Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Investigation of the Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement of Athletes' according to the Perceptions of the Leadership Types of the Trainers

[1]Alparslan Gazi AYKIN [2]Tamer ERMİSKET

[1]Corresponding author, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University School of Physical Education and Sports, E-mail: aykinalparslan@gmail.com

[2]Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, School of Physical Education and Sports

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the task and ego orientations and the level of commitment to sports according to the perceptions of the athletes about the leadership type of the trainers. A total of 310 amateur basketball players, 205 men, and 105 women constituted the research group. As the data collection tools, in addition to a questionnaire containing items about personal information, task and ego orientation scale, and levels of sports engagement scale were used. Since the data were not normally distributed ($p<0.05$) as a result of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the Mann-Whitney U test was used for binary variables and the Kruskal-Wallis H test for groups with more than two variables. Looking at the research findings, a statistically significant difference was found ($p<0.05$): According to gender, in the main dimension of task and ego orientation, the sub-dimension of task orientation and the main dimension of sports engagement; according to the duration of playing basketball, in the main dimension of sports engagement and the sub-dimensions of vigor and dedication; according to educational status, in the main dimension of task and ego orientation, sub-dimension of task orientation, main dimension of sports engagement, vigor and dedication sub-dimensions; according to family income, only in dedication sub-dimension of sports engagement; according to the place of residence, only in dedication sub-dimension of sports engagement; according to the leadership types of trainers, in the main dimension of task and ego orientation and ego orientation sub-dimension. The following conclusions were reached: The task and ego orientations of women and their level of sports engagement are higher than men; those who played basketball for 3-4 years had a higher level of sports engagement than others; the task and ego orientations of secondary school graduates and their level of sports engagement are higher than those of primary school graduates; those with a family income of 7501 TL and above have a higher level of dedication in the sub-dimension of sports engagement; those living in the district have a lower level of dedication in the sub-dimension of sports engagement than those living in villages, towns, and city center; the task and ego orientation levels of the athletes with charismatic trainers were higher than those with democratic, authoritarian and liberal trainers.

Key Words: Trainer, leadership types, task and ego, sport engagement

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that sport, which has become an integral part of our social life, comes to life based on people's tasks and ego-oriented motives, on the axis of feelings of commitment. Nowadays, sports for many people; emerges as an area where the motivations are satisfied and the sense of commitment develops in two different aspects such as participation and viewing.

Satisfaction from life with the achievement of goals in life makes it easier to engage in activities more; The desire to be satisfied and happy also encourages them to participate in sports activities. Since achieving success in sports will make people happy, as in normal life, how success is described by people gains importance. For example, for some athletes, success is winning medals, while for some athletes, success can only be to improve their skills (Şeker, 2017).

The achievement goal theory is one of the approaches that explain the success motivation in the field of sports and it assumes that there are two success goals in success environments. People feel successful when they reach their goals, and fail when they don't. In this context, goal orientation is accompanied by task-oriented and ego-oriented emotions. Goal orientation means that people be connected with various goals or activities to achieve the sense of achievement that results from reaching the goals. People tend toward various types of goals to gain a sense of achievement (Toros, 2001). Task-oriented goals are personal, but ego-oriented goals are competitive. Process for individuals who prioritize task-oriented goals; For individuals who give priority to ego-oriented goals, the result is important (Toros and Yetim, 2000).

Individual factors such as enjoyment of the sport, personal investments, opportunities for participation, goal orientation, and coping ability; team-related factors such as peer leadership and team communication; and social factors such as coach-player relationship and parental support affect commitment, which is expressed as the opposite of burnout (Londsdale et al., 2007), and thus, commitment to sports. The decrease in the level of burnout appears as a possible result of a commitment to sports (Mishra and Kamalanabhan, 2014). The strongest determinants of commitment are pleasure and personal investments (Frayeh and Lewis, 2017). This study, which aimed to examine the task and ego orientations and sports engagement levels of trainers according to leadership type, the task and ego orientations and sports engagement levels of athletes, and ego orientation and sports engagement according to leadership type makes this research important.

2. MATERIAL & METHOD

In this section, there are pieces of information about "Particular", "Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ)" and "Sports Engagement Scale (SES)" used as data collection tools; research model, universe and sample, data collection, data analysis and limitations of research.

2.1 Material

The data collection tool consisted of three parts and 35 items. In the first part, there were 7 items to determine the personal characteristics of amateur athletes. In the second part, there was TEOSQ (Toros, 2004), which includes 13 items about the task and ego orientation in sports. In the third part, there was

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

the SES (Sırgancı et al., 2019), in which there are 15 items about the participants' level of sports engagement.

2.1.1 Personal Characteristics

The table containing personal characteristics is given below (see Table 1).

Table 1. Personal characteristics

Variables	Categories	n	%
Gender	Male	205	66,1
	Female	105	33,9
Age Category	U12 (11-12)	58	18,7
	U14 (13-14)	91	29,4
	U16 (15-16)	106	34,2
	U18 (17-18)	55	17,7
Basketball Playing Time	Less than 1 year	33	10,6
	1 – 2 Years	46	14,8
	3 – 4 Years	94	30,3
	5 Years or more	137	44,2
Education	Primary Education	45	14,5
	Secondary Education	265	85,5
Family Income	Minimum Wage and Less	68	21,9
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	37,1
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	19,0
	7501 TL and More	68	21,9
Residential Area	Village or Town	24	7,7
	District	158	51,0
	Provincial Center	128	41,3
Trainer's Leadership Type	Charismatic	89	28,7
	Democratic	91	29,4
	Authoritarian	117	37,7
	Liberal	13	4,2
Total		310	100,00

Looking at Table 1 regarding the personal characteristics of the participants: According to gender, 66.1% of the participants were male and 33.9% were female; according to age, 18.7% of the participants are in the U12, 29.4% U14, 34.2% U16, 17.7% U18 age category; according to the duration of playing basketball actively, 10.6% of the participants are less than one year, 14.8% are 1-2 years, 30.3% are 3-4 years, 44.2% are 5 years or more playing; according to education level, 14.5% of the participants are at primary education level and 85.5% at secondary education level; 21.9% of the participants have minimum wages or less, 37.1% have between minimum wages and 5000TL, 19% have a family income of 5001-7500TL, and 21.9% have a family income of 7501TL or more; according to the residential area, 7.7% of the participants live in a village or town, 51% live in a district, and 41.3% live in the provincial center; according to the athletes, 28.7% of the trainers are charismatic, 29.4% are democratic, 37.7% are authoritarian, and 4.2% are liberal.

2.1.2 Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire

The task and ego orientation scale in sports is also known as the goal orientation scale. It is a five-point Likert type scale developed by Duda (1989; 1992) with the name "Task and Ego Orientation in Sport

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Questionnaire (TEOSQ)" to explain whether the goal orientations of individuals are task or ego-oriented to maintain their participation in sports. It was later adapted into Turkish by Toros (2004). The results of the reliability analysis of the scale are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics for the Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire

Dimensions	**α**	**Number of Items**
Task Orientation	0,87	7
Ego Orientation	0,82	6
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	0,88	13

The alpha value indicates a high degree of reliability in the range of $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$ (Kayış, 2010). Looking at Table 2; It is seen that the task and ego orientation scale and its sub-dimensions are highly reliable.

2.1.3. Sport Engagement Scale

The Sports Engagement Scale was developed by Guillen and Martinez-Alvarado (2014) by adapting the "Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)" to the sports environment to determine the devotion of the athletes to the sports branch in which they actively perform and how they feel. Sirganci et al. (2019) and Kayhan et al. (2020) revealed that the Turkish version of the scale is valid and reliable.

Table 3. Reliability Statistics for the Sports Engagement Scale

Dimensions	**α**	**Number of Items**
Vigor	0.81	5
Dedication	0.73	5
Absorption	0.72	5
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	0.89	15

Looking at Table 3; The Sport Engagement Scale and the sub-dimension of vigor were found to be highly reliable. Alpha value in the range of $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$, shows that the scale is quite reliable (Kayış, 2010). Accordingly, the scale is quite reliable in the sub-dimensions of dedication and absorption.

2.2. Method

In this chapter; Information about the research model, universe and sample, data collection, and data analysis are given.

2.2.1. The Model of the Research

In this study; the survey model, which is a research approach that aims to describe a past or present situation as it is (Kuzu, 2013), was used. This research is descriptive and quantitative.

2.2.2. Population and Sample

The research population consists of 1521 basketball players in the age category of U12 (11-12), U14 (13-14), U16 (15-16), and U18 (17-18) playing in amateur basketball leagues in Hatay. 310 amateur

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

basketball players who participated in the research voluntarily constitute the sample of the research. The sample group of 310 people represents the population of 1521 people (Ural and Kılıç, 2011).

2.2.3. Data Collection

Research data were collected through a questionnaire. In the survey; personal information, task and ego orientation scale, and sports commitment scale, respectively. The form was filled out by the participants in person and online.

2.2.4. Analysis of Data

The data were statistically analyzed using the SPSS 22 package program. The data were first subjected to a normality test. Since our sample number was more than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, one of the normality tests, was applied and the results are given in Table 4. Since it was seen that the data did not show normal distribution, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied for binary variables, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied in case of more than two variables. Significance was sought at the $p<0.05$ level at the 95% confidence interval.

Table 4. Tests of Normality for the Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire and the Sports Engagement Scale

Dimensions	**Kolmogorov-Smirnov**		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Task Orientation	,128	310	,000
Ego Orientation	,059	310	,012
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	,083	310	,000
Vigor	,104	310	,000
Dedication	,149	310	,000
Absorption	,114	310	,000
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	,080	310	,000

Looking at Table 4, which includes the Kolmogorov-Smirnov values obtained as a result of the normality test; There is no normal distribution in both the task and ego orientation scale and its sub-dimensions, and the sports engagement scale and its sub-dimensions ($p<0.05$).

3. RESULTS

In this chapter; The task and ego orientations and sports commitment levels were examined according to gender, age, duration of playing basketball, educational status, family income, residential area, and leadership type of trainers.

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Table 5. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Gender (Mann-Whitney U Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Median	Z	p
Task Orientation	Male	205	143,81	4,00	-3,218	,001**
	Female	105	178,32	4,14		
Ego Orientation	Male	205	149,57	3,33	-1,630	,103
	Female	105	167,08	3,50		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	Male	205	145,72	3,69	-2,686	,007**
	Female	105	174,60	3,92		
Vigor	Male	205	149,54	4,00	-1,645	,100
	Female	105	167,14	4,20		
Dedication	Male	205	149,86	4,40	-1,561	,118
	Female	105	166,51	4,40		
Absorption	Male	205	148,66	4,00	-1,888	,059
	Female	105	168,85	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	Male	205	148,06	4,13	-2,043	,041*
	Female	105	170,02	4,26		

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

When Table 5 is examined; It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the task and ego orientation, and task orientation sub-dimension (p<0.01). Although no significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of sports engagement (p>0.05), it was observed that there was a significant difference in the main dimension of sports engagement (p<0.05).

Table 6. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Age (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Age	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Task Orientation	U12 (11-12)	58	157,67	4,00	3,298	,348
	U14 (13-14)	91	144,17	4,00		
	U16 (15-16)	106	155,65	4,00		
	U18 (17-18)	55	171,66	4,00		
Ego Orientation	U12 (11-12)	58	158,33	3,33	1,753	,625
	U14 (13-14)	91	154,07	3,33		
	U16 (15-16)	106	148,72	3,33		
	U18 (17-18)	55	167,95	3,33		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	U12 (11-12)	58	159,07	3,76	2,456	,483
	U14 (13-14)	91	148,41	3,61		
	U16 (15-16)	106	151,70	3,69		
	U18 (17-18)	55	170,79	3,92		

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Table 6. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Age (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results) *Continued*

Dimensions	Age	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Vigor	U12 (11-12)	58	146,44	4,00	3,037	,386
	U14 (13-14)	91	146,39	4,00		
	U16 (15-16)	106	162,72	4,20		
	U18 (17-18)	55	166,21	4,00		
Dedication	U12 (11-12)	58	135,37	4,00	6,602	,086
	U14 (13-14)	91	148,15	4,40		
	U16 (15-16)	106	163,90	4,40		
	U18 (17-18)	55	172,70	4,60		
Absorption	U12 (11-12)	58	140,89	4,00	3,050	,384
	U14 (13-14)	91	151,88	4,20		
	U16 (15-16)	106	160,25	4,20		
	U18 (17-18)	55	167,74	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	U12 (11-12)	58	140,13	4,06	4,759	,190
	U14 (13-14)	91	147,78	4,13		
	U16 (15-16)	106	162,16	4,20		
	U18 (17-18)	55	171,65	4,20		

When Table 6 is examined; according to age category, no statistical difference was found in the main and sub-dimensions of task and ego orientation, and in the main and sub-dimensions of sport engagement (p>0.05).

Table 7. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Basketball Playing Time (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results

Dimensions	Basketball Playing Time	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Task Orientation	>1	33	143,97	4,00	3,133	,372
	1 – 2 Years	46	138,76	3,92		
	3 – 4 Years	94	156,93	4,00		
	5 & >	137	162,92	4,00		
Ego Orientation	>1	33	153,00	3,33	1,552	,670
	1 – 2 Years	46	165,21	3,50		
	3 – 4 Years	94	147,13	3,16		
	5 & >	137	158,59	3,33		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	> 1	33	145,77	3,61	1,041	,791
	1 – 2 Years	46	153,61	3,73		
	3 – 4 Years	94	152,03	3,69		
	5 & >	137	160,86	3,76		

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, *9*(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Table 7. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Basketball Playing Time (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results. *Continued*

Dimensions	Basketball Playing Time	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Vigor	> 1	33	121,52	3,80	13,150	,004**
	1 – 2 Years	46	126,05	3,80		
	3 – 4 Years	94	165,77	4,20		
	5 & >	137	166,53	4,20		
Dedication	> 1	33	114,77	4,20	18,671	,000***
	1 – 2 Years	46	123,22	4,00		
	3 – 4 Years	94	159,73	4,60		
	5 & >	137	173,25	4,60		
Absorption	> 1	33	139,06	4,00	5,864	,118
	1 – 2 Years	46	133,62	4,00		
	3 – 4 Years	94	156,47	4,20		
	5 & >	137	166,14	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	> 1	33	117,65	3,93	15,867	,001**
	1 – 2 Years	46	124,15	3,80		
	3 – 4 Years	94	162,51	4,26		
	5 & >	137	170,34	4,20		

When Table 7 is examined; no statistical difference was found in terms of basketball playing time, task and ego orientation, and sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$). A significant difference was found in the main dimension of sport engagement and vigor sub-dimension ($p<0.01$), and the dedication sub-dimension ($p<0.001$).

Table 8. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Education (Mann-Whitney U Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Education	n	Mean Rank	Median	Z	p
Task Orientation	Primary Education	45	116,82	3,71	-3,141	,002**
	Secondary Education	265	162,07	4,00		
Ego Orientation	Primary Education	45	152,63	3,16	-,232	,816
	Secondary Education	265	155,99	3,33		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	Primary Education	45	130,89	3,53	-1,994	,046*
	Secondary Education	265	159,68	3,76		
Vigor	Primary Education	45	104,24	3,60	-4,170	,000***
	Secondary Education	265	164,20	4,20		
Dedication	Primary Education	45	104,72	3,80	-4,145	,000***
	Secondary Education	265	164,12	4,40		
Absorption	Primary Education	45	132,17	4,00	-1,900	,057
	Secondary Education	265	159,46	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	Primary Education	45	105,09	3,73	-4,084	,000***
	Secondary Education	265	164,06	4,20		

*p<0,05; **p<0,01; ***p<0,001

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

When Table 8 is examined: It is seen that there is a statistical difference according to education level, in the main dimension of task and ego orientation ($p<0.05$) and task orientation sub-dimension ($p<0.01$); in the main dimension of sport engagement ($p<0.001$), vigor sub-dimension and dedication sub-dimension ($p<0.001$).

Table 9. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Family Income (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Family Income	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Task Orientation	Minimum Wage and Less	68	147,13	4,00	1,741	,628
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	160,04	4,00		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	148,04	4,00		
	7501 TL and More	68	162,66	4,07		
Ego Orientation	Minimum Wage and Less	68	168,85	3,41	5,854	,119
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	162,12	3,33		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	150,75	3,33		
	7501 TL and More	68	135,07	3,16		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	Minimum Wage and Less	68	158,96	3,73	1,911	,591
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	162,56	3,76		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	148,44	3,69		
	7501 TL and More	68	146,23	3,69		
Vigor	Minimum Wage and Less	68	155,61	4,10	4,251	,236
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	157,54	4,00		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	136,32	4,00		
	7501 TL and More	68	168,57	4,40		
Dedication	Minimum Wage and Less	68	142,93	4,20	8,231	,041*
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	162,53	4,40		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	134,87	4,20		
	7501 TL and More	68	174,09	4,60		
Absorption	Minimum Wage and Less	68	152,87	4,00	6,094	,107
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	164,45	4,20		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	131,50	4,00		
	7501 TL and More	68	163,82	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	Minimum Wage and Less	68	148,26	4,03	7,612	,055
	Minimum Wage – 5000 TL	115	163,90	4,20		
	5001 – 7500 TL	59	130,98	3,93		
	7501 TL and More	68	169,79	4,23		

*p<0,05

When Table 9 is examined; a statistical difference was found only in the dedication sub-dimension of the scale of sports engagement according to family income ($p<0.05$).

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Table 10. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Residential Area (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Residential Area	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Task Orientation	Village or Town	24	182,02	4,21	3,346	,188
	District	158	148,39	4,00		
	Provincial Center	128	159,30	4,00		
Ego Orientation	Village or Town	24	186,42	3,58	3,444	,179
	District	158	155,68	3,33		
	Provincial Center	128	149,48	3,25		
THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	Village or Town	24	189,69	4,00	3,857	,145
	District	158	151,40	3,69		
	Provincial Center	128	154,15	3,76		
Vigor	Village or Town	24	149,79	4,10	2,818	,244
	District	158	148,16	4,00		
	Provincial Center	128	165,63	4,20		
Dedication	Village or Town	24	160,33	4,40	7,111	,029*
	District	158	142,55	4,20		
	Provincial Center	128	170,58	4,40		
Absorption	Village or Town	24	169,31	4,20	3,182	,204
	District	158	146,76	4,00		
	Provincial Center	128	163,70	4,20		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	Village or Town	24	160,04	4,20	4,870	,088
	District	158	144,67	4,06		
	Provincial Center	128	168,01	4,20		

*p<0,05

When Table 10 is examined; a statistical difference was found only in the dedication sub-dimension of the scale of sports engagement according to residential area (p<0.05).

Table 11. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Trainer's Leadership Type (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results)

Dimensions	Trainer's Leadership Type	n	Mean Rank	Median	X^2	p
Task Orientation	Charismatic	89	170,67	4,14	4,577	,206
	Democratic	91	152,37	4,00		
	Authoritarian	117	149,64	4,00		
	Liberal	13	126,23	3,71		
Ego Orientation	Charismatic	89	180,07	3,50	10,732	,013*
	Democratic	91	137,99	3,16		
	Authoritarian	117	152,11	3,33		
	Liberal	13	140,38	3,00		

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, *9*(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Table 11. Task and Ego Orientation and Sport Engagement Levels by Trainer's Leadership Type (Kruskal-Wallis H Test Analysis Results) *Continued.*

THE TASK AND EGO ORIENTATION	Charismatic	89	179,95	3,92	9,890	,020*
	Democratic	91	142,51	3,61		
	Authoritarian	117	149,50	3,69		
	Liberal	13	133,04	3,30		
Vigor	Charismatic	89	162,13	4,20	3,528	,317
	Democratic	91	164,25	4,20		
	Authoritarian	117	143,41	4,00		
	Liberal	13	157,73	4,40		
Dedication	Charismatic	89	158,69	4,40	,491	,921
	Democratic	91	154,36	4,40		
	Authoritarian	117	152,62	4,40		
	Liberal	13	167,54	4,60		
Absorption	Charismatic	89	166,27	4,20	2,935	,402
	Democratic	91	157,35	4,20		
	Authoritarian	117	148,41	4,00		
	Liberal	13	132,65	4,00		
SPORT ENGAGEMENT	Charismatic	89	163,37	4,26	1,543	,672
	Democratic	91	157,64	4,13		
	Authoritarian	117	148,12	4,13		
	Liberal	13	153,15	4,20		

*p<0,05

When Table 11 is examined; the statistical difference is seen in the main dimension of task and ego orientation and ego orientation sub-dimension ($p<0.05$). No statistical difference was found in other dimensions ($p>0.05$).

4. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Looking at Table 5; A statistically significant difference was found in favor of women in the main dimension of task and ego orientation, sub-dimension of task orientation, and the main dimension of sports engagement according to gender ($p<0.05$). Dekker et al. (2013) revealed that girls have higher mastery goals than boys. Siyahtaş et al. (2020) concluded that female athletes are more committed to sports than male athletes. According to Uzgur et al. (2021) revealed that the relationship between recreational runners' sports engagement levels is significant according to the gender variable. In the light of this information, our results are supported by the literature.

Looking at Table 6; No statistical difference was found in any dimension according to age ($p>0.05$). Dekker et al. (2013) revealed that while mastery goals decrease with age, work avoidance increases. According to Siyahtaş et al. (2020), sports engagement level weakens as the age of the athletes progresses, and the sports engagement of the athletes who do individual sports is higher than the athletes who play team sports. Özsarı and Çetin (2019), in their study on the task and ego orientations

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

of amateur football players, found a significant difference in task orientations according to age groups. In this context, it can be said that the findings of our study are partially supported by the literature.

Looking at Table 7; according to the duration of playing basketball, a significant difference was found in the main dimension of sports engagement and vigor sub-dimension ($p<0.01$), and the sub-dimension of dedication ($p<0.001$). There was no statistical difference in terms of basketball playing time in the task and ego orientation and its sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$). According to Özsarı and Çetin (2019), there is no statistically significant difference between the task and ego orientations of amateur football players depending on the variable of the year of doing sports, and our study is supported in this respect.

Looking at Table 8, It is seen that there is a statistical difference according to education level, in the main dimension of task and ego orientation ($p<0.05$) and in the task orientation sub-dimension ($p<0.01$), in the main dimension of sports engagement ($p<0.001$), in the sub-dimensions of vigor and dedication ($p<0.001$). According to Özsarı and Çetin (2019), there was no statistically significant difference between the task and ego orientations of amateur football players depending on the education level variable ($p>0.05$); According to Uzgur et al. (2021) found a statistically significant relationship in the sports engagement level according to the education level variable ($p<0.05$). Becker et al. (2018) concluded that the performance-approach goals of those who start vocational training early decrease over time. In the light of this information, it can be said that the results we have obtained are partially supported.

Gender and education are two of the key factors influencing the sports engagement level during the Covid-19 shutdown. Angosto et al. (2020); concluded that the group with the highest level of commitment was university-educated men, and the group with the lowest level of commitment was university-educated women with possible different assignments such as housework and childcare.
Looking at Table 9; a statistical difference was found only in the dedication sub-dimension of the sports engagement scale according to family income ($p<0.05$). It is noteworthy that the group with the highest family income level has the highest level of dedication.

Looking at Table 10; A statistical difference was found only in the dedication sub-dimension of the sports engagement scale according to the place of residence ($p<0.05$). It is seen that the dedication score of the group whose settlement is a district is at the lowest level. In their study on sports commitment in adolescent football players, Pedreño et.al. (2015) revealed the importance of social goals and praise for autonomous behavior and pointed out that intrinsic motivation contributes positively to sports engagement. Looking at Table 11; It is seen that the statistical difference according to the leadership types of the coaches is in the main dimension of task and ego orientation and the sub-dimension of ego orientation ($p<0.05$). Remarkably, charismatic coaches have the highest scores in both ego orientation and our main scale, task and ego orientation. In addition, the fact that charismatic coaches have the highest scores in the task orientation sub-dimension and the main dimension of commitment to sports, which do not have a statistically significant difference, indicates that the most effective coach type for athletes is charismatic coaches.

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

5. LIMITATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This research is limited to the data collected from amateur basketball players in the U12, U14, U16, and U18 age groups and playing in local amateur basketball leagues in Hatay. Whether it is task-oriented or ego-oriented, Future studies looking for answers to the question of "Is there a positive moral development in parallel with the level of sports engagement, as an area where children and young people can spend their energy by getting away from bad habits?" which will contribute to the literature to see to what extent have Gazi Mustafa Kemal's words "I like the smart, agile and at the same time moral athlete." been adopted by our society.

Ethical Text

"In this article, the journal writing rules and publication principles rules were followed. The responsibility belongs to the author (s) for any violations that may arise regarding the article.

Author Contributions

The first author is responsible for data analysis and editing of the article, the second author is responsible for data collection, both authors are responsible for the problem situation and financial means.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest about the article.

REFERENCES

Angosto, S., Berengüí, R., Vegara-Ferri, J. M., & López-Gullón, J. M. (2020). Motives and commitment to sport in amateurs during confinement: A segmentation study. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 17*(20), 7398.

Becker, S., Pfost, M., & Artelt, C. (2018). New challenge, new motivation? Goal orientation development in graduates of higher track schools and their peers in vocational training. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1371.

Dekker, S., Krabbendam, L., Lee, N. C., Boschloo, A., Groot, R., & Jolles, J. (2013). Sex differences in goal orientation in adolescents aged 10–19: The older boys adopt work-avoidant goals twice as often as girls. *Learning and Individual Differences, 26*, 196-200.

Duda, J. L. (1989). Goal perspectives, participation and persistence in sport. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *20*(1), 42–56.

Duda, J. L. (1992). Motivation in sport setting: A goal perspective approach. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise* (pp.57-91). Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Frayeh, A. L., & Lewis, B. A. (2017). Sport commitment among adult recreational soccer players: Test of an expanded model. *International Journal of Exercise Science, 10*(1), 4-24.

E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Guillén, F., & Martínez-Alvarado, J. R. (2014). The sport engagement scale: An Adaptation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) for the sports environment. *Universitas Psychologica*, *13*(3), 975-984.

Kayhan, R. F., Bardakçı, S., & Caz, Ç. (2020). Spora bağlılık ölçeği'ni Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *9*(3), 2905-2922.

Kayış, A. (2010). Güvenilirlik analizi (Reliability analysis). Içinde Ş. Kalaycı (Ed.), *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* (p. 405). Ankara: Asil Yayın.

Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Raedeke, T. D. (2007). Athlete engagement: A qualitative investigation of relevance and dimensions. *Int J Sport Psychol*, *38*, 451-470.

Mishra, N., & Kamalanabhan, T. J. (2014). A study on antecedents and outcome of sport commitment among cricket players - case study. *International Journal of Business Insights and Transformation*, 7(2), 64-71.

Özsarı, A., & Çetin, M. Ç. (2019). Amatör futbolcuların görev ve ego yönelimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, *5*(2), 99-109.

Pedreño, N. B., Morel, R. F., Rivas, S., Almagro, B., López, P. S., Cervelló, E., & Murcia, J. A. M**.** (2015). Sport commitment in adolescent soccer players. *Motricidade*, *11*(4), 3-14.

Sırgancı, G., Araç Ilgar, E., & Cihan, B. B. (2019). "Spora bağlılık ölçeği"nin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *7*(17), 5-19.

Siyahtaş, A., Tükenmez, A., Avcı, S., Yalçınkaya, B., & Çavuşoğlu, S. B. (2020). Bireysel ve takım sporu yapan sporcuların spor bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *International Social Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal*, *6*(34), 1310-1317.

Şeker, R. (2017). *Elit sporcularda hedef yöneliminin, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlar ile başarısızlık korkusu üzerine etkisi* (Doktora Tezi). Hitit Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çorum.

Toros T., & Yetim Ü. (2000). *Sporda görev ve ego yönelimi ölçeğinin Türk sporcuları için uyarlama ön çalışması*. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, İstanbul.

Toros, T. (2001). *Elit ve elit olmayan erkek basketbolcularda, hedef yönelimi ve güdüsel iklim ve hedeflerin özgünlük, güçlük derecesi özelliklerinin yaşam doyumuna etkisi (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Mersin.

Toros, T. (2004). Sporda görev ve ego yönelim ölçeği -SGEYÖ-nin Türk sporcuları için güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. *Hacettepe J. of Sport Sciences*, *15*(3), 155-166.

Ural, A., & Kılıç, İ. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Uzgur, K., Pekel, H. A., & Aydos, L. (2021). Rekreasyonel koşucuların spora bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Aksaray University Journal of Sport and Health Researches*, *2*(1), 62-82.

Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, *9*(2): 154-168, 2022 Research Article
www.sportifbakis.com
E-ISSN: 2148-905X
doi: 10.33468/sbsebd.269

Received: 10.02.2022

Accepted: 25.05.2022