



Presentation 3

Motivational correlates of ethnic and cultural identity in the sport context

Kouli, O., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Elbe, A-M., Ries, F., Fernandez-Gavira, J., & Sanchez, X.



Ethnic and Cultural Identity Salience

- **ethnic identity** salience reflects the degree to which individuals hold **their ethnicity** to be of importance
- **cultural identity** salience reflects the degree to which individuals hold the **larger culture** to be of importance.

ethnic and cultural identity are important determinants of social integration .

(Ting-Toomey, Yee-Jung, Shapiro, Garcia, W., Wright & Oetzel, 2000)



Motivational Climate

- an **ego-involving (or performance)** motivational climate which fosters social comparison and emphasizes normative ability, and
- a **task-involving (or mastery)** motivational climate that encourages effort and rewards task mastery and individual improvement.

Ames (1992)



Autonomy Support

Autonomy supportive contexts emphasize

- **minimization of control**
- **understanding other people's perspectives**
- **provision of choices that guide and facilitate the decision making process.**

(Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000)



Controlling Coaching Behaviour

Controlling contexts

- dismiss individuals' perspectives
- devalue individuals' thoughts and feelings
- undermine autonomy

Bartholomew, Ntoumanis & Thøgersen-Ntoumani (2010)



Previous Research

- **task orientation** and learning climate **positively linked with ethnic belonging and assimilation**
- **ego orientation** and performance climate **were positively associated with feelings of fringe, and with lack of desire to interact**

Kouli & Papaioannou (2009)



Purpose

This presentation focuses on the examination of the relationships between **ethnic and cultural identity salience and motivational factors in the sport environment**, in particular:

- motivational climate,
- autonomy support, and
- controlling coaching behaviour.



Method

Participants were **972 young athletes**
from **4 European countries:**

- Denmark (n = 106),
- Germany (n=255),
- Greece (n=243) and
- Spain (n=368).



Method

Participants completed:

the **Ethnic-Cultural Identity questionnaire** (*Ting-Toomey et al., 2000 as adapted by Kouli & Papaioannou, 2009*), comprising four identity dimensions, **ethnic belonging**, **feelings of fringe**, **assimilation**, and **lack of interaction**.

➤ the **Motivational Climate Scale for Youth Sport Questionnaire** (*Smith, Cumming & Smoll, 2008*), comprising two motivational dimensions **mastery orientation** (task oriented climate) and **performance orientation** (ego oriented climate).



Method

Participants completed:

- the **Sport Climate Questionnaire assessing autonomy support** (*Deci, 2001*), with on dimension **autonomy support**.
- the **Coaches' Controlling Interpersonal Style** (*Bartholomew, Ntoumanis & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2010*), which comprises the four dimensions of controlling **behaviour, rewards, negative conditional regard, intimidation, and excessive personal control**.



Results

Canonical correlation analysis was conducted to test the relationships between the two sets of variables

- **ethnic-cultural identity (4 dimensions)**
- **motivational variables (7 dimensions).**

**Table 1.****Canonical Loadings****Set 1****Set 2****Ethnic – Cultural Identity**

Belonging	-.13	.53
Lack of Interaction	.70	-.33
Fringe	.67	.10
Assimilation	-.39	-.14
% variance for identity variables	.27	.11
% variance explained by identity variables	.03	.01

Motivational variables

Mastery orientation	-.66	.31
Performance orientation	.47	.50
Autonomy	-.33	.08
Control – Rewards	.66	.18
Control – Negative Conditional Regard	.73	.00
Control – Intimidation	.71	.50
Control – Excessive Personal Control	.78	-.10
% variance for motivational variables	.41	.09
% variance explained by motivational variables	.04	.00

Canonical Correlation**.31****.14**



Results

- **cluster analysis**
classify participants with regard to their perception of motivational environment
- **MANOVA**
test differences in ethnic and cultural identity between the different clusters.

**Table 2.**

	Cluster 1 ($\underline{n} = 635$) More Adaptive motivational environment		Cluster 2 ($\underline{n} = 353$) Less adaptive motivational environment	
	M \pm SD	MEAN Z	M \pm SD	MEAN Z
Mastery orientation	4.30 \pm .59	.22	3.84 \pm .82	-.40
Performance orientation	2.24 \pm .65	-.35	3.06 \pm .82	.63
Autonomy	5.19 \pm 1.19	.14	4.67 \pm 1.28	-.26
Control – Rewards	2.27 \pm 1.20	-.45	4.14 \pm 1.15	.80
Control – Negative Conditional Regard	2.16 \pm .94	-.54	4.32 \pm 1.00	.96
Control – Intimidation	2.00 \pm .92	-.56	4.28 \pm 1.03	1.00
Control – Excessive Personal Control	1.95 \pm 1.05	-.47	4.07 \pm 1.51	.84

**Table 3.**

	Cluster 1 (<u>n</u> = 635) More Adaptive motivational environment	Cluster 2 (<u>n</u> = 353) Less adaptive motivational environment
Belonging	2.85 ± .87	2.80 ± .84
Lack of interaction	1.67 ± .70	1.87 ± .78
Fringe	1.66 ± .72	1.91 ± .80
Assimilation	3.17 ± .82	3.01 ± .82



Conclusion

Overall, the results suggest that an **emphasis on mastery climate and autonomy supportive sport environments** are related to more adaptive towards integration dispositions, whereas controlling environments seem to foster more isolating patterns.



Discussion

The present findings **encourage the conduct of intervention studies emphasizing task orientation and decreasing ego orientation to promote mutual respect among ethnicities** and acculturation from the larger culture.



Discussion

The present findings can provide the foundation on which interventions **to promote integration through sport** should be designed and developed.



**THANK
YOU!!!**

