ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254321053

Mercy Killing: Sportsmanship and Blowouts

Article *in* Journal of the Philosophy of Sport · May 2010

DOI: 10.1080/00948705.2010.9714766

CITATIONS
4

READS
772

1 author:

Pam Sailors
Missouri State University

26 PUBLICATIONS **156** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

All content following this page was uploaded by Pam Sailors on 07 July 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

This article was downloaded by: [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors]
On: 08 August 2012, At: 07:33
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Journal of the Philosophy of Sport
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjps20

Mercy Killing: Sportsmanship and Blowouts

Pam R. Sailors [a]

[a] Dept. of Philosophy, Missouri State University, Springfield, MO, 65897 E-mail:

Version of record first published: 19 Jan 2012

To cite this article: Pam R. Sailors (2010): Mercy Killing: Sportsmanship and Blowouts, Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 37:1, 60-68

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2010.9714766

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 2010, 37, 60-68
© 2010 Human Kinetics, Inc.

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

Mercy Killing: Sportsmanship and Blowouts

Pam R. Sailors

In a high school girls' basketball game on January 13, 2009, The Covenant School defeated Dallas Academy by a score of 100–0 and rekindled the debate over lopsided victories. Ratcheting up the emotional response was the fact that the Covenant School is a religious (Christian) school and Dallas Academy is a school for students with learning disabilities, whose basketball team had never won a game. Media outlets across the United States picked up the story and within 10 days, the Headmaster of The Covenant School issued a public apology, stating that the incident was "shameful and an embarrassment," as it failed to "reflect a Christ-like and honorable approach to competition." He went on to indicate that the school would submit a formal request to TAPPS (the state's governing body for private and parochial schools) to forfeit the game. Covenant's coach, who by some reports didn't instruct his team to stop pressing until after they scored their 100 points, was publicly and forcefully unapologetic, saying "my girls played with honor and integrity," and "if I lose my job over these statements I will walk away with my integrity" (11). Shortly thereafter, he took that walk, having been fired by the Covenant School. Do such uneven contests violate the spirit of sportsmanship?

Nicholas Dixon has formulated a thesis that would answer in the affirmative. The Anti-Blowout thesis (AB) holds: "It is intrinsically unsporting for players or teams to maximize the margin of victory after they have secured victory in a one-sided contest" (3). Dixon, however, did not formulate the AB thesis to support it, but rather to contest it. In response, Alun Hardman, et al. and Randolph Feezell, among others, have argued that the AB thesis should be upheld. Hardman, et al., base their conclusion on the psychological harm they believe may be done to the athletes who are on the losing side of blowouts (9). Feezell proposes a Revised Anti-Blowout thesis (RAB), which adds to the AB thesis the qualification that blowouts are only prima facie, rather than intrinsically, unsporting. Thus, for Feezell, blowouts, while generally morally problematic, might be acceptable under some circumstances. Feezell also suggests strategies for "easing up" in lopsided contests, whereby the game would go on but the winning team would change its tactics in an effort to stop scoring (7). Against this background, I examine various "mercy rules" used in different sporting contexts to attempt to avoid prolonging athletic contests when they have become blowouts. I argue that, regardless of the moral status of blowouts, most such rules should be upheld, and perhaps

The author <pamelasailors@missouristate.edu> is with the Dept. of Philosophy, Missouri State University, Springfield, MO 65897.

expanded. That is, even if blowouts are morally acceptable, mercy rules are right to prevent them in almost all circumstances.

Perhaps the most famous blowout occurred in 1916, when John Heisman coached the Georgia Tech college football team to a 222–0 blowout of Cumberland College. Cumberland had eliminated its football program a year earlier, but was forced by Heisman—still angry after a 22–0 loss to a Cumberland baseball team stocked with professionals the previous year—to honor their contract to play Georgia Tech. Scraping together a team of students with little experience, Cumberland showed up for Heisman to take his revenge. The score was 126–0 at the half. Things got so bad that at one point the Cumberland quarterback fumbled and called to a teammate to pick up the ball. The teammate yelled back, "You dropped it. You pick it up." Heisman himself invoked a mercy rule, by ending the game 5 minutes early (8). More recently, in 1990, then high school student, later WNBA basketball star, Lisa Leslie scored 101 points in the first half of a game. At the half the score was 102–24 and it seemed certain that Leslie would break the single game scoring record, but her hopes were dashed by the refusal of the opposing coach to bring his team out onto the court for the second half (8). Sixteen years later, in 2006, Epiphanny Prince had better luck, scoring 113 points in a game her team won 137–32 (1).

Mercy rules constitute an attempt to hasten the end of such lop-sided contests. The rules vary by sport, by location, and by level of competition. In the United States, the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) permits mercy rules for football, baseball, basketball, softball, field hockey, ice hockey and soccer on a state-by-state basis. The Federation suggests use of a running clock in timed sports and a run differential rule in sports without a clock (10). Examination of further strategies to avoid blowouts finds "some indoor soccer facilities stop changing the scoreboard once a team takes a commanding lead. In some…youth basketball leagues, a team must stop full court pressing once it is up by 10 points. Many girls' youth lacrosse leagues stop having a draw when a team is up by five goals. Instead, the losing team starts with the ball" (2). Obviously, there are various and many complicated mercy rules designed to lessen blowouts; what is not so obvious is why blowouts are things to avoid.

To review quickly some of what has been written about the moral status of blowouts, Dixon kicked off the debate with the formulation of the *Anti-Blowout* thesis (AB): "It is intrinsically unsporting for players or teams to maximize the margin of victory after they have secured victory in a one-sided contest" (3: p. 1), which he then argued against, concluding that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with blowouts. Hardman, Fox, McLaughlin, and Zimmerman disagreed in an article emphasizing the emotional/psychological harm done to the losers who are humiliated in blowouts (9). Dixon countered by arguing that Hardman, et al., overstated the link between loss of self-esteem and strong humiliation (4). Thus, any loss of self-esteem caused by blowouts does not make them unethical. Feezell then joined the debate, looking to soften the absolute prohibition of blowouts with his *Revised Anti-Blowout* thesis (RAB): "It is prima facie unsporting for players or teams to maximize the margin of victory after they have secured victory in a one-sided contest" (7: p. 70). In his response to Feezell, Dixon reiterated his argument that blowouts do not cause morally objectionable harm, and also claimed Feezell's RAB thesis and suggestions for easing up strategically would not work

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

to soften the pain of the losers anyway, and might actually make the humiliation of the loser even worse than it would otherwise be (5).

It might be thought that there's no reason to support mercy rules unless the AB or RAB thesis has been upheld—that is, if blowouts are morally acceptable, then there is no need for mercy rules. I disagree. Even if we assume that Dixon is correct and there is nothing intrinsically wrong with blowouts, there remain good reasons, pragmatic and based on the undesirable consequences of allowing blowouts, for preventing them.

So I will not engage in the core debate about blowouts because my argument regarding mercy rules is independent of the ethics of blowouts. Indeed, I take this to be an advantage of the argument since it can appeal to proponents of either side of the blowout debate.

The primary flaw with all such claims about blowouts is that they are too broad, making universal statements while failing to establish distinctions that may well determine moral status. I want to propose four such distinctions and suggest that a fully adequate examination of blowout ethics should include all four. Further, discussion of each of the distinctions provides support for the use of mercy rules. The distinctions are: (1) between time-limited and untimed events, (2) between team and individual contests, (3) between direct and indirect competition, and (4) between what we might call "have" and "have-not" teams. I will examine each in turn.

First, the distinction between time-limited and untimed events. In sports with timed segments, eventually the clock will run out, no matter the score, but sports that are divided into innings or other untimed segments could theoretically go on forever in the absence of mercy rules. A common procedure to avoid this is the use of the "run rule," by which games come to a stop when one team secures an insurmountable lead after a designated number of innings. In NCAA softball, for example, this is an 8 run lead after the completion of 5 innings. A university softball coach, consulted on this issue,[1] says she wants the run rule regardless of whether she's coaching the winning or losing team, in part for pragmatic reasons. Many softball contests are scheduled to require playing more than one game on a single day, so it is particularly desirable not to exhaust or risk injury to one's players in a contest once one team's superiority has been decisively demonstrated. Beyond prudence, she claims that the point of sports is athletic striving for excellence, but there is little opportunity for this in a blowout since the better team is not being challenged and the inferior team is so out-classed that they can't even perform well enough to enhance their skills. Both teams would be better served by practice than by a meaningless contest. Neither is well-served by continuing a game that isn't benefitting either team by lack of opportunity to exhibit skills against a worthy opponent or opportunity to gain skills through a determined battle against a superior opponent. As Feezell puts it, "Significant athletic excellence requires worthy opponents who can challenge a team or player" (7: p. 73).

Thus, even if the losing side should want to continue the contest beyond the point where the mercy rule would be invoked, there are at least two reasons their wish should not be granted. First, it is arguable that such a contest would involve true competition, since that requires that opponents engage in a mutual quest for excellence, a quest made impossible if the gap between the abilities of the teams is so great as to have led to the invoking of the mercy rule. Second, as a pragmatic

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

concern, the very real risk of injury outweighs the potential benefits of continuing the contest beyond the point where the vast superiority of one team over the other has been established.

Dixon also recognizes the pragmatic concerns, noting that: “It may be *unwise* for a coach to risk injuries to key players and waste a golden opportunity to give second-string players some playing time and perhaps try out novel plays and strategies in a low-risk setting” (3: p.3).[2] And “None of this is to deny the value of substituting backup players for starters in uneven contests. Aside from the prudence of not risking injury to key players, team morale will be improved by sharing the fun, and these values may well outweigh the importance of creating scoring records and giving an objectively accurate measure of the winning team’s superiority” (3: p. 9). However, Dixon doesn’t share the notion that blowouts are a waste of time. He claims they still allow a measure of athletic excellence in providing an objective accounting of the comparative abilities of the teams (3: p. 7). I agree that a blowout provides this, but suggest that a victory by a wide-margin does so as well, while also managing the pragmatic concerns that come with continuing a contest after the victor has been decided. Mercy rules allow a team to exhibit its comparative athletic excellence by winning by a wide margin, *and* allow coaches to rest first-string players, avoid unnecessary injuries, try out new plays, and give playing time to less skilled team members. Granted, mercy rules would eliminate the dazzling display of offensive skill in a 10 goal victory in soccer or 10 touchdown victory in football, but I’d argue that such a victory is not really impressive in such obviously uneven competition, as it reveals as much about the weakness of the defense as the strength of the offense. The point where a contest moves from victory by a wide margin to a blowout is not always clear. But, just as we can distinguish day from night without identifying exactly the moment of change from one to the other, we can mark the distinction between victory by a wide margin and a blowout at the point where the team that’s losing cannot realistically hope to catch up.

Next, the distinction between team sports and individual sports. According to one official who has worked football, softball, baseball, and soccer contests, taunting, baiting, trash talking, and retaliation are almost inevitable in a blowout. As the level of frustration rises, so also does the potential for injury as players begin to lash out physically at one another. Coaches give up on strategy and play-calling and turn their attention to scrutinizing every call of the officials. Fans from both teams pay less attention to the game and begin ridiculing the fans from the opposing team; tempers flare and the chance for fan violence increases. No wonder, then, that officials who find themselves in the middle of a blowout just want to get it over with as quickly as possible. In baseball and softball, the strike zone gets wider; in football and soccer the close call will always go the way that will keep the clock running. Mercy rules seem to offer a better solution to such situations.

Why would this be more of a problem in team sports than in individual sports? The answer can be found in the principle of “least significant morality,” proposed by sociologist Melvin Tumin.

> In any social group, the moral behavior of the group as an average will tend to sink to that of the least moral participant, and the least moral participant

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

> will, in that sense, control the group unless he is otherwise restrained and/or expelled….Bad money may not always drive out good money, though it almost always does. But 'bad' conduct surely drives out 'good' conduct with predictable vigor and speed (6: p.178).

Given the odds, there almost certainly will be at least one morally bad apple on every team, which means that it is practically inevitable that blowouts will bring out the very worst behavior in both the winning and the losing team. Dixon condemns the behavior, but seems to expect it to be much more easily avoidable than I believe it is in actual fact. According to Dixon: "Any plausible model of sportsmanship…requires that all competitors show mutual respect at all times. Mocking, taunting, and gloating at outmatched opponents is despicable. The sportsmanlike victors should thank the losers for the game, and console them for their obvious disappointment" (3: p. 11). I share Dixon's view of these acts as despicable, but I have no confidence that there will *be* "sportsmanlike victors" after their unsportsmanlike teammates have reduced them to the least significant morality. In these cases, mercy rules could preserve sportsmanship by saving athletes from their own worst instincts, ones that are ignited only by the phenomenon of least significant morality unique to group behavior.

One might suggest that mercy rules may not be the best response to bad behaviors. Is it really appropriate to end the contest for everyone just because some athletes misbehave? Perhaps taunting or retaliatory violence would be better addressed by imposing severe punishments, like season-long suspensions. In an ideal world, this would be common practice, but current conditions are far from ideal. In reality, we see evidence of not only acceptance but glorification of some forms of taunting, like elaborately choreographed moves to celebrate a score. Stopping a contest to avoid bad behavior may be seen as one specific example of the general practice of restricting the freedom of those who would not misbehave in order to curtail the freedom of those who would. For example, I can't accompany my mother to the boarding gate at the airport to see her safely onto the plane because we know that some people would do harm if allowed to move freely about the airport, no matter how strict the punishment attached to the doing of such harm.

The third distinction, between direct and indirect competition, is important primarily for what it reveals about the relationship between blowouts and sportsmanship. In direct competition, athletes not only try to do well, but also try to block in some way the efforts of opponents. In indirect competition, the performance of one athlete has little or no impact on the performance of another. An example from Hardman, et al., referring to indirect competition as "parallel" and direct competition as "interactive," makes this more clear:

> "Parallel" tests are found in such sports as track races run in lanes, athletic field events, ten-pin bowling, archery, shooting, downhill skiing, and golf. In such games, participants can play to the best of their ability, primarily independent of the progress of their opponent. If, for example, two bowlers agreed to play against each other and the superior performer's typical score was 250, while the inferior bowler had never broken 80, both players could still perform to the best of their ability. Although the contest outcome would

> be a foregone conclusion, the potential for achievement and display of personal performance excellence remains for both individuals. The winner could strive for a personal best, as could the inferior player. Although it would be clear who the better player was, with the importance of winning and losing in this hypothetical sporting culture downgraded, strong negative feelings would be unlikely (9: p. 61).

Blowouts are not taken to be a problem in sports that involve indirect competition, like golf, but are more problematic in sports that involve direct competition, like baseball. This is, at least in part, because the focus is placed on personal achievement in the former and on overcoming a particular opponent in the latter. Thus it makes sense that one doesn't hear calls for mercy rules in bowling, but does in basketball.

One might suggest that losing players in interactive sports can try to improve their personal best scores, just like losing players in parallel sports. Wouldn't a defensive stand or offensive touchdown in the waning minutes of a contest still be a source of pride for the team on the losing side of a blow-out? Although possible, I take it to be highly unlikely. In parallel sports, the quality of my performance depends only on me, so I can do well or not without thought to what others do. In interactive sports, it is almost certain that a last-minute goal line stand or a consolation touchdown would come against a different group of players than the ones who started the game. There is a missing consistency in conditions. In the unlikely event that the feat comes against the first-string, I would be smart enough to know that it happened because they "eased up," and I would find that more offensive than having the contest stopped by the mercy rule.

The final distinction is between what I'll call "have" and "have not" teams, and it is this distinction that is most often at the bottom of outcry over blowouts. A former university basketball coach pointed this out to support her claim that what is key is to establish a level playing field before the contest begins. So public and/or poorer schools (often have-nots) shouldn't schedule private schools; non-scholarship schools shouldn't schedule schools that award scholarships; schools with long traditions in a sport should avoid as much as possible scheduling contests against newly established programs or programs where the administration does not fully support the program with funding or qualified coaches. Victory under such unequal conditions is not admirable and may not even be honorable if it comes with the bad consequences that tend to accompany blowouts. Given that, mercy rules are certainly justified.

One could argue that matters of geography and economics may stand in the way of scheduling to ensure a level playing field. In the case of mismatches created by practicalities of scheduling, wouldn't it be enough to remind all participants and spectators that athletics are secondary to the educational mission? I think not. In an ideal world, this might be effective, but one has only to scan through the daily sports section in the newspaper to see that it simply is not, in practice, the case that sports serve education. In fact, there is a wealth of evidence that the aims and practices of the two often conflict, and that the educational mission of an institution often carries a lower degree of importance than the won/loss record of its sporting teams.

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

There is one exception I would allow here, and this is the scheduling of "guarantee games." Most university-level football and basketball programs in the United States schedule a limited number of nonconference games, usually at the beginning of the season, where the teams are athletically unequal. The vastly superior team pays a large sum of money to the inferior team, who generally travels to the better team's home. While these contests are almost always blowouts, they are not morally problematic since both teams benefit from the tradition. The superior team gets a good practice, in a real-game situation, for the more difficult portion of their schedule. The inferior team gets a large financial pay-off (which may allow them to improve their own facilities or purchase better equipment), increased exposure (which may lead to greater recruiting successes), and the experience of participating in a "big-time" environment, testing their skills against the best athletes.

Still, I recognize that some of the gains just noted from guarantee games might actually call for playing the full game, rather than invoking the mercy rule. This might, in fact, be the one case where I wouldn't argue for mercy rules. Given the difference in the attitude carried into these games, where the focus is less on winning than on gaining experience and the financial payment to the institution of the lesser ranked team, the problems that generally accompany blow-outs are much less likely to occur. Still, it is possible to get "too much of a good thing," so I would want to leave to the discretion of game officials the option to invoke the mercy rule if problems arise.

Having discussed four distinctions I think ought to be made, I should acknowledge one that others make, but I do not. Many commentators have thought it important to distinguish between children's sports and adults sports, but I do not because I believe it does children an injustice to perpetuate the notion that "everyone is a winner." I think Torres and Hagar have it exactly right, noting that:

> as Frankfurt has argued, knowing and confronting harsh realities is more beneficial than being oblivious to them. In his judgment,
>
> it is nearly always more advantageous to *face* the facts with which we must deal than to remain ignorant of them. After all, hiding our eyes from reality will not cause any reduction of its dangers and threats; plus, our chances of dealing successfully with the hazards that it presents will surely be greater if we can bring ourselves to see things straight. (p. 58)
>
> How can children deliberate autonomously about the value—and risks—of sport competition if the competitive qualities have been eliminated from their sports experience but the endeavor is still labeled as such (12: p. 204).

Of course, mercy rules should be used in children's sports, but I do not think they are any more important there than at other levels.[3] We owe it to children to expose them to some of the disappointment that will come to them as an unavoidable part of life. Attempts to "protect" children from the pain of losing may be characterized as deceitful and take away valuable opportunities to teach them how to respond to adversity with courage and to loss with graciousness.

One might be tempted to extend this point to include blowouts, arguing that allowing children to experience such heavy defeats can teach them that life itself

still goes on even after dealing out a heavy defeat. But I think this temptation is misguided. Just because a little bit of medicine is good doesn't mean that more will be better. We punish children in order to teach them lessons about acceptable behavior, but our punishment must not be so severe that it is emotionally or physically crippling. There comes a point of diminishing returns. Losing by a wide margin can teach children a valuable lesson; losing in a blowout may be crippling, such that a child just gives up and doesn't want to participate in athletics any longer.

Mercy rules will not eliminate victories by wide margins (which may be desirable for objective comparisons of athletic excellence), but they will go some way toward eliminating the harms that come along with blowouts. They also seem to be a better and more honest response to blowouts than having the winning team adopt tactics to slow down scoring, since they allow the winning team to play with full effort until the rule is invoked. Thus, I conclude that while blowouts may not be intrinsically (or even prima facie) morally wrong, there are good reasons to encourage the use of mercy rules.

Notes

1. Here and on two later occasions, I refer to a coach or official with whom I consulted during my research on the issue of blowouts and mercy rules. For various reasons, some more obvious than others, each of the three expressed a desire to remain anonymous.

2. Dixon suggests that an additional reason to allow blowouts is so that fans can delight in the show of great athleticism offered by superior athletes. I disagree with this claim, as my own experience is that fans quickly become bored at best and unruly at worst during such lopsided contests. As nonanecdotal evidence of this, I point to the common practice of television networks switching coverage from blowouts to contests that are closer. Given that television networks want to offer programming that will attract and retain the greatest number of viewers, it seems unlikely that they would cut away from a blowout if such a move carried a risk of losing spectators.

3. A further question, which deserves more examination that I can provide here, is what place, if any, mercy rules should play in professional sporting contests. My intuition is that something shifts in the weighting of the moral calculus when we move from contests waged by amateurs to contests between athletes who are carrying out the duties of their jobs, perhaps simply because—win or lose—they are being paid, but that argument needs to be further developed. Related to this issue, one might suggest that the reason not to have mercy rules for professionals is that they would be perceived as condescending, or even demeaning, because the superior level of competition takes place between more mature elite athletes, so both the competition and the competitors are on a higher level than college and earlier. If this is what underlies the absence of mercy rules for professionals then it could be argued that mercy rules should also be absent whenever the level of competition and competitors reaches what we take to be the elite level. I'm not convinced that this is the underlying rationale for exempting professional sports—my intuition is that it's more closely tied to the difference between engaging in a job versus a hobby—but, even so, I think the practical difficulty of deciding what constitutes a sufficient level of maturity and the fact that the rosters of school sports are constantly in flux, defeats the feasibility of the suggested practice.

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

References

1. Brady, Eric, and Halley, Jim. "The blowup over blowouts." USA Today, February 4, 2009.
2. Dawson, Effie. "The good and bad of mercy rules." The Examiner, March 12, 2008.
3. Dixon, N. "On Sportsmanship and 'Running Up the Score.'." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 19, 1992, 1–13.
4. Dixon, N. "Why Losing by a Wide Margin is Not in Itself a Disgrace: Response to Hardman, Fox, McLaughlin and Zimmerman." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 25, 1998, 61–70.
5. Dixon, N. "The Inevitability of Disappointment: Reply to Feezell." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 27, 2000, 93–99.
6. Eitzen, D. Stanley. "Ethical Dilemmas in American Sport: The Dark Side of Competition," in *Sport in Contemporary Society*, 6th edition, edited by D. Stanley Eitzen, New York: Worth Publishers, 2001, pp. 169-79.
7. Feezell, R.M. "Sportsmanship and Blowouts: Baseball and Beyond." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 26, 1999, 68–78.
8. Freeman, Mike. "Lopsided Scores Fuel School Sports Debate." New York Times, March 4, 2003.
9. Hardman, A., Fox, L., McLaughlin, D., and Zimmerman, K. "On Sportsmanship and 'Running Up the Score': Issues of Incompetence and Humiliation." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 23, 1996, 58–69.
10. Hensley, Lauren. "'Mercy Rules' Adopted by Several States." nfhs.org, May 2005.
11. Horn, B. "Covenant coach who beat Dallas Academy 100-0 is fired." *The Dallas Morning News*. 26 January 2009. 26 January 2009 http://dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/localnews/stories/012609dnspocovenantnu.2781526.html
12. Torres, C.R., and Hager, P.F. "De-emphasizing Competition in Organized Youth sport: Misdirected Reforms and Misled Children." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport,* 34, 2007, 194–210.

Downloaded by [Missouri State University], [Pam Sailors] at 07:33 08 August 2012

View publication stats