International
SOCIAL SCIENCES STUDIES JOURNAL
e-ISSN:2587-1587
Open Access Refereed E-Journal & Indexed & Publishing
Research Article
Article Arrival : 29/08/2021
Published : 15.10.2021
Doi Number http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sssj.3479
Reference Pehlevan, Z. (2021). "Participation Motivations Of Turkish Students Who Participated In Interschool Sport Competitions Organized As Hypercompetitive And Recreational Activity" International Social Sciences Studies Journal, (e-ISSN:2587-1587) Vol:7, Issue:88; pp:4149-4160

# PARTICIPATION MOTIVATIONS OF TURKISH STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN INTERSCHOOL SPORT COMPETITIONS ORGANIZED AS HYPERCOMPETITIVE AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITY

## Aşırı Yarışma ve Rekreasyonel Biçiminde Organize Edilen Okullararası Spor Yarışmalarına Katılan Türk Öğrencilerinin Katılım Motivasyonları

Prof. Dr. Zekai PEHLEVAN
Mersin University, Sports Science Faculty, Mersin/TURKEY
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4532-2508

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare the participation motivation of 10-15-year-old Turkish youth who participated in interschool sport competitions organized as hypercompetitive and recreational activity within school sports competitions. Four hundred fifty-four students whose average age is M= 12. 9; SD= 1.3 participated in this study. Two hundred twenty two subjects (49%) participated in hypercompetitive interschool competitions while 232 (51%) subjects participated in interschool competition organized as local tournament events. For data collection, Turkish version of the Participation Motivation Questionnaire (PMQ) was used. The statistical technique of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used for data analysis. MANOVA results showed that there are no differentiation in PMQ subscales for the gender and gender*organization format variables, yet there is a significant differentiation for organizational format. Results of one-way analysis of variance revealed that there is also a significant difference between PMQ subscales of "friendship" and "competitive" in terms of independent variable of organization format in interschool sport competition. The values demonstrate that independent variable of organization format has a lower influence on PMQ subscales of friendship and fun. The organizational format for sports competitions interschool has an impact on the motivation for participation of children. Competition and a winning sensation are the main sources of motivation for participants in hypercompetitive sports organizations which emphasize competition and winning, whereas "friendship" feeling is more important for participants in tournament sports organizations. It is suggested that the general purpose of the physical education curriculum is to promote lifelong physical activity while avoiding hypercompetitive sport experiences and including experiences in tournament/recreational sport. Recreational sports are more effective in supporting the goals of the physical education program. For this reason, it is recommended to avoid sports competition organized in the form of hypercompetitiveness, which emphasize winning and competitive feeling.

**Keywords:** Participant motivation; Interschool sport competition; Hyper-Competitiveness, Tournamet

## ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı aşırı yarışma ve rekreasyonel biçiminde organize edilmiş okullar arası spor yarışmalarına katılan 10-15 yaş grubu çocukların katılım motivasyonlarında cinsiyet, organizasyon biçimi ve cinsiyet*organizasyon biçimi değişkenlerinin etkileşimini belirlemektir. Araştırmanın örneklem grubunu aşırı yarışma biçiminde organize edilen okullar arası spor yarışmalarına katılan 222, rekreasyonel/turnuva biçimde organize edilmiş yarışmalara katılan 232 olmak üzere toplam 454 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Örneklem grubunun yaş ortalaması $\overline{X}$= 12.9, SS= 1.3'dür. Katılımcıların % 49'u aşırı yarışmacı (n= 222), %51'i ise turnuva/rekreasyonel (n= 232) biçimde organize edilen grubu oluşturmaktadır. Veriler Katılım Motivasyonu Ölçeği (PMQ) ile toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde Çok Değişkenli Varyans Analizi (MANOVA) kullanılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre PMQ alt ölçeklerinde cinsiyet ve cinsiyet*organizasyon formatı değişkenlerinde farklılaşma olmamış, PMQ alt ölçeklerinde organizasyon formatı değişkeninde farklılaşma bulunmuştur. ANOVA analiz sonuçlarına göre okullar arası spor yarışmalarında organizasyon formatı değişkenine göre "arkadaşlık" ve "yarışma" alt ölçeklerinde anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur. Bu değerler göstermektedir ki; organizasyon formatı arkadaşlık ve eylence alt ölçeklerinde düşük bir etkiye sahiptir. Okullararası spor yarışmalarında organizasyon formatı çocukların katılım

motivasyonlarını etkilemektedir. Okullar arasında aşırı yarışmacı biçimindeki spor organizasyonlarında rekabet ve kazanma duygusu temel motivasyon kaynağı olurken, turnuva/rekreasyon formatında yapılan organizasyonlarda ise arkadaşlık hissi daha fazla motivasyon kaynağı olmaktadır. Beden eğitimi öğretim programı, aşırı rekabetçi spor deneyimlerinden kaçınarak, turnuva/rekreasyonel biçimde yapılan aktiviteler yoluyla yaşam boyu fiziksel aktivitenin teşvik edilmesini önermektedir. Rekreasyonel sporlar beden eğitimi öğretim programının amaçlarını desteklemede daha etkilidir. Bu nedenle kazanma ve rekabet duygusunu ön plana çıkaran aşırı rekabetçilik şeklinde düzenlenen spor müsabakalarından kaçınılması önerilmektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Katılım motivasyonu, Okullararası spor yarışması, Aşırı yarışmacılık, Turnuva

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Sports participation motivation

In recent years, research in sport psychology and sport education has focused on why school-aged youth participate in organized sports. The focus of this body of literature is the identification and categorization of motivational factors (Gould, 1982; Gill, Gross & Huddleston, 1983; Gould, Feltz, & Weiss, 1985; Klint & Weiss, 1987; Zahariadis & Biddle, 2000; Cecchini, Méndez, & Muñiz, 2002; Erdogdu, Sirin, Ince, & Ocalan, 2014) which influence participation choices. Gould (1982) stated that research results on motivation of participants in sports are beneficial to coaches, administrators and program development professionals. An understanding of factors which influence participation of school-aged youth, coaches can meet the needs of participants, which may positively affect their motor and psychological development. Gill et al. (1983) developed a Participant Motivation Questionnaire (PMQ) to examine factors which explain why youth choose to participate in sport. Skill development, learning, fun, fitness, acquiring new friends and achievement were identified as the most significant factors which influence sport participation. In another scale development study of Spanish 8 to 18 year-old subjects, nine sub-dimensions were identified (Cecchini et al., 2002). A factor analysis of study participant motives identified the following factors: “physical condition/bodily appearance”, “heterosexuality”, “team”, “fun/friendship”, “ability”, “winning”, “relaxation”, “health” and “social approval”.

Elementary and secondary school students usually participate in sports for fun, skill refinement and learning new skills (Gill & Deeter, 1988). The study by Gill et al., (1983) revealed that students participating in sports are motivated for “achievement/status,” “team atmosphere,” “fitness,” “energy release,” “skill development,” “friendship” and “fun”. Gould, Feltz, & Weiss (1985) found that young swimmers participating in sports are motivated by “fun”, “fitness”, “skill development” and “team spirit”, whereas Gross found that students participating in sports are motivated by “fun”, “skill development”, “learning new skills”, “trying new challenges” and “fitness” (in Brustad, Babkes, & Smith, 2001). Open-ended questionnaire responses of 9 to 18 year-olds to develop an Italian version of the PMQ instrument (Buonamano, Cei, & Mussino, 1995) revealed the primary motivational factors for sport participation were “enjoyment” (49.2%), “physical motives” (32.0%), “social reasons” (8.9%), “competitive motives” (4.2%), “skill motives” (2.9%) and “social visibility” (2.8%).

Another ~~In a~~ study of 9-17 age years old Turkish students (Oyar, Ascı, Celebi, & Mulazimoglu, 2001) identified the primary motivating factors as “they wanted to use equipment and facilities”, “their parents and close friend wanted them to play”. In addition, the authors found that the participation motivations (PMQ subscales) such as “friendship”, “being active”, “fun” and “achievement status”, were more important for girls than boys. In an investigation of New England sports league participants (ages 9 to 14 years), Barber, Sukhi, & White (1999) found that motivation of males was different from females in the sub-scale of “gaining achievement/status”. Erdogdu, et al. (2014) investigated factors which motivated Turkish interscholastic high school participants ($M_{age}$ =15.9). The motivating factors were different for males and females with the former motivated by “team atmosphere” and the latter motivated by “skill development” for boys, while the least important motivation is “friendship” for both girls and boys. PMQ subscale of “fun” is more motivational for females in sports participation than males (Erdogdu, et al., 2014). In a study of Turkish women football players *($M_{age}$ =13.3)* showed that the most significant motivational factors on the PMQ subscales for women were “motion/being active”, “skill development” and “team spirit” while the least significant motivation factor was “fitness/energy release”. Also, intrinsic motivation, rather than extrinsic motivation, plays an important role in women’s choice to participate in organized sports (Sirin, 2008). Zahariadis & Biddle (2000) reported that among 11-16 year-old English youth, sport participation is positively correlated with patterns of task orientation, intrinsic motivation (team spirit, skill development, etc.), ego orientation and extrinsic motivation (achievement/statute, etc.). In

a Spanish study on PMQ scale development for 8-18 year-old youth, it was revealed that the first three motivating factors for sports participation are "to stay healthy", "to keep fit" and "to make progress and improve sporting level" while the least motivating factors are "to be well-known and popular", "because good sportsmen/women are attractive to the opposite sex" and "to be more successful with the opposite sex" (Cecchini et al., 2002).

### 1.2. Sports type, health and culture in sports participation motivation

The type of sport (individual-team) also influences one's motivation to participate. In team sports, it is usually "socialization" that primarily motivates youth to participate in sports and this choice is markedly consistent with the motivational needs of young participants (Buonamano et al., 1995). In studies focusing on individual and team sports, there are no differences in terms of sex, yet significant differences are identified in PMQ subscales of "team spirit", "friendship" (Altıntas & Bayar-Koruc, 2014; Sirin, Caglayan, Cetin, & Ince, 2008) and "competitive" (Sirin et al., 2008), which is favored by participants in team sports. Another study of young participants identified the desire to be the part of a team and make new friends by participating in team sports. The frequent emphasis by coaches on the importance of being a member of a sports team leads team members to always be mindful of teamwork (Altintas & Bayar-Koruc, 2014).

An important motive in youth sports participation is to maintain and improve health (Biddle & Mutrie, 2001; Sit & Lindner, 2006). The study with Spanish sport participants revealed that the most important motives for sports participation are "to stay healthy" and "to keep fit" (Cecchini et al., 2002). For younger participants, "fun" and "competitive" are the primary motives to participate in sports. As youth age, they abandon activities which require physical competency and only participate in sports to support health (Lindner & Kerr, 2001).

Collectively, examination of research results revealed that there are minimal differences in factors which motivate youth from different countries and societies to participate in organized sport and activities. Any differences result from individual differences (Brodkin & Weiss, 1990) along with socio-cultural and geographic factors (Buonamano, 1995). In the study conducted by Yan & McCullagh (2004), 12-16 year-old youth were tested and the results showed that culture is an influential participation motivational factor of youth from different cultures in sports and physical activities. For instance, this study indicated that cultural differences are also meaningful in terms of age and sex.

### 1.3. Hypercompetitive and its environment

Hypercompetition is a high level competition. Hypercompetition was defined as a turbulent, changing environment in which decisions were made quickly and on time (Schultz & Sheffer, 2007). Hypercompetition requires quick decisions to be able to cope with the turbulences that arise in organizations and to maintain excessive competition. As a consequence of this behavior, individuals and organizations neglect fair competition and can exhibit unbalanced and aggressive behaviors by getting off the point of traditional rules, emotions and behaviors (Gimeno & Woo, 1996; Bogner & Barr, 2000). The variable of hypercompetition is studied in the field (Thornton, 2014), health (Woodie & Fromuth, 2009), trade (Craig, 1996; Gimeno & Woo, 1996), media (Schultz & Psychology (Collier, Rycman, Thornton, & Gold, 2010), education (Ryckman, Van Den Borne, & Syroit, 1992; Westbrook & Steven Arendall, 2010; Janani & Girija Anil, 2017), physical education and sport (Martin, 1997, Ryska, 2001; Ryska, 2002; Moses, 2015; Luchner, Houston, Walker, & Houston, 2011) and social psychology (Akinwale, Ayenibiowo, & Ezeanyim, 2017; Thornton, Ryckman, & Gold, 2011).

Additionally, research shows that motivation of participants and their achievements are also related to how sports are organized (Kohn, 1986; Ryckman, Hammer, Kaczor, & Gold, 1990; Ryckman & Hamel, 1992; Ryckman, Hammer, Kaczor, & Gold, 1996; Stanne, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999; Duru, 2003). These authors state that sports have positive or negative effects on participants' social behaviors depending on whether they are organized as hypercompetitive or personal development/recreation-oriented events. According to Moses (2015), youth sports should be a healthy outlet for children, however the hypercompetitive environment of organized sports puts children's minds and bodies at risk of overuse, burnout, and career-ending injury. Moses also stated that thirty percent of children involved in organized sports are exposed to severe injuries, and most sports do not address the risk factors that lead to these injuries, these risk factors are originated from problematic practices such as specialization in sports; and furthermore coaches do not prioritize their players' becoming healthy by means of sports and put them at risk, and they even state that

they do this to win.

On the other hand Wigfield (1994), who reviewed the "expectation-theory" by Eccles et al. (1983), suggested that children's adoption of new behaviors are shaped by the effect of winning on their behaviors and attitudes. An individual, who predicts how his or her behavior will be rewarded in the social context, prefers the behavior which is most likely to be rewarded (Mischel, 1973). In a sports context, this behavior is focused on winning "at any cost".

Consistent with the "expectation value" theory Wigfield (1994) and Ryckman et al., (1997) found that participants in hypercompetitive or personal development-oriented competitions desire to win; however, there is not a positive correlation between the two competition types. It was also reported that hypercompetitive athletes focus on winning at any cost while other participants (of personal development/recreation oriented competition) do not want to be successful at the expense of their rivals. Hypercompetitive individuals are reported to be excessively neurotic (neuroticism), have low self-esteem, are highly mistrustful and inflexible. Also, they have a derogatory attitude towards women and tend to use violence when they are under threat (Ryckman et al., 1990).

Some studies report that a competitive environment which places a disproportionate emphasis on winning and losing produces stressful experiences on young participants. Horner (2003), Kaiser & Sachser (2005) and Sampson (1988) cited the negative impact emphasis on winning by coaches. Salvador (2005) stated that the pressure to win can also originate from referees, administrators and parents. Also, the additional stress due to the efforts made to develop coping strategies has negative effects on the daily life and social relationships of participants.

Although youth are very interested in sport and competition, the sports climate and the competition organization can be attractive to all participants only when the social and psychological conditions of the activities are targeted to the behavioral needs of the participants. Simply put, hypercompetitive sports and personal development/recreational activities are different and must be taken in account when providing activities for young participants (Ryckman et al., 1990; Ryckman et al., 1996; Ryckman, et al., 1997; Stanne et al., 1999; Ryska, 2002). The results from these studies show that participants in a hypercompetitive sports environment perceive individualistic aspects of sports such as gaining social status and acknowledge that competition is desirable. However, Ryska (2002) found that youth with hypercompetitive tendencies perceive that cooperation, which is one of the main purposes of competitive sports, as negative. Participants in hypercompetitive sports are also more aggressive, dominant, possess a desire to distinguish themselves and are less interested in welfare and health of others (Ryckman et al., 1997). Unlike participants in hypercompetitive sport, Ryska (2002) found that participants in personal development/recreation-oriented sports activities perceive the qualities of competitiveness, proficiency, cooperation with others, participation in sports to achieve self-esteem and attainment of competitive skills as positive. Consequently, individuals competing for personal development reasons are interested in health, emotions of others, teamwork, and are respectful to others whereas hypercompetitive participants are not interested in these perspectives (Ryckman et al., 1997).

### 1.4. School sport competitions and its goal

Sports participation is influential in supporting youth to achieve desired behaviors and guards against adoption of undesired social behaviors (Harrison & Narayan, 2003). In addition, participation in sports contributes positively to educational goals and participants' psychological health. It is recognized that one goal of school sports is to improve personal skills of participants. Interclass or interschool sports competitions are important in supporting the goals of physical education programs (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000, p.308; Gallahue & Donnelly, 2003, p.355). In Turkey, "K 5-8 Physical Education Curriculum", that was revised by Ministry of National Education (MEB, 2018), encourages children to participate in extra-curricular sports activities in order to reinforce what is taught in physical education classes and to support teaching outcome. Children's participation in sports activities are expected to offer educational outcomes such as communication skills, cooperation, fair play, social responsibility, leadership, respect for nature and differences (p.9). However, an attitude towards winning at any cost cannot be tolerated for any student who participates in school sports program. Physical education programs provide students with opportunities to increase their skill competencies; important for participation in multiple sport and activity contexts. Winning is in inherent part of sport culture; however, it should not be seen as the primary goal of competition for elementary school youth (Gallahue & Donnelly, 2003, p.355).

In Turkey, scholastic sports, which culminate in national championships, are organized under supervision of the Ministry of National Education, formal scholastic sport competitions are divided into three categories: Junior (ages 7-11), teenager (ages 12-14) and youth (ages 15-17) (Official Gazette, 2013). However, informal interschool sports tournaments that also include recreational competitions are organized in some school districts. The participation of children who participate in formal school sports competitions and hold a sports license in these competitions are prevented in order to provide fair competition and an opportunity for the participation of large number of children.

In addition to their teaching responsibilities, physical education teachers work as coaches for interscholastic athletic teams. Interscholastic competitions are conducted at local, regional and national levels with semifinal and final competition. Competing youth do not attend classes during competitions and are rewarded with trophies, cash prizes, athletic clothing and shoes. Also, teams are also recognized in media such as newspapers and online publications. While these rewards are consistent with the benefits of competition identified in the Report of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP, 2001), there are adverse effects (failure, competition, regimentation and injuries) which discourage youth from participating. Therefore, organizations aiming to increase participation in sports should sponsor activities with a greater educational focus and less emphasis on competition. If a competition contributes to education of students and is organized in a way that promotes enjoyment without excessive anxiety and stress, all participants can experience achievement with reasonable expectations and participants will adopt sports as a life style. Therefore, the results of this study will reveal certain evidence that will show which type of competition organization will be more effective in achieving the goals of general education and physical education curriculums. Additionally, this study is considered as unique due to the fact that any study on the impact of organization type variable of interschool sports competitions on participation motivation has been encountered in this culture where this research is conducted.

Based upon the literature, it was hypothesized that differences between males and females and between hypercompetitive and recreational groups will exist. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to determine if there is any differentiation in terms of sex, organization format and interaction of sex*organization format between participation motivation of 10-15 year-old Turkish youth in school sports competitions.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Research model

This research was designed by considering the "comparative screening" model. Comparative screening model is "a study in which the significance of the difference between the scores of two or more groups is examined without interfering with the variables" (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017).

### 2.2. Participants

The subjects in this study were 454 Turkish school-aged students who were approved for partcipation by their teachers or coaches. The mean age of male subjects was 13.0 (SD= 1.4) and the mean age for females was 12.8 (SD= 1.1) with the ages ranging from 10 to 15 years for both genders. 222 subjects (49%) participated in hypercompetitive interschool competitions (local, regional, national semifinal and final) while 232 (51%) subjects participated in interschool competition organized as local recreational events. Participants included basketball, football, handball and volleyball players. Before the questionnaires were distributed, permission was obtained from administrators, teachers and coaches, and only volunteer students participated in the research. Ethical principles have been taken into consideration. Detailed information on participants is represented in Table 1.

**Table 1**. Descriptive statistics of research samples.

| Organization Format | Gender (n) | % | Mean (Age) | SD (Age) | Age Min-Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hypercompetitive | Male = 119 | 54.0 | 13.4 | 1.3 | 10-15 |
| | Female = 103 | 46.0 | 13.4 | 1.1 | 10-15 |
| | Total = 222 | 100.0 | 13.4 | 1.2 | 10-15 |
| Recreation | Male = 64 | 28.0 | 12.1 | 1.3 | 10-15 |
| | Female = 168 | 72.0 | 12.4 | 1.0 | 10-15 |
| | Total = 232 | 100.0 | 12.3 | 1.1 | 10-15 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | Male = 183 | 40.0 | 13.0 | 1.4 | 10-15 |
| | Female = 271 | 60.0 | 12.8 | 1.1 | 10-15 |
| | Total= 454 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 1.3 | 10-15 |

### 2.3. Research instrument and procedure

The data were collected by Participation Motivation Questionnaire (PMQ). The scale was developed by Gill et al., (1983) and adaptation to the Turkish language was done by Oyar et al., (2001). The original Cronbach alpha internal consistency values for PMQ subscales ranged from .30 to .76. Cronbach alpha values of PMQ subscales adapted to Turkish are between. 60 and 86. PMQ subscales explain for 54.81% of the total variance. For the eight subscales in this study, Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients ranged between .52 and .62. The Turkish version of the PMQ consists of a 30 item inventory scored on a 3-point Likert scale "Very Important (1)", "Somewhat Important (2)" and "Not Important at All (3)". The instrument included eight subscales ("achievement/status", "fitness/energy release", "team membership/team spirit", "friendship", "fun", "competition", "skill development" and "action/being active"). A Turkish version of the PMQ instrument was delivered and administrated by researcher in paper form to subjects at competitive venues. The data were collected at different times from both independent groups. According to the tournament rules, those who participated in official school sports competitions (the license holders) did not participate (were not included) in recreational sports organizations. The instrument was delivered prior to competition and there was no time limitation for completing the instrument. The average time required by subjects to complete the instrument was 13 minutes. Low scores are considered as high participation motivation.

### 2.4. Analysis

The statistical technique of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used for data analysis. Test of normality was performed before data analysis and it was observed that the data were not distributed normally. After then, Mahalanobis Distance method was used to determine the outliers' scores and 200 subjects affecting normal distribution were deleted from data set. Box's M test was used for equality of covariance homogeneity and Levene test was used for equality of error variances. Because the variances of the MANOVA test were equal, Wilks Lambda value ($\lambda$) was used. An F test was conducted for significant differences between the independent variables. Partial Eta Squared ($\eta^2$) was used to determine the effect size.

## 3. RESULTS

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used in order to determine the effect of the sex and organization format on the Turkish PMQ subscales. The main assumptions of this analysis were checked and it was detected that homogeneity assumption of distribution matrix was demonstrated according to Box's M Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices ($F_{(108\text{-}218241,\ 13)} = .868$; p= .834).

**Table 2**. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for PMQ Subscales

| PMQ Subscales | F | df1 | df2 | *Sig.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Achievement/status | 1.43 | 3 | 450 | .233 |
| Fitness/Energy Release | 1.87 | 3 | 450 | .134 |
| Team Spirit | 1.12 | 3 | 450 | .340 |
| Friendship | .14 | 3 | 450 | .939 |
| Fun | .98 | 3 | 450 | .402 |
| Competitive | .72 | 3 | 450 | .543 |
| Skill Development | .98 | 3 | 450 | .401 |
| Action/Being Active | 1.42 | 3 | 450 | .237 |

The results of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances showed (Table 2) that this criterion is met for each of eight subscales of PMQ (Achievement/Status; F= 1.43; p= .233, Fitness/ Energy release; F= 1.87; p= .134, Team spirit; F= 1.12; p= .340, Friendship; F= .14; p= .939, Fun; F= .98; p= .402, Competitive; F= .72; p= 543, Skill development; F= .98; p= .401 and Action/Being active; F= 1.42; p= .237).

**Table 3.** Results of Multivariate Tests (MANOVA) according to independent variables.

| *Effect* | *Wilks' Lambda* | *Value* | *F* | *Hyp. df* | *Error df* | *Sig* | *($\eta^2$)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | (λ) | .98 | 1.21 | 8 | 443 | .293 | .021 |
| Organization Format | (λ) | .95 | 2.86* | 8 | 443 | .004 | .049 |
| Gender*Organization Format | (λ) | .99 | .42 | 8 | 443 | .908 | .008 |

*p<0.05

Multivariate tests (MANOVA) (Table 3) showed that there is no differentiation in PMQ subscales in terms of Gender ((λ) = .98; $F_{(8-443)}$ = 1.21; p= .293; $\eta^2$= .021), however there is a significant differentiation in terms of organization format [Wilks Lambda (λ)= .95; $F_{(8-443)}$ = 2.86; p=.004; $\eta^2$ = .049]. Interaction of Gender * Organization Format (Hycomp and Recreation) revealed that there is no difference in terms of PMQ subscales (Wilks Lambda (λ) = .99; $F_{(8-443)}$ = .42; p= .908; $\eta^2$= .008). In terms of participation motivation, interaction of sex*organization format for the students participating in school sports competitions creates no differentiation in PMQ subscales. General overview of the results in terms of PMQ scale in *Table 3* shows that *sex* variable explained 21% of PMQ variance, *organization format* variable explained 49% of the variance and *sex*organization format* interaction explained 8% of the variance.

**Table 4**. Descriptive statistics and One-Way ANOVA test results for organization format variable.

| PMQ Subscales | Organization Format | Mean | Std. E. | df | F | p | $\eta^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Achievement/status | Hycomp | 1.27 | .02 | 1-450 | 2.78 | .096 | .006 |
| | Recreation | 1.23 | .02 | | | | |
| Fitness/energy release | Hycomp | 1.31 | .02 | 1-450 | 2.06 | .152 | .005 |
| | Recreation | 1.35 | .02 | | | | |
| Team spirit | Hycomp | 1.07 | .01 | 1-450 | .16 | .687 | .000 |
| | Recreation | 1.07 | .01 | | | | |
| Friendship | Hycomp | 1.33 | .02 | 1-450 | 8.03** | .005 | .018 |
| | Recreation | 1.24 | .02 | | | | |
| Fun | Hycomp | 1.39 | .02 | 1-450 | .97 | .326 | .002 |
| | Recreation | 1.36 | .02 | | | | |
| Competitive | Hycomp | 1.23 | .02 | 1-450 | 4.85* | .028 | .011 |
| | Recreation | 1.30 | .02 | | | | |
| Skill development | Hycomp | 1.04 | .01 | 1-450 | .36 | .547 | .001 |
| | Recreation | 1.04 | .01 | | | | |
| Action/being active | Hycomp | 1.19 | .02 | 1-450 | .00 | .983 | .000 |
| | Recreation | 1.19 | .02 | | | | |

*p<.05; **p<.01

The results of variance analysis (Table 4) revealed that there is a significant difference between groups (Hycomp vs. Recreation) in PMQ subscales of "friendship" ($F_{(1-454)}$= 8.03; p= .005, $\eta^2$= .018) and "competitive" ($F_{(1-454)}$= 4.85; p= .028; $\eta^2$= .011) in terms of the independent variable of organization format for participation in school sport competitions. The values demonstrate that independent variable of organization format has a lower influence on PMQ subscales of friendship and fun.

## 4. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Examination of the variable, organizational format (Hycomp & Recreation) shows a significant difference between the groups in the subscales of "friendship" and "competitive". For students participating in school sports organized as recreational organizations, the PMQ subscale of "friendship" are significantly higher than for participants in hypercompetitive sports organizations (*see Table 4*). Sports are influential in building cooperation with others, sharing and creating a new social environment. Students also achieve social outcomes such as being a part of a team and making new friends (Wiersma, 2000) as well as character development (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Recreational sports organizations which are expected to be organized for fun, friendship, personal development purposes and also focus on "winning". In other words, students who participate in recreation-based sports desire "to win" but not with the "win at any cost" mentality (Ryckman et al., 1996; Motluk, 2002; Gallahue et al., 2003, p.355).

However, the main purpose of Turkish school sports is to support students' personal development and wellbeing. It is a valid assumption that recreational sports organizations serve these purposes to a greater extent than hypercompetitive sports organizations. Recreational school sports organized at local level primarily focus on fun and friendship goals since there is no discrimination between winners and losers and the belief of "winning at any cost" is not emphasized. One may conclude that the de-emphasis on "winning

at any cost" strengthens friendship, promotes sports participation and is important for adopting sport as a life style.

Consequently, it is not surprising for the PMQ subscale of "competitive" that participation motivation levels of participants in hypercompetitive school sport organizations are significantly greater than those participating recreational organizations. Sports organization formats have positive effect on physical, psychological, and social lives of participating students (Branta, Lerner, & Taylor, 1996; Wiersma, 2000; Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2001, p. 4-11; Gallahue et al., 2003, Part 1-6). According to Suits (1988), Hypercompetitive sports include competition and rivalry and contributes to participants' desire to improve skills and to win. Therefore, students contemplating participation in hypercompetitive sports should recognize that skill development is a requirement to competitive success (Motluk, 2002). Also, it is acknowledged that a student who improves his/her skills also desires to outperform teammates and consequently is more self-confident (Marsh, 1998). Consequently, students who participated in hypercompetitive sport organizations place significantly greater importance on the "competitive" subscale than those participating in recreational sports. The author infers that the importance of the "competitive" subscale is related to the desire to win and its motivation, even obligatorily, for skill development.

Comparisons of the PMQ "friendship" subscale item showed that the recreational school sports participants scored higher on the PMQ "friendship" subscale than did their hypercompetitive counterparts. These results can also be explained as a way for participants to cope with anxiety and stress since competitive settings can create anxiety and stress in participants (Martin, 1997). If participants do not possess coping skills to diminish stress and anxiety, they can draw closer to their friends for support. However, it is interesting, but not surprising, to find out that there are significant differences between recreational and hypercompetitive participants in terms of "competition" subscale. Although recreational school sports include competitive elements, participants experienced eustress rather than distress since their environment was not constructed as hypercompetitive. This enjoyment aspect of eustress is likely to support healthy rivalry/competition behaviors. Moreover, Ryckman et al., (1996) found that groups who participated in hypercompetitive sports organizations or personal development competitions desired to win, however there was not a positive correlation between the hypercompetitive and recreational groups.

Given the overall results of this study, the main purpose of school sports is to educate participants through sport activities (Gallahue & Donnelly, 2003, p.355). Goals of hypercompetitive sport do not support the learning goals of physical education. Secondary School Physical Education and Sports Curriculum of Turkey (MEB, 2018) encourages children's participation in extra-curricular sports activities in order to reinforce what is taught in physical education classes (p.12) and also suggests that extra-curricular physical activities should be planned based on age and physical characteristics of children (p. 13). The justification of hypercompetitive experiences as supporting the goals of physical education creates ethical problems for teachers and coaches. Subjecting learners to hypercompetitive sport within a physical education program may cause learners to eventually drop out of physically active lifestyles (Jewett, Bain & Ennis, 1995, p.331, 332**;** Branta et al., 1996; Wiersma, 2000). Most teachers and psychologists support both collaborative and independent learning in education programs rather than rivalry (Slavin 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Ediger, 1996). Consequently, the assumption that hypercompetitive sport and physical education goals are mutually exclusive is valid.

The purposes of participation in sports are to support participants' psychological wellbeing and attainment of cognitive and psychomotor learning goals. However, hypercompetitive sport programs require participants to engage in systematic and rigorous training programs. Moreover, the training programs of teams competing at local, regional and national levels are increasingly rigorous. It is not unusual for participants at these levels of competition to experience psychological distress, disorders and physical injuries (Sorensen & Larsen, 1998; Drolsum, 1999; Kakavelakis, et al., 2003). A case-in-point is found in the research conducted by Sorensen & Larsen (1998) on sports injuries of Danish participants (aged 6-17), in which it was reported that 37.2% were injured at school and could not attend classes. One thousand eight hundred and ninety-six school days and 7897 training hours were missed. However, participants in school sports competitions which were organized to have fun did not experience rigorous training programs and experienced less psychological distress, disorders and physical injuries when compared to the participants in hypercompetitive sport (Faigenbaum & Zaichkowsky, 1997).

In conclusion, it is acknowledged that elementary and secondary school student participation in sport activities can support learning, in physical education as well as learning in academic subjects. Experts recognize that hypercompetitive school sport can have detrimental effects on participants and hinder teachers from focusing on physical education (Jewett, et al., 1995, p. 331, 332). Nevertheless, students do not take sports competition seriously without recognition of a winner whereas recognition of winners is meaningful and enjoyable for participants (Motluk, 2002). The Ardell Wellness Report (AWR, 1997) revealed that the competitions in which all participants are recognized as winners are more educational and humanistic. This social aspect of sport competition is a determining factor in shaping participant emotions in a positive way (Ediger, 1996; Stillwell & Willgoose, 1997, p.277). Coaches, physical educators, administrators and parents have important responsibilities eliminating the destructive effects of hypercompetitive sports and turning to the more developmentally appropriate sport competition found in recreational-type sport competitions. Proper equilibrium can be sustained by providing suitable environments for students to work in harmony with others as well as adopting an individual-oriented administrative structure and expectations. Although competition is dominant within many aspects of society (Ediger, 1996); sport administrators, teachers and parents should be attentive to not cultivate the negative effects of losing on the psyche of young participants. School sport organizations in which each participant can receive recognition for their participation will help keep participants in sports for a long time, increase their mental health, support educational goals and also cultivate healthier participant attitudes for themselves and others.

**REFERENCES**

AAP. (2001). American Academy of Pediatrics Report. Organized sports for children and preadolenscents. *Pediatrics, 107(6),* 1459-1462.

Akinwale, G. A., & Ayenibiowo, K., Ezeanyım, O. (2017). Interpersonal relation: Connections between hypercompetitiveness and birth order among undergraduates. *African Journal For The Psychological Study of Social Issues, 20(3),* 177-187.

Altıntas, A., Bayar Koruc, P. (2014). Determining participation motivation of young athletes with regard to gender and sport type. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport.* July, Special Issue, 1, 61-67.

AWR. (1997). *Ardell Wellness Report*. Competition: Lesson of the Dodo, 46, 1-3.

Barber, H., Sukhi, H., & White, S. A. (1999). The influence of parent-coaches on participant motivation and competitive anxiety in youth sport participants. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22(2), 162-181.

Biddle, S. J. H., & Mutrie, N. (2001). *Psychology of Physical Activity: Determinants, Well-Being and Interventions.* London: Routledge.

Bogner, W. C., & Barr, P. (2000). Making sense in hypercompetitive environments: A cognitive explanation for the persistence of high velocity competition. *Organization Science, 11 (2),* 212–226. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.2.212.12511

Branta, C. F., Lerner, J. V., & Taylor, C. S. (1996). Physical activity and youth sports: Social and moral ıssues. *Journal of Peace Psychology, 2(4),* 301-303.

Brodkin, P., & Weiss, M. R. (1990). Developmental differences in motivation for participating in competitive swimming. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 12,* 248-263.

Brustad, R. J., Babkes, M. L., & Smith, A. L. (2001). Youth in sport: Psychological considerations. In R. Singer, H., Hausenblas & C. Janelle (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Sport Psychology. New York: John Willey & Sons.

Buonamano, R., Cei, A., & Mussino, A. (1995). Participation motivation in Italian youth sport. *The Sport Psychologist, 9,* 265-281.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2014). Scientific research methods [Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri], (17. Ed), Ankara: Pegem Publications.

Cecchini, J. A., Méndez, A., & Muñiz, J. (2002). Motives for practicing sport in Spanish schoolchildren. *Psicothema, 14(3),* 523-531.

Collier, S. A., Rycman, R. M., Thornton, B., & Gold, J. A. (2010). Competitive personality attitudes and forgiveness of others. *The Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 144(6),* 535-543. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2010.

Craig, T. (1996). The Japanese beer wars: Initiating and responding to hypercompetition in new product development. *Organization Science, 7(3),* 302-321.

Drolsum, L. (1999). Eye injuries in sports. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 9(1), 53-56.

Duru, V. (2003). Relationship between an ego orientation scale and a hypercompetitive scale: Their correlates with dogmatism and authoritarianism factors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(7), 1509-1524.

Ediger, M. (1996). Cooperative learning versus competition: Which is better? *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 23(3), 204-210.

Erdogdu, M., Sirin, E. F., İnce, A & Ocalan, A. (2014). A study into the sports participation motivation of the secondary school-students in school teams in different types of sports, *Nigde University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 8(1), 157-166.

Faigenbaum, A., & Zaichkowsky, L. D. (1997). Psychological effects of strength training on children. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20(2), 164-175.

Gallahue, D. L., & Donnelly, F. C. (2003). *Developmental Physical Education for All Children*, 4th Ed. Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.

Gill, D. L., & Deeter, T. E. (1988). Development of the sport orientation questionnaire. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 59(3), 191-202.

Gill, D. L., Gross, J. B., & Huddleston, S. (1983). Participation motivation in youth sports. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 14, 1-14.

Gimeno, J., & Woo, C. Y. (1996). Hypercompetition in a multimarket environment: the role of strategic similarity and multimarket contact in competitive de-escalation. *Organization Science, 7(3),* 322-341.

Gould, D. (1982). Sport psychology in the 1980s: Status, direction, and challenge in youth sport research. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 16, 126-140.

Gould, D., Feltz, D., & Weiss, M. (1985). Motives for participating in competitive youth swimming. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5, 390-409.

Graham, G., Holt-Hale, S. A., & Parker, M. (2001). *Children Moving*. (5th Ed.), California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Harrison, P. A., & Narayan, G. (2003). Difference in behavior, psychological factors, and environmental factors associated with participation in school sports and other activities in adolescence. *Journal of School Health*, 73(3), 113-120.

Horner, K. C. (2003). The emotional ear in stress. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 27(5), 437-447.

Janani, A. S., & Girija Anil, G. (2017). Critically analysis of education intuitional system in India. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 3(7),* 99-103. Available from: http://www.onlinejournal.in

Jewett, A. E., Bain, L. L., & Ennis, C. D. (1995). *The Curriculum Process in Physical Education*. (2th Ed.), Dubuque: IA, WCB Brown & Benchmark.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Kaiser, S., & Sachser, N. (2005). The effects of prenatal social stress on behavior: mechanisms and function. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 29(2), 283-295.

Kakavelakis, K. N., Vlazakis, S., Vlahakis, I., & Charissis, G. (2003). Soccer injuries in childhood. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 13(3), 175-178.

Klint, A. K., & Weiss, M. R. (1987). Perceived competence and motives for participating in youth sports: A test of Harter's competence motivation theory. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 9, 55-65.

Kohn, A. (1986). *No Contest: The Case Against Competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lindner, K. J., & Kerr, J. H. (2001). Predictability of sport participation motivation from metamotivational dominances and orientations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 759-773.

Luchner, A. F., Houston, J. M., Walker, C., & Houston, M. A. (2011). Exploring the relationship between two forms of narcissism and competitiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51(6),* 779-782. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.033

Marsh, H. W. (1998). Age and gender effects in physical self-concepts for adolescent elite athletes and nonathletes: a multicohort-multioccasion design. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 20, 237-259.

Martin, D. (1997). Interscholastic sport participation: reasons for maintaining or terminating participation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20(1), 94-104.

MEB, (2018). İlköğretim Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Dersi Öğretim Programı [K 5-8, Physical Education and Sports Curriculum]. Bursa: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. Available from: http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Programlar.aspx

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization. *Psychological Review*, 80(4), 252-283.

Moses, G. (2015). Competitive youth sports and the rise of overuse, burnout, and career-ending ınjury. *The People, Ideas, and Things (PIT) Journal*, *6*. Available from: http://pitjournal.unc.edu/article/competitive-youth-sports.

Motluk, A. (2002*).* Girls get competitive, but only if it's worth it. *New Scientist, 175*, 21-22.

Official Gazette, (November 2013). Okul Spor Faaliyetleri Yönetmeliği [School Sports Activities Government Statutes]. Date: November 05, 2013, No: 28813.

Oyar, Z. B., Ascı, F. H., Celebi, M., & Mulazimoglu, O. (2001). Validity and reliability of Participation Motivation Questionnaire. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences, 12(2),* 21-32.

Ryckman, R. M., & Hamel, J. (1992). Female adolescents' motives related to involvement in organized team sport. *İnternational Journal of Sport Psychology*, *23,* 147-160.

Ryckman, R. M., Hammer, M., Kaczor, L. M., & Gold, J. A. (1990). Construction of a hypercompetitive attitude scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55(3-4),* 630-639.

Ryckman, R. M., Hammer, M., Kaczor, L. M., & Gold, J. A. (1996). Construction of personal development competitive attitude scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66(2),* 374-385.

Ryckman, R. M., Libby, C. R., van den Borne, B., Gold, J. A., & Lindner, M. A. (1997). Values of hypercompetitive and personal development competitive individuals. Journal of Personality Assessment, *69(2),* 271-283.

Ryckman, R. M., Van Den Borne, H. V., & Syroit, J. E. M. (1992). Differences in hypercompetitive attitude between American and Dutch university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 132(3),* 331-334. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1992.9924708

Ryska, T. A. (2001). Self-Esteem among intercollegiate athletes: The role of achievement goals and competitive orientation. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 21(1),* 67-80. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2190/D6R7-KGFM-HALC-UPB7.

Ryska, T. A. (2002). Perceived purposes of sport among recreational participants: The role of competitive dispositions. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 25(1),* 91-113.

Salvador, A. (2005). Coping with competitive situations in humans. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 29(1),* 195-206.

Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. *American Psychologist, 43*, 15-22.

Scanlan, T. K., Stein, G, L,, & Ravizza, K., (1989). An in-depth study of former elite figure skaters: II. Sources of enjoyment. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 65-83.

Schultz, B., & Sheffer, M. L. (2007). Explaining local television sports through hypercompetition. *SAGE Journals (Electronic News), (1)1*, 1, 37-52. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/19312430709336903.

Shields, D. L., & Bredemeier, B. J. (1995). *Character Development and Physical Activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education*. California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Sirin, E. F. (2008). Determination of participation motivation in young female soccer players (12-15 years old). *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 6(1)*, 1-7.

Sirin, E. F., Caglayan, H. S., Cetin, M. Ç., & Ince, A. (2008). Determination of factors affecting sports participation motivation of high school students who make sports. *Journal of Physical education and Sport Sciences, 2(2),* 98-109.

Sit, C. H., & Lindner, K. J. (2006). Situational state balances and participation motivation in youth sport: Areversal theory perspective. *British Journal of Education Psychology, 76*, 369-384.

Slavin, R. E. (1988). Synthesis of research on grouping in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Leadership, 46*, 66-67.

Sorensen, L., & Larsen, S. E. (1998). Sports injuries in school-aged children. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Sport, 8(1),* 53-55.

Stanne, M. B., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Does competition enhance or inhibit motor performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 125(1),* 133-154.

Stillwell, J. L., & Willgoose, C. E. (1997). *The physical Education Curriculum*. (5th Ed.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Suits, B. (1988). The elements of sport. (Ed: Morgan, W. J., & Meier, K. V.). *Philosophic İnquiry in Sport*. İllinois, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

Thornton, B., Ryckman, R. M., Gold, J. A. (2011). Hypercompetitiveness and relationships: Further implications for romantic, family, and peer relationships. *Scientific Research Psychology, 2(4),* 103-108. doi:10.4236/psych.2011.24043.

Thornton, M. (2014). Hypercompetitiveness or a balanced life? Gendered discourses in the globalisation of Australian law firms. *Legal Ethics, 17(2),* 153-176. Available from: https://doi.org/10.5235/1460728X.17.2.153

Westbrook, K. W., Steven Arendall, C. (2010). Unethical bargaining behavior and the effects of hypercompetitiveness and learning orientation, *Conflict Resolution & Negotiation Journal, Dec 4*, 1-18. Available from: http://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?

Wiersma, L. D. (2000). Risks and benefits of youth sport specialization: Perspectives and recommendations. *Pediatric Exercise Science, 12,* 13-22.

Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 6(1),* 49-78.

Woodie, D. S., & Fromuth, M. E. (2009). The relationship of hypercompetitiveness and gender roles with body dysmorphic disorder symptoms in a nonclinical sample. *Body Image, 6(4),* 318-321. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2009.05.006

Yan, J. H., & McCullagh, P. (2004). Cultural influence on youth's motivation of participation in physical activity. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 27(4),* 378-391.

Zahariadis, P. N., & Biddle, S. J. H. (2000). Goal orientations and participation motives in physical education and sport: Their relationships in English schoolchildren. *Athletic Insight: The Online Journal of Sport Psychology, 2(1),* 1-12.