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Abstract

Purpose. The aim of this study to determine and compare the received social support and aggressiveness level of martial artists and team sportsmen.

Method. The study was conducted by the athletes in Muğla Province of Turkie. The researchers gave information about the aim and scope of the study to the athletes, and then they completed the scales voluntarily. There were 180 athletes in both martial arts in team sports group. The instruments of the study were Kiper’s Aggressiveness Inventory and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support.

Results. The scores of aggressiveness for martial artists and team sportsmen were $x_{m}=46,51\pm7,85$; $x_{f}=47,74\pm7,26$ and $x_{f}=46,64\pm7,42$; $x_{f}=47,69\pm7,46$ respectively. There is not significant differences between male and female martial artists and team sportsmen (p>0.05) in aggressiveness. Received social support scores for martial artists and team sportsmen were: $x_{m}=35,19\pm14,07$, $x_{f}=60,20\pm12,31$ and $x_{f}=66,86\pm6,25$, $x_{f}=48,07\pm8,13$ respectively. Thus, the scores of male team sportsmen were significantly higher than martial artists (p<0,001). On contrary this, the social support scores of martial artists for women are higher than team sportsmen significantly (p<0,001). In total, aggressiveness and received social support scores of martial artists ($x_{m}=46,58\pm7,62$; $x_{f}=51,02\pm19,23$) and team sportsmen ($x_{f}=47,72\pm7,34$; $x_{f}=54,13\pm12,05$) showed no significant differences.

Conclusions. Aggressiveness is not related to sports branches. Future research on this subject is a need.
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**Purpose**

An important question in the sociology of sport is how and why some people become involved in a type of sport while others do not. Early studies (J.W. Loy, B.D. McPherson, G.S. Kenyon, 1978; B.D. McPherson, 1971) indicated that most people who become involved in sport have been influenced by others who serve as role models or in some way reinforce the athletic role behavior. They point to the family as being generally responsible for early sport socialization. Parents who have positive evaluations of sports tend to produce children who view sports positively. Participation and/or interest in sport by parents is often one of the antecedents of sport participation by children. Social support refers to "an exchange of resources between at least two individuals perceived by the provider or the recipient to be intended to enhance the well-being of the recipient".

Behaviors that fulfill these support functions include expressing emotional support (e.g., affection), appraisal support (e.g., performance feedback), giving information (e.g., advice and role clarification), offering emotionally sustaining behaviors (e.g., empathy), and listening to the concerns and feelings of the other person (T.L. Albrecht, M.B. Adelman, 1984; C. Conrad, 1985; B.H. Gottlieb, D. Todd, 1979; J. House, 1981). According to I.G. Sarason, B.R. Sarason and G.R. Pierce (1990), social support is effective when the type of social support given matches the type of support needed. This functional or multidimensional approach has received merit elsewhere (T.L. Albrecht, M.B. Adelman, 1984; C.J. Hardy, J.M. Richman, L.B. Rosenfeld, 1991; A.M. Pines, E. Aronson, D. Kafry, 1981; L.B. Rosenfeld, J.M. Richman, C.J. Hardy, 1989). One example of the multidimensional social support perspective is a model of social support from A.M. Pines et al. (1981), which identifies six types of social support:

1. Listening—others who actively listen without giving advice or making judgments, with whom the joys of success as well as the frustrations of failure may be shared. Listening support is the perception that others genuinely care about what you have to say and listen nonjudgmentally.

2. Shared social reality—others with similar priorities, values, and perspectives who can serve as reality "touchstones," through whom perceptions of the social context can be verified. Shared social reality support is the belief that others share your understanding of the world. This knowledge validates the recipient's feelings.

3. Emotional support—others who support an individual during an emotionally difficult time without necessarily taking her or his side. Emotional support is based on the idea that others care about you and are on your side.

4. Emotional challenge—others who can challenge an individual to do her or his best to overcome obstacles and fulfill goals. Emotional challenge is the perception that others care about you while also facilitating personal growth or development.

5. Technical appreciation—others who acknowledge when a good piece of work or performance is accomplished. Technical appreciation is the perception that others appreciate and support your efforts and accomplishments in a specific setting such as sport.

6. Technical challenge—others who can challenge, stretch, and encourage the athlete to achieve more, to be more creative and excited about her or his work. Technical challenge, similar to emotional challenge, can be described as support that encourages the individual to do better or achieve more in a specific setting such as sport.

The last two types of support are thought to be provided by individuals who have knowledge or expertise in the relevant area. In the sport setting, coaches and teammates may be prominent sources of these types of social support. The first four types of support can be provided effectively by most people. Research by A.M. Pines et al. (1981); provide evidence for operationalizing social support into these six distinct types. In the last decade there has been a sharp increase in research in many professional fields on the effects of social support, for example psychology, education, social work, and communication.

A number of authors have noted that aggression and violence are serious problems in sport (e.g. D.E. Conroy, J.M. Silva, R.R. Newcomer, B.W. Walker, M.S. Johnson, 2001; D.E. Stephens, 1998), particularly contact sports such as ice hockey (G.L. Worrell, D.V. Harris, 1986). Despite growing concern and much debate, the study of aggression in sport has suffered from problems associated with formulating an acceptable definition of aggression (J.H. Kerr, 1999, 2002) and the development of sound measurement techniques (B.F. Husman, J.M. Silva, 1984; J.P. Maxwell, 2004; D.E. Stephens, 1998). A more practical course for psychometric research may be to focus on the measurement of the psychological antecedents of aggression (J.P. Maxwell, 2004). Anger and aggressiveness have been identified as strong predictors of aggressive behavior (L.B. Berkowitz, 1983, 1989, 1993); therefore, it would seem prudent to be capable of identifying athletes who are particularly prone to angry or aggressive feelings. The research presented here attempts to develop a self-report measure of aggressiveness and anger with the aim of furthering our understanding of the antecedents of aggression in competitive sport.

R.A. Baron and D.R. Richardson (1994) define human aggression as "any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment (p. 7)". The use of this definition in sport is problematic because behaviours that are integral to competitive success would be described as harmful or injurious (e.g. rendering an opponent unconscious in boxing). An alternative definition was adopted by J.P. Maxwell (2004) who operationally defined aggression in sport as
Anger is defined as the subjective evaluation that one’s physical or psychological wellbeing (J.R. Averill, 1983). Anger has been linked to aggression by several theorists (e.g. L. Berkowitz, 1993), but has received sparse attention regarding its role in sporting aggression.

Despite problems with measuring aggression, it is still desirable, both theoretically and practically, to develop an efficient method of identifying individuals who are more inclined to use aggression in sport (sanctioned or unsanctioned). To overcome problems with measuring aggression directly in a broad range of sports, it may be more prudent to isolate factors that are thought to precede aggression. L. Berkowitz (1993) identified anger and aggressiveness as important antecedents of aggression. Aggressiveness is defined as the disposition to become aggressive or acceptance of and willingness to use aggression. Acceptance of aggression has previously been linked to increased athlete aggression (e.g. D.E. Conroy et al., 2001). Both anger and aggressiveness are liable to be relatively stable personality characteristics (i.e. trait like) and not sport specific, although individuals with high levels of aggressiveness may be attracted to combat type sports. High levels of both anger and aggressiveness are likely associated with greater propensity for aggression (D.P. Farrington, 1978).

In this study we aimed to determine and compare the received social support and aggressiveness level of martial artists and team sportsmen.

**Method.** The study was conducted by the athletes in Muşla Province of Türkiye. The researchers gave information about the aim and scope of the study to the athletes, and then they completed the scales voluntarily. There were 180 athletes in martial arts group, 90 of whom were female in both groups and thye total was 360. The age of the martial artists and teamsportsmen are between 15-30 and 16-28 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 The breakdown of the team-sportsmen</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-boxer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tae-kwon do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instruments of the study were Kiper’s Aggressiveness Inventory (KAI) and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS).

Kiper’s Aggressiveness Inventory (KAI).

Validity and reliability of the inventory was done by İ. Kiper (1984). It has 30 items. Each item has 7 choices from “I agree it completely” to “I dont agree at all”. The scores for each item differs from +3 to -3. The highest total score can be 183 while the lowest is 3.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). G. Zimmet et al., (1988) developed the scale and D. Eker, H. Arkar (1995) conducted the reliability and validity of scale for Turkish population. The scale has 12 items with 7 alternatives differ from “completely no” to “completely yes”. The total score can be between 12 and 84. The data collected was analyzed by independent samples t-test.

**Results**

The scores of aggressiveness for martial artists and team sportsmen were $x_{male} = 46.51+7.85; x_{male} = 47.74+7.26$ and $x_{female} = 46.64+7.42$; $x_{male} = 47.69+7.46$ respectively. There is not significant differences between male and female martial artists and team sportsmen ($p>0.05$) in aggressiveness. Received social support scores for martial artists and team sportsmen were: $x_{male} = 35.19+14.07; x_{male} = 60.20+12.31$ and $x_{female} = 66.86+6.25; x_{female} = 48.07+8.13$ respectively. Thus, the scores of male team sportsmen were significantly higher than martial artists ($p<0.001$). On contrary this, the social support scores of martial artists for women are higher than team sportsmen significantly ($p<0.001$). In total,
aggressiveness and received social support scores of martial artists ($X_{MAs} = 46.58 \pm 7.62$; $X_{TS} = 51.02 \pm 19.23$) and team sportsmen ($X_{TS} = 47.72 \pm 7.34$; $X_{MAs} = 54.13 \pm 12.05$) showed no significant differences.

**Discussion and Conclusion.** In our study there is not significant difference between female and male MAs and TS in aggressiveness level (Table 1). On the other hand, the scores of male team sportsmen for social support were significantly higher than martial artists (Table 1). On contrary this, the social support scores of martial artists for women are higher than team sportsmen significantly (Table 1). The higher social support for female MAs result in the culture of Turkiye. Doing martial arts for a female can be received as interesting thus the support is higher than the athletes of common sports such as basketball, volleyball and handball. Like many others, we think that the assertiveness level of MAs is higher than team sports athletes. It is not a true claim. Within the general psychological domain, there appear to be affective, cognitive, social, and behavioral benefits from martial arts training. Affective factors associated with martial arts training include higher self-esteem (e.g., M.E. Finkenberg, 1990; C.L. Richman, H. Rehberg, 1986; M.E. Trulson, 1986), a more positive response to physical challenges (J.R. Fuller, 1988), greater character growth through the constant evaluation of thoughts and actions and subsequent adaptation of thoughts and actions for the better. J.R. Fuller (1988) commented on the martial arts character training by stating, “From a psychotherapeutic viewpoint, the martial arts may be viewed as formalized, refined systems of human potential training which provide interesting practical models and mechanisms of psychological intervention”. C.L. Richman and H. Rehberg (1986) suggested that the perseverance and growth of the martial arts over time might provide evidence of their significant physical and psychological benefits. Empirical studies and theoretical reviews of the martial arts has linked to self-regulation theory and provides a more thorough review of the processes involved in martial arts training that strengthen one’s capacity for self-regulation (K.D. Lakes, 2003). Broadly, outcomes of martial arts training can be classified into two domains: physical (i.e., physical skill and psychological effects related to physical appearance and ability) and psychological (i.e., generalized psychological benefits). In the physical domain, earlier researchers attributed outcomes, such as increased physical confidence (M.E. Finkenberg, 1990), improved self-perceptions of physical ability (C.L. Richman, H. Rehberg, 1986), and enhanced body image to martial arts training. As the result of this study is limited it can not be generalized and further research should be done different study design and instruments.

### Table 3. The Comparison of Martial Artists (MAs) with Team Sportsmen (TS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs Male-TS Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.51</td>
<td>7.859</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs Male-TS Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>7.266</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs Male-TS Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>14.074</td>
<td>-12.689</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs Female-TS Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td>12.313</td>
<td>17.369</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs (Total)- TS (Total)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>7.624</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAs (Total)- TS (Total)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>19.237</td>
<td>-1.839</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Purpose. The paper, realized within the project “Risk Factors of Doping Behavior related to Personality Structure and Social Environment of the Athletes”, financed by World Anti-doping Agency (WADA) (2007 – 2008) and managed by Romanian Anti-Doping Agency (ANAD) (Project Responsible Prof.Ph.D. Graziela Vajiala), has as purpose to analyze the relation between sportsmen motivation for high performance sports and temptation to use prohibited substances.

Methods. Among the research methods used in the project, we note for this paper momentary psychological state questionnaire (POMS) and opinion questionnaire for athletes. From the 57 items of the questionnaire for athletes, we have examined those which refer to the motivation of athletes for sports performance. This attitude was associated with those related to consumption of prohibited substances and momentary mental states. To analyze the differences between groups of athletes (1404 juniors and seniors) it was used the chi square test.

Results. There were found significant correlation between some type of motivation, sportsmen mood states and temptations to use doping substances.

Conclusions. The athletes externally motivated to practice sport, who present anger-hostility states with over average values, as well as those internally motivated to practice different sport disciplines, who have over average tension-depression values are tempted to use prohibited substances more that other athletes. No matter how content they are, the athletes experiencing certain spontaneous states of mind – such as tension, depression, fatigue might use doping substances. The risk is higher in senior athletes with weak results.

Key words: motivation, risk factors, doping substances, education.

Introduction and research objectives.

The phenomenon of prohibited substances use among athletes, intending to increase artificially their performance has its origins in the ancient times and it is now so present, as it is supported and fed by the professional sport, so much commercialized and mediated.

The risk factors are variables associated to the risk, in terms of probability, where one or more variable in some circumstances may be boosts for a deviant behavior such as the use of prohibited substances among athletes. According to WADA “prevention of doping in sport supposes to increase the conscience about the real problems inside this phenomenon, to disseminate relevant and correct information, and also to influence in a positive manner the beliefs, the attitudes and the behaviors.”