012). Social Justice Advocacy in Rural Communities: Practical Issues and Implications. *The Counseling Psychologist* 40(3) 363–384 DOI: 10.1177/0011000011415697
- Cornell, D., & Limber, S. P. (2015). Law and policy on the concept of bullying at school. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 333-343.
- Campanile, G., Bast, A., & Radutzky, M. [Producers] Keteyian, A. [Correspondent]. (2016, May 8). Russia’s doping at Sochi Winter Olympics exposed dark secret [Video file]. *CBS News, 60 Minutes*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/60-minutes-russian-doping-at-sochi-winter-olympics-exposed/>
- Chu, J. (2016, April 26). Rep. Chu Bill requires Pentagon to track, report on military hazing [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://chu.house.gov/press-release/rep-chu-bill-requires-pentagon-track-report-military-hazing>

- Cronin, B. (2013, April 15). Did Reese really embrace Robinson in '47? Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/blog/playbook/fandom/post/_/id/20917/did-reese-really-embrace-robinson-in-47
- Darley, J.M. & Batson, C. D. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 100-108.
- Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377-383.
- Davey, L. (November 16, 2015). Using psychology to effect social change: the science and art of framing issues. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pi/about/social-change.pdf>
- Donnelly, P., Kerr, G. A., Heron, A., & DiCarlo, D.. (2014) Protecting youth in sport: An examination of the status of harassment policies in Canadian sport organizations. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19406940.2014.958180>.
- Edwards, H (2016, March 24) College athletes' rights as civil rights; from Mexico City to Missouri. Keynote paper presented at College Athletes' Rights & Empowerment Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Ferguson, C. J. (2015). "Everybody knows psychology is not real science": Public perceptions of psychology and how we can improve our relationship with policymakers, the scientific community, and the general public. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 527-542.
- Ganellen, B. & Robbennolt, J. K. (2015, February). Judicial Notebook: University marching bands and the psychology of hazing. *Monitor on Psychology*, 46(2), 24

- Gansburg, M. (1964, March 27). 37 who saw murder didn't call the police. *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1964/03/27/37-who-saw-murder-didnt-call-the-police.html?_r=0
- Gilbert, W. (November, 2015). Coaching in emotional control. Team USA Newsletter. Retrieved 11/9/15 from Human Kinetics Coach Education Center <http://www.asep.com/news/ShowArticle.cfm?ID=255>
- Goodman, J. (2016, February 29). NFL legend Bart Starr was victim of 'brutal' Alabama hazing. *Alabama News*. Retrieved from http://www.al.com/sports/index.ssf/2016/02/nfl_legend_bart_starr_was_vict.html
- Grout, J. (n.d.). Gladiators. In *Encyclopedia Romana*. Retrieved November 12, 2016 from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/~grout/encyclopaedia_romana/gladiators/gladiators.html
- Heil, J. (1993). *Psychology of sport injury*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Heil, J (2015, November). Mizou's "show me" moment. *Swim Science NOW*. International Swim Coaches Association. Retrieved from <https://www.swimisca.com/wp-content/uploads/November-Newsletter.pdf>.
- Heil, J., Bennett, G., Brolinson, P. G. & Goforth, M. (2009). Sports Medicine Response to the Virginia Tech Shootings: Lessons Learned. Blacksburg, VA; Virginia Tech Center for Peace Studies & Violence Prevention Library. <http://www.cpsvp.vt.edu/library.html>
- Heil, J., & Etzel, E. (2016, August). Ethics and advocacy in sport psychology. Conversation hour at the American Psychological Association Annual Conference, Denver, CO.

- Heil, J. & Lanahan, R. (1992, October). The HIV Positive/Athlete with AIDS: Performance and Confidentiality Issues. Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology Annual Conference, Colorado Springs, CO.
- Heil, J., Johnson, P., Soter, P. Antozzi, R., Heil, E. & Wiita, N. (2012). High school soccer is a needlessly dangerous game. Report submitted to the Virginia High School League. Unpublished manuscript.
- Heil, J. & Soter, P. (2009). Team game project. United States Fencing Association Technical Report (No. 2009-01). Colorado Springs, CO: United States Olympic Training Center.
- Heil, J., Wiita, N. Johnson, P. & Staples, G. (2009, September). *Injurious rule violating sport behavior: Who is accountable?* Poster presented at the Association for Applied Sport Psychology Conference, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Heil, J. & Wiita, N (2012, October). Drawing the line for aggressive sport behavior: Athletes, referees, and coaches as targets. Poster presented at the Association for Applied Sport Psychology Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Henschen, K. & Heil, J. (1992). A retrospective study of the effect of an athlete's sudden death on teammates. *Omega*, 25(3), 217-223.
- International Paralympic Committee (n.d.). Retrieved November 12, 2016 from <https://www.paralympic.org/>
- Jewison, N. (Producer & Director). (1975). *Rollerball* [Motion Picture]. United States: United Artists.
- Kirshenbaum, S. (2015, November 16). Communicating science. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pi/about/communicating-science.pdf>.
- Laing, R. D. (1972). *Knots*. New York: Random House

- Leach, M. (2010, January 11). McGwire opens up on steroid use. Retrieved from <http://m.mlb.com/news/article/7900244>
- Longman, Jere. (2002). *Among the heroes: The story of Flight 93 and the passengers who fought back*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Manning, R., Levine, M., & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses. *American Psychologist* 62 (6), 555–562.
- Maslow, A. M. (1971). *The Farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Maraniss, D. (2000). *When pride still mattered: A life of Vince Lombardi*. New York: Touchstone Books.
- McKeon, R. (2001). *The basic works of Aristotle*. New York: Modern Library.
- McMurtry, R. (2013). *Memoirs and reflections*. University of Toronto Press.
- Mettler, K. (2016, November 2). Stanford sexual assault survivor named Glamour ‘Woman of the Year.’ The Washington Post News Service. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/lifestyle/2016/11/02/stanford-sexual-assault-survivor-named-glamour-woman-year/jHuWozOExeuWTGMu4LodeI/story.html>
- Milgram, S. (1975). *Obedience to authority*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Moore, J. (2014, October 30). Vince Lombardi isn’t who you think he is. *ViceSports*. Retrieved from https://sports.vice.com/en_us/article/vince-lombardi-isnt-who-you-think-he-is
- Muhammad Ali: Olympic.org, (n.d.). Retrieved 4/16/16 from <http://m.olympic.org/mobile/cassius-clay>

Muhammad Ali Center to host Fourth Annual Athletes and Social Change Forum (2015, November 23). Retrieved from <http://alicenter.org/news/muhammad-ali-center-to-host-fourth-annual-athletes-and-social-change-forum/>

Myers, J. E., Sweeney, T. J., White, V. E. (2002). Advocacy for Counseling and Counselors: A Professional Imperative. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 80(4), 494-402.

Ourand, J. (2016, January 25). Pope Francis sees sports as a world changer. *SportsBusiness*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2016/01/25/Sports-in-Society/Pope-Francis.aspx>

National Center for Catastrophic Sport Injury Research. (n.d.). Retrieved January 5, 2016 from <http://nccsir.unc.edu/>.

NCAA Sport Science Institute (2016). Mental health best practices: Inter-association consensus document: best practices for understanding and supporting student-athlete mental wellness. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Mental%20Health%20Best%20Practices%20WEB%20SINGLE.pdf>

Nuwer, H (2015, July 24) Hazing Deaths. Retrieved from <http://www.hanknuwer.com/articles/hazing-deaths/>

Overman, S. J. (1999). "Winning isn't everything. It's the only thing": The origin, attributions and influence of a famous football quote," *Football Studies*, 2 (2) 77-99.

Ourand, J. (2016, January 25). Pope Francis sees sports as a world changer. *SportsBusiness*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2016/01/25/Sports-in-Society/Pope-Francis.aspx>

“Pennsylvania Hazing Law” (n.d.) Retrieved April 20, 2016 from

<https://www.bloomu.edu/documents/dawn/HazingLaw.pdf>

Petersen, K. (2014, October 22). “It’s rape”: Sayreville High School players face charges for abusive hazing. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-echochambers-29716923#page>

Pope, K. S. (2015) Steps to strengthen ethics in organizations: Research findings, ethics placebos, and what works. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 16(2), 139-152.

Pope, K. S., & Vasquez, M. J. T. (2011). *Ethics in psychotherapy and counseling: A practical guide* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Queally, J. (2014, October 31). Man convicted in hazing death of Florida A&M band member. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-man-convicted-florida-band-member-20141031-story.html>

Reiter, B. (2015, December 28). Brain trust. *Sports Illustrated*, 29-34.

Ritter, R. (2015, March 18). UMBC announces new women’s lacrosse coach after 5 players suspended. Retrieved from <http://baltimore.cbslocal.com/2015/03/18/coaching-change-at-umbc-after-womens-lacrosse-suspension/>

Ryan, A. J. (1973). Medical practices in sport. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 38(1), 99-111.

The V Foundatin (n.d.).Retrieved 4/1 2/2016 from <http://www.jimmyv.org/about-us/our-story/>

Sands, R. R. (2002). *Sport Ethnography*. Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Seidel, J. (2015, February 22). Slain ref’s family hopes new laws will deter attacks. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/story/sports/columnists/jeff-seidel/2015/02/21/legislation-protect-refs/23808761/>

Special Olympics International (n.d.). Retrieved November 12,

2016 <http://www.specialolympics.org/>

Smith, C. P. & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist*, 69(6), 575-587.

States with Anti-hazing laws (2015, May 28). Retrieved from

<http://www.stophazing.org/laws/states-with-anti-hazing-laws/>

Step Up!: Hazing. (n.d.). Retrieved 4/22/16 from <http://stepupprogram.org/topics/hazing/>

Strauss, B., Haverstick, M., Johnson, R., & Silver, S. (2016, March 26). College athletes, the

NCAA, & due process. Panel presentation at College Athletes' Rights & Empowerment

Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

The Nazi Olympics Berlin 1936. Retrieved 12/5/16 from

<https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005680>

Taylor Hooten Foundation (n.d.). Retrieved 7/2/16 from <http://taylorhooton.org/>

Taylor, P. (2014, September). The Ray Rice video and what it exposes about the NFL. *Sports*

Illustrated, 121(10),12-14.

Taylor, T. (2015, December 14). Brain and brawn: Special report. *Sports Illustrated*,74-79.

The Ancient Olympics; A Special Exhibit of the Perseus Digital Library Project. Retrieved April

1, 2016 from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/Olympics/index.html>

Van Raalte, J. L., Cornelius, A. E., Linder, D. E., & Brewer, B. W. (2007). The relationship

between hazing and team cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 30, 491-507.

Victor, D. (2015, August 26). Jonathan Martin, Former N.F.L. player, says he attempted suicide.

New York Times. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/27/sports/football/jonathan-martin-former-nfl-player-says-he-attempted-suicide.html?_r=0

Watkins, M. (August 19, 2015). After athletics scandal, Kenneth Starr leaves Baylor faculty.

Texas Tribune. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/08/19/after-athletics-scandal-kenneth-starr-leaves-baylor-faculty/>

Wilson, F. (2012, May 31). Congresswoman Wilson announces framework for anti-hazing legislation [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://wilson.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congresswoman-wilson-announces-framework-for-anti-hazing-legislation>

Wolff, A. (2011, September 26). Sports saves the world. *Sports Illustrated*, 115 (12), 62-74.

Wolff, A. (2015, September 26). Abuse of power. *Sports Illustrated*, 123 (12), 50-55.

World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) (2004, March 17). The World Anti-Doping Code: The 2004 Prohibited List: International Standard. Retrieved from: www.wada-ama.org.

Yukhymenko-Lescroart, M.A, Brown, M. E. & T. S. Paskus, T. S. (2014). The relationship between ethical and abusive coaching behaviors and student-athlete well-being. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*. 4(1), 36-49. doi.org/10.1037/spy0000023.

Zenovich, M. (Producer & Director). (2016). *Fantastic Lies* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: ESPN Films.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1969). The human choice: Individuation, reason and order versus deindividuation, impulse and chaos. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Author Note

This paper is based on the 2015 American Psychological Association Society for Sport, Exercise & Performance Psychology President's Address. It is a revised and expanded version of a paper of the same title published in *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*. The reference citation is: Heil, J. (2016). Sport advocacy; Challenge, controversy, ethics and action. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 5(4), 281-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000078>.

It is available at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=browsePA.volumes&jcode=spy>

My thanks go to those who have allowed use of personal comments, provided review and critique, or have otherwise contributed to this paper, notably Paul Soter, David Shapiro, Mark Layman, Chip Magdelinskas, Paul Sanborn, Trent Petrie, Don Forsyth, Ellison Heil and Edmund Acevedo. My appreciation goes to the APA Public Interest Directorate for its leadership and recently invigorated efforts in encouraging psychologists to embrace the role of advocacy.

I would like to express my gratitude to my high school and college coaches, Paul Sanborn and John Covert, whose positive coaching set a standard of excellence that I am only able to fully appreciate with the perspective of time and experience.

Information regarding personally referenced consulting and other professional activities is available from the author. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to John Heil Psychological Health Roanoke, 2840 Electric Rd., Suite 200, Roanoke, VA 24018.

E-mail: jheil@PsychHealthRoanoke.com.