

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

Pooja Sengupta^{1*}, Dr. Tilottama Mukherjee²

ABSTRACT

The present study explores the Perceived autonomy support and Sport motivation of three groups of badminton players within the age range of 17-35 years. Total 31 participants including Established Players (n=10), Potential Players (n=11) and Recreational Players (n=10) were chosen for the study. The participants completed the questionnaires of GHQ-12 (Goldberg & Williams 1988), Sport Motivation Scale (SMS; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere 1995), and Sports Climate Questionnaire (SCQ)- Deci & Ryan (2006). In the present study, GHQ has been used as a screening tool and only those individuals were included in the sample who scored 19 or less. Descriptive statistics (Mean and SD) followed by Non-Parametric Test (Mann-Whitney U test) were done to analyse the data. Findings suggest that the environment is most autonomy-supportive for recreational players and also for the potential players to some extent than established player. Potential players are found to be more intrinsically motivated than established players. These findings have significant applied value in terms of designing motivational interviewing and counselling programmes specific to various mental health issues faced by the players in Indian sport set ups. Many times, they go unnoticed and unaddressed thereby leading to gross deterioration in their psychological wellbeing and hence affect their performance. There is scope for further research to show the requirement for inclusion and recruitment of sports psychologists compulsorily to provide timely intervention to the players.

Keywords: *Perceived Autonomy Support, Sports Motivation, Mental Health*

Passion about sports has been a myth, concept and fact for several decades and still has its relevance in the current scenario. Since ancient times, sports are enjoyed by human beings, as evidences collected from the archaeological surveys and ethnographic records such as the rare accounts of foreign explorers and cave paintings. In India, sport is regarded as one of the important medium to ensure physical and psychological well-being. In ancient India, Dehvada meant that “sport is a way of realizing the body potential to its fullest”. The immortal mythological epics of Ramayana, Mahabharata and dharma

¹College Whole Time Teacher (CWTT), Department of Psychology, The Bhawanipur Education Society College, 5 Lala Lajpat Rai Sarani, Kolkata, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Calcutta University College of Science, Technology & Agriculture (UCSTA), 92 Acharya Prafulla Chandra Road, Kolkata, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: March 15, 2021; Revision Received: April 07, 2021; Accepted: April 25, 2021

manuscripts like Vedas and Puranas marked the golden era of competitive sports in India. Since then, India has been the birthplace of many sports and games. Badminton is one of such games which started its modern history from the city of Pune in India and so its original name was “Poona” after the city’s old name. In colonial times, British officers played this game during their postings in Pune. The competitive version of this new sport was launched in 1873 at Badminton House, Gloucestershire and thus the game was officially called “Badminton”. The Badminton Association of England published the first collection of laws in 1893. The All-England Open Badminton Championships (the first badminton competition in the world) was played in 1899. The International Badminton Federation (IBF) (now known as Badminton World Federation) was established in 1934 with Canada, Denmark, England, France, the Netherlands, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland, and Wales as its founding members. India joined as an affiliate in 1936. The BWF now regulates all the games of international badminton and promotes the sport globally.

Motivation is one of those factors which provides the foundation for the player’s psyche. In this context, Motivation can be defined as a “tendency to strive for success, persist in the face of failure, and experience pride in accomplishments” (Gill, 1986). Motivation is the driving force that acts to nurture an athlete’s desire and determination to accomplish their goals. Participation in exercise and sport has been valued as an important way to increase personal fitness and emotional well-being (Biddle & Mutrie, 2001) by a high number of researchers. Motivation has two determinants, that is, one to explain the past and actual behaviour; secondly to predict and actively influence the future behaviour. In order to achieve this, different motivational theories have been proposed. One of the theories which is especially useful for the context of sport is self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985a, 2000). Self-determination theory differentiates between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation as well as the extent to which these different types of motivation are perceived as autonomous and emanate from the self (Deci & Ryan, 1985b). Self-determination has to do with the degree to which one’s behaviours are chosen and self-initiated. The behavioural regulations can be placed on a self-determination continuum--amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation (from the least to the most self-determined).

Amotivation represents a lack of intention to engage in behaviour, accompanied by a lack of connection between one’s behaviour and the expected outcome leading to feelings of incompetence. For example, an amotivated athlete might be heard saying, ‘I can’t see the point in training any more – it just tires me out’ or ‘I just don’t get any kick out of competition whatsoever’. Such athletes exhibit a sense of helplessness and often require counselling, as they are highly prone to dropping out. External and introjected regulations represent controlling types of extrinsic motivation because athletes do not realise that their behaviour is their own choice and, as a consequence, they experience psychological pressure. Participating in sport to receive prize money, win a trophy or a gold medal typifies external regulation. Participating to avoid punishment or negative evaluation is also external. Introjections are an internal pressure under which athletes might participate out of feelings of guilt or to achieve recognition. Identified and integrated regulations represent self-determined types of extrinsic motivation because behaviour is initiated out of choice, although it is not necessarily perceived to be enjoyable. These types of regulation explain the reason for some athletes’ repeating mundane drills for hundreds of hours; they think that such activity will ultimately help them to improve. Identified regulation represents engagement in sports activities because it is highly valued, whereas when behaviour becomes integrated it is in harmony with one’s sense of self and almost entirely self-

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

determined. Completing daily flexibility exercises because one realises they are part of an overarching goal of enhanced performance. Chantal and his colleagues (1996), in a sample of Bulgarian athletes, have reported that higher performing athletes (i.e., title and medal holders in national and international events) exhibited significantly higher levels of external regulation than those who did not win titles or medals in national and international competitions.

Intrinsic motivation comes from within self, is fully self-determined and characterised by interest in, and enjoyment derived from, sports participation. There are three types of intrinsic motivation, namely intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. High level of intrinsic motivation and internalized extrinsic motivation should lead to positive affect, positive behavioural outcomes, and improved cognition. Research shows (Vallerand & Loiser, 1999) that athlete who engage in sport for self-determined reasons experience more positive and less negative affect, have greater persistence, and exhibit higher levels of sportspersonship. Research (Nicolas Gillet and Elisabeth Rosnet, 2008) examining the relationships between competitive and recreational sport structures, level of competition, sport motivation and athletes' perceptions of autonomy, in order to enhance our knowledge of the motivational processes in sport used two hundred and eighty-eight athletes who completed the Sport Motivation Scale. Results revealed that District level athletes also exhibited less intrinsic motivation, less introjected regulation, and less external regulation than national level athletes.

In the context of sport, the coach has been identified as an influential social factor at all competitive levels (Horn, 2002; Smoll, & Smith, 2002; Barnett, Smith, & Smoll, 1992; Bredemeier & Shields, 1993; Scanlan, 1986). The way a coach structures practice and game situations, his way of making decisions, the quality and quantity of feedback he provides in response to athletes' performances, the relationships he establishes with athletes as well as his leadership style can all have an impact on athletes' behaviours, cognitions, and affective responses (Amorose, 2007) as well as on their autonomy. Autonomy is referred to as the ability to behave independently, to do things on one's own. Autonomy is defined as the sense of choice and willingness one experiences when one behaves in a way that is congruent with self-endorsed values and interests (Deci et al. 2006; Williams et al. 2006). According to self-determination theory, autonomy supportive (Deci and Ryan, 1985) means that 'an individual in a position of authority (e.g., an instructor [or a coach]) takes the other's (e.g., a student's [or an athlete's]) perspective, acknowledges the other's feelings, and provides the other with pertinent information and opportunities for choice, while minimizing the use of pressures and demands' (Black and Deci, 2000, p. 742) and, giving a meaningful rationale for a request, and maximizing people's sense of self-initiation and choice (Deci et al. 1994; Grolnick, 2003; Koestner et al., 1984; Ryan, 2005). Defined in this way, autonomy support differs from permissiveness (i.e., lack of structure) and neglect (i.e., lack of involvement; Joussemet et al., 2008). Grolnick and Ryan (1989) further defined autonomy support as coaches are placing value on self-initiation as well as encouraging choice, independent problem solving and participation in decision making. Autonomy support thus implies that athletes are regarded as individuals deserving self-determination, and not mere pawns that should be controlled to obtain a certain outcome (deCharms, 1968). Deci and Ryan (1980, 1985) claim that autonomy-supportive behaviours enhance intrinsic motivation and self-determined extrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan, 2002). Autonomy-supportive coaches provide choice, but also a rationale for requested tasks, rules and limits, acknowledge athletes' feelings and perspective, provide opportunities for initiative taking and transmit

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

non-controlling competence feedback. Finally, autonomy-supportive coaches avoid controlling behaviours in the form of physical and psychological control and tangible rewards. These autonomy-supportive behaviours, in turn, have been shown repeatedly to facilitate athletes' motivation.

Research has shown that in organized sports, autonomy support has been positively linked to self-determined motivation and negatively associated with amotivation and physical symptoms (Gagné, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, & Brière, 2001; Reinboth & Duda, 2006; Reinboth, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2004). Another body of research has shown that autonomy-supportive coaching has been shown to be important for motivating athletes and for boosting their performance. Furthermore, varsity athletes were higher than club and recreational athletes in external reward motivation and lower in extrinsic motivation. Hence, this finding suggests that elite-level coaches should make special efforts to be autonomy-supportive (rather than controlling) with their athletes (Sheldon & Watson, 2011).

The performance of an athlete or a player can be expanded to his or her fullest potential only when the enhancement of both athletic performance and the social-psychological aspects of human life is ensured (Cox, 2002).

The goal of present research is to use self-determination theory as a theoretical framework from which to study player's perceived autonomy support and sport motivation and their individual effects on different levels of same sport i.e., among established, potential and recreational badminton players of Kolkata.

This population has been chosen because although badminton is extensively played throughout India, it lacks the recognition of games such as cricket and only a few players have earned international titles. Secondly, the Badminton Association of India (BAI) was originally formed as the All-India Badminton Association established in Calcutta in 1934 by Sarat Mitra and the first tournament was held in Calcutta in the year 1935; hence West Bengal being the second most birthplace of competitive badminton has never got the limelight when compared with sports like cricket, table tennis and many others.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were 31 volunteer male badminton players, aged between 17-35 years were chosen for the present study. Participants were selected from different sporting clubs of Kolkata. The Badminton associations and clubs with the number of badminton players practicing there and fulfilling the inclusion criteria of the study such as on the basis of their age, level of sports played and years of official training. Total numbers of participants were divided into three groups: recreational player group, potential player group and established player group on the basis of the level of sport played.

Materials

Three questionnaires were given to the participants. The first one was GHQ-12, that is, General Health Questionnaire 12, which is a quick, reliable and sensitive short form to assess current mental health, developed by Goldberg & Williams (1988). It focuses on two major areas- the inability to carry out normal functions and the appearance of new and distressing experiences. It is a self-administered individual paper and pencil test. There is no time limit to complete it. The instructions to complete the questionnaire precede the

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

questions. Each item is rated on a four-point scale, i.e., a Likert scale-0, 1, 2, 3 from left to right. Score range from 0 to 36. Scores vary by study population. Scores about 11-12 are typical. Scores above 15 suggests evidence of distress which can be indicative of presence of stressor in the environment currently. Scores above 20 suggests severe problems and psychological distress which can be indicative of presence of psychiatric morbidity. Split-half and test-retest correlations have been carried out with good results (Goldberg & Williams, 1988). Analysis used during the development of GHQ-12 ensured that it has good content validity (Goldberg & Huxley, 1980). Internal consistency has been reported in a range of studies using Cronbach's Alpha with correlations ranging from 0.77 to 0.93. In the present study, GHQ has been used as a screening tool where only those individuals were included in the sample that scored 19 or less.

The second questionnaire was a new measure of motivation toward sport has been developed in French, namely the Echelle de Motivation vis-a-vis les sports, which was then translated and validated in English named 'The Sport Motivation Scale'(SMS). The SMS consists of seven subscales that measure three types of intrinsic motivation (IM; IM to know; IM to accomplish things; IM to experience stimulation), three forms of regulation for extrinsic motivation (identified, introjected and external) and amotivation (Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere, 1995). Self-determined sport motivation was also estimated using the French validated version of the Sport Motivation Scale (Briere, Vallerand, Blais, & Pelletier, 1995). It is a self-administering scale and can be administered either individually or in groups. Instructions and scale description (Likert rating scale) was clearly stated on the top of the questionnaire. There is no time limit but the participants must not take more than 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The Sport Motivation Scale (SMS-28) includes 28 items in total which are assessed by the respondents on a 7-point Likert-type scale. Four items each measure the aspects of intrinsic motivation (to know, to accomplish and to experience stimulation), the aspects of extrinsic motivation (by identification, introjections and external regulation) and amotivation for sports.

Key for Sms-28

Items Domains

2, 4, 23, 27 Intrinsic Motivation-to know

8, 12, 15, 20 Intrinsic Motivation-to accomplish

1, 13, 18, 25 Intrinsic Motivation-to experience stimulation

7, 11, 17, 24 Extrinsic Motivation-identified

9, 14, 21, 26 Extrinsic Motivation-introjected

6, 10, 16, 22 Extrinsic Motivation-external regulation

3, 5, 19, 28 Amotivation

After the questionnaire is completed, item responses are summed to create a score for a group of items. Higher scores indicate higher motivation in respective domains.

For the sake of parsimony, mean scores on the SMS subscales were combined into a composite index of self-determined motivation following a twofold procedure. First and in line with prior research (e.g., Chantal, Robin, and Vernat & Bernache-Assollant; in press; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Ryan & Connell, 1989), participant's scores were weighted as follows: intrinsic motivation to accomplish things, M score X 2; extrinsic motivation by identified regulation, M score X 1; extrinsic motivation by external regulation, M score X -1 and amotivation, M score X -2. That is, each motivation was weighted according to its positioning on the self-determination continuum (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Ensuing products

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

were added in the second step of the scoring procedure. The item responses on each domain must be interpreted accordingly. Higher score in amotivation domain indicates no motivation at all and hence athletes are expected to score low on this domain. On the other hand, intrinsic motivation exhibits highest level of determinism which is internal in nature. Higher score in the subscales of intrinsic motivation indicate that athlete's motivation in sport is derived from his own interest and will. Higher score on the domain of extrinsic motivation i.e. in the three subscales indicate that the athlete performs only to obtain an external reward or to avoid punishment i.e. externally guided. As for interpreting the self-determination index, higher positive scores indicate that one's participation is characterised by prominent feelings of autonomy and pleasure (i.e. sport is an end in itself). Conversely, higher negative score suggests that one's sport participation is tainted by dominant feelings of constraints and instrumentality (i.e. sport is a mean to some end, other than the pleasure of participation per se). Pelletier et.al (1995) reported adequate internal consistency, with alpha scores on six of the seven subscales ranging from 0.74 to 0.80, with the internal consistency score of the identification subscale slightly lower (0.63). Finally, they supported the existence of the self-determination continuum (e.g., amotivation/external regulation) were correlated more highly in a positive direction than those further apart the continuum (e.g., external regulation/intrinsic motivation to know). Such a pattern is known as simplex pattern. Intrinsic Motivation subscales were more highly correlated in a positive direction with other intrinsic subscales than extrinsic subscales and vice-versa. Correlation between the subscales and various motivational antecedents and consequences also support the construct validity of the Sport Motivation Scale. In the present study, this questionnaire is used to assess sport motivation on a self-determination continuum.

The Sport Climate Questionnaire (SCQ) has a long form containing 15 items and a short form containing 6 of the items. The questionnaire is typically used with respect to specific coaches or individuals in comparable positions with respect to a sport or physical activity. The questions are usually used to determine level of respect for coaches, trainers or instructors (Deci & Ryan, 2006). The SCQ is a self-administering questionnaire. There is no time limit to complete the test; however, the participant should not delay and should give immediate answers. The scale can be administered either individually or in groups. The instructions are clearly stated in the questionnaire. Scores are calculated by averaging the individual item scores. For the long version, first the score of item '13' has to be reserved (i.e. subtract the score on item 13 from 8 and the result is used as the item score for this item-for example, the score of 3, when reversed would become 5). All the 15 items were summed for a total score and were scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy support. The alpha coefficient of internal consistency is virtually always above 0.90. In the present study, this questionnaire is used to assess the perceived autonomy support provided by the coach to the players.

Data Collection

During the training sessions, participants are provided with the total booklet containing the questionnaires- General Health Questionnaire-12 (Goldberg & Williams 1988), Sport Motivation Scale (SMS; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere 1995), and Sports Climate Questionnaire (SCQ)- Deci & Ryan (2006). The participants who were found to be psychologically healthy were included in the sample after screening through GHQ-12 and the participants' who scored 19 or less were then administered SMS and SCQ questionnaires to assess their sports motivation and perception of autonomy from coaches.

Statistical Analysis

The data was statistically analysed. Mean and Standard Deviation were computed along with non-parametric tests such as,

1. Kruskal-Wallis- to obtain the significant mean rank difference between three independent samples.
2. Mann-Whitney U Test- to obtain the significant difference between means of any two independent samples.

Mann-Whitney was done only for the values found significant from the Kruskal –Wallis. For the analysis, 0.05 level of significance was accepted.

RESULTS

The aim of the present investigation was to make a comparative study among three groups of badminton players (established players, potential players and recreational players) on the variables such as sports motivation and perceived autonomy support.

By comparing the means of three groups on different domains of Sports Motivation, it reveals that the potential players scored highest on intrinsic motivation – to know, to accomplish domains. Recreational players scored highest on intrinsic motivation – to experience stimulation domain. Potential players scored highest on three domains of extrinsic motivation – identified, introjected, external regulation. Recreational players scored lowest on Amotivation domain. Potential player scored highest on Self-Determined Motivation domain. On comparison of Means of three groups, it is seen that recreational player scored highest and established player scored lowest. There exists significant mean rank difference between three groups of players in terms of intrinsic motivation (to know), identified and introjected form of extrinsic motivation. There exists no significant mean rank difference between three group of players in terms of intrinsic motivation (to accomplish, to experience stimulation), externally regulated form of extrinsic motivation, amotivation and self-determined motivation. There is a significant difference between the three groups of players – established, potential and recreational player group in terms of Perceived Autonomy Support. The U value is significant for established and recreational players group i.e., significant mean rank difference between the mean ranks of these two groups exists.

Table I: Mean and Standard deviation (SD) of different domains of Sports Motivation Scale (IM – Intrinsic Motivation, EM – Extrinsic Motivation, Amotivation, Self-determined Motivation) among three groups of players- established, potential and recreational player group.

Domains of Sports Motivation	Established Player		Potential Player		Recreational Player	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
IM – to know	18.30	5.83	23.82	3.52	22.60	5.38
IM – to accomplish	18.30	6.50	23.45	3.59	23.20	2.70
IM – to experience stimulation	21.40	4.60	21.82	4.07	22.50	3.92
EM – Identified	16.70	4.30	21.55	4.08	17.00	6.00
EM – Introjected	18.20	4.87	23.09	4.48	22.00	3.62
EM – external regulation	15.00	5.01	19.18	4.96	18.40	3.06
Amotivation	10.50	6.40	11.00	5.02	10.20	2.86
Self-determined Motivation	3.70	4.90	7.45	4.78	7.00	2.98

Table II: Mean and standard deviation (SD) of Perceived Autonomy Support among three groups of players- established, potential and recreational player group.

Established Player		Potential Player		Recreational Player	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
4.90	0.99	5.64	0.92	6.10	0.99

Table III: Mean Rank and corresponding x^2 values of different domains of Sports Motivation Scale (IM – Intrinsic Motivation, EM – Extrinsic Motivation, Amotivation, Self-determined Motivation) among three group of players (established, potential and recreational player).

Domains of Sports Motivation	Established Player	Potential Player	Recreational Player	x^2 Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank		
IM – to know	10.40	19.23	18.05	5.94	Significant
IM – to accomplish	11.15	18.73	17.85	4.28	Not Significant
IM – to experience stimulation	15.10	15.36	17.60	.471	Not Significant
EM – Identified	12.85	21.14	13.50	6.49	Significant
EM – Introjected	10.60	19.91	17.10	5.98	Significant
EM – external regulation	11.10	19.05	17.55	4.47	Not Significant
Amotivation	15.15	17.09	15.65	0.26	Not Significant
Self-determined Motivation	11.50	18.27	18.00	3.71	Not Significant

Table IV: Mann-Whitney U value for the significance of difference between the means of any two groups of Badminton players for Intrinsic Motivation – to know.

Different Group of Players	U Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
Established and Potential Player	23	Significant
Potential and Recreational Player	51	Not significant
Established and Recreational Player	26	Not Significant

Table V: U values for the significance of difference between the means of any two groups of Badminton Players for Extrinsic Motivation identified.

Different Group of Players	U Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
Established and Potential Player	23	Significant
Potential and Recreational Player	30	Not significant
Established and Recreational Player	49	Not significant

Table VI: U values for the significance of difference between the means of any two groups of Badminton Players for Extrinsic Motivation – introjected.

Different Group of Players	U Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
Established and Potential Player	24	Significant
Potential and Recreational Player	43	Not significant
Established and Recreational Player	27	Not significant

Table VII: Mean Rank and corresponding x^2 values of Perceived Autonomy Support among three group of players (established player, potential player and recreational player)

Established Player	Potential Player	Recreational Player	x^2 Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank		
10.55	16.64	20.75	0.68	Significant

Table VIII: U values for the significance of difference between the means of any 2 group of Badminton players for Perceived Autonomy support.

Different Group of Players	U Value	Level of Significance (at 0.05 level)
Established and Potential Player	31	Not significant
Potential and Recreational Player	38	Not significant
Established and Recreational Player	19	Significant

DISCUSSION

The aim of this research to study player’s perceived autonomy support and sport motivation and their individual effects on different levels of same sport i.e., among established, potential and recreational badminton players of Kolkata, was achieved. The following domains specifically discusses the difference among the three level of players with respect to sports motivation and perceived autonomy support:

Intrinsic Motivation

There exists significant difference between three groups of players in terms of intrinsic motivation – to know. On this domain, the significant difference exists between established and potential players. Potential players scored highest mean value on this domain than other two groups. Potential players are at a stage of their career where they haven’t achieved a lot and hence, they are more eager to know about the specific details of the game than established players who are more experienced in their exposures (as they played national and international tournaments) and achieved many titles and medals.

Extrinsic Motivation

There exists significant mean rank difference between three groups of players in terms of identified and introjected form of extrinsic motivation. Further analysis reveals significant mean rank difference exist between the established and potential player group.

By comparing the means of three groups on this two-sub domain, it has been seen that potential players scored highest and it is supported by the findings of Sheldon & Watson (2011) who revealed varsity athletes were higher than club and recreational athletes in external reward motivation and lower in extrinsic motivation. Potential players have

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

identified with an extrinsic motivation to the degree that they see the activity as being instrumental for them to attain another goal such as certain titles, improving skills and so on.

Amotivation

There exists no significant difference between the three groups of players on amotivation domain. By comparing the means of three groups, it has been seen that recreational group scored lowest and this may be due to high autonomy supportive rather than controlling environment provided to them; as a result, they could express their true selves in the game. Hence autonomy support is negatively associated with amotivation. This finding is supported by Ryan & Bargmann (2003), Pelletier et. al (2001), Reinboth & Duda (2006).

Self-Determined Motivation

There exists no significant difference between the three groups of players in terms of self-determined motivation. By comparing the mean of three groups, it has been seen that potential players scored highest on self-determined motivation domain and the established group has scored lowest. This result is supported by the findings of Chantal et. al (1998) who suggested that highly competitive and controlling environments may facilitate performance through less self-determined forms of motivation; and also supported by the findings of Mallet & Hanrahan (2004) who found that, less self-determined motives also surfaced for some athletes among the champions as they identified money and social recognition as significant motivators. From the present findings, it can be said that autonomy support is positively linked to self-determined motivation and this view has been supported by the findings of Duda & Ntaunanis (2004), Reinboth & Duda (2006), Pelletier et. al (2001).

Perceived Autonomy Support

On statistical analysis, it has been seen that there exists a significant mean rank difference between the three groups of players. Further analysis reveals that significant difference exists between established and recreational players. On comparison of mean between three groups, it has been seen that established group scored lowest. This result is supported by Sheldon & Watson (2011) whose findings suggest that elite-level coaches should make special efforts to be autonomy supportive rather than controlling with their athletes. It has been also evident while interviewing the Indian Ranking Badminton Player who said that “if I ask my coach to let me try things on my own way, he will kill me (laughing).” On the other hand, for recreational players, who rarely takes guidance from a coach, sports climate is more autonomy supportive which means they play for their own sake and interest and not due to external pressures or demands (i.e., controlled; Deci & Ryan 1987). Studies have shown that autonomy supportive coaching is important for intrinsically motivating athletes (Deci & Ryan, 1987).

CONCLUSION

Sports scenario is quite different in Indian context. Money invested in sports is minimal and it is not same for all sports. Established players have achieved a position, bagged good jobs and had a regular income whereas for potential players the financial crisis is more prominent which is revealed in their external regulation form of motivation. Yet potential players have extrinsically identified themselves with different aspects of the game and also intrinsically motivated to know more. On the other hand, established players can be at a risk for stagnation after their achievement. So, it is important to understand the differential needs of each level of players and apply motivational techniques accordingly. Sports, in India, are steadily gaining its position in the World Sports so these findings have significant applied

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

value in terms of designing motivational interviewing and counselling programmes specific to various mental health issues faced by the players in Indian sport set ups. Many times, they go unnoticed and unaddressed thereby leading to gross deterioration in their psychological wellbeing thereby affecting their performance. There is scope for further research and inclusion and recruitment of sports psychologists compulsorily to provide timely intervention. Finally, the role of sport for promoting positive mental health can be explored and elevated by further research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Ames & M. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 6, pp.81-115). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Amorose, A. J. and Anderson-Butcher, D., *Autonomy Supportive Coaching and Self-Determined Motivation in High School and College Athletes: A Test of Self-Determination Theory*, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2007, 8, 654-670.
- Amorose, A.J. *Coaching effectiveness: Exploring the relationship between coaching behavior and motivation from a self-determination theory perspective*. In: Hagger, M.; Chatzisarantis, NLD., editors.
- Black, A. E. and Deci, E. L., *The Effects of Instructors' Autonomy Support and Students' Autonomous Motivation on Learning Organic Chemistry: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective*, *Science Education*, 2000, 84, 740-756.
- Blanchard, C.M., Amiot, C.E., Perreault, S., Vallerand, R.J. and Provencher, P., *Cohesiveness, Coach's Interpersonal Style and Psychological Needs: Their Effects on Self-Determination and Athletes Subjective Well-being*, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2009, 10(5), 545-551.
- Ciani, K. D., Middleton, M. J., Summers, J. J. and Sheldon, K. M., *Buffering Against Performance Classroom Goal Structures: The Importance of Autonomy Support and Classroom Community*, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 2010, 35, 88-99.
- Deci EL, Ryan RM. *The support of autonomy and the control of behavior*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1987; 53:1024–1037. [PubMed: 3320334]
- Deci, E.L. (1980). *The psychology of self-determination*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*, University of Rochester Press, Rochester, NY, 2002.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M., *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior*, Plenum, New York, NY, 1985.
- Duda, J.L., & Treasure, D.C. (2001). *Toward optimal motivation in sport: Fostering athletes' competence and sense of control*. In J.M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied Sport Psychology: Personal Growth to Peak Performance* (4th ed., pp. 43-62). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Dweck, C.S. (1986). *Motivational processes affecting learning*. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048.
- Dwyer, J. (1988). *Development of the Sports Intrinsic Motivation Scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Saskatchewan.
- Dwyer, J.J.M. (1988). *Development of the Sports Intrinsic Motivation Scale (SIMS)*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention. edited by Daniel E. Smith, Michael. Bar-Eli.
- Ferrer-Caja, E. and Weis, M. R., *Predictors of Intrinsic Motivation Among Adolescent Students in Physical Education*, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 2000, 71(3), 267-279.

Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal

- Gagné M, Ryan RM, Bargmann K. Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and wellbeing of gymnasts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* 2003;15:372–390.
- Guay, G., Vallerand, R.J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion*, 24, 175-213.
- Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K. and Rose, E., Athlete Burnout in Elite Sport: A Self-Determination Perspective, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 2009, 27, 785-795.
- Mageau GA, Vallerand RJ. The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sport Sciences* 2003;21:883–904.
- Mallett, C., Kawabata, M., Newcombe, P., Otero-Forero, A. and Jackson, S., Sport Motivation Scale-6 (SMS- A Revised Six-Factor Sport Motivation Scale, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2007, 8, 600-614.
- Markland, D. and Hardy, L., On the Factorial and Construct Validity of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory: Conceptual and Operational Concerns, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 1997, 68(1), 20-32.
- Martens, M. P. and Webber, S. N., Psychometric Properties of the Sport Motivation Scale: An Evaluation With College Varsity Athletes From the U.S., *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 2002, 24, 254-270.
- Martens, M.P., & Webber, S.N. (2002). Psychometric properties of the Sport Motivation Scale: An evaluation with college varsity athletes from the U.S. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24, 254-270.
- Morgan, W.P. (1979). Prediction of performance in athletics. In P. Klavara & J.V. Daniel (Eds.), *Coach, athlete, and sport psychologist* (pp. 173-186). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Morgan, W.P. (1980). Test of champions: The ice-berg profile. *Psychology Today*, 14, 92-102.
- Orlick, T.D., & Mosher, R. (1978). Extrinsic rewards and participant motivation in a sport Task. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 9, 27-39.
- Nicholls, J.G., *The Competitive Ethos and Democratic Education*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1989.
- Ntoumanis, N., A Self-Determination Approach to the Understanding of Motivation in Physical Education, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2001, 71(2), 225-242.
- Pelletier LG, Fortier MS, Vallerand RJ, Brière NM. Associations among perceived autonomy support, forms of self-regulation, and persistence: A prospective study. *Motivation & Emotion* 2001; 25:279–306.
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J. and Tuson, K. M., Toward a New Measure of Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Amotivation in Sports: The Sport Motivation Scale (SMS), *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1995, 17, 35-53.
- Rajender Singh and Gopal Garg, "First National Conference on Sports Psychology" (1986): 19-20.
- Richer, S.F. and Vallerand, R.J., Construction et Validation de L'Échelle du Sentiment D'Appatenance Sociale, *Revue Européenne Psychologie Appliquée*, 1998, 48, 129-137.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L., Active Human Nature: Self-Determination Theory and the Promotion and Maintenance of Sport, Exercise, and Health, in: Hagger, M.S., and Chatzisarantis, N.L.D., eds., *Handbook of Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Exercise and Sport*, Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL, 2007, 1-19.

International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching Volume 7 · Number 1 · 2012
105

- Smoll, F.L., Smith, R.E. and Cumming, S.P., Effects of a Psycho educational Intervention for Coaches on Motivational Climate and Changes in Young Athletes' Achievement Goals, *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 2007, 1(1), 23-46. Sport (pp. 301-313). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sports and Personality- By Urvashi Roul (2011)
- Vallerand, R.J. and Losier, G.F., An Integrative Analysis of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in Sport, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 1999, 11(1), 142-169.
- Vallerand, R.J., Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in Sport and Physical Activity: A Review and a Look at the Future, in: Tenenbaum, G., and Eklund, R.C., eds., *Handbook of sport psychology*, 3rd edn., Wiley, New York, NY, 2007, 59-83.
- Vallerand, R.J., Towards a Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation, in: Zanna, M.P., ed., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, NY, 1997, 271-360.
- Vallerand, R.J., & Fortier, M.S. (1998). Measures of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in sport and physical activity: A review and critique. In J.L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 81-101). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Weiss, M.R., Bredemeier, B.J., & Shewchuk, R.M. (1985). An intrinsic/extrinsic motivation scale for the youth sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 75-91.
- Wilson, P.M. and Rodgers, W.M., the Relationship between Perceived Autonomy Support, Exercise Regulations, and Behavioural Intentions in Women, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2004, 5, 229-242.
- Wilson, P.M., Rodgers, W.M., Fraser, S.N. and Murray, T.C., Relationships Between Exercise Regulations and Motivational Consequences in University Students, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 2004, 75(1), 81-91.

Acknowledgement

I gratefully express my indebtedness to Dr. Tilottama Mukherjee, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Calcutta, for her valuable guidance and advice along with support and encouragement throughout the research study. This research work wouldn't have been possible without the cooperation of players and coaches of Badminton fraternity of West Bengal as they allowed me not only in their practice premises and session timings but also allowed me to enter their psyche through extensive interviews and question answer sessions.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Sengupta P. & Mukherjee T. (2021). Sports Motivation and Perceived Autonomy Support among Badminton Players of West Bengal. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(2), 207-219. DIP:18.01.026.20210902, DOI:10.25215/0902.026