



The relationship between aggressions with athletic identity on Shiraz team sports

Najme Banayi*¹, Reza Nikbakhsh², Tayebe Zargar²

1 . Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

2 Department of sport management, Faculty of physical education and Sport Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding Author: najmehbanayi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The extent to which an individual labels her/himself as an athlete is strongly influenced by individuals within the athlete's social environment who give that athlete reinforcement. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between aggression with athletic identity on Shiraz team sports. The population of the study consisted of 600 Shiraz city team athletes. The 235 athletes were selected as a sample by Morghan table. Saatchi Aggression Scale (2010) and Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS; Brewer et al, 1993) were used. The results of Pearson correlation indicate that there was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with aggression on team sport athletes. There was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with anger, verbal aggression. Again, there was not significant relationship between athletic identity hostility. Regression analysis indicates aggression subscales predict athletic identity

INTRODUCTION

The literature has supported the idea that individuals do not assess their self-concept in a unidimensional manner. Rather, they take a multidimensional approach [1, 2]. Athletic identity was first conceptualized as a social role [3]. By considering athletic identity as a social role, it acknowledges the importance of others in shaping this identity. The extent to which an individual labels her/himself as an athlete is strongly influenced by individuals within the athlete's social environment who give that athlete reinforcement. These social agents include parents, coaches, teachers, and peers. Athletic identity has been defined as the extent to which an individual relates to the role of an athlete [4]. Individuals who are intensely involved with athletics and receive encouragement for their participation may focus their self-identity on the role of an athlete. If an individual is centered on the role of an athlete and then becomes injured, his or her identity might be threatened. In essence, because his or her life focus is primarily sport-related, the occurrence of injury may disrupt that focus and lead to emotional and psychological reactions, which are typically negative. If individuals are constantly being applauded by parents, coaches, and peers for their play in sports, and the athletes perceive that these social agents place importance on the athlete role, then such athletes are much more likely to develop a stronger sense of being an athlete. In adolescence, the formation of athletic identity may also be influenced by peer groups, because at this time, athletes begin to value the opinions of their peers more than from parents and other older role-models [5]. According to Stets and Burke [6] individuals will seek to have their identities verified by others. Verification occurs when significant others attribute the same meanings to individuals that they hold for themselves. Similar to environmental situations, when social relationships do not confirm an individual's identity, feelings of distress [7] and hostility [8] can be experienced. Consequently, while on the playing field, the football player may monitor his coaches, teammates, and fans' reactions and choose to engage in behaviors that would verify his identity or that would serve to counteract any misperceptions in his identity that he may perceive them to have. Research has suggested that the process of identity verification results in higher self-esteem and feelings of mastery/control [7].

Aggression is perhaps one of the most important problems in sports today [9]. Much research has looked at aggressive behaviors in sport, trying to understand the processes underlying such an unethical behavior [10]. Although the results of these and other studies have been of some value, it has been argued that the

theoretical models on which they are based are of limited use for studying aggression in sport because they fail to take account of the special status of aggression within the unique context of sport and especially in those sports involving antagonistic physical interaction [11, 12, 6]. In a similar way, definitions of aggression in sport have tended to reflect the definitions of aggression used in main stream psychology. For example, aggression has been defined as: "an overt verbal or physical act that can psychologically or physically injure another person or oneself" [13], and "the infliction of an aversive stimulus upon one person by another, an act committed with intent to harm, one perpetrated against an unwilling victim, and done with the expectancy that the behavior will be successful" [14]. Several authors have argued that intent to injure is the most crucial element in defining aggressive acts in sport [13, 15]. However, other authors have pointed out the difficulties of incorporating the notion of intent to harm or injure into definitions of aggression in sport [11, 12, 6].

The research regarding athletic identity and aggression is quite extensive; the relationship between the two has remained unexplored by sport scientists. Previous research has alluded to a possible relationship between these constructs but has only studied these variables independent of one another [18]. Therefore, there appears to be a lack of understanding regarding the potential role of athletes' level of athletic identity and the degree to which they may or may not engage in aggressive sport behavior. Wann et al [19] found significant small to moderate positive relationships ($r = .25$ to $.31$) between the extent to which spectators identify with a sport team and their aggressive behavior. Visek et al indicates positive relationships among athletic identity, anger, and aggressiveness with differences in those variables found with respect to sport type and culture [20]. Therefore, the current research question is there relationship between athletic identity and aggression on athletes?

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participant

The population of the study consisted of 600 Shiraz city team athletes. The 235 athletes were selected as a sample by Morghan table.

Measures

Aggression. Aggression was assessed by Saatchi Aggression Scale (2010). This scale consisted of 29 item that all items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The alphacronbach coefficient for this scale was 0.78.

Athletic identity. AI was measured with the 10-item Athletic Identity Measurement Scale [4]. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strong Agree). Viewed as a unidimensional construct the scale was internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .81); however, internal consistency estimates were lower for the facets of AI. The alphacronbach coefficient for this scale was 0.86.

Methods

The method of the study is descriptive correlational. The data was collected using questionnaires and through field study procedure. Descriptive statistics were used for describing and categorizing raw data and for measuring Mean, frequency, SD and table drawing. Regression and Pearson coefficient were used. For analyzing data the SPSS software was applied and 93% of confidence level was considered

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There results of table 1 indicate that the highest frequency for age is belonging to 15-20 range. In regarding to education status diploma has highest frequency.

Table 1: Demographic information of athletes

Variable	Range	Frequency	Percent
Age	15-20	170	42.5
	21-26	117	29.3
	27-32	83	20.8
	33-38	30	7.5
	Total	400	100.0
Education status	Diploma	171	42.8
	Associate degree	85	21.3
	Bachelor	83	20.8
	Masters	58	14.5
	PhD	3	0.8
	Total	400	100
Sport experience	1-5 year	144	36.0
	6-10	179	44.8

	11-15	54	13.5
	Up to 16	23	5.8
	Total	400	100

As table 2 indicate there was significant interactive relationship between research variables. The results of Pearson correlation indicate that there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion on team sport athletes. Also, there was negative significant relationship between self-presentation with team cohesion subscales.

Table 2: Pearson coefficient between team cohesion and self- presentation

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Individual Attractions to the Group-Social	31.68	8.66	1					
Individual Attractions to the Group – Task	31.18	9.33	0.80**	1				
Group Integration-Task	30.37	9.25	0.68**	0.75**	1			
Group Integration-Social	22.70	7.32	0.57**	0.52**	0.66**	1		
Team cohesion	115.93	30.06	0.89**	0.90**	0.90**	0.77**	1	
Self-presentation	42.60	16.06	-0.32**	-0.36**	-0.32**	-0.31**	-0.38**	1

*P<0.05

According to table 3 team cohesion 15% predict self-presentation. As regression analysis indicate with increase of individual attractions to the group – task self presentation decreased ($\beta=-0.24$) and also with increase of group integration-social self presentation decrease ($\beta=-0.16$).

Table3. Regression associated with prediction of self- presentation according team cohesion and its subscales

	R	R ²	F (df)	Team cohesion	B	Beta	t	Sig
self- presentation	0.39	0.15	17.66*(4.395)		66.09		21.98	0.00
				Individual Attractions to the Group-Social	-0.05	-0.03	-0.36	0.72
				Individual Attractions to the Group – Task	-0.41	-0.24	-2.72	0.01
				Group Integration-Task	-0.03	-0.02	-0.21	0.83
				Group Integration-Social	-0.35	-0.16	-2.54	0.01

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between aggression with athletic identity on Shiraz team sports. Aggressive behaviors were seen as manifestations of existent tendencies as well as products of sport socialization. The results of this study indicate that there was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with aggression on team sport athletes. Also, there was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with anger, verbal aggression. Again, there was not significant relationship between athletic identity hostility. The results of this study indicate that there was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with aggression on team sport athletes. Also,

there was positive significant relationship between athletic identity with anger, verbal aggression. Again, there was not significant relationship between athletic identity hostility. The result of this study is in line with Wann et al [21] and Visek et al [20]. In an effort to reaffirm his identity with himself, coaches, teammates, and even fans, he may resort to aggressive behavior on the playing field—this may in effect not only lead to identity verification, but also to increased self-esteem and feelings of mastery and control. Based upon the Athletic Identity Maintenance Model (e.g., the underpinnings and integration of Burke [7] and Wann's models [21]) it is important to note that similar behavior may not necessarily be seen in sports that are not typified by high degrees of physicality or exhibited by athletes whose identity standards are not defined by meanings associated with aggressiveness. Aggressive behavior is an overt verbal or physical act that can psychologically or physically injure another person or oneself. Aggressive behavior against another person is called extropunitive behavior. Aggressive behavior is non-accidental, the aggressor intends on injury and the behavior selected for this is under his or her control [22]. The nature of aggression in sport should be considered the degree of ambiguity regarding aggression in sports.

REFERENCES

1. Harter, S. (1990). Causes, correlates and the functional role of global self-worth: A life-span perspective. In R.J. Sternberg & J. Kolligian (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 67-97). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
2. Markus, H. & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. In M.R. Rosenzweig & L.W. Porter (Eds.), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
3. Pearlin, L.I. (1983). Role strains and personal stress. In H.B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Psychosocial stress: Trends in theory and research*. New York: Academic Press.
4. Brewer, B., Van Raalte, J., & Linder, D. (1993). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or Achilles Heel? *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24(2), 237-254.
5. Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, 102, 458-489.
6. Smith, M. D. (1983). *Violence and sport*. Toronto: Butterworths.
7. Burke, P. J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Psychological Review*, 56, 836-849.
8. Cast, A. D., & Burke, P. J. (2002). A theory of self-esteem. *Social Forces*, 80, 1041-1068.
9. Sacks, D. N., Petscher, Y., Stanley, C. T., & Tenenbaum, G. (2003). Aggression and violence in sport: Moving beyond the debate. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1, 167-179.
10. Kirker, B., Tenenbaum, G., & Mattson, J. (2000). An investigation of the dynamics of aggression: direct observations in ice hockey and basketball. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 71, 373-386.
11. Kerr, J. H. (2005). *Rethinking aggression and violence in sport*. London: Routledge.
12. Russell, G. W. (2008). *Aggression in the sports world: A social psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
13. Husman, B. F., & Silva, J. M. (1984). Aggression in sport: definitional and theoretical considerations. In J. M. Silva, & R. S. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 246-260). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
14. LeUnes, A. D., & Naton, J. R. (1989). *Sport psychology: An introduction*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Inc.
15. Tenenbaum, G., Stewart, E., Singer, R. N., & Duda, J. (1997). Aggression and violence in sport: an ISSP position stand. *The Sport Psychologist*, 11, 1-7.
16. Kerr, J. H. (1999). The role of aggression and violence in sport: a rejoinder to the ISSP position stand. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 83-88.
17. Kerr, J. H. (2002). Issues in aggression and violence in sport: the ISSP position stand revisited. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 68-78.
18. Jackson, J. S., Keiper, S., Brown, K. T., Brown, T. N., & Manuel, W. (2002). Athletic identity, racial attitudes, and aggression in first-year black and white intercollegiate athletes. In M. J. Gatz, M.
19. Wann, D. L., Hayes, G., McLean, B., & Pullen, P. (2003). Sport team identification and willingness to consider anonymous acts of hostile aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 406-413.
20. Visek, A., Watson, C. (2010). Athletic identity and aggressiveness: A cross cultural analysis of the athletic identity maintenance mode. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*.
21. Wann, D. L., & Porcher, B. J. (1998). The relationship between players' names on uniforms and athlete aggression. *International Sports Journal*, 2, 28-35.
22. Silva and Weinberg, (1984) *Psychological Foundations of Sport*, Human Kinematic Publishers, U.S.A., pp 247-248.