

VICES AND VIRTUES – A CASE OF TECHNOLOGY IN SPORT

*John Davies, Victoria Business School, Victoria University of Wellington, Rutherford House,
23 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6140, NZ, +64 4 4635382, john.davies@vuw.ac.nz*

ABSTRACT

This case examines the use of technology in sport. In particular, it explores how the use of technology ostensibly to help match officials make better decisions and to ensure fair outcomes for players and teams, can induce gaming behaviour that perversely runs counter to fairness and to the spirit of the sport.

The context for the case is a high profile match involving leading cricket nations playing in a century-old series of international test matches competing for a traditional trophy known as the Ashes. The incident detailed in the case relates to a batsman who edges a ball, not seen by the umpire, and is caught 'out' by an opposing fielder. The umpire, for procedural reasons, is unable to make use of available Hawkeye digital tracking and Hotspot heat sensing contact technology to review his decision.

The batsman and umpire refuse to bow to appeals by opposing players and play continues. The incident was seen by spectators at the match, captured by photographers and TV cameras, and seen later by countless TV and YouTube viewers.

The case can be used to explore issues related to the ethical behaviour of individual athletes, teams and sports organisations, the impact on stakeholders, and the role of coaches, managers and governing bodies in addressing such behaviour and managing such issues.

The case also provides opportunity to discuss the impact and relevance of context when assessing the behaviour of professionals and executives in other industry sectors who gain advantage when purposely or knowingly breach of a code of conduct, and who fail to convey that breach to an auditor, supervisor etc.

Keywords: ethical behaviour, governance, stakeholders, sport.

BACKGROUND

Cricket – A Global Sport

Cricket is a global sport with particular links to countries within the former British Empire, and now the Commonwealth. In particular, cricket has grown from being a sport introduced and played mainly by expatriate British citizens during the colonial era, to being a sport that has permeated the hearts and minds of sport-minded people in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and which consumes society in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and the West Indies.

Its traditions, values and rivalries date back more than a century, and endure and mutually reinforce each other to feed an interest in the sport which has made it a billion dollar industry. Indeed, on the back of such rivalries and new global competitions, developments in media and satellite technology have made the elite game a media spectacle, promoting media coverage that has made the elite game a pervasive and ever-present feature of broadcasting.

Despite the pressures that arise in highly contested and potentially lucrative competition, the values that infuse the playing of the game have been absorbed into many cultures, where phrases like "That's just not cricket!" are understood to convey a view that the unwritten rules of fair play have been broken.

The advances and strength of the global game have been underpinned by a unified and unifying governance structure manifest in its governing body, the International Cricket Council (ICC). It has grown in authority as it has masterminded sponsorship and media rights deals for its elite competitions such as the ICC Champions Trophy and the Cricket World Cups for the respective ODI and Twenty20 versions of the game.

At the same time, the axis of financial and political power within the ICC has shifted away from the traditional financial powerhouses of England, Australia and South Africa to the Asian sub-continent, where fanatical support for the game has not only underpinned the rise in value of media and sponsorship rights for the game worldwide, but made India the richest and most powerful player in the politics of world cricket and in the organization of the professional game.

However, it is one of the oldest sporting competitions, known as The Ashes, and contested by the national teams of England and Australia that remains out as the stand-out event that grabs the attention of fans, the media, sponsors etc.

This paper relates to an incident in the 2013 Ashes series when player behavior, the drive for success, the values of the game, and newly available digital technology available to assist match officials all intersect to create ethical dilemmas that confront players, officials and the governing bodies of the sport.

The Ashes

International Test cricket matches between England and Australia were first played in 1861. On the occasion of Australia's first victory on England against the full England representative team, a young journalist penned a mock obituary of England cricket in the *Sporting Times* [10]

*"In affectionate remembrance of English cricket
which died at The Oval, 29th August, 1882.*

Deeply lamented by a large circle of sorrowing friends and acquaintances, RIP.

NB The body will be cremated and the Ashes taken to Australia."

The urn that contains the now symbolic Ashes is one of the oldest and smallest trophies played for in the sporting world. Its size, however, understates its significance, its stature and its importance to cricketers worldwide.

STUART BROAD

Born into a cricketing family, baby faced Stuart Broad followed his father Chris Broad into first class county cricket and England teams. Born in 1986, his 6ft 5in frame is ideal for his right-arm fast bowling style which earned him his county debut at twenty years of age, and his first England selection at age twenty one in 2007. His early promise saw him awarded Cricket Writers' Club Young Cricketer of the Year 2006, and Wisden Cricketer of the Year in 2010.

Before the eventful first Ashes Test at the Trent Bridge ground in home town of Nottingham, he had already surpassed his father's record of twenty five Tests for England, having played more than 50 Test matches and 100 One Day International (ODI) matches for England. His ability as a useful left-handed batsman, having scored one Test century and ten scores of 50 or more, averaging 24 runs per Test innings, has made him an automatic choice for England teams not just as an opening fast bowler but as a valuable and skilful all-rounder [3].

THE INCIDENT

The specific incident outlined here relates to England all-rounder, Stuart Broad, whilst batting in England's second innings in the first Ashes test match at Nottingham's Trent Bridge ground, on Friday 12 July 2013.

England had scored 297 runs for the loss of six wickets, and with Broad 'not out' on 37 runs, the match was finely balanced with the odds seeming to favour Australia if they could dismiss the remaining England batsmen without too many runs being scored.

Broad then seemed to edge a ball which deflected off the wicketkeeper, Brad Haddin, to captain Michael Clarke at first slip - with Clark leading the Australians in a confident and jubilant appeal for Broad's dismissal. However, the umpire, Aleem Dar, did not agree and Broad was saved. With the umpire's decision in dispute, it was possible to request the umpire access the *decision referral system (DRS)* – accessing digital tracking and heat sensing systems to determine whether the ball had edged the bat and/or deviated.

However, as in baseball, American football and tennis, the number of occasions when players or teams can request use of the *DRS* is limited - and the Australians had already used up their three requests. In such circumstances, the umpire's decision stands – unless the batsman 'walks', that is, unless he admits that he touched the ball, and accepts being caught out.

Regardless, TV coverage always shows the evidence made available by the DRS, and it did so at the time – providing evidence that, in all probability, Broad had edged the ball.

The incident was seen by spectators at the match, captured by TV cameras, and seen by countless TV viewers in immediate replays.

Broad refused to acknowledge appeals and exhortations by the Australians players and acted as if nothing unusual had happened. With no reviews at his disposal, the Aussie captain, Michael Clarke remonstrated with passion, his frustration turning to anger in the finely balanced game.

When England finally achieved victory, the additional 28 runs scored by Stuart Broad took the winning margin to 14 runs – indicating the closeness of the game.



IMMEDIATE REACTION FROM THE COACHES

The attitudes displayed by both coaches seemed to indicate that they could rationalise the controversy in terms of the acceptance of umpires' authority and acceptance of the DRS. For example, Darren Lehmann, Australia's coach, said [2]:

*"It's dealt with as far as I'm concerned"
The DRS [Decision Review System] has improved the decision-making process.
Both sides have the same issues.
We've got to get better at using it, basically."*

Andy Flower, the England coach, said:

*"Most players leave it to the umpires to make the decision
... and I don't think there's anything wrong with that."
"When I played cricket I didn't walk if I'd edged it,
so I'd be a hypocrite to say that all other players should walk"*

IMMEDIATE REACTION FROM FAMILY AND THE PUBLIC

The incident was not seen as controversial by all stakeholders. For example, Stuart Broad received a standing ovation from the Trent Bridge support when he completed his innings.

Neither was regarded as of great significance in family circles, given a report [4] that Stuart Broad's father had texted him to ask him how he managed to "keep a straight face".

IMMEDIATE REACTION FROM THE MEDIA

Print, radio and TV media coverage of the test reflected the high profile of the Ashes series, and Sky TV coverage ensured that millions of TV viewers were able to "see" the incident and form their own views of whether Broad had unfairly kept his wicket, had deliberately cheated, and whether Australia had been denied justice. The media kept the story alive and well beyond normal reporting of match details.

During the match, TV commentator and former England captain, David Lloyd's spontaneous commentary on the incident [9] included:

*"He is gone this time. Not the best delivery!
... and he is still there – Stuart Broad. .
What's he standing there for? They've all appealed
It looked as if he nicked it to the keeper.
Oh my goodness me! Speechless!*

The audacity of it – he just walked up the pitch to have a word with the non-striking batter."

James Lawton, writing in *The Independent* [refusal] similarly referred to Broad's behaviour as defiant, stating, not only that:

"Broad knew that he could stand there, defiant, unbowed and unashamed"

... but that:

"Stuart Broad's refusal to walk shows that the Spirit of Cricket is well and truly dead."

Lawton further commented [8]:

*"There had to be a winner and a loser, a pity though ... it was delivered to England not in the utterly unequivocal way of one of those passages of stunning cricket ... but by mere gadgetry.
You need the .. gadgetry, of course, because ... it both renders justice and makes of the cheating that was taking such a hold on the old game a few years ago an extremely small window of opportunity ...
Stuart Broad crawled through it egregiously enough at a pivotal point in this extraordinary contest,
refusing to walk when all those present and even someone with a TV dish on the side of a Swiss Alp
knew that he had been caught by Australian captain Michael Clarke."*

Australian cricket reporter, Greg Baum [1] commented on various dimensions of the controversy. Whilst recognising Clark's expression of frustration and anger should be tempered by his responsibilities as captain; and recognising that the rule-restricted use of digital technology was a responsibility of the ICC as the rule-making governing body, he also implied that Broad should shoulder some responsibility for his actions:

*"If there was a noble voice inside Stuart Broad,
it must have been screaming at him to turn around and make for the pavilion."*

Or was it that it was shouted down by a baser, but louder and now more common instinct, which recognises no nicety except the distinction between winning and losing? Maybe there was no debate in Broad's mind; maybe nothing happened there."



"The Broadwalk: Stuart Broad raises his bat to the crowd as he eventually walks off the field at stumps" ... to a standing ovation.

AFTERMATH OF ONGOING MEDIA COVERAGE AND REACTION

Six weeks later, on the eve of the final test at the Oval in south London, Broad took opportunity to offer his views on the success of the team, their attitudes and responsibilities, and the controversy that involved him [5] :

It is quite an un-English thing that this team has got ...

We do have a win-at-all-costs mentality.

We want to win, we want to make the fans happy

"I knew I had hit it.

For [other] players on the field to not know I had nicked it shows there was confusion there."

"You look through the series and look at the Australian players who have nicked it and not walked you could name Warner, Rogers, Khawaja, Smith, Haddin, Clarke, Agar.

That's quite a lot of players for it to be a big issue.

We always have a responsibility to the fans and youngsters growing up because you are role models.

But you have to play hard and play fair.

That is the spirit of the game and how it is defined.

The whole walking debacle I thought was pretty poor journalism because it was just one player who was picked up.

I have named seven/eight Australia and four Englishmen where that [controversy] has not happened.

Learning of these comments, and reacting to Broad's admission that he had edged the ball, Australian cricket coach, Darren Lehmann, opened up in an interview with a Melbourne radio station [6]

"I hope the Australian public give it to him right from the word go for the whole [Australian] summer ... and I hope he cries and goes home.

"Certainly our players haven't forgotten, they're calling him everything under the sun ...

I hope the Australian public are the same because that was just blatant cheating.

I don't advocate walking but, when you hit it to first slip, it's pretty hard"

The interview led to Lehmann being charged by ICC CEO Dave Richardson. Lehmann consequently pleaded guilty to "publicly criticising and making inappropriate comments" about Broad. Richardson set out his expectations:

"Whilst noting the context and nature of the comments made, showing mutual respect for one's fellow professionals - including for coaches, players and match officials - is a cornerstone of how we play the game."

Lehmann's comments struck a different kind of raw nerve with former Australia captain Ian Chappell [], who said in a BBC Radio 5 Live interview:

"I don't like to be called a cheat and basically he (Lehmann) is calling all people who don't walk a cheat, which would include himself"

"And even when you've got your tongue in your cheek ... it's pretty hypocritical for an Australian to complain about somebody not walking."

EPILOGUE

England went on to win the 2013 Ashes series, 3- 0, with two matches drawn.

SAMPLE OF STUDENT DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

A - General – Introductory Questions

- (a) List and describe the main actors in this case. Describe their roles in the controversy.
- (b) What is the main dilemma you have identified in this case? Are there other dilemmas?
- (c) Why has this case attracted so much attention?
- (d) Should Stuart Broad be censured?

B - Assessing Behaviour on and off the Sports Field.

- (a) Should players, in this case, Broad, accept the umpire's decision, and just play to the whistle?
... even though they know the umpire/referee has got it wrong, or ...
... even when they have doubts about whether an umpire/referee was unsighted?
... suggesting that they accept the good and the bad?
- (b) Should players, in general, admit when they have broken the rules of the game?
- (c) Should players try to fool the referee or umpire?
- (d) Comment on the moral emotions expressed by Australian/English supporters and players, the press, media commentators, the team officials etc, and suggest what actions may be predisposed by those emotions.
- (e) What moral values were breached by Stuart Broad and Darren Lehmann (use Lumpkin, Beller and Stoll's Conceptualisation of Moral Values)?
- (f) Did Broad cheat? What rules did he break? What rules did Lehmann break? Why was Lehmann subject to ICC disciplinary procedures, but not Broad?
- (g) Using Kohlberg's framework, indicate the level of moral reasoning exhibited by Stuart Broad and Darren Lehmann for the dilemma(s) you identified.

C - Governance, Management and Stakeholder Considerations - Decisions

- (a) Should the governing body, the ICC, ...
... have engaged in a post-match video-review of the incident?
... give consideration to changing the rules for using technology
to improve the accuracy of umpiring decisions? to eliminate unnecessary controversy.
Consider the impact on other stakeholders of taking such actions.
- (b) Given the reaction of various stakeholders to this incident, evaluate the potential downside for Broad, the England team, the governing bodies, when blatant incidents of cheating may create injustice.
- (c) Why did Lehmann become a target for comment and disciplinary action?
- (d) Given the reaction of various stakeholders to this incident, evaluate the potential downside for Lehmann, the Australian team, the governing bodies, when accusations of cheating are made.
- (e) What broad strategies could the ICC as governing body, put in place to curb unethical behaviour by those under their jurisdiction?
- (f) Discuss and evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies in situations where there is a need to clarify role ambiguity for players, as opposed to addressing role conflict for those players.
- (g) How would the governing bodies of other sports be likely to react to incidents of blatant cheating?
- (h) Is the use of technology necessary? Identify the range of impacts on various stakeholders.

D – Key Lessons

- (a) Offer some considered views on how Stuart Broad and Andy Flower, the England coach, could have managed the situation differently. Should Darren Lehmann have acted differently?
- (b) Can the situation be seen as presenting opportunities for the key actors to accept responsibility for leadership, values, setting direction and ethics; to be honest, and to convey integrity?

E - Applicability to other Managerial or Professional Situations

Compare this situation to that of a management professional who has unwittingly breached a code of conduct, which breach has conferred advantage to the manager, to his or her organisation – but which has gone unnoticed by auditors or market regulators.

F - Behaviour in the Managerial or Professional Environment.

- (a) Should managers play to the metaphorical whistle?
 - even though they know the auditor has got it wrong, and ...
 - even when they have doubts about whether an auditor has noted the breach of code?
 - suggesting that they accept the good and the bad?
- (b) Should managers, in general, admit when they have broken the rules?
- (c) Should managers try to fool the auditor or regulator?
- (d) Comment on the moral emotions expressed by the media, investors, consumers etc. when they observe blatant breaches of codes or frauds that benefit some, but disadvantage others?
- (e) What moral values would be breached by an act of fraud, or not disclosing a fraudulent act?
- (f) Using Kohlberg's framework, indicate the level of moral reasoning likely to be exhibited by those engaged in fraudulent acts, or cover-ups of fraud?

G - The Importance of Context in Behaviour in the Managerial or Professional Environment.

- (a) Consider whether and why cheating or fraudulent behaviour is more or less acceptable in some contexts than in others.
- (b) If cheating is less acceptable in a professional environment, what actions could sport managers and/or sport governing bodies take to reduce the likelihood of cheating?

REFERENCES

- [0] AFP. (2013). Chappell labels a 'hypocrite'. *Sydney Morning Herald*, retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au/sport/cricket/chappell-labels-lehmann-a-hypocrite-20130824-2shta.html>, Aug 24 2013.
- [1] Baum, G. (2013). Cricket's ethics demanded that Stuart Broad walk. *Sydney Morning Herald*, July 13 2013, retrieved from: <http://www.smh.com.au/sport/cricket/crickets-ethics-demanded-that-stuart-broad-walk-20130713-2pwe8.html>, July 13, 2013
- [2] Brenkley, S. (2013). England's head coach insists teams now wait for umpire's decision after controversy in first Ashes Test, *The Independent*, retrieved from: http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/cricket/ashes-2013-andy-flower-refuses-to-criticise-stuart-broad-for-not-walking-8709380.html?utm_source=indynewsletter&utm_medium=email16072013, Tuesday 16 July 2013.
- [3] ESPN Cricinfo (2013). Player Profiles, retrieved from: <http://www.espncricinfo.com/ci/content/player/9230.html>
- [4] Hoult, N. (2013). Ashes 2013: Chris Broad adds fuel to the fire after asking in text message how son Stuart 'kept a straight face', *The Daily Telegraph*, retrieved from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/cricket/international/theashes/10178259/Ashes-2013-Chris-Broad-adds-fuel-to-the-fire-after-asking-in-text-message-how-son-Stuart-kept-a-straight-face.htm>, 13 July 2013.
- [5] Hoult, N. (2013). Ashes 2013: Ashes 2013: we win at all costs, so yes, I did nick the ball at Trent Bridge, says England's Stuart Broad', *The Daily Telegraph*, retrieved from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/cricket/international/theashes/10253309/Ashes-2013-we-win-at-all-costs-so-yes-I-did-nick-the-ball-at-Trent-Bridge-says-Englands-Stuart-Broad.html>, 19 August 2013.
- [6] Hoult, N. (2013). Ashes 2013: Australia's Darren Lehmann fined £2,000 by ICC for attack on Stuart Broad, *The Daily Telegraph*, retrieved from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/cricket/international/theashes/10259782/Ashes-2013-Australias-Darren-Lehmann-fined-2000-by-ICC-for-attack-on-Stuart-Broad.html>, August 22 2013.
- [7] Lawton, J. (2013). Stuart Broad's refusal to walk shows that the Spirit of Cricket is well and truly dead, *The Independent*, retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/cricket/james-lawton-stuart-broads-refusal-to-walk-shows-that-the-spirit-of-cricket-is-well-and-truly-dead-8706616.html>, Friday, July 12 2013.
- [8] Lawton, J. (2013). Ashes 2013: A pity that this fascinating contest had to be ended by mere gadgetry, *The Independent*, retrieved from: <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/cricket/ashes-2013-a-pity-that-this-fascinating-contest-had-to-be-ended-by-mere-gadgetry-8708400.html>, 14 July 2013.
- [9] Lloyd, D. (2013). Stuart Broad's Controversial Dismissal - Day Three, First Ashes Test, 2013, *Fix Sports 2*, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aHhZb-cBKwc>, Friday 12 July 2013.
- [10] Williamson, M. (2014). A short history of the Ashes, *ESPN cricinfo*, retrieved from: <http://www.espncricinfo.com/the-ashes-2013/content/story/259985.html>.