

MATCHFIXING:
A FRAMEWORK TO ANALYZE FACTORS
THAT MAKE ATHLETES AGREE TO RIG A MATCH

Dr. Els De Waegeneer

MATCHFIXING

- Worldwide problem
- Detrimental to the sport sector
- No conceptual framework to analyse if/why athletes agree to fix a match

THE MODEL OF REST

- Several authors have discussed how people come to behave in an (un)ethical manner
- The most complete model is put forward by Rest
- Any form of ethical behavior can be broken into a four-step process.
- A persons needs to fulfill these four conditions in order to establish an ethical act

STEP 1: MORAL SENSITIVITY

- the ability of a person to interpret a situation and recognize the moral issues that come with it
- e.g. doping
- e.g. matchfixing

STEP 2: MORAL JUDGEMENT

- Moral judgment is the process through which the person comes to a moral evaluation of the issue at hand.
- Do I find this behaviour ethically correct or not?
- e.g. doping
- e.g. matchfixing

STEP 3: MORAL MOTIVATION

- the intention to choose the value of morality, formulated in the moral judgment, over a different value, such as winning at all costs, power, fame, or money
- e.g. doping
- e.g. matchfixing

STEP 4: MORAL CHARACTER

- the ability to follow through with the moral decision and to actually behave in this way
- e.g. doping
- e.g. matchfixing

THE MODEL OF REST

- Failure in any of these steps can result into failure to behave in an ethical manner
- > In this case: the agreement to fix a match

- It is important for our knowledge on the decision-making process in which step(s) athletes need more guiding in order not to give in to MF proposals

- Different strategies to combat MF need to be in place when:
 - there's mostly a lack of awareness (step 1)
 - athletes do not think of MF as something wrong (step 2)
 - when athletes condemn MF, but are driven by money or other interests (step 3)
 - When they can't handle the pressure or fear (step 4)

SURVEY: MATCHFIXING

- Football
- Flanders
- A questionnaire/interviews to assess the personal and contextual factors that lead to agreeing to fix a match
- ongoing research -> preliminary results

- Non-betting-related: corruption with the aim of getting certain results on the field

e.g. rigging a match so that one's team wins and can avoid relegation

- Betting-related: corruption with the aim of enrichment on the sports betting market (financial gain + money laundering)

e.g. getting one's own team to lose and betting large sums of money on one's own defeat

NON-BETTING RELATED MATCHFIXING

1. Moral sensitivity

- They see intentional loss as a strategy, not as MF

2. Moral judgment

- they don't consider MF wrong: no harm in 'helping out' another team

3. Motivation

4. Moral Character

- group pressure: "we go along with the rest of our team"

BETTING-RELATED MATCHFIXING

1. Moral sensitivity

- They are aware of the ethical debate on MF

2. Moral judgment

- they do see MF as wrong

3. Motivation

- the financial aspect

4. Moral Character

- out of fear

The different types of fixing need different approaches when it comes to

- raising awareness & correct judgment in athletes (step 1 & 2 of the Rest model)
- preventing athletes to take part in a proposed fix (step 2, 3, 4 of the Rest model)

Els De Waegeneer

postdoctoral researcher sport ethics

MOVEMENT AND SPORT SCIENCES

E Els.dewaegeneer@ugent.be

T +32 9 264 86 36

www.ugent.be

 Ghent University

 @ugent

 Els De Waegeneer