HUBRIS: ATHLETES, PERCEPTIONS OF AUTHORITY, AND FEELINGS OF INVULNERABILITY ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS

MARK VERMILLION, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT
The purpose of this research was to utilize the concept of hubris to frame a discussion of differences between collegiate athletes and collegiate non-athletes. Surveys were distributed to a collegiate student population that included both athletes and non-athletes and included questions that served as proxies for varying dimensions of hubris, such as perceptions of campus police (conventional authority structures) and taking measures of self-protection (feelings of invulnerability), while controlling for race and gender. Statistical results indicate that contrary to the previous ideas, college athletes have better perceptions of campus authority structures. Significant differences are identified and discussed between male athletes and male non-athletes; male athletes and female athletes; and minority athletes and minority non-athletes. In accordance with previous ideas, athletes take fewer measures of self protection relating to feelings of invulnerability. These conclusions are significant across racial categories and between male and female athletes, but do not relate to differences between female athletes and female non-athletes. As a way of interpreting the results, the author advocates the integration of interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks.

INTRODUCTION
With the increasing commercialization of college sports (Sperber, 2000; Upthegrove, Rosicigno, & Zubrinsky, 1999), elite athletes have the potential to develop larger-than-life personalities (Coakley, 2004). Indeed, Bob Knight and Bill Self (basketball coaches in the Big XII) both agree college sports has become a large, profitable industry as exemplified by the multibillion-dollar contract the NCAA has with CBS to air the men's basketball tournament ("Knight, Big 12 coaches"). On a related note, Adler and Adler (1999) show how college athletes deal with the fame, spotlight, and attention of being elite athletes on a college campus. Oftentimes, athletes developed aggrandized views of themselves and were set apart from the rest of the collegiate community (Adler & Adler, 1999). As a result of being separated from their community setting, athletes have the potential to develop extreme personalities that do not strictly adhere to current norms, values, or laws of society. These extreme personalities may result in athletes' feeling invulnerable and/or disobeying current authority structures.

Cox (2007) states athletes and non-athletes differ based on many personality characteristics. Athletes often believe they are invincible, above the law, or incapable of being hurt (Goodman, 1995; McMahon, 2004). Elite athletes, especially in performance sports, exhibit more competitiveness (Cox, 2007) and thrill-seeking behavior, which demonstrates invincibility or invulnerability (Patel & Luckstead, 2000). Examples of athletes engaging in high-risk behaviors include Ben Roethlisberger and Kellen Winslow (from the National Football League) and Corey Lidle and Thurman Munson (from Major League Baseball). Roethlisberger and Winslow were seriously injured while riding high performance motorcycles ("Browns GM: Risk-taking athletes," 2006), while Munson and Lidle were killed piloting small airplanes (Weinbaum, 2006). In conjunction with feelings of invulnerability, some elite athletes have a decreased acceptance of current authority figures and structures, resulting in criminal activity, deviant behavior, and the belief that the "jock culture" supersedes current authority structures (Safai, 2002).

Athletes engaging in deviant behavior and violating laws is nothing new in American culture (Leonard, 1998). Elite athletes displaying a pride-driven arrogance, an inflated sense of self, and decreased ac-

ceptance of current authority structures are byproducts of social dynamics operating within athletic cultures (Coakley, 2006). Within collegiate sports, for example, "male college student-athletes, compared to the rest of the male population, are responsible for a significantly higher percentage of sexual assaults reported to judicial affairs on the campuses of Division I institutions" (Benedict-Cross Study cited in Locklear 2003). Other high-profile examples of college athletes allegedly engaging in deviant or criminal behavior include the recent Duke Lacrosse scandal and alleged rape (Wilson & Bernstein, 2006), sexual assault by an Arizona State football player (Scott & Kiefer, 2006), and using sex, alcohol, and drugs to recruit football players at the University of Colorado (Steinberger, 2005). Moreover, Manning (2005) notes athletes competing in team-oriented sports have a lower level of moral judgment, while Feezell (2004) speaks of the term "athlete" as meaning a unique individual differentiated from his/her surroundings based solely upon his/her physical abilities. The connection between athletes being revered, unique, separated, and somehow different from the people around them is difficult to understand and needs further elaboration.

The popularity of college sports is an important factor in determining how athletes develop identities and interact with the communities around them (Adler & Adler, 1999). Additionally, Coakley (2006) notes coaches often, "create team environments that keep athletes in a perpetual state of adolescence" (p. 165). Environments that mirror states of adolescence are often characterized by feelings of invulnerability and a decreased respect for current authority structures (Patel & Luckstead, 2000). As a result, the focus of this research is to determine if differences exist between collegiate athletes and collegiate non-athletes in relation to their acceptance of legitimated authority structures and feelings of invulnerability.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Coakley (2004) uses the Greek word *hubris* to describe elite athletes' "sense of being unique and extraordinary" and how "it may be expressed in terms of pride-driven arrogance, an inflated sense of power and importance, and a public persona that communicates superiority and even insolence" (p. 173). The hubris in athletes can result in feelings of invulnerability to decreased levels of respect for authority structures. Hughes and Coakley (1991) note how athletes subscribe to norms and values that are embodied in sport, not in the larger societal context, and this contributes to the development of hubris. Specifically, this set of norms and values is called the sport ethic and includes tenants such as: 1) sacrificing for 'the game', 2) seeking individual distinction, 3) taking risks, and 4) challenging personal limits and possibilities (Hughes & Coakley, 1991).

An unquestioned acceptance of these ideals may lead an athlete to engage in positive deviance, which results from an "unqualified commitment to the sport ethic" (Coakley, 2004, p. 172). Specifically, the group dynamics present in team sports aid in bonding athletes together, thereby normalizing the overconformity to the sport ethic (Leonard, 1998). Commitment to the "team" and the sport ethic appears to take precedence over society's norms and values, resulting in "overconformity" (Hughes & Coakley, 1991; Coakley, 2004). Because of the closeness and the commitment required to stay a part of these elite teams, athletes are separated from the social environments in which they are embedded creating a sense of mystery and admiration from the surrounding community. These dynamics and the cyclical nature of being select, elite athletes exacerbate the concept of hubris. Coakley (2004) illustrates how this cycle is perpetuated:

> After all, they [elite athletes] are told this day after day by everyone from coaches to team boosters to autograph seekers. They read it in newspapers and magazines, and they see it on TV and the Internet…we see that much of the deviance in sports is not motivated primarily by the desire to win or to make money. Instead, it is motivated by desires to play the game, to be an athlete, and to maintain membership in an elite athletic in-group. (pp. 173-4)

Due to the feelings of superiority (i.e., hubris), commercialization of college sports (Upthegrove, Rosrcigno, Zubrinski, 1999), and the high premium placed on college athletics in American culture (Washington & Karen, 2001) elite athletes can potentially develop a sense of uniqueness, separation, and arrogance.

Invulnerability and Authority

On collegiate campuses a centralized and dominant authority structure is the campus police (Lanier, 1995). Research indicates the way students perceive campus police officers is related to their perception of effective and legitimate authority within a campus community (Trojanowicz, Benson, & Trojanowicz, 1988). As a result, perceptions of authority structures on campus can be measured by measuring perceptions of the campus police. Additionally, taking measures of self-protection while on campus to avoid campus crime victimization represents a student's perceived level of care, safety, and vulnerability (Fisher, 1995). Conversely, individuals that do not actively engage in taking measures of self-protection can have more feelings of invulnerability. The aforementioned concept of hubris, if present within the collegiate student-athlete population, would greatly affect perceptions of authority (i.e., campus police), invulnerability (i.e., taking measures of self-protection while on campus), and potentially levels of victimization. Throughout the literature (e.g. Brown & Benedict, 2002), there are two salient individual-level variables influencing an individual's respect for authority and feelings of invulnerability, which can be usefully applied to college athletes. The two variables are gender and race.

Within college athletics, gender is an important factor in determining how female athletes are viewed and feel about themselves (Coakley, 2006). Women's college sports are imitating the institutionalized center of male sports by adopting many of the same dynamics and characteristics in hopes of achieving similar popularity levels (Messner, 2002). Similarly, female athletes are adopting the values and traits of male athletes. For example, Young (1997) notes female athletes in power and performance sports, such as rugby, basketball, and wrestling, have embraced the physicality and potential violence within their sport, while still retaining their "feminine" identity. As a result, female athletes are moving away from current social definitions that women should not be involved in physical or aggressive activities (Young, 1997). If hubris is prominent in male sports and female sports are evolving along the lines of male sports, then the potential for female athletes to exhibit feelings of invulnerability is greatly enhanced.

Additionally, gender is a relevant concept when examining perceptions of campus police authorities. Brown and Benedict (2002) note while men are more likely to be arrested, women are much more likely to be victimized, especially on college campuses (Fox & Hellman, 1985; Henson & Stone, 1999; Volkwein, Szelest, & Lizotte 1995). Higher rates of victimization (i.e., females) and higher arrest rates (i.e., males) are both associated with negative views of authority organizations (Brown & Benedict, 2002). Female athletes' perceptions of campus crime, victimization, or campus police officers, however, have never been adequately examines. When examined through the conceptual framework of hubris, female and male athletes could have similar perceptions of authority figures.

The athlete's race is another characteristic that could influence hubris in college athletes. The relevance of race to college athletics is often noted in the disproportionate number of high-profile athletes that are African-American and the overall lack of African-American college coaches and administrators (Coakley, 2006; Sage, 1998). In addition Edwards (1985) and Lapchick (2001) address exploitation of African-American athletes within both professional and college athletics.

A focus on identify formation is crucial for developing a relationship between hubris and race within sport. Concerning identity formation in sport, Lawrence (2005) notes the importance of team cohesion in team sports and the role race plays in developing athlete's experiences. Specifically, teammates'

race, while important and influential to team dynamics, is embedded within the team's feelings of togetherness. Additionally, African-American athletes felt a sense of empowerment because of their participation in sports, while simultaneously maintaining the belief that being African-American was superior to being white and provided them specific athletic skills in certain sports (Lawrence, 2005). Indeed, Coakley (2006) notes how some young African-American males "believe their destiny is to play [sports] better than anyone else, especially whites" (p. 290). Majors (1986) identified the concept of "cool pose" to describe the tough, in-control, and invulnerable nature of African-American males. This unique presentation of self is the ultimate portrayal of masculinity for this group (Coakley, 2006). The concept of hubris, when combined with previous research, can be very useful for isolating how an athlete's race affects their feelings of invulnerability.

Additionally, race is influential in perceptions of campus police authorities. In a study of college campus crime Miller and Pan (1987) note that positive attitudes towards the police tended to vary based on race; that is, African-Americans tended to have more negative views of the police than their white counterparts. On a related note Berry and Smith (2000) note African-American athletes are overrepresented in not only crime statistics, but also as criminal sport figures in the media. This media representation allows society to expect African-American athletes to disobey the law more compared to other athletes (Berry & Smith, 2000). Since African-Americans feel empowered by sports (Lawrence, 2005), are socially expected to engage in crime as athletes (Berry & Smith, 2000), and have more negative views towards campus police authorities, the concept of hubris would be a relevant influence on perceptions of authority figures.

Research Questions

Hubris is a concept that further elaborates how athletes may feel invulnerable and have decreased acceptance of authority figures. Additionally, both the gender and race of the individual affects feelings of invulnerability and acceptance of authority structures. When focusing on college athletes the most public form of authority for a campus community is that of the campus police. While on a campus, feelings of invulnerability could result in avoiding measures of self-protection. Therefore, based upon the previous literature and the aforementioned discussion of conceptual ideas, the following research questions are posed:

1) Do athletes and non-athletes differ in their perceptions of institutionalized authority security agencies and in their feelings of vulnerability on campus?
2) Regarding perceptions of institutionalized authority/security agencies and in their feelings of invulnerability on campus, do differences exist between female athletes and female non-athletes, male athletes and male non-athletes, and male athletes and female athletes?
3) Regarding perceptions of institutionalized authority/security agencies and in their feelings of invulnerability on campus, do differences exist between minority athletes and minority non-athletes, white athletes and white non-athletes, and white athletes and minority athletes?

METHODOLOGY

Measures

To investigate differences between college athletes and the rest of the student body pertaining to perceptions of the police, victimization rates, and taking measures of self-protection, a survey was constructed. Specifically, the survey contains a scale to measure perceptions of the police, which serves as a proxy for adherence to and perceptions of institutionalized authority structures- a key element to the idea of hubris. The scale is composed of eleven statements that are measured using summated Likert-scale responses, such as "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." The category of "Neutral" was omitted in order to avoid an acquiescence bias from respon-

dents (Nardi 2003). Each mixed-worded response was given a number. For example, respondents that that chose "Strongly Agree" were given a score of four (4); "Agree" were given a score of three (3), "Disagree" were given a score of (2), and "Strongly Disagree" were given a score of one (1). Respondent's answers were tabulated along the scale resulting in a numerical score for each respondent that varied from a score of eleven (11), which was considered low, to forty-four (44), which was considered high. The higher the score per respondent, the better their perception is of campus police officers.

The scale was adapted from Love (1973), which measures adolescents' perception of police officers. Brodsky and O'Neil (1983) note the scale has demonstrated good reliability and appears to have good face validity. For this particular analysis the scale, after being altered to fit the designated population, demonstrated an extremely strong cronbach alpha level, which measures the inter-correlation reliability of a scale (Nardi, 2003). When applied to this sample, the scale's reliability analysis revealed an acceptable alpha level of .85.

In addition to the perceptions of the police scale, the survey contains a section of demographics questions. These questions included respondents self-reporting their age, race/ethnicity, residence, participation in a university sanctioned sport, and gender. This demographic data is useful in providing univariate statistics that describe the sample being used.

Another section of the survey contains questions about measures of self-protection and serves as a proxy for invulnerability- another key dimension of hubris. The more 'invulnerable' the respondent feels, the fewer measures of self-protection they will take while on campus. Specifically, this section illustrates how often students on campus take measures of self-protection, including carrying objects (such as keys) in a defensive manner, walking with someone while on campus, avoiding certain areas on campus at night, and attending crime prevention workshops. These statements are measured using Likert-type responses and include categories of "Always," "Often," "Sometimes," "Rarely," and "Never." The category of "Neutral" was omitted in order to avoid an acquiescence bias from respondents (Nardi, 2003). Each mixed-worded response was given a number. For example, respondents that that chose "Always" were given a score of four (4); "Often" were given a score of three (3), "Sometimes" were given a score of (2), and "Never" were given a score of one (1). Respondent's answers were tabulated along the scale resulting in a numerical score for each respondent that varied from a score of four (4), which was considered low, to sixteen (16), which was considered high. When applied to this sample, the scale's reliability analysis demonstrated an acceptable alpha level of .62.

The third section on the survey deals with crime victimization. These questions are broad in scope and merely measure the presence of crime victimization in reference to the respondent. Specifically, respondents are asked whether they have ever been assaulted, had property stolen, had property vandalized, or been subject to verbal harassment- all common forms of victimization within a campus setting (Fisher, 1995). The possible responses include answers of "Yes," which was labeled as one (1) or "No," which was labeled as two (2). The responses are then summed together to form a 'campus crime victimization index'. A higher score on this index, which ranged from four (4) to eight (8), indicates a higher level of not being victimized (a.k.a. safety) on campus.

Subjects

Subjects for the study were selected from the student population of a large, state university located in the southern high plains of the United States. The university has a Division IA athletic program, which competes annually at the highest level of NCAA athletics. Students were selected from a restrictive sample of lower and upper division Arts and Sciences classes. Introductory courses are used because of their large size (anywhere from 65-300 persons per class), diversity of majors, number of student-athletes in these classes, and their representativeness of the student population. Durkin,

Wolfe, and Clark (2005) note that large "introduction" courses provide a great deal of information and are representative, in general, of the student population. Upper division courses (i.e., 4000 and 5000 level courses) are selected in addition to introductory courses to further increase diversity. Once the surveys were collected, they were coded and entered into SPSS in order to develop an electronic database. Surveys with missing (skipped) questions or ambiguous answers were thrown out and not included in the database. As a result, over five hundred surveys are used in the analysis (N=518).

RESULTS

The following section displays univariate, bivariate, and multivariate results. Univariate results are given to provide description of the sample used. T-tests are used to measure bivariate differences in mean scores between athletes and non-athletes, which addresses research question #1. Multivariate results are given as mean differences between athletes and non-athletes, via t-tests, while controlling for gender and race. These results address research questions #2 and #3 respectively.

UNIVARIATE RESULTS

Almost half of the sample self-identified as being freshmen (45.4%), while sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students make up 19.1%, 18.1%, 16.8% and 0.6% of the sample respectively (see Table 1). In addition, the sample reported being composed of more females than males (52.7% vs. 47.3%), slightly more non-athletes compared to athletes (51.5% vs. 48.5%), and comprised of more full-time students compared to part-time students (97.7% vs. 2.3%). There were an equal number of students in the sample that self-reported living in university owned housing (i.e., dorms) and living off-campus (50% vs. 50%). The sample is mostly white, non-Hispanic compared to non-white minority group members (80.5% vs. 19.5%) and the average age of the sample was 20.27 years old. These descriptive results are not only useful, but are also in-line with similar demographic characteristics of the university.

BIVARIATE RESULTS

In order to locate basic differences within the sample, a bivariate analysis is conducted. Specifically, in order to differentiate between two groups within a sample, a t-test is conducted. The t-test will locate differences between the dichotomous groups as directed by the previous literature. The resulting groups are athletes and non-athletes in the collegiate student population, and are used to answer research question #1: Do athletes and non-athletes differ in their perceptions of institutionalized authority/security agencies and in their feelings of vulnerability on campus? The scales and indexes measuring perceptions of campus police, taking measures of self-protection, and victimization are variables used as indicators to measure the concept of hubris (see Table 2).

Table 2 notes that athletes, regardless of race or gender, compared to non-athletes have a higher score on the perceptions of police scale (24.13 vs. 22.85), which means athletes in this sample have a better perception of the campus police. The mean difference is statistically significant ($p<0.001$). In addition, non-athletes report taking more measures of self-protection (9.03 vs. 8.26), which is also statistically significant ($p<0.05$). While athletes report being slightly safer on campus (7.77 vs. 7.75), this relationship is not statistically significant. In order to further examine hubris within the sample of collegiate athletes and non-athletes, multivariate results are presented.

MULTIVARIATE RESULTS

Multivariate analyses are conducted by using mean differences, via t-tests, between athletes and non-athletes while controlling for gender and race. These multivariate results, while basic in nature, help to further expand the explanatory power of the concept of hubris. The following analysis attempts to answer research question #2: Regarding perceptions of institutionalized authority/security agencies and in their feelings of invulnerability on campus, do differences exist between female athletes and female non-athletes, male athletes and male non-athletes, and male athletes and female athletes?

Table 3 illustrates mean differences between male athletes and male non-athletes. The results find male athletes have a better perception of the campus police (24.90 vs. 23.53), which is statistically significant ($p<0.05$). While male athletes report taking fewer measures of self-protection (6.41 vs. 6.60) and slightly higher safety rates on campus (7.72 vs. 7.53), these differences are not statistically significant.

Table 4 reports the mean differences between male athletes and female athletes. Male athletes, surprisingly, have a better perception of the campus police (24.90 vs. 23.00). This difference, moreover, is statistically significant ($p<0.01$). In addition, female athletes take far more measures of self-protection (11.10 vs. 6.41), which is also statistically significant ($p<0.001$). While female athletes are less victimized while on campus (7.86 vs. 7.72), this relationship is not statistically significant.

To further explicate the relationship of athletes and the concept of hubris, t-tests are conducted while controlling for race. Since race is one of the most important variables in the sociology of sport (Sage, 1999), its inclusion in this analysis is appropriate. Specifically, the following analysis answers research question #3: Regarding perceptions of institutionalized authority/security agencies and in their feelings of invulnerability on campus, do differences exist between minority athletes and minority non-athletes, white athletes and white non-athletes, and white athletes and minority athletes?

Table 5 identifies the mean differences between minority athletes and minority non-athletes. Specifically, minority athletes have a better perception of campus police officers (24.87 vs. 22.52) and take fewer measures of self-protection (7.22 vs. 8.92). Both of these differences are statistically significant ($p<0.001$ and $p<0.05$, respectively). While minority athletes report a greater rate of being victimized (7.60 vs. 7.67), this relationship is not statistically significant.

Table 6, on the other hand, reports mean differences between white athletes and white non-athletes. Specifically, white athletes have a better perception of campus police officer as compared to white non-athletes (24.00 vs. 22.95). This relationship is statistically significant ($p<0.01$). While white non-athletes report taking more measures of self-protection (9.06 vs. 8.43), and being more victimized while on campus (7.77 vs. 7.81), these relationships are not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The concept of hubris is an important and useful tool for analyzing how athletes interact with society (Coakley, 2004). While conventional wisdom has applied the concept of hubris to professional athletes, the purpose of this research was to apply it to collegiate athletes. If the concept of hubris accurately applies to elite Division IA college athletes, then athletes should have lower perceptions of institutionalized authority structures, such as the campus police. In addition, athletes that have hubris should feel invulnerable, which relates to taking fewer measures of self-protection and could result in higher rates of crime victimization. Additionally, mean differences between athletes and non-athletes were analyzed while controlling for gender and race.

When looking at the univariate statistical results, it is easy to see that this particular college campus is a reflection of the community within which it is located. Specifically, it is comprised of a traditionally college-aged sample with few older students (average age of sample is 20.27 years) and with an equal number of students living on and off campus (50% vs. 50%). There were slightly more non-athletes than athletes in the sample (48.5% vs. 51.5%). The breakdown based on the individual's sex is roughly equal with slightly more females than males in the sample (52.7% vs. 47.3%). All of the demographics up to this point are in alignment with the official demographic breakdown of the university and similar to what is expected of a "traditional" college campus.

This university can be characterized as racially homogenous. Because of the homogeneity of the campus, different racial groups are coded into one "minority" category that is juxtaposed to the white

majority. As a result, the sample was 80.5% for whites vs. 19.5% for non-whites. Accordingly, the sample is more diverse than the university population.

Concerning the differences between athletes and non-athletes as they may relate to hubris, results of this study run counter to some common expectations (e.g. Coakley, 2004). College athletes have better perceptions of the campus police than non-athletes (24.13 vs. 22.85, $p<0.001$). This indicates college athletes had a better perception of their institution's authority structure (i.e., campus police). This finding could be the result of numerous social dynamics operating simultaneously on this campus. For example, athletes, by virtue of their high profile position on campus, could have more positive contact with campus police officers. According to the community policing literature, more positive face-to-face contact with officers "humanizes" authority figures, thereby producing better perceptions of the police (Jiao, 1997; Peak, 1995).

A final, and more logical, reason that athletes may have better perceptions of institutionalized authority structures involves their structured lives on college campuses. Specifically, athletes may have more exposure and familiarity with rigid authority structures and processes, in general (Cox, 2007). Compared to the larger student body, athletes have extremely structured environments based on hierarchical authority. Athletes are constantly being monitored by various academic services, coaching staffs within their sport, and compliance personnel. According to Stevenson (1999) elite athletes go through a process of being introduced to a sport; becoming committed to their chosen sport; and developing relationships within their chosen sport. All of these stages involve the individual athlete becoming socialized to specific authority structures (Coakley, 2006). The structured environment may expose them more too hierarchical authority, which manifests itself in a better perception of authority, including security agencies on campus like the campus police department.

In keeping with the concept of hubris, athletes took significantly fewer measures of self-protection (8.26 vs. 9.03, $p<0.05$). If a feeling of separation from the surrounding community results in a larger-than-life persona (Coakley, 2004), then athletes could feel "untouchable" or "invulnerable." The invulnerability an athlete feels is a dynamic process that involves not only the athlete and team, but also the social environment in which these athletes are embedded (Adler & Adler, 1999). Avoiding measures of self-protection, could speak to "pride-driven arrogance" alluded to in the concept of hubris; that is, athletes may feel nothing, including physical, emotional, or verbal harassment or assault, can harm them while in their community. Additionally, the team dynamics produced by being associated with an elite sport (i.e., Division I A athletics) increases the togetherness of athletes producing a team dynamic based on loyalty where fellow teammates will "have their back" (Coakley, 2006; Lawrence, 2005).

GENDER AND RACE

The multivariate analyses examined mean differences, via t-test, between athletes and non-athletes across categories of gender and race. In reference to gender, male athletes had a significantly better perception of the campus police in comparison to male non-athletes. One posited reason for this difference is that male athletes may have been exposed more to authority through sports as compared to male non-athletes (Stevenson, 1999).

Moreover, male athletes had significantly better perception of the campus police when compared to female athletes. Hughes and Coakley (1991) note athletes that overconform to the sport ethic tend to be individuals that do not have well developed identities outside of their athletic status. Oftentimes, these athletes include male athletes and minority athletes in revenue generating sports (Hughes & Coakley, 1991). Elite male athletes in revenue generating sports could have exclusively athletic-based identities, which results in a win-oriented personality predicated on approval from coaches (Tusak, 2005). This need for approval, in turn, exposes the athlete to a familiarity with current institutional-

ized authority structures because of the hierarchical nature of team sports. In addition, female athletes perceive campus police officers to be less effective, which actually mirrors the lower perception of campus police officers by the larger female student population, in general (Vermillion, 2006). Female athletes' perception of campus police officers highlights the idea that female students are more likely to be victimized, which is the strongest predictor of perceiving the police as ineffective and authoritative (Skogan & Maxfield, 1981).

Regarding race, both white athletes and non-white athletes have significantly better perceptions of the campus police as compared to their non-athlete counterparts. Here again is the reflection of athletic status and its relationship with institutionalized authority structures. Of considerable interest, however, is the fact that minority non-athletes take significantly more measures of self-protection. This result could point to many dynamics, such as minority group members having a decreased perception and reliance upon police agencies for security and safety (Brown & Benedict, 2002; Weitzer & Tuch, 1999). Individuals on a college campus who have little confidence in the campus police often take more measures of self-protection (Fisher, 1995). With non-white athletes (especially African-Americans) being disproportionately overrepresented in high profile, revenue generating sports (i.e., football and men's basketball) minority athletes might be feeling some of the effects of hubris. That is, they may feel overtly invulnerable as a result of their athletic prestige.

Finding useful ways of interpreting such results is difficult. In an effort to provide a potentially useful theory for interpreting such conclusions, Tittle (1995) developed a theory of deviance known as "control balance" theory. In it he identified crime victimization as a result of the victim's ability to account for crime victimization within certain situations, such as a potential of looking "weak" or "strong" based on individual characteristics. With the extreme physical conditioning required of Division I A college athletes, Tittle's (1995) theory that takes into account the physical presence of elites can be very useful. Additionally, Tittle (1995) illustrates that celebrities and other well known individuals within a community have feelings of invulnerability and "untouchability" because others go out of their way to accommodate them (Piquero & Hickman, 2003). As applied to sports, the enormous popularity of male sports (such as men's basketball and football) could produce a mechanism by which these particular athletes have become local celebrities (Adler & Adler, 1999), resulting in not only feelings of invulnerability, but also in positive perceptions of institutionalized authority structures (Stevenson, 1999).

While Tittle's (1995) control balance theory addresses the invulnerability idea of hubris, it does not explicitly touch upon adherence to current authority structures. What it does do, however, is illustrate the usefulness and need for theory integration within academic research (Coakley, 2006). The conceptual idea of hubris can be strengthened by social psychological research (i.e., Cox, 2007), and sociological or criminological research (i.e., Tittle, 1995). In addition to Tittle's (1995) theory, Sperber (2000) illustrates the influence of the sport entertainment industry upon college athletics, in general. Specifically, it appears the money and the overall unique nature of college athletes is influential in developing a context whereby college athletes are separate and unique from their surrounding community (Coakley, 2006).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

All of the previous results and discussions, however, should be taken with caution. While this analysis attempts to highlight some basic differences between dichotomous groups, more research needs to be done on this subject. In particular, more research from multiple college campuses randomly selected from around the nation to account for regional biases needs to be done. The study's use of one campus lends a "case study" feel to the analysis illustrating some potentially useful ideas, but the statistical results could be explicated by engaging in more detailed multivariate analyses. Moreover, the inclusion of different types of campuses and athletic programs, such as Division IAA, Division II, Division

III, or NAIA, could greatly enhance hubris research by isolating whether the "elite" status of the athlete refers to the sport the athlete plays, or the level on which the athlete plays their sport.

In addition, the validity of the proxies used to represent dimensions of hubris could be another study limitation. Future research into the area of hubris and college athletes should focus on more elaborate multivariate analysis, such as developing scales that explicitly measure operationalized dimensions of hubris. In addition, more qualitative based analyses, such as in-depth interviews or participant observations, could be used to better understand the social environment of elite college athletes, especially those in the revenue generating sports within the sport-entertainment industry. For example, Lawrence (2005) engaged in a qualitative examination of the meaning and context of sports for African-Americans as a better means for understanding minority participation in sport.

Finally, Feldman and Matjasko (2005) note sport participation can promote or inhibit adolescent deviance based upon differences between athletes in different sports. Specifically, as identified in the concept of hubris, elite athletes on elite teams are more likely to develop these personality characteristics. Athletes in non-revenue generating sports (e.g. water polo) are probably not going to feel separate and "above" the community around them. Athletes in revenue generating sports, in conjunction with the commercialization of college sports and the proliferation of college sport media coverage, have a "celebrity" status and are under public scrutiny more so than other athletes or the traditional college student (Coakley, 2004). This analysis, however, is the first research to start discussion of the concept of hubris as directly applied to college athletes. The differences between athletes and non-athletes and those noted when controlling for gender and race on this college campus illustrate some starting points for future research.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1999). College athletes in high-profile media sports: the consequences of glory (pp. 162-170). In J. Coakley & P. Donnelly (Eds.), *Inside sports*. London: Rutledge.

Berry, B., & Smith, E. (2000). Race, sport, and crime: The misrepresentation of African Americans in team sports and crime. *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 17, 171-197.

Brodsky, S., & O'Neal, S. H. (1983). *Handbook of scales for research in crime and delinquency*. New York: Plenum Press.

Brown, B., & Benedict, W. R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 25, 543-580.

Browns GM: Risk-taking athletes part of football. (2006, June 13). *ESPN.com,* Retrieved from http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/wire?section=nfl&id=2482792.

Coakley, J. (2007). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. (9th ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Coakley, J. (2004). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. (8th ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cox, R. H. (2007). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications*. (6th ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Durkin, K., Wolfe, T., & Clark, G. (2005). College students' and binge drinking: An evaluation of social learning theory. *Sociological Spectrum,* 25, 255-272.

Edwards, H. (1979). Sport within the veil: The triumphs, tragedies and challenges of Afro-American involvement. *The Annals of the American Academy,* 445, 116-128.

Feldman, A., & Matjasko, J. (2005). The role of school-based extracurricular activities in adolescent development: A comprehensive review and future directions. *Review of Educational Research,* 75, 159-210.

Feezell, R. M. (2004). *Sport, play, and ethical reflection.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Fisher, B. D. (1995). Crime and fear on campus. *ANNALS, AAPSS,* 539, 85-101.

Fox, J. A., & Hellman, D. A. (1985). Location and other correlates of campus crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 13, 429-444.

Goodman, W. (1995, November 30). Television review; athletes without umpires: male aggression off the field. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07E2DC1139F933A05752C1A963958260.

Henson, V. A., & Stone, W. E. (1999). Campus crime: A victimization study. *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 27, 295-307.

Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive deviance among athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 8, 307-325.

Jiao, A. (1997). Factoring policing models. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management,* 20, 454-472.

Knight, Big 12 coaches agree: College sports are big business. (2004, February 16). *USA Today*. Retrieved from www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2004-02-16-notes_x.htm.

Lanier, M. (1995). Community policing on university campuses: Tradition, practice, and outlook (pp.246-264). In B. Fisher & J. J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus Crime: Legal, Social and Policy Perspectives.* Springfield, IL: Charles C.

Lapchick, R. (2001). *Smashing barriers: Race and sport in the millennium*. Lanham, MD: Madison Books Inc.

Lawrence, S. M. (2005). African American athletes' experiences of race in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 40, 99-110.

Leongard, W. M. (1998). *A sociological perspective of sport* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Locklear, J. R. (2003). Policy alone is not a deterrent to violence, *NCAA News*. Retrieved from http: www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/newsdetail?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/NCAA/NCAA+News/NCAA+News+Online/2003/Editorial/Policy+alone+is+not+a+deterrent+to+violence+-+5-26-03.

Love, N. J. (1973). Juvenile attitudes of hostility-competence toward the police as a function of progression through the juvenile justice system. Unpublished master's thesis, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Edwardsville, Illinois, United States.

Majors, R. (1986). Cool pose: The proud signature of black survival. *Changing Men: Issues in Gender, Sex, and Politics,* 17, 184-85.

Manning, A. (2005, October 7). Research: Athletes less moral: Boston University administrators, athletes agree with Idaho study. *The (Boston U.) Daily Free Press*. Retrieved from http://www.dailygamecock.com/home/index.cfm?event=displayArticlePrinterFriendly&uS.

McMahon, S. (2004). Student-athletes, rape supportive culture, and social change: Executive summary. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey: Report for the Department of Sexual Assault Services and Crime Victim Assistance.

Messner, M. A. (2002). *Taking the field: Women, men, and sports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miller, J. L., & Pan, M. J. (1987). Student perceptions of campus police: The effects of personal characteristics and police contacts. *American Journal of Police,* 6, 27-44.

Nardi, P. (2003). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Patel, D. R., & Luckstead, E. F. (2000). Sport participation, risk-taking, and health risk behaviors. *Adolescent Medicine,* 11, 141-155.

Peak, K. (1995). The professionalization of campus law enforcement: comparing campus and municipal law enforcement (pp. 228-245). In B. Fisher & J. J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus Crime: Legal, Social and Policy Perspectives*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Piquero, A. R., & Hickman, M. (2003). Extending Tittle's control balance theory to account for victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 30, 282-301

Safai, P. (2002). Boys behaving badly: Popular literature on the mis/behavior of male team sport athletes in North America. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 37, 97-102.

Sage, G. H. (1998). *Power and ideology in American sport: A critical perspective* (2nd ed.). Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Scott, E., & Kiefer, M. (2006, March 18). Suit: ASU didn't help prevent alleged rape. *The Arizona Republic*. Retrieved from http://www.azcentral.com/arizonapublic/sports/articles/031suit0318.html.

Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with crime: Individual and neighborhood differences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Steinberger, M. (2005). US sports graduate to big business, *Financial Times*. Retrieved from http://financialtimes.printhis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?action=cpt&title=FT.com+%2F+Arts.

Stevenson, C. (1999). Becoming an elite international athlete: Making decisions about identity (pp. 86-95). In J. Coakley and P. Donnelly (Eds.), *Inside sports*. London: Routledge.

Tittle, C. R. (1995). *Control balance: Toward a general theory of deviance*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Trojanowicz, R., Benson, B., & Trojanowicz, S. (1988). Community policing: University input into campus police policy-making. Community Policing Series No. 14, East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center.

Tusak, M. (2005). Is athletic identity an important motivator? *International Journal of Sport Psychology,* 36, 9-49.

Upthegrove, T., Rosicigno, V., & Zubrinsky, C. (1999). Big money collegiate sports: Racial concentration, contradictory pressures, and academic performance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80, 719- 736.

Vermillion, M. (2006). Perceptions of campus crime. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Volkwein, J. F., Szelest, B., & Lizotte, A. J. (1995). The relationship of campus crime to campus and student characteristics. *Research in Higher Education,* 36, 647-670.

Washington, R., & Karen, D. (2001). Sport and society. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 187-212.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. (1999). Race, class and perceptions of discrimination by the police. *Crime and Delinquency,* 45, 494-507.

Weiberg, S., & Carey, J. (2006). *Two players arrested in Duke lacrosse case, USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2004-02-16 notes_x.htm

Weinbaum, W. (2006). *Lidle, Munson tragedies share a baseball bond.* Retrieved from http://sports.espn.go.com/mlb/news/story?id=2622331.

Young, M. (1997). Women, sport, and physicality: Preliminary Findings from a Canadian Study. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 32, 297-305.

Table 1:

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Sample (n=518)

Variable	Frequency	%
Class		
Freshmen	235	45.4
Sophomore	99	19.1
Junior	94	18.1
Senior	87	16.8
Graduate Student	3	0.6
Gender		
Male	245	47.3
Female	273	52.7
Participates in Sports		
Yes	251	48.5
No	267	51.5
Status		
Full-time	506	97.7
Part-time	12	2.3
Live in University Housing		
Yes	259	50.0
No	259	50.0
Race		
White, non-Hispanic	417	80.5
Non-white	101	19.5
Age*	NA	20.27

* Because “age” is continuous, the mean age of the sample is reported within the “%” column. In addition, the range of the “age” category varied from 18-to-51 years old.

Table 2:
Mean Differences along Hubris Indicators between Athletes and Non-athletes

Indicator	Athlete			Non-athlete		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Police Perceptions	24.13	4.40	***	22.85	4.00	***
Self-Protection	8.26	4.07	*	9.30	3.76	*
Victimization	7.77	0.87		7.75	0.74	

Significance=*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 3:
Mean Differences along Hubris Indicators between Male Athletes and Male non-athletes (n=245)

Indicator	Athlete			Non-athlete		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Police Perceptions	24.90	4.76	*	23.53	4.91	*
Self-Protection	6.41	3.10		6.60	3.18	
Victimization	7.72	0.99		7.53	0.82	

Significance=* $p<0.05$

Table 4:
Mean Differences along Hubris Indicators between Male Athletes and Female Athletes (n=241)

Indicator	Athlete			Non-athlete		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Police Perceptions	24.90	4.76	**	23.00	3.50	*
Self-Protection	6.41	3.10	***	11.10	3.74	***
Victimization	7.72	0.99		7.86	0.65	

Significance=*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 5:
Mean Differences along Hubris Indicators between Minority Athletes and Minority non-athletes (n=101)

Indicator	Athlete			Non-athlete		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Police Perceptions	24.87	3.10	***	22.52	4.03	***
Self-Protection	7.22	4.14	*	8.92	3.73	*
Victimization	7.60	0.84		7.67	0.82	

Significance=*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01

Table 6:
Mean Differences along Hubris Indicators between White Athletes and White non-athletes (n=417)

	Athlete			Non-athlete		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Police	24.00	3.10	**	22.95	4.03	***
Self-	8.43	4.04		9.06	3.98	
Victimization	7.81	0.88		7.77	0.71	

Significance=*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01