



Education Quarterly Reviews

Güler, B., Alemdar, U., & Turan, S. (2022). Explanators of Sports Commitment: Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviors. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(1), 145-155.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.05.01.426

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide



Explanators of Sports Commitment: Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviors

Bahar Güler¹, Uğur Alemdar², Serhat Turan³

¹ Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Faculty of Sports Science, Tokat

² Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Sakarya

³ Balıkesir University, Faculty of Sports Science, Balıkesir

Correspondence: Bahar Güler, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Sports Science Faculty, Tokat, Tel: 03562521429. E-mail: bahar.guler@gop.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of the study is to determine the effect of prosocial and antisocial behaviors on sports commitment. 294 (98 female+196 male) athlete students aged between 18 and 39 (Mean=20,69, SD=2,78) participated in the study by convenience sampling method for this purpose. "Personal Information Form," "Sports Engagement Scale (SES)" and "Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS)" are used as data collection tools in the research. Data collected online are coded and transferred to the SPSS program, and descriptive statistics, unrelated samples t-test, One Way ANOVA, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression are used for statistical analysis. In the study, the level of significance is taken as $p < .05$. According to the results of the analysis, it is determined that there is a positive, low and significant correlation between Prosocial team-mate and Vigor, Dedication, Absorption and SES. It has been determined that there is a positive, low and significant correlation between absorption and Antisocial opponent and Prosocial opponent. While there is no significant effect in the prosocial opponent sub-dimension; It has been determined that Antisocial team-mate, Antisocial opponent and Prosocial team-mate have a significant effect on sports commitment. These variables explain 7.3% of the total variance on sports commitment.

Keywords: Sports Engagement, Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior, Sport

1. Introduction

As a social being, human exhibits many behaviors throughout his life. These behaviors affect people's social behaviors and characteristics in society. Prosocial and antisocial behavior emerges as the behavior patterns that people exhibit in social and sports environments throughout their lives. Prosocial behaviors are defined as behaviors that are beneficial to other people in society (Penner et al., 2005), a broad category of behavior that will benefit individuals other than oneself (Batson & Powell, 2003), a moral norm that expresses certain social expectations of helping other people in different social contexts (Bykov, 2017).

Researchers have shown that prosocial behavior is not only for a specific purpose, but also has an important role in the person providing the prosocial behavior (Eisenberg & Eggum, 2008). People who engage in prosocial behaviors exhibit certain behaviors primarily when they transfer their behaviors to other people for altruistic or social motives (Andreoni, Nikiforakis, & Stoop, 2017). In this context, people who engage in prosocial behavior have some positive personal results such as higher self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-concept clarity (Fu et al., 2017; Zuffianò et al., 2016).

Since the second half of the 20th century, researchers have seen the positive results obtained from this behavior for people and relationships as a multidimensional construct that includes behaviors such as helping, volunteering and being kind to others, sharing, paying attention and caring, and making up for past mistakes. (Jebb et al., 2020; Grusec & Sherman, 2011). Relationships between people also benefit from these behaviors. Research shows that people help each other to achieve goals (Rusbult et al., 2009; Overall et al., 2010), respond to each other's needs (Reis, 2013), and support each other (Jakubiak et al., 2020).

Prosocial behaviors, which are evaluated positively by the society, are also a social skill and are separated from antisocial behaviors because they are completely voluntary behaviors (Gülay, 2010). Prosocial and antisocial behaviors have been the subject of much research in the last two decades (Kavussanu & Stanger, 2017). While prosocial behavior consists of behaviors aimed at helping or benefiting others, such as helping a player get off the field or congratulating another player after a good game (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998); Antisocial behavior, on the other hand, is behavior that aims to harm or disadvantage others, such as verbally harassing or trying to injure another player (Sage et al., 2006). There are both prosocial and antisocial behaviors in sports (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009).

People with antisocial behavior exhibit high levels of uncooperative behavior, low concern for the well-being of others, and are characterized by a lack of empathy, a reduced capacity to feel guilt and shame (Black, 2013; Simonoff et al., 2004).

Antisocial behavior is expressed as actions performed intentionally to harm another person (Cheon et al., 2018; Coyne et al., 2011). Commitment to sport represents people's determination and desire to pursue a particular activity or program, as well as belief, effort, energy and happiness in the sporting environment (Lonsdale et al., 2007). It is also defined as pleasure, participation opportunities, personal investments, attractive alternatives, social restrictions (Scanlan et al., 1993) and social supports (Scanlan et al., 2003).

In order to understand the commitment processes in sports, it is necessary to examine the Sports Commitment Model, which is a widely used theoretical framework model (Scanlan et al., 1993; Scanlan et al., 2016). SCM expresses sports commitment as a one-dimensional "*psychological structure that represents the desire and determination to continue sports participation*" (Scanlan et al., 1993). Apart from this, it explains why athletes continue to participate in sports (Scanlan et al., 2016).

While commitment research in the sports context has largely focused on the global commitment of athletes to sports, scientists have long recognized that there are numerous commitment goals and an individual is committed to one or more of these goals (O'Neil et al., 2021). It is thought that prosocial or antisocial behaviors performed in sports will enable the individual to internalize the values that are at the core of sports, and thus increase the commitment of individuals to sports. In this context, it is important to examine the effects of prosocial and antisocial behaviors on sports commitment and that the subject has not been studied in the literature.

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

In the research, correlational survey model is used to examine the correlation between sports commitment and prosocial and antisocial behaviors in sports. Correlational survey model is a research model that aims to determine the existence and/or degree of co-variance between two or more variables (Karasar, 2013).

2.2 Research Group

The research group consists of 294 (98 female+196 male) athlete students aged between 18 and 39 years (Mean=20,69, SD=2,78) using convenience sampling method. Information about the students is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Information

Variables	Subgroups	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	196	66,7
	Female	98	33,3
Sports Age	1-4 years	60	20,4
	5-8 years	103	35
	9-12 years	89	30,3
	13 years and over	42	14,3
Branch	Individual Sports	104	35,4
	Team Sports	190	64,6
Total		294	100

When the demographic information of the participants whose percentage values are higher than the other groups are examined, it is determined that 66,7% are female, 35% had been doing sports for 5-8 years, and 64,6% are students who took part in team sports.

2.3 Data Collection Tools

“Personal Information Form,” “Sports Engagement Scale” and “Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS)” are used as data collection tools. Detailed information about data collection tools is given below.

2.3.1 Personal Information Form

The "Personal Information Form" created by the researchers is used to determine demographic information. In this form, it is aimed to reach information such as gender, age and sports age of athlete students.

2.3.2 Sports Engagement Scale (SES)

The Spanish version of The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Schaufeli, Bakker (2004) is adapted for athletes by Guillen and Martinez-Alvarado (2014). The scale, adapted to Turkish by Sirgancı, Ilgar, and Cihan (2019), is structured in a 5-category Likert type consisting of 15 items and three sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the scale measure the vigor, dedication and absorption of the athletes. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the scale is calculated in the vigor dimension ($\alpha=0.75$), dedication dimension ($\alpha=0.75$), absorption dimension ($\alpha=0.74$) and the whole scale ($\alpha=0.90$).

In this study, information about the scale is given in the table below.

Table 2: Distribution of SES Scale Scores

Dependent Variable	Item Number	\bar{X}	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
Vigor	5	4.08	.60	-.440	-.024	.76
Dedication	5	4.32	.53	-.516	-.238	.78
Absorption	5	4.13	.58	-.414	.134	.77
SES	15	4.18	.52	-.437	-.103	.91

It is seen that the total mean score of the participants from the SES scale is 4.18. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale; .76 for vigor, .78 for dedication and .77 for absorption sub-dimension. The Cronbach

Alpha reliability coefficient for the overall scale is calculated as .91. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ± 1 provides the necessary prerequisite for the normal distribution.

2.3.3 Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS)

The Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior Scale in Sports, developed by Kavussanu and Boardley (2009) and adapted to Turkish by Balçıkanlı (2013), consists of four sub-dimensions (Prosocial behavior towards opponent, prosocial behavior towards team-mates, antisocial behavior towards opponent, antisocial behavior towards team-mates). Cronbach Alpha values in the original version of the scale; 0.74 for prosocial behavior towards opponent, 0.74 for prosocial behavior towards team-mates, 0.86 for antisocial behavior towards opponent, 0.83 for antisocial behavior towards team-mates. Cronbach Alpha values in the version adapted to Turkish by Balçıkanlı (2013); 0.72 for prosocial behavior towards opponent, 0.70 for prosocial behavior towards team-mates, 0.75 for antisocial behavior towards opponent, 0.70 for antisocial behavior towards team-mates.

In the analysis made within the scope of this research, information about the scale is given in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of PABSS Scale Scores

Dependent Variable	Item Number	\bar{X}	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
Prosocial team-mate	4	4.12	.67	-.875	.884	.73
Prosocial opponent	3	3.58	1.01	-.755	.157	.83
Antisocial team-mate	5	2.07	.85	1.22	1.50	.83
Antisocial opponent	8	2.25	.88	.905	.60	.87

It is determined that the participants had an mean score of 4.12 in the Prosocial team-mate sub-dimension, 3.58 in the Prosocial opponent sub-dimension, 2.07 in the Antisocial team-mate sub-dimension, and 2.25 in the Antisocial opponent sub-dimension. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is calculated as .73 in the Prosocial team-mate sub-dimension, .83 in the Prosocial opponent sub-dimension, .83 in the Antisocial team-mate sub-dimension, and .87 in the Antisocial opponent sub-dimension. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ± 1.5 provides the necessary prerequisite for the normal distribution.

2.4 Data Collection

The questions in the research are made ready by transferring them to the online environment via Google forms. At the beginning of the form, detailed explanations about the purpose and importance of the research are given, and a voluntary participation consent button is added. Data are collected from teachers who read the information given and voluntarily agreed to participate in the research.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data collected in the online environment are coded and transferred to the SPSS program and the normality distribution is examined. In the analyzes made, the skewness and kurtosis values of the data are taken into account and it is determined that the values obtained are in the range of $-1,5, \dots, +1,5$. These values are accepted as suitable for normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Descriptive statistics, unrelated samples t-test, One Way ANOVA, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analysis are used in statistical analysis. In the study, the level of significance is taken as $p < .05$.

3. Results

In this part of the research; It is examined whether the variables of gender, sports branch and sports age differed significantly for Sports Engagement Scale (SES) and Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS) and it is tried to determine how much Sports Engagement Scale (SES) explained Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS).

In the table below, the gender variable total scores are compared in the sub-dimensions of the Sports Engagement Scale (SES) and the Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS).

Table 4: Unrelated samples t-test for gender

Dependent Variable	Gender	\bar{X}	SD	t	df	p	
SES	Vigor	Female	3.98	.61	-1.857	292	.064
		Male	4.11	.60			
	Dedication	Female	4.27	.58	-1.125	292	.261
		Male	4.34	.50			
	Absorption	Female	4.12	.63	-.112	292	.911
		Male	4.13	.56			
SES	Female	4.12	.55	-1.141	292	.255	
	Male	4.20	.50				
PABSS	Prosocial team-mate	Female	4.01	.74	-1.935	292	.054
		Male	4.17	.62			
	Prosocial opponent	Female	3.63	1.16	.765	292	.445
		Male	3.54	.91			
	Antisocial team-mate	Female	1.85	.75	-2.928	292	.004*
		Male	2.14	.81			
	Antisocial opponent	Female	1.92	.79	-4.383	292	.000*
		Male	2.37	.84			

*p<.05

According to the results of the analysis, while there is no significant difference between genders in SES and its sub-dimensions, and in the dimensions of Prosocial team-mate and Prosocial opponent, it is determined that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of Antisocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent.

In the antisocial team-mate dimension, male's mean scores (\bar{X} =2.14, SD=.81) are significantly higher than female's mean scores (\bar{X} =1.85, SD=.75). In antisocial opponent mean scores, the mean score of male (\bar{X} =2.37, SD=.84) is significantly higher than the mean score of female (\bar{X} =1.92, SD=.79).

In the table below, the total scores of the sports branch variable are compared in the sub-dimensions of the Sports Engagement Scale (SES) and the Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS).

Table 5: Unrelated samples t-test for Sports Branch

Dependent Variables	Sports Branch	\bar{X}	SD	t	df	p	
SES	Vigor	Individual Sport	4.08	.64	.210	292	.834
		Team Sport	4.06	.57			
	Dedication	Individual Sport	4.35	.56	.849	292	.397
		Team Sport	4.30	.51			
	Absorption	Individual Sport	4.22	.61	2.027	292	.044*
		Team Sport	4.07	.57			
SES	Individual Sport	4.22	.56	1.136	292	.257	
	Team Sport	4.15	.49				
PABSS	Prosocial team-mate	Individual Sport	3.98	.76	-2.428	174.446	.016*
		Team Sport	4.20	.60			
	Prosocial opponent	Individual Sport	3.47	1.16	-1.154	172.533	.250
		Team Sport	3.63	.91			
	Antisocial team-mate	Individual Sport	2.05	.82	.120	292	.905
		Team Sport	2.04	.79			
	Antisocial opponent	Individual Sport	2.23	.88	.110	292	.912
		Team Sport	2.22	.84			

*p<.05

According to the results of the analysis, while there is no significant difference between sports branches in vigor and dedication sub-dimensions and SES score averages, in the absorption sub-dimension, the score averages of those who participated in individual sports ($\bar{X}=4.22$, $SD=.61$) are compared to the mean scores of those who participated in team sports ($\bar{X}=4.07$, $SD=.57$).) are found to be significantly higher. While there is no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Prosocial opponent, Antisocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent in terms of sports branch, the mean score of those who participated in team sports in the sub-dimension of Prosocial team-mate ($\bar{X}=4.20$, $SS=.60$) is compared to the mean score of those who participated in individual sports branches ($\bar{X}=3.98$, $SD=.76$) are found to be significantly higher.

In the table below, sports age variable total scores are compared in the sub-dimensions of Sports Engagement Scale (SES) and Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior in Sport Scale (PABSS).

Table 6: Unrelated samples One way Anova for Sports Age

Dependent Variables			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	p
SES	Vigor	Between Groups	2,339	3	0,780	2,210	0,087
		Within Groups	102,303	290	0,353		
		Total	104,642	293			
	Dedication	Between Groups	1,636	3	0,545	1,975	0,118
		Within Groups	80,062	290	0,276		
		Total	81,698	293			
	Absorption	Between Groups	1,030	3	0,343	0,997	0,394
		Within Groups	99,841	290	0,344		
		Total	100,871	293			
SES	Between Groups	1,459	3	0,486	1,842	0,140	
	Within Groups	76,569	290	0,264			
	Total	78,028	293				
PABSS	Prosocial team-mate	Between Groups	4,427	3	1,476	3,376	0,019*
		Within Groups	126,770	290	0,437		
		Total	131,197	293			
	Prosocial opponent	Between Groups	1,594	3	0,531	0,522	0,667
		Within Groups	295,025	290	1,017		
		Total	296,619	293			
	Antisocial team-mate	Between Groups	2,112	3	0,704	1,097	0,351
		Within Groups	186,218	290	0,642		
		Total	188,331	293			
	Antisocial opponent	Between Groups	6,527	3	2,176	3,068	0,028*
		Within Groups	205,659	290	0,709		
		Total	212,187	293			

* $p<.05$

As a result of the analysis, it is determined that there is a significant difference between the groups in the dimensions of Prosocial team-mate ($F_{(3,290)}=3.376$, $p=.019$) and Antisocial opponent ($F_{(3,290)}=3.068$, $p=.028$) In order to determine from which group the difference originated, the LSD test, one of the multiple comparison tests are performed.

Table 7: Multiple comparison test

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	\bar{X}	SD	LSD
Prosocial team-mate	1-4 years (1)	3.89	.65	4,3,2>1
	5-8 years (2)	4.21	.63	
	9-12 years (3)	4.12	.67	

	13 years and over (4)	4.20	.74	
	1-4 years (1)	1.94	.77	
	5-8 years (2)	2.26	.78	
Antisocial opponent	9-12 years (3)	2.31	.94	4,3,2>1
	13 years and over (4)	2.36	.85	

As a result of the LSD test, 13 years and over ($\bar{X}=4.20$, $SD=.74$), 9-12 years ($\bar{X}=4.12$, $SD=.67$), 5-8 years ($\bar{X}=4.21$, $SD=.63$) in the Prosocial team-mate dimension, the mean scores of the students who do sports are found to be significantly higher than the mean scores of students who did sports for 1-4 years ($\bar{X}=3.89$, $SD=.65$). In the antisocial opponent dimension, the mean score of the students who did sports for 13 years and over ($\bar{X}=2.36$, $SD=.85$), 9-12 years ($\bar{X}=2.31$, $SD=.94$), 5-8 years ($\bar{X}=2.26$, $SD=.78$), it is found to be significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}=1.94$, $SD=.77$) of the students who did sports for 1-4 years.

Table 8: Correlation analysis results

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	SES	Prosocial team-mate	Prosocial opponent	Antisocial team-mate	Antisocial opponent
Vigor	1							
Dedication	,793**	1						
Absorption	,646**	,747**	1					
SES	,901**	,930**	,883**	1				
Prosocial team-mate	,168**	,250**	,225**	,235**	1			
Prosocial opponent	0,066	0,076	,148*	0,108	,476**	1		
Antisocial team-mate	-0,052	-0,082	0,008	-0,045	0,077	,128*	1	
Antisocial opponent	0,060	0,052	,131*	0,091	,122*	0,032	,736**	1

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

As a result of the correlation analysis, it is determined that there is a positive, low and significant correlation between Prosocial team-mate and Vigor, Dedication, Absorption and SES. It has been determined that there is a positive, low and significant correlation between Absorption and Antisocial opponent and Prosocial opponent.

Table 9: Results of regression analysis on sports commitment

Variable	B	Std. Error	β	t	P
Stable	3.44	.192	---	17.935	,000
Prosocial team-mate	.162	.050	.210	3.233	.001
Prosocial opponent	.016	.033	.031	.479	.633
Antisocial team-mate	-.158	.054	-.245	-2.897	.004
Antisocial opponent	.148	.051	.244	2.891	.004
R=,29	$R^2_{adj}=.073$				
$F_{(4,289)} = 6.779$	$p=.000$				

As a result of the multiple linear regression analysis in Table 8, it is seen that the regression model is statistically significant. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on sport commitment Antisocial team-mate, Antisocial opponent, Prosocial team-mate and Prosocial opponent. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined; While no significant effect is found in the sub-dimension of Prosocial opponent ($\beta=.031$; $t=.479$; $p=.663$), Antisocial team-mate ($\beta=-.245$; $t=-2.897$; $p=.004$), Antisocial opponent ($\beta=.244$; $t=2.891$; $p=.004$) and Prosocial team-mate ($\beta=.210$; $t=3.233$; $p=.001$) are found to have significant effects on sports commitment. These variables explain 7.3% of the total variance in sports commitment.

4. Discussion

Prosocial behaviors are defined as behaviors that are made voluntarily without any expectation of reward, aiming to benefit another person or group (Çetin & Samur, 2018). In the study findings, while there is no significant difference between genders in SES and its sub-dimensions, and in the dimensions of Prosocial team-mate and Prosocial opponent, it is determined that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of Antisocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent. In the dimension of Antisocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent, the mean score of male is significantly higher than the mean score of females. It is seen that the most important reason why males engage in more antisocial behavior is the roles that society ascribes to genders. While the society can tolerate the male when he exhibits an antisocial behavior, similar behaviors of the female can be found strange. When the literature is reviewed, it is thought that males are more competitor (Gill, 2002), competitive (Sagar et al., 2011), ambitious and combative (Conway et al., 2005), thus causing antisocial behaviors. It has been determined that there are studies in the literature with similar findings (Micai et al., 2015; Stanger et al., 2013; Özdemir, 2019).

According to the results of the analysis, while there is no significant difference between sports branches in vigor and dedication sub-dimensions and SES score averages, the score averages of those who participated in individual sports in the absorption sub-dimension are found to be significantly higher than the mean scores of those who participated in team sports. Since the focus of the athletes in individual sports branches should always be on their opponent, it is thought that the concentration feature develops more than team athletes. Where the athlete lacks in team sports, his team-mate can make up for this deficiency. Therefore, it is possible to compensate for mistakes, but it is difficult to compensate for individual sports. For this reason, the athlete has to work very hard. It is thought that this situation affects the athlete's immersion in sports over time and increases the level of absorption. When the literature is searched, a study is found that is contrary to the study finding. In the study conducted by Siyahtaş and friends (2020), the vigor and dedication and SES score averages of the individuals participating in individual sports branches are found to be significantly higher than the team athletes, while the absorption score averages are not significant.

While there is no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Prosocial opponent, Antisocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent in terms of sports branch, the score averages of those who participated in team sports in the Prosocial team-mate sub-dimension are found to be significantly higher than the mean scores of those who participated in individual sports branches. Athletes fighting for the same goal within the team; It is thought that it activates emotions such as cooperation, sharing, tolerance towards mistakes, and thus enables the display of prosocial behaviors within the team. When the literature is searched, it is seen that the findings for the variable used are few. Görgülü and friends (2018) found that the mean scores of individual athletes in the Antisocial opponent sub-dimension are significantly higher, but they did not detect a significant difference in other dimensions.

In the sports age variable, the mean score of the students who did sports for 13 years and over, 9-12 years, 5-8 years in the Prosocial team-mate and Antisocial opponent dimension are found to be significantly higher than the averages of the students who did sports for 1-4 years. It is thought that those who do sports for a long time internalize the values such as peace, love, respect, honesty, sharing and cooperation that are at the core of sports more and exhibit Prosocial team-mate more because they see sports as an action with its own purpose. It is thought that there is a significant difference in the Antisocial opponent dimension as a result of the individuals participating in the sport acting with the ambition of winning as they do the sport for a long time (Conway and friends, 2005). In the literature, it is seen that experienced athletes display more prosocial behaviors towards their team-mates than those with less experience (Turkay, 2019; Miller, Roberts, & Ommundsen, 2004; Kagan & Madsen, 1972).

When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined; While no significant effect is found in the Prosocial opponent sub-dimension, it is determined that Antisocial team-mate, Antisocial opponent and Prosocial team-mate had a significant effect on sports commitment. These variables explain 7.3% of the total variance on sports commitment. When the literature is searched, it is seen that there is no study similar to this study. Within the scope of prosocial behaviors, people helping each other to achieve goals (Rusbult et al., 2009; Overall et al., 2010), and supporting each other (Jakubiak et al., 2020), are thought to affect sports

commitment. Helping and supporting behaviors can be expressed as a basic psychological need that positively affects individuals' relationship with the environment. It is stated that basic psychological needs may be related to the level of commitment to sports (Sirgancı et al., 2019). In the antisocial behavior dimension, it is thought that the individual's acting with the motivation to win affects his dedication to and attachment to sports more.

5. Conclusion

As a result, it can be said that prosocial and antisocial behaviors are effective in increasing commitment to sports. In addition, it can be stated that doing sports for a long time increases antisocial behaviors as well as prosocial behaviors. It is thought that measures should be taken to increase the frequency of prosocial behaviors and reduce the frequency of antisocial behaviors in order to preserve the essence of sports and to maintain the existence of sports.

References

- Al-Yaaribi, A., & Kavussanu, M. (2017). Team-mate prosocial and antisocial behaviors predict task cohesion and burnout: The mediating role of affect. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 39(3), 199-208. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2016-0336>
- Al-Yaaribi, A., Kavussanu, M., & Ring, C. (2016). Consequences of prosocial and antisocial behavior for the recipient. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 26, 102-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.06.012>
- Andreoni, J., Nikiforakis, N., & Stoop, J. (2017). *Are the rich more selfish than the poor, or do they just have more money? A natural field experiment* (No. w23229). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Batson, C. D., & Powell, A. A. (2003). Altruism and prosocial behavior. *Wiley Online Library*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei0519>
- Black, D. W. (2013). Bad boys, bad men: Confronting antisocial personality disorder (sociopathy).
- Bykov, A. (2017). Altruism: New perspectives of research on a classical theme in sociology of morality. *Current Sociology*, 65(6), 797-813. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116657861>
- Çetin, B. B. & Samur, A. Ö. (2018). 60-72 aylık çocukların prososyal davranışları ile anne-babalarının prososyal davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.286651>
- Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Ntoumanis, N. (2018). A needs-supportive intervention to help PE teachers enhance students' prosocial behavior and diminish antisocial behavior. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 35, 74-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.11.010>
- Conway, M., Irannejad, S. & Giannopoulos, C. (2005). Status-Based Expectancies for Aggression, with Regard to Gender Differences in Aggression in Social Psychological Research. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 381-398. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20058>
- Coyne, S. M., Nelson, D. A., & Underwood, M. (2010). Aggression in children. *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood social development*, 491-509.
- Eisenberg, N., & Eggum, N. D. (2008). *Empathy-related and prosocial responding: Conceptions and correlates during development*. In B. A. Sullivan, M. Snyder, & J. L. Sullivan (Eds.), *Cooperation: The political psychology of effective human interaction* (pp. 53-74). Blackwell Publishing.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 701-778). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
- Fu, X., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Brown, M. N. (2017). Longitudinal relations between adolescents' self-esteem and prosocial behavior toward strangers, friends and family. *Journal of Adolescence*, 57, 90-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.04.002>
- Gill, DL. (2002). Gender and sport behavior. In: Horn T S. Ed. 2nd Ed. *Advances in Sport Psychology*. Champaign IL, England: Human Kinetics. 355-375.
- Görgülü, R., Adiloğulları, G. E., Tosun, Ö. M., & Adiloğulları, İ. (2018). Prososyal Ve Antisosyal Davranış İle Sporcu Kimliğinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *Spor Ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(3), 147-161. <https://doi.org/10.17155/omuspd.397248>
- Grusec, J. E., & Sherman, A. (2011). Prosocial behavior. In M. K. Underwood & L. H. Rosen (Eds.), *Social development: Relationships in infancy, childhood, and adolescence* (pp. 263-286). Guilford Press.
- Gülay, H. (2010). *Okul öncesi dönemde akrân ilişkileri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Jakubiak, B. K., Feeney, B. C., & Ferrer, R. A. (2020). Benefits of daily support visibility versus invisibility across the adult life span. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 118(5), 1018. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000203>

- Jebb, A. T., Morrison, M., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2020). Subjective well-being around the world: trends and predictors across the life span. *Psychological science*, 31(3), 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619898826>
- Kagan, S. & Madsen, M. C. (1972). Experimental analyses of cooperation and competition of Anglo-American and Mexican children. *Developmental Psychology*, 6(1), 49. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1972-20788-001>
- Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* (25. bs.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. D. (2009). The prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 31(1), 97-117. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.31.1.97>
- Kavussanu, M., & Stanger, N. (2017). Moral behavior in sport. *Current opinion in psychology*, 16, 185-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.010>
- Micai, M., Kavussanu, M. & Ring, C. (2015). Executive Function Is Associated With Antisocial Behavior and Aggression in Athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. 37, 469-476. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0021>
- Miller, B. W., Roberts, G. C. & Ommundsen, Y. (2004). Effect of motivational climate on sportspersonship among competitive youth male and female football players. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 14(3), 193- 202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2003.0320.x>
- O'Neil, L., Amorose, A. J., & Pierce, S. (2021). Student-athletes' dual commitment to school and sport: Compatible or conflicting?. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 52, 101799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101799>
- Overall, N. C., Fletcher, G. J., & Simpson, J. A. (2010). Helping each other grow: Romantic partner support, self-improvement, and relationship quality. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 36(11), 1496-1513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210383045>
- Özdemir, İ. (2019). *Takım sporları ile uğraşan yetişkin sporcuların prososyal ve antisosyal davranışlarının belirlenmesinde mükemmeliyetçilik ve başarı* (Doctoral dissertation, Marmara Üniversitesi. İstanbul. <https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/handle/20.500.12812/282381>
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 56, 365-392. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141>
- Reis, H. T. (2013). Relationship well-being: The central role of perceived partner responsiveness. In C. Hazan & M. I. Campa (Eds.), *Human bonding: The science of affectional ties* (pp. 283–307). The Guilford Press.
- Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2009). The michelangelo phenomenon. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(6), 305-309. https://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/eli-finkel/documents/47_RusbultFinkelKumashiro2009_CDDir.pdf
- Sagar, SS. & Boardley, D. (2011). Kavussanu M. Fear of failure and student athletes interpersonal antisocial behaviour in education and sport. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 81, 391–408. <https://doi.org/10.1348/2044-8279.002001>
- Sage, L., Kavussanu, M., & Duda, J. (2006). Goal orientations and moral identity as predictors of prosocial and antisocial functioning in male association football players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(05), 455-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500244531>
- Scanlan, T. K., Carpenter, P. J., Simons, J. P., Schmidt, G. W., & Keeler, B. (1993). An introduction to the sport commitment model. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 15(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.15.1.1>
- Scanlan, T. K., Chow, G. M., Sousa, C., Scanlan, L. A., & Knifsend, C. A. (2016). The development of the sport commitment questionnaire-2 (English version). *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 233-246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.08.002>
- Scanlan, T. K., Russell, D. G., Beals, K. P., & Scanlan, L. A. (2003). Project on elite athlete commitment (PEAK): II. A direct test and expansion of the sport commitment model with elite amateur sportsmen. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 25(3), 377-401. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.25.3.377>
- Simonoff, E., Elander, J., Holmshaw, J., Pickles, A., Murray, R., & Rutter, M. (2004). Predictors of antisocial personality: Continuities from childhood to adult life. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 184(2), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.184.2.118>
- Siyahaş, A.; Tükenmez, A.; Avcı, S.; Yalçınkaya, B. & Çavuşoğlu, S.B. (2020). Bireysel Ve Takım Sporu Yapan Sporcuların Spor Bağlılık Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, *International Social Mentality and Research Thinkers Journal*, 6(34): 1310-1317. <https://doi.org/10.31576/smryj.581>
- Stanger, N., Kavussanu, M., Boardley, ID. & Ring, C. (2013). The influence of moral disengagement and negative emotion on antisocial sport behavior. *Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology*. 2(2), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030585>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. (6th edn). Boston. Ma: Pearson.
- Turkay, H. (2019). *Futbolcularda Sosyal Kimlik Bağlamında Prososyal Ve Antisosyal Davranışlar*. (Doktora Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.

<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=jUUvMCsUAHmggA8uFKT4UA&no=euMfiEUC9bCqPgszoUMHyA>

- Young, B. W., & Medic, N. (2011). Examining social influences on the sport commitment of Masters swimmers. *Psychology of sport and exercise, 12*(2), 168-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.09.004>
- Zuffianò, A., Eisenberg, N., Alessandri, G., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Pastorelli, C., Milioni, M., & Caprara, G. V. (2016). The relation of pro-sociality to self-Esteem: The mediational role of quality of friendships. *Journal of Personality, 84*(1), 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12137>