

Do You Feel You Are Modeling Appropriate Behavior for Today's Youth? A Guide for Parents of Junior Tournament Players

My name is Chuck Cunningham, a certified tennis official in the Chicago District of the USTA's Midwest Section. During my work as a roving official I've had the opportunity to engage in casual conversation with parents of junior players like you, conversation which frequently centered on negative experiences that occurred during tournaments where your child was a participant. These experiences involved you or your child directly or were witnessed by you, and in each case the behavior in question was that of a player, parent, coach, tournament director, or official.

Such concerns have been on my radar screen for more than a decade. After retiring from officiating professional tennis in 2002, my investment in junior tournament tennis increased significantly and led to an interest in examining junior tennis within a developmental and philosophical framework. In 2010 this examination became part of formal research tied to my graduate study in education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (MEd awarded May 2016). A substantial amount of my course work centered on investigating sanctioned junior tournament tennis as a structured, organized youth activity, which as such can serve as a powerful catalyst for prosocial development (Larson, 2000). While this investigation examines junior tournament tennis within a number of different contexts, one of the most important has been the type of environment cultivated by adults associated with tournament play, specifically, parents, coaches, tournament directors, and officials.

Initiatives related to youth prosocial development are currently being enacted at the district level, specifically targeting player sportsmanship (sportspersonship). Indications are that progress is being made by strategies centered on the players and how they treat the game and each other during the course of play. However, through my studies a body of evidence has emerged which suggests that a strong relationship may exist between junior player behavior and the environment in which they perform.

Developmentally, tournament play is a social setting in which youth learn to manage the storm and stress of daily life. And in this setting, like with family and school, adult practices play a significant role. Long term my aim is to use research to discover the depth of this role and determine whether the relationship between adult practices and

player behavior is causal or correlational. My immediate aim is to draw attention to questionable adult practices that continue to occur during tournament play and how such behaviors possibly influence problem player behavior. Along with this attention I hope that the evidence revealed by my investigation will educate parents and broaden their perspective as it relates to issues which trigger questionable practices during tournament play.

I theorize that problems you have experienced during tournaments emanate from and are perpetuated by parent predispositions towards junior tennis that are quite different from those harbored in other youth domains and that appear inconsistent with prosocial development. This summary presents empirical evidence explaining how predispositions influence parent behavior, how junior tournament participation connects with prosocial development and how self-governance and roving officiating impact the tournament environment. I conclude with adaptive strategies designed to connect development theory to practice.

My aim is to address problem player behavior by examining the environment in which they compete. This process begins with examining the practices of parents.

Rationale

Observing play from the lobby, a player made an out call on a ball that landed on the baseline (the match was 5 courts away from the lobby). The parent of the player against whom the call was made became visibly upset and walked away from where he was sitting, stating the ball was a foot and a half inside the baseline," also stating that it was set point (he was sitting several feet in front of me with both of us directly in line with the baseline where the call was made). Speaking to himself (loud enough to be heard by me) he returned to his seat and said something to the effect that "it certainly speaks to her reputation." As soon as his daughter came off court (she won the match), one of his first comments to her was about the baseline call and how bad it was.

Monitoring play from the lobby, I observed a father become visibly upset that his son lost track of score during a game. After a second occurrence the father gestured to his son, attempting to point out his scoring mistakes. When this failed to get his son's attention,

the father verbally lashed out at his son and walked away, discontinuing watching the match.

At a boy's 12's level 5 event, during the first game of the match a player complained about a line call. After appealing to me (I witnessed the call but chose not to overrule), he became visibly upset, and, after looking up to his parents in the stands, immediately began to cry. During the next two games 2 more questionable line calls were made by his opponent which I observed but didn't feel an overrule was justified. While the offended player continued to be distraught, the parents, rather than be supportive and reassuring, also became extremely distraught to the point where a verbal altercation occurred with the parents of the other player, with the mom upset to the point of discontinuing watching the match.

At a boy's 12's level 5 event, a roving official overruled a line call at 7-all in the match tie-break (this was the final match of the day). The father of the player who was overruled yelled at the official stating that "it was not your call to make," possibly inferring that the line call should not have been overruled since it was not challenged by the opponent. Subsequently, at the conclusion of the match while exiting the site, the same parent (from his car) verbally confronted the official with some abusive remarks.

At a girl's 14's level 5 event, a parent accused his daughter's opponent of cheating and became verbally abusive to the player and the players' parents.

The above experiences, albeit a small sample size, reflect parent behavior I've encountered directly or anecdotally in recent years. Yet, even with such egregious displays of behavior, it is possible that what you or other parents have personally experienced may be viewed as an aberration by those who govern sanctioned junior tournament play and, as such, not deserving the same attention given to problem player behavior. It is also quite possible that the lack of substantial empirical evidence targeting this phenomenon leads those who govern sanctioned junior tournament tennis to use player behavior as the primary means of addressing sportspersonship.

Two questions are raised by this issue. One, regardless of the arguable depth of problem parent behavior, should such behavior be tolerated within a social setting

ostensibly created to promote youth prosocial growth? Two, do initiatives exist that can address this issue in a clear and objective manner?

An answer to the first question must come from adult stakeholders in the sanctioned junior tournament community. Answering the second question serves as the basis of this paper.

Parental Predispositions

Parents enroll their children in sport for a variety of reasons.

Similar to other life domains (i.e. school, peer relationships, eating habits) the goal is to manipulate an environment that would allow their children to develop and adopt skills and competencies that support a healthy, self-directed, responsible and autonomous form of life (Hutchinson, Baldwin, & Caldwell, 2003)... Parents have also come to view sports participation, especially competitive sports, as a key component of their children's overall socialization (Coakley, 2006).

If the above is true, then there has to be an explanation for the aberrant parent behavior often displayed during tournament play. The reason for such behavior exhibited by parents who by and large behave more positively in other social settings may be the result of predispositions based upon a performance model inconsistent with prosocial development.

Early theorists defined all attitudes as behavioral dispositions to respond in particular ways.

Bogardus (1931) stated that *an attitude is a tendency to act toward or against something in the environment which becomes thereby a positive or negative value (p. 62)*... And Campbell (1963) posited that *attitudes were comprised of acquired behavioral dispositions, in which learned states created an inclination for directional responding.*

Placed on a continuum, as a competitive activity sanctioned junior tournament tennis lies between two extremes; one defined by a results orientation, the other by a development orientation. Stated another way, one extreme prioritizes winning; the other prioritizes learning.

When results define a parent's predisposition toward their child's tournament participation, expectations can easily mirror those found in "professional" sports:

Unlike youth sports, the major goals of professional sports are to entertain and, ultimately, to make money. Financial success is of primary importance and depends heavily on ...winning (Smith & Smoll, 1997).

With such high stakes, what also comes into play is the need for "*justice*." This means that decisions affecting outcome must be consistent and uncompromisingly correct throughout play, regardless of context. Subsequently, junior tennis parents harboring predispositions leaning towards this model tend to display little tolerance for (perceived) incorrect line calls, scoring mistakes or any behavior exhibited by their child's opponent that may potentially impact her chance of winning.

With the high stakes involved in professional sports, the need for justice is easily understood, which is why technology (i.e. electronic review, instant replay etc.) is in place to "get it right."

However, with junior tournament tennis, equal justice is compromised by the self-governing environment in which players compete and the often sparse or non-existent supervision by certified officials. Subsequently, these variables make the notion of consistently and uncompromisingly "getting it right" throughout play literally impractical, if not impossible.

When learning defines a parent's predisposition toward their child's tournament participation, different expectations emerge:

The developmental (learning) model of sports has a far different focus. As its name suggests, the goal is to develop the individual. The most important product is not wins or dollars but, rather, the quality of the experience for the child. In this sense, sport participation is an educational process whereby children can learn to cope with realities they will face later in life. Although winning is sought after it is by no means the primary goal... In a developmental model, sports provide an arena for learning, where success is measured in terms of personal growth and development (Smith & Smoll, 1997).

To sum it up, as postulated by Smith and Smoll (1997) *...most of the problems in youth sports occur when uninformed adults erroneously impose a professional model on what should be a recreational and educational experience for children. When excessive emphasis is placed on winning, it is easy to lose sight of the needs and interests of the young athletes.*

Junior Tournament Tennis as a Context for Prosocial Development

Participation in structured, organized out-of-school activities has been shown to be a fertile context for positive youth development (Larson, 2000). A substantial body of research literature indicates that youth life skills development crosses a number of social domains, one of which is engagement in organized sports. Through sports participation youth learn adaptive ways of competing and cooperating with other people...and they learn to deal with successes and failure (Smith & Strand, 1997).

Positive youth development suggests that youth are autonomy-seeking individuals who possess a tremendous capacity for growth (Larson, 2006), a capacity that manifests in three dominant youth settings: school, family and leisure time. Research, however, has revealed limitations within these social settings. Essential to the process of prosocial growth is a relevant connection between youth behaviors and constraints inherent in the environment i.e. managing the storm and stress of daily life. Empirical evidence exists suggesting that the social settings of school, family, and leisure time do not consistently offer the conditions necessary for agency and initiative, two key barometers of prosocial growth. School has time constraints tied to curriculum and academic related outcomes not directly connected to prosocial development. Family life and leisure time fail to offer the challenges that allow agency and initiative to manifest.

However, what researchers such as Larson (2000) have discovered is that structured voluntary activities are a context particularly suited to the development of initiative, which underscores the importance of sanctioned junior tournament tennis as a context for prosocial growth. Two reasons may explain this phenomenon. One may be that early adolescence is a period where agency emerges and youth begin making choices regarding their out-of-school time activities. Another may be that structured, organized youth out-of-school programs provide opportunities to expose young people to caring

adults who challenge them, encourage them to participate in positive experiences and respect their opinions (Eccles & Gootman, 2002).

Junior Tournament Tennis, Self-Governance and Roving Officiating

The triadic relationship between tournament play, self-governance and roving officiating fuels much of the frustration experienced by parents, due in part to the inconsistent manner in which governance, or jurisdiction, vacillates between competitors and officials.

Self-governance serves as the bedrock for junior tournament play with respect to jurisdiction. As articulated in the USTA rule book, a Friend at Court (FAC), players operate under the proviso of “The Code,” *a set of procedures to assist player decision-making when conflict occurs and no official is present*. Because officiating presence is sparse in this environment, this proviso ostensibly provides juniors with a relatively level playing field.

Self-governance has its own inherent challenges. However, player conflict is often exacerbated by the timing of a roving officials’ direct involvement and her subsequent judgment and decision-making. In some instances the need for a roving official subsuming jurisdiction is clear. However, most often personal discretion determines when this occurs. And just as with parents, a roving official’s predispositions of junior tournament tennis will be oriented toward results or development.

The impact of these predispositions heightens when you consider the language used to guide roving officiating procedures:

A roving official shall call obvious foot faults and overrule obvious incorrect line calls. A player may be cautioned about borderline behavior before a point penalty is issued. Roving should be done uniformly.

*What constitutes “obvious?” What constitutes “caution?” What constitutes “borderline?”
What constitutes “uniformly?”*

Decision-making as a roving official is often subjective. Subsequently, when roving jurisdiction is juxtaposed upon self-governance, a roving official is often placed on a

slippery slope when decisions affecting match outcome must be made, such as overrules and foot faults. For example:

Having observed a player serving throughout the first set of his match, you never see evidence of a foot fault. Later, however, while serving a second serve at 10-11 during a match tie-break, this player's foot touches the line before striking the ball. This being the first time observing such an occurrence, do you call a foot fault?

During a match a player you have been observing throughout the morning consistently called close line calls in favor of his opponent during the first two sets. (Throughout the match his opponent never questions a line call). However, during the final set match tie-break the same player makes an "out" call on a ball that you believe landed on the (outside) edge of the far sideline (near the baseline). With no history of questionable line calls during this match, do you overrule?

And revisiting an earlier example highlighting how a roving official occasionally faces a seemingly untenable situation:

At a boy's 12's level 5 event, a roving official overruled a line call at 7-all in the match tie-break (this was the final match of the day). The father of the player who was overruled yelled at the official stating that "it was not your call to make," possibly inferring that the line call should not have been overruled since it was not challenged by the opponent. Subsequently, at the conclusion of the match while exiting the site, the same parent (from his car) verbally confronted the official with some abusive remarks.

At issue is not the official's right to be present during the match tie-break or justification for overruling a line call. Without context, the official's presence and subsequent decision was proper according to roving officiating procedures. However, examined contextually, it should be noted that at no point during this match were there any disputed line calls, overrules, behavior problems or disagreements. Further, neither player asked the roving official to watch the match tie-break. Philosophically, what is at issue is the official's rationale for deciding to directly observe the match at this point. What was his predisposition regarding self-governance during this assignment (results or learning)?

Sanctioned Junior Tournament Tennis Strengthening the Case for a Learning Environment

Throughout this summary, improving player behavior has been addressed from a perspective centered on adult practices, most notably the behavior of parents. Evidence has been presented suggesting that the interest of juniors is better served when adult practices center on learning or prosocial development rather than performance outcome or winning. My attempt here is to strengthen this case by highlighting findings related to my investigation of player behavior within the context of self-governance, moral reasoning and vision science.

Self-governance, as the foundation upon which junior tournament tennis rests, imposes constraints on participants not found in any other structured, organized youth sport. Besides competing, participants must not only play within the rules, but when conflict arises, they must also interpret rules, regulations and principles of The Code, frequently unaided by an official. (during an eight month study of supervised vs un-supervised junior tournament play, 100 sanctioned tournaments were held with no assigned certified official, and over 26 tournament days encompassing approximately 281 matches where a (solo) roving official was assigned, an individual match was directly supervised less than half the actual playing time). And of greater significance is the constraint related to score. Even with the presence of a roving official, absolute jurisdiction over line calls rests with the players.

Simply stated, juniors must navigate the complexities of tournament play (frequently unsupervised) which includes absolute jurisdiction over critical decisions (line calls) in which each player has a vested interest in outcome.

Developmentally, these constraints bring moral reasoning into the conversation. Implicit in self-governance is *player integrity*. Embedded in The Code is the credo *...any doubt with respect to a line call... must be resolved in favor of one's opponent*. An opponent's shot is considered "in" or "out" at the discretion of the player making the call. This remains true even when an official is directly observing play. Of course, the safeguard in such instances is that the official is empowered to overrule any call deemed incorrect. Unique to tennis, however, is the fact that a substantial amount of play occurs without

this safeguard. In these instances the only safeguard available is a players' *"moral code."* In no other structured, organized youth sport does a players' moral code play such a critical role in decision-making that impacts outcome. With other youth sports, play is officiated throughout a contest, presence which virtually negates the impact of dishonorable player decisions affecting outcome.

Implicit in the one-size-fits-all tenet of self-governance is the presumption that all juniors, without respect to age and maturational development, are on a moral trajectory whereby the credo - resolving doubt in favor of one's opponent - will be consistently and uncompromisingly upheld throughout play. Evidence contained in adolescent development literature suggests to me that this may be an unreasonable expectation imposed upon junior tournament players, especially by parents.

Evidence of this expectation becomes most apparent with questionable line calls. Comments such as *"he's a cheater"* or *"she is making some bad line calls"* become the operative responses of some parents when a line call made against their child is perceived to be incorrect. My investigation of junior tournament tennis reveals two contributing factors to such responses. One is predispositions parents may have of behavioral tendencies of juniors, similar to those related to the tournament environment in general. Another factor relates to vision science, something I have been examining for the past six years.

Three studies reveal visual error as a major contributing factor to incorrect tennis line calls. During a study encompassing 33 junior tournaments and approximately 1100 matches, 729 line calls were documented as incorrect with 683 (94%) called in favor of the opponent and 46 (6%) overruled. A scientific study of visual accuracy, which involved participants making calls when a tennis ball was dropped from a specified height on or near a tennis line, revealed an accuracy rate of approximately 66%. Another study of line calls made by professional line officials at three major tournaments using electronic review (US Open, Australian Open and Wimbledon) also revealed line call accuracy to be approximately 66%.

Recommendations

This summary has provided significant findings which may link questionable parent practices off court to problem player behavior on court during sanctioned junior tournament play. Rationale for this discussion has been shown along with evidence suggesting that problem parent behavior may be linked to predispositions centered on a performance model inappropriate for a structured, organized youth sport such as sanctioned tournament tennis. Empirical evidence has been presented suggesting that junior tournament tennis can serve as a catalyst for prosocial development. Further, complexities inherent in the triadic relationship between tournament play, self-governance, and roving officiating with respect to jurisdiction impedes the process of justice being meted out equally and consistently throughout play. Lastly, the integrity quotient embedded in self-governance may be compromised by variances in the prosocial trajectory of juniors with respect to moral reasoning.

What can be extracted from these findings is that problem behavior, both on court and off, may be eradicated or at the very least minimized by viewing sanctioned junior tournament tennis as a learning environment. Viewed as such, juniors will learn self-regulation and how to navigate the vicissitudes of daily life when conflict or a perceived injustice occurs. And this process begins with improving parent practices.

Use vision science to broaden perspective on line calls.

Vision science has revealed limiting factors related to visual degradation. Positioning at the net post and eye level are two which impact a roving official's visual acuity. Standing at the net post is the only vantage point available for a roving official to make overrules. This and other factors i.e. fatigue, indoor lighting, outdoor glare etc. can cause visual degradation of as much as 34%.

Positioning, movement, speed of the ball in flight, fatigue and skill level are limiting factors which affect player visual acuity. Also, because line calls must be made promptly, neuroscientific evidence suggests that anticipation or expectation may cause visual error.

Spectators view line calls from a vantage point unabated by the limiting factors causing visual degradation with roving officials and players. Viewing line calls from an elevated position or looking down or across a line is likely to lead to a level of visual accuracy higher than that afforded officials and players on court.

Support the developmental model for youth sports.

With self-governance guiding player decision-making, the potential for disagreement between opponents will always exist. Be it line calls, scoring disputes or other acts, the fact remains that these are adolescents possessing human frailties which often become most visible when making decisions under stress. The rigidity of the integrity quotient embedded in self-governance sets a standard for moral reasoning that may be developmentally inappropriate for some adolescents, given the vast difference in age and maturation.

On the development side, self-governance provides a pathway to autonomy, self-regulation, and peer socialization, calling cards for membership in adult society. This environment affords opportunities for your child to positively manage conflict due to perceived injustice occurring during play.

For your child to “buy into” this developmental approach to tournament play it must be bought into by “you.” This can be done in two ways. First, respond positively when your child is angered by a line call. Unlike the example where the parent fueled her child’s emotional distress over a line call by displaying her own, behave in a manner that is supportive and reassuring. Remember, when he looks to you in the stands, the restraint exhibited by you over an opponent’s line call can have a calming effect on his emotions. Also, self-governance is about trust. Your behavior in the stands can potentially strengthen or weaken your child’s confidence in his opponent’s line calls. Second, when talking to your child after a match about questioned line calls or other disputes, use language that supports the prosocial aspects of managing adversity. Even if you agree that a line call was incorrect, refrain from labeling her opponent as a “*cheater*” or a line call as “*bad*.” Teach your child how to disagree with an opponent’s decision without questioning character.

Invest in education.

Learn roving officiating procedures. An example is with the parent who angrily protested that a line call should not have been overruled during a match tie-break. In USTA tournament play, overrules are made *at the discretion of a roving official who is in direct observance of play, and must be done so without player appeal* (player appeal only applies to college tennis).

Learn The Code. For example, who makes the call on a “double bounce,” a ball that passes “through the net” or a ball that is struck “before it crosses the net?” What must your child do when he hits a second serve that lands out and he clearly sees it is out? Your child hits a shot that lands out. She knows it landed out but the opponent did not see it and asks for help. What must she do?

These “sticky” situations fall under The Code and can be found under officiating or rules of tennis on the USTA website. .

Engage your child in active learning by becoming an active teacher.

During a recent assignment I called a foot fault on a player whose foot touched the court (inside) the baseline before striking the ball. Several foot faults were called during the first set, and each time one occurred I explained what she was doing. In spite of my efforts to help her fix the problem, attempts to self-correct led to frustration and emotional distress to the point of tears, something which also proved unsettling to her mom.

Foot faults are called at an official’s discretion. As much as this, at times, infuriates players and parents, this will never change. Foot faults are often a matter of habit. You don’t change a habit such as this during a match. The time to fix this problem is in practice where you (and your child’s coach) must reinforce proper serve delivery.

Questionable opponent line calls and overrules made (or not made) by roving officials are frequently criticized by players and parents. Perspective can be broadened (yours and your child’s) by engaging in exercises that reveal factors which affect visual acuity from the vantage point of an official and an opponent.

One, observe line calls from the net post during a practice match. Remember, this is the only vantage point from which a roving official can overrule. Two, standing on court, drop balls on or near a line and make calls (“in” or “out”) with the promptness required during play. Three, place or have balls dropped on or near one baseline while you (and your child) make calls from the opposite baseline.

Support Self-governance

With sanctioned junior tournament tennis, autonomy, socialization, conflict resolution, and self-regulation are prosocial traits potentially actualized by players due to a system which promotes self-management. In spite of the negative experiences you and I have occasionally experienced or witnessed, I suspect that we might be in agreement when I suggest that the self-governing nature of junior tournament tennis, more than any other structured, organized youth sport, at its best, facilitates this process.

This being said, I believe the prosocial trajectory created by this environment becomes disrupted by on-court presence and involvement of a roving official. Granted, some presence and involvement is necessary even in the absence of immediate or imminent problems. However, I believe the personal discretion attached to when and how much time a roving official is on court, combined with expectations of some players, parents, coaches, and tournament directors may influence players, when both options are available, to choose outside intervention instead of self-management.

I frequently experience this behavior shift with roving assignments. I observe a player question several line calls during a set. Each time the player making the call says he’s sure. No racquet is raised, no further reaction comes from the player who questioned the calls and they play on. However, once I begin directly observing this court, even on line calls much less questionable I find this same player asking me “how did you see it?” Also, in a similar scenario but observing from a distance, I frequently notice a player’s reaction to questionable line calls change dramatically after looking into the stands at a parent or coach. Intrigued by what appears to be a behavioral shift caused by different contexts, an area of investigation I will be pursuing is roving officiating on-court presence and parent behavior and how the two relate to *“attachment theory”* (Bretherton, 1992).

Be it causal or correlational, I theorize that some relationship exists, and believe that the game would be better served if a roving official's on-court presence were tempered by a willingness to take a back seat to self-governance, and with some exceptions, be dictated more by circumstance and less out of habit or the desire to appease concerns of parents, coaches, and tournament directors about what may or may not occur when he is not directly observing play.

An example of how this works can be seen in my function as a game clock operator for the NBA's Chicago Bulls and WNBA's Chicago Sky.

Aside from managing information displayed on the scoreboard such as score, fouls, timeouts, and sounding the horn for substitutions, I also function as a timekeeper. And when I say (a) timekeeper, what the average spectator may not realize is that while I sit in front of the console that operates the game clock, with a notable exception my jurisdiction over timekeeping is secondary to that of the three officials on the court. Equipped with transponders connected to their whistles, ninety percent of the time when the game clock stops it is because one or more officials blew their whistle. The only exception is with made baskets in the final minute of specified periods in which case the clock is stopped only by me.

Here's my point. Ostensibly I am considered the timekeeper. However, in reality my jurisdiction over time is secondary to the officials. My role is necessary due to the possibility that a transponder might fail to operate during play. Thus, for ninety percent of a game I am merely reacting to an official's whistle. Looking at jurisdiction during junior tournament play I am beginning to see prudence in a roving official replicating the function of a clock operator in professional basketball. Jurisdiction should start with and remain primarily a function of self-governance, with a roving official subsuming jurisdiction (with some exceptions) when self-governance, like a basketball official's transponder, is compromised.

I encourage you to reflect on your level of trust in self-governance. How quick are you to request that a roving official pay attention to your child's match because of a scoring mistake, questionable line calls, or some other situation that displeases you, even though no request for help has been made by your child? When coaching your child off

court do you encourage her to request an official the first time she doesn't like an opponent's line call or do you encourage her to fight her own battles? Yes, situations exist where such a request is warranted i.e. medical condition, replacement racquet, water etc. However, trust in self-governance is best measured by how you behave as your child navigates the turbulent waters of competition.

Conclusion

The issues surrounding problem parent behavior and player sportspersonship are complex and must be investigated, evaluated, and addressed philosophically, developmentally, and pragmatically in order for positive change to manifest with permanence. While helpful insight may have been provided by my research and initial findings, the small sample size contained in this summary suggests the need for investigation much broader in scope than that provided by my limited knowledge and resources. I do believe the evidence provided supports my theory that parent practices during tournament play have a measurable impact on player behavior and as such, must be part of any conversation centered on junior sportspersonship.

Finally, as you continue to engage in your child's pursuits in the social setting of sanctioned junior tournament tennis, the question that rests on your shoulders every time he steps onto the court is, *"do you feel you are modeling appropriate behavior for today's youth?"*

References

- Bogardus, E. S. (1931). Attitudes and the Mexican immigrant. *Social attitudes*, 291-327.
- Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental psychology*, 28(5), 759.
- Campbell, D. T. (1963). Social attitudes and other acquired behavioral dispositions.
- Coakley, J. (2006). The good father: Parental expectations and youth sports. *Leisure studies*, 25(2), 153-163.
- Gootman, J. A., & Eccles, J. (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. National Academies Press. (148)
- Hutchinson, S. L., Baldwin, C. K., & Caldwell, L. L. (2003). Differentiating parent practices related to adolescent behavior in the free time context. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35(4), 396.
- Larson, R. Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist*, Vol 55(1), Jan 2000, 170-183.
- Larson, R. (2006). Positive youth development, willful adolescents, and mentoring. *Journal of community psychology*, 34(6), 677-689.
- Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1997). Coaching the coaches: Youth sports as a scientific and applied behavioral setting. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16-21.