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MATCHFIXING

- Worldwide problem

- Detrimental to the sport sector

- No conceptual framework to analyse if/why athletes agree to fix a match
- 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 person 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)
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