

[Barry University](#)  
[Institutional Repository](#)

[Theses and Dissertations](#)

2017

Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Athletic Achievement  
Motivation Among University Students

Jaci Wright

BARRY UNIVERSITY

EFFECT OF SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS ON ATHLETIC ACHIEVMENT

MOTIVATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by  
Jaci Wright, B.S.

A MASTERS THESIS  
Submitted to the Faculty of  
Barry University in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science

Miami Shores, Florida

March 1, 2017

BARRY UNIVERSITY

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science

Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Athletic Achievement Motivation among University  
Students

By  
Jaci Wright, B.S.

Approved:

---

David Feldman, Ph.D.,  
Associate Professor of Psychology

---

Karen A. Callaghan, Ph.D.,  
Dean of College of Arts  
and Sciences

---

Sabrina Des Rosiers, Ph.D.,  
Assistant Professor of Psychology

---

Eileen McDonough, Ed.D.,  
Associate Vice President  
For Student Affairs

---

Date:

## Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude for my thesis committee chair, Dr. David Feldman, for all of your guidance and encouragement throughout this process. You have been an amazing mentor to me throughout the program and have continuously supported me with patience, motivation, and knowledge. Thank you for consistently allowing this paper to be my own work, but also steering me in the right direction. I truly appreciate the professional guidance that you have provided me and will continue to utilize the knowledge that I have received from you in my future as a professional.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Sabrina Des Rosiers and Dr. Eileen McDonough at Barry University. I am gratefully indebted to you for your valuable comments, edits, and suggestions on my thesis. Thank you for your support at my proposal defense and guidance in the area of statistics. Also, thank you to the Barry University Psychology Department for your help throughout this process and encouragement over the past 3 years.

Last but not least, a very special thank you to my family and loved ones for being my biggest supporters throughout my life and throughout this program. You have been my motivation and have given me the foundation, love, and encouragement that I needed to do my best in this program and in life. I would not be where I am without you and I love you all very much!

### Abstract

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the relationship between the socioeconomic status (SES) and athletic achievement motivation among undergraduate students.

Previous literature has examined the impact of socioeconomic status on development and academic achievement motivation. Findings have suggested that families with lower socioeconomic statuses do not have access to the same amount of services, educational benefits, and face more challenges such as higher levels of financial stress than families with higher economic statuses (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997, Karimshah, Tay, Capelin, & Short, 2013, Guiffrida, Lynch, Wall, & Abel, 2013). Motivation to achieve also spans across the context of participation in sports. Higher levels of intrinsic motivation related to sports performance have been found to be associated with athletes who possess a mastery-goal approach (Adie & Jowett, 2010, Li, Chi, Yeh, Guo, Ou, & Kao, 2011). Literature examining the relationship between athletic achievement motivation and SES is sparse. This study examined collegiate athletes and their athletic achievement motivation related to their SES. Participants were recruited from two private-universities in the United States. Participants completed a brief demographic and the Sports Motivation Questionnaire (Pelletier, L., Fortier, M., Vallerand, R., Tuson, K., Briere, N., & Blais, M., 1995). Responses were analyzed using two one-way ANOVAs and demographic data was reported.

Effect of Socioeconomic Status on Athletic Achievement Motivation among University  
Students

There has been a great deal of research on the impact of socioeconomic status on college student performance. Students, as well as individuals in general, have motives behind behavior. Achievement motivation is a person's need for success or the attainment of excellence (Van de Pol & Kavussanu, 2011). The achievement goal theory lies within the context of achievement motivation. This theory explains that a person is goal-directed and operates rationally. The motivator behind rational behavior are achievement goals which direct our behavior and beliefs in certain contexts, such as in the classroom and in sports (Balague, Castillo, Duda, & Tomas, 2009).

According to the American Psychological Association (2014), socioeconomic status is commonly conceptualized as the social standing or class of an individual or group. It is often measured as a combination of education, income, and occupation. There are often inequities in access to resources, privileges, power, and control in society between individuals from low SES groups and high SES groups. One area that has received a great deal of research attention is the relationship between SES and academic achievement motivation. In the college setting, students from low SES families often face many more challenges than do students from high SES families such as a higher level of stress, lower levels of retention (Karimshah et al., 2013), and less importance placed on going to college to fulfill autonomy needs (Guiffrida et al., 2013). The hurdles faced by college students of low socioeconomic status has implications on their level of motivation to succeed in college and this may be due to a higher level of financial stress (Guiffrida et al, 2013). Prospero & Vohra-Gupta (2007) found that first generation

students, which tend to be of lower economic status, tended to rate higher in amotivation. Amotivation describes individuals who perceive their behaviors as caused by forces outside of their control. This could carry over to a student's academic motivation behind low retention rates (Karimshah et al., 2013) causing low-income students to feel that no matter what they do, their success in college is outside of their control.

Athletic achievement motivation is organized into two goal orientation groups, task and ego (Van de Pol & Kavussanu, 2011). Task oriented individuals evaluate their competence based upon self-reference and participate in activities in order to do the best they can. Contrary to this, ego oriented individuals evaluate themselves in terms of normative superiority; they participate in activities in order to rise above others (Van de Pol, Kavussanu, & Ring, 2012). Research has shown that athletes with a task orientation associate positively with motivation as well as higher levels of enjoyment and interest within their sport (Dewar & Kavussanu, 2012, Van de Pol & Kavussanu, 2011). The achievement goal theory also encompasses performance versus mastery goals in athletics. Athletes with performance goals engage in a sport in order to look good or to be evaluated higher than others, whereas athletes who engage in mastery goals seek to genuinely improve and to learn skills in order to master their task. Research has shown that athletes who adopt a mastery-approach goal are more determined to succeed and are positively related to higher levels of intrinsic motivation and sports performance (Adie & Jowett, 2010, Li et al., 2011).

There has been a great deal of research on the effects of socioeconomic status on college students, and motivation to achieve in both academic and athletic contexts. However, the research on the relationship between SES and athletic achievement

motivation is sparse. The purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between the two variables. The remainder of this literature review will further examine the impact SES has on college students, academic achievement motivation, and athletic achievement motivation. The review concludes with a summary and critique of existing literature, followed by a discussion of the specific research question and hypothesis suggested by the review and examined in this thesis.

### **Socioeconomic Status as a Context of Development According to Urie Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory of Development**

According to Bronfenbrenner (1979) an individual's development occurs within a comprehensive system of nested levels including the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem. Each level includes social, cultural, economic, and political contexts which contribute to the development of each individual person. Each ecological level is integrated. The microsystem includes the environment with which an individual has direct contact. This includes family and peers. The relationships within the microsystem are bi-directional between the individual and this system. The next level is the mesosystem, which consists of the interactions between characters of the individual's microsystem, such as parent-teacher interaction. The third level is the exosystem, which involves a setting that has an effect on the individual, even though he or she does not have an active role in the situation. Finally, the macrosystem involves macro-institutions that have an effect on a developing individual and may include the federal government or public policies.

This theory places an importance on the interaction between an individual and their environment when examining overall development. Each system is integrated and



has an effect on the developing individual. An important aspect of this theory of development is the introduction of the chronosystem, the influence of time throughout each nested level of development (Bornstein & Lamb, 2011). The chronosystem represents a change or continuity across time that influences each of the systems individually. Transitions from middle childhood to adolescence and the impact of this change would be an example of a chronological development according to the Ecological Systems Theory (Neal & Neal, 2013). Bronfenbrenner's theory provides the relevance that context of development has on an individual's growth within society. Each nested level has an impact on the development of a child from birth where the main interaction occurs within the microsystem, and continues throughout the lifespan affecting later choices in life, including academic success and motivation. According to previous literature, economic status has been placed within the exosystem of the bioecological theory (Brooks-Gunn & Leventhal, 2000 & Zuvarin, 1989). The work place of a child's parent does not directly involve the child but has an impact on the child's development and behavior (Bornstein & Lamb, 2011).

### **Measuring Socioeconomic Status**

Previous research lacks a scale to use to categorize individuals into either high or low poverty levels. However, each year the U.S. Census Bureau analyzes the percentage of individuals and families in poverty by factors such as race, age, sex, nativity, disability status, educational attainment, family structure, work experience, residence, and region.

In the most recent census data on information from 2014 the poverty rate in the United States was 14.8%. This represents 46.7 million people residing in the U.S. The poverty rate by age was 21.1% (under 18 years old), 13.5% (18-64 years), and 10% (65

and older). Data determined that the poverty rate by race was 10.1% non-Hispanic whites, 26.2% Black, 12% Asian, and 23.3% of Hispanic origin. The percentage of males in poverty was 13.4% and 16.1% of females were in poverty. Native U.S. citizens in 2014 made up 86.6% of the population and 13.4% were of foreign origin. The percentage of native-born individuals in poverty was 14.2% and the poverty rate for foreign-born individuals was 18.5%. The poverty rate for individuals with a disability was 28.5%. The poverty rate for educational attainment was 28.8% (25 years or older without a diploma), 14.2% (high school diploma, no college), 10.2% (Some college, no degree), and 5% (Bachelor's degree). The poverty rate by region was 12.6% (northeast residents), 13% (Midwest residents), and 15.2% (southern residents). The poverty rate for individuals residing in a metropolitan area was 14.5% and those outside of metropolitan areas were 16.5%. Working individuals between the ages of 18 and 64 had a poverty rate of 6.9%. The poverty rate for full-time, year round workers was 3%, less than year round (15.9%), didn't work at all (24.7%). Finally, 11.6% of families were in poverty. The poverty rate for married couples was 6.2%, 30.6% for single female householders, and 15.7% for male householders.

The Census Bureau determines whether an individual is "in poverty" or "not in poverty" by using an income to poverty ratio. This ratio is represented as a percentage comparing families or unrelated persons income per household with the applicable poverty threshold determined by the federal poverty level. Individuals and families were determined as "not in poverty" if they made more money than the poverty threshold and "in poverty" if they fell below. Income was measured as amount of money made by each household before taxes and not including any type of noncash benefits that the family

may have received through governmental assistance programs. The Census Bureau determined the poverty threshold by the number of individuals in the household and number of those individuals who were children under the age of 18. It was determined that this measure did not differ by geographic region. Therefore, it can be used as a measure to determine poverty level for individuals and families in any U.S. region (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015).

### **The Impact of Economic Status on Development**

Brooks-Gunn and Duncan (1997) expressed that families with a lower socioeconomic status do not have access to the same multitude of services that families of a higher economic status do, which puts the children in these families at a higher risk for developmental problems. These problems may include challenges with achievement and education. As low socioeconomic status families tend to experience more threatening and uncontrollable life events, these events place low-SES families at a higher risk of exposure to environmental hazards such as higher levels of unemployment, violence, and family dissolution. These destabilizing events often lead to higher stress levels (Bradley & Whiteside-Mansell, 1997). As the number of stressors within a neighborhood increases and the number of support systems decreases, it has been shown that the level of distress among individuals within lower SES communities increases (Zuvarin, 1989).

Socioeconomic status may be categorized as a community-level variable in the context of development using the Ecological Systems Theory. It is important to consider community level SES because of evidence supporting the fact that the neighborhood in which an individual resides is associated with health, achievement, and behavioral outcomes even when individual level income and education of the parent are controlled.

It has been shown that living in higher economic status neighborhoods has positive benefits regarding school readiness and school achievement (Brooks-Gunn & Leventhal, 2000).

### **Impact of SES on Students**

Previous research has shown that socioeconomic status has an impact on reaping the benefits of education. Guiffrida et al. (2013) conducted a study assessing the relationship between intrinsic motivation for attending college as defined by self-determination theory and academic success, while moderating for socioeconomic status. This study emphasized the importance that SES as a moderating variable has on facilitating college success, specifically, the intent to persist with education and GPA. Investigators examined the relationship between intent to persist and the role that motivation plays. Researchers hypothesized that student motivation based on autonomy and competence would be positively related to student outcomes, but motivation based on relatedness would have a more significant association. Participants in this study included 2,520 college students (4-year college, n = 962; community college, n = 1,558). Each participant completed a questionnaire that collected information regarding their SES, race/ethnicity, gender, and level of the institution (2 or 4 year). The intention to persist with their college education was measured using a questionnaire developed by Hardre and Reeve (2003), and consisting of three items measuring intent to stay in school. Participants completed the Competence Motivation Scale (Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Brier, Senecal, & Vallieres, 1992) to assess intrinsic motivation towards accomplishment. The Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (Guiffrida, Gouveia, Wall, & Seward, 2008) was used to assess the degree to which students attend college to fulfill relatedness

with others. The Autonomous Motivation Scale was designed particularly for their study. This scale assessed autonomous reasons for attending college.

Results showed that, as hypothesized, there were relationships between relatedness and academic achievement. Intentions to persist were more complex than they were for autonomy and competence. Results also showed that SES was a moderator in the relationship between autonomy and competence as well as outcome variables. Autonomy was more important to higher SES students than to low SES students. This study suggests that higher SES students may benefit more from intrinsic motivation than do lower SES students.

Karimshah et al. (2013) also completed a study examining retention strategies for low SES students. This study examined whether low SES students had a more difficult time in college compared to high SES students. The hypothesis was that students from low SES families would have a higher amount of stressors on academic studies due to financial issues, family issues, health problems, and relationship issues. Participants of this study included 1,002 domestic undergraduate students (71% female, 29% male) attending the University of Queensland, Australia. Each participant completed an online survey designed by the researchers to measure the extent to which cultural capital, social integration, and self-agency/efficacy influenced a student's ability to remain in a university. The survey contained three categories. The first contained a set of demographic questions such as gender, living situation, faculty, year, and part-time or full-time student status. The second section measured the effects of stress on students by assessing the stress effects of financial problems, health problems, family issues and relationship issues on academic performance as well as if they considered dropping out

and if the factors were an interruption to studying. The final section contained an examination of students' motivation to remain in the university.

Results supported the hypothesis that low SES students were found to be more likely to experience multiple stressors compared to other students. There was a significant effect of family issues and financial problems on low SES students' academic retention. Also, the impact of stress on studies was greater for low SES students ( $p = .01$ ). Results also showed that students from low SES backgrounds were significantly more likely to experience family issues (51.3% of low SES students, 42.1% of other students). There were also significant differences between low SES and other students in their financial support environment.

These results are important because it shows that there are significant issues low SES students face that causes a larger challenge to remain in higher education. The qualitative data revealed that social relationships, such as friends and family, play a major role in a student's decision to stay in college, and this is significantly lower in students of lower socioeconomic status. Since low SES backgrounds are a barrier to accessing higher education, it is significant to understand retention strategies that will reduce drop-out rates and promote higher education among low SES populations. Conclusions of the study indicates an increase in social support may increase academic retention rates among low SES students.

### **Academic Achievement Motivation**

Another area of research addressed is motivation within the educational system. (Karimshah et al., 2013). Young, Johnson, Hawthorne, & Pugh (2011) examined the importance of social support as a predictor of academic motivation and academic success

across cultures, socioeconomic status, and generation with college experience as predictors of academic motivation. The aim of this study was to determine the importance of perceived social support as a predictor of academic motivation and success for different cultural groups. They hypothesized that perceived social support is a predictor for academic motivation and academic success across cultures. Also, that SES and generation of college with college experience would have a role in impacting academic motivation and achievement.

Participants of this study included 93 undergraduate students from a regional university in northeast Texas and included 31 European Americans, 31 African Americans, and 31 Hispanic Americans. Of the European American students, 7 were college seniors, 6 were juniors, 13 were sophomores, and 5 were freshman. Of the African American students, 9 were seniors, 11 were juniors, 6 were sophomores, and 5 were freshmen. Hispanic American students consisted of 3 seniors, 18 juniors, 8 sophomores, and 2 freshmen.

Each participant completed 3 different scales. The first scale was the Achievement Motivation Scale (Vallerand et al., 1992). This scale analyzed the students' motivation levels for academic success based on three types of motivation including intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. This scale was a 28-item self-reporting scale. The Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Status was created in 1957 (Hollingshead, 1971). This scale was used to measure social status based on family occupation and education. This survey was designed to measure social status of an individual based on four domains: marital status, retired/employed status, educational attainment, and occupational prestige. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet,

Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1998) was used to assess perceived social support among undergraduate students. This scale included a 12-item self-report measure with 3 subscales evaluating different aspects of perceived social support from family, friends, and professors.

Results suggested that perceived social support, SES, and generation of college students had an effect on academic motivation, supporting the original hypothesis. As the total perceived support increased, the degree of academic motivation also increased. Also, total perceived support, generation of the college student, and SES factored to predict total intrinsic motivation at a significant level. Analysis of each ethnic population showed a significant relationship between total perceived social support and SES. Overall, this study showed that there were unique differences within different ethnic populations that contribute to motivation. SES accounted for a 14% of the variance of perceived social support. The findings of this study suggested that the role of perceived social support varies across cultural groups as does the impact of generation of college student and SES.

Prospero & Vohra-Gupta (2007) also examined academic motivation. Their study examined motivation and the integration dimensions that influence college academic achievement of first-generation college students, students who do not have parents who attended college, and non-first generation students. Previous research by Choy (2001) found that first generation students are more likely to work more hours, drop out of a 4-year institution, have fewer credit hours, attend less selective institutions, and live off-campus. Prospero & Vohra-Gupta used that information and expanded the study to assess the relationship between success in college and first-generation students. By doing



so, they examined the disparities between first generation and non-first generation students. The hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between first generation and non-first generation college students when accounting for motivation and integration.

The participants in this study were 197 community college students. The mean age for first-generation students was 22.04 years and the mean age for non-first generation students was 23.24. Each participant completed a demographic survey including gender, ethnicity, GPA, employment status, and parental education status. 37 items asked for information about participants' college motivation and integrations. Motivation included: intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. Amotivation describes individuals who perceive their behaviors as caused by forces outside of their control. Integration variables included social and academic integration and were measured using 9 items. Motivation and integration were measured using a 7-point Likert scale with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 7 indicating strong agreement. The internal consistency estimate of reliability for the entire scale had a coefficient alpha of .89.

Results showed that there was a significant difference found between the motivational dimensions and the integration dimensions between first-generation students and non-first generation students. Academic integration, amotivation, intrinsic motivation, social integration, and extrinsic motivation account for 23% of the variance of first-generation students' GPA. Also, first-generation students who were more academically integrated into the college system were more likely to have a higher GPA. There was also a significant relationship between amotivation and academic integration. This study has major implications. First generation college students are less likely to

complete any degree, even when controlling for SES. Changes in college that promote integration may help first-generation students develop higher intrinsic motivation for education that could in turn, increase the likelihood of staying in college and graduating.

Research on achievement motivation in college has sparked interest in achievement motivation in other areas, including the athletic department. The following section will describe how achievement motivation is applied to athletic achievement in collegiate athletes.

### **Athletic Achievement Motivation**

As defined above, achievement motivation is a person's need for success or the attainment of excellence (Van de Pol & Kavussanu, 2011). Through athletics individuals are pressured to strive and excel in their sport. Previous research supports that achievement motivation is related to athletic success. It has been shown that by providing subsidies and aide to parents of low-income children, participation in extracurricular activities such as sports or religious activities can be increased (Epps, Huston, & Bobbit, 2013). Epps, Huston, & Bobbit (2013) examined the impact of an intervention, New Hope, which provided low-income parents living in inner cities in Milwaukee and work full time with earning supplements, child care subsidies, and health care subsidies. Giving the resources to low-income parents, the children were directly affected by creating pathways for which the children could increase activity participation in extracurricular activities such as sports. Children from low income families often do not have the resources available to participate in sports such as limited financial, human, and social capital. New Hope was created in order to eliminate the disparities in opportunity for low-income children compared to children from high SES families. The

study by Epps, Huston, & Bobbit (2013) examined children's participation in lessons, sports, religious activities, clubs, community centers, and service using a cross-sequential design that took place over a 6 year period. Families that participated had earnings at or below 150% of the federally defined poverty level. The parents were randomly assigned to two groups. The first group had access to services provided by New Hope and the control group only had access to services that already existed within the community. Children were divided into three cohorts including children ages 6-7, 8-10, and 11-13. The parents and children each reported the amount of the child's participation in out-of-school activities. Results of this study showed that despite typical information that involvement in activities declines beyond early adolescence, that the introduction of New Hope to low-income families had an impact on participation. Providing families of low-income with earning supplements, child care subsidies, and health care subsidies, families were better able to support their children in extra-curricular activities financially. Limitations of this study included the fact that the program only targeted parents rather than providing direct services to children as well. However, implications of this study further back previous research that although SES lies within the exosystem of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory, the children of these families are impacted by the amount of money the parent makes.

However, research on using sports to escape poverty is limited. Psychology research on motivation in athletics often focuses on the achievement goal approach. These approach goal orientations have been a large dimension that previous research has focused on including two types: mastery goals and performance goals. Individuals with goals of mastery tend to focus on self-improvement in comparison to an earlier

performance and focus on task-based intrapersonal standards of competence. Individuals with performance goals are interested in competition and seek to perform well above others. They focus on interpersonal standards of competence (Van Yperen, Elliot, & Anseel, 2009, Li et al., 2011). There are 2 dimensions of mastery goals, approach and avoidance, and two dimensions of performance goals, approach and avoidance. In both approach goal categories the focus is on obtaining positive possibilities whereas avoidance goals focus on avoiding negative possibilities (Van Yperen et al., 2009). The goal orientation approach has been widely researched in psychology.

Li et al. (2011) examined the influence of 2 x 2 achievement goals on intrinsic motivation and performance in the sport of handball. Mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals were used as predictors on intrinsic motivation. Researchers predicted that mastery-approach goals would have a positive effect on both intrinsic motivation and sports performance. They also hypothesized that performance-approach goals may have positive effects on sports performance and performance-avoidance goals would have more maladaptive effects on outcome variables, levels of intrinsic motivation, and sports performance. Participants in this study consisted of 16 top 8, 2009 National Senior and Junior High School Handball Championship teams in Taiwan. Twelve athletes were chosen from each of the 16 teams for a combined total of 164 handball athletes (90 senior high school players, 74 junior high school players) who participated. Ages of participants ranged from 13 to 19 years of age ( $M = 5.1$ ,  $SD = 1.8$ ).

Each participant completed the 2 x 2 Achievement Goals Questionnaire for Sport (Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003). This scale consisted of four 3-item subscales: mastery-

approach goal, mastery-avoidance goal, performance-approach goal, and performance-avoidance goal. The mastery-approach goal was measured using statements such as, "It's important to me to perform as well as I possibly can." Mastery-avoidance goals were measured by statements such as, "I worry that I may not perform as well as I possibly can." Performance-approach goals measured by statements such as, "It is important to me to do well compared to others." Performance-avoidance goals were measured with statements such as, "I just want to avoid performing worse than others." Each was rated on a 7-point Likert scale with anchors 1, not at all like me and 7, completely like me. The Intrinsic Motivation Subscale of the Sport Motivation Scale (Pelletier et al., 1995) was used as an outcome variable. Intrinsic motivation measures whether athletic behavior is driven by internal rewards or external rewards, extrinsic motivation. Afterward, the coaches were asked to rate the athletes' overall performance in the latest championship by stating their players' performances compared to other handball players' performances in the 2009 National Championship. A total of 16 coaches rated their athletes using the item, "Compared to other handball players' performance in 2009 National Senior and Junior Handball Championship, please rate each athlete's overall sports performance." The assessment was done using a global 100-point rating format, with the information, "The passing grade is 60."

Results of this study showed that athletes who scored higher on mastery-approach goals also rated their intrinsic motivation higher. Athletes scoring high on mastery-approach ( $p = .004$ ) and low on performance-avoidance goals ( $p = .04$ ) were more likely to receive higher sports performance ratings by their coaches. These results suggest that athletes who use a mastery-approach to athletics find their sport enjoyable, and they also

perform well. When the performance-avoidance goal was applied, there was a higher chance of maladaptive consequences suggesting that the type of goal an athlete uses has an effect on their level of intrinsic motivation in an athletic situation. This study also shows that task oriented athletes who use a mastery-approach goal would have the highest level of achievement motivation.

Additional research by Adie & Jowett (2010) examined the relationship between the four achievement goals and intrinsic motivation. This study assessed the same four goals including mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance. This study is significant because of previous evidence that the coach has an influence on which goal an athlete will adopt (Morris & Kavussanu, 2008). Adie & Jowett hypothesized that variability in athletes' perceived functioning of the relationship with their coach would be linked to variability in their adoption of an achievement goal. They also hypothesized that endorsing a mastery-approach goal would increase intrinsic motivation. The final hypothesis was that there would be a positive link between an athlete's perception and performance-approach goal.

Participants in this study included 194 track-and-field athletes (122 males, 72 females) from four British University Athletics clubs. Participants were between the ages of 18 and 31 years ( $M = 21.5$ ,  $SD = 2.8$ ). On average, participants had been training for approximately 8 years and the average length of coach-athlete relationships were 3.6 years.

Coach-athlete relationships were measured using the Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004). This scale was adapted to capture athletes' meta-perceptions of commitment using 3 items, closeness using 4 items, and

complementarity using 4 items. Each response was taken using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1, strongly disagree, to 7, strongly agree. Achievement goals were assessed using the 12-item Achievement Goal Questionnaire for Sport (Conroy et al., 2003). This scale assessed the degree to which athletes endorsed a mastery-approach goal, a mastery-avoidance goal (3 items), a performance-approach goal, and a performance-avoidance goal, each using 3 items respectively. Finally, intrinsic motivation was assessed using 12 items from the Sport Motivation Scale (Pelletier et al., 1995). This scale was adapted to assess the degree to which participants in athletics are intrinsically motivated. Participants answered using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1, does not correspond at all to 7, and corresponds exactly.

Results showed that athletes' meta-perceptions of a high functional relationship with their coaches positively by having a more committed and close relationship predicted an adoption of the mastery-approach goal, supporting the research hypothesis. The mastery-approach goal adoption was positively related to intrinsic motivation.

Research has also investigated the motivation across training versus competition and also sport. Van de Pol & Kavussanu (2012) investigated the consistencies and differences in task and ego orientations across training and competition contexts and whether these were moderated by sports type. The purpose of their study was to examine whether goal orientations predicted effort, enjoyment/interest, and trait anxiety differently across training and competition and whether these relationships were affected by sports type. The first hypothesis was that there will be a correlation between training and competition goals, and higher ego orientation in competition than in training. The second hypothesis was that there will be a larger increase in ego orientation from training

to competition in individual sports athletes compared to team-sport athletes. The third hypothesis was that task orientation would positively predict effort and enjoyment, and negatively predict trait anxiety in both contexts: individual and team sports. The fourth hypothesis was that the relationships between task orientation and outcomes would be stronger in individual sports than in team sports. The fifth prediction was that ego orientation would not be related to effort in training and positively predicted effort in competition in individual sports. The final hypothesis was that ego orientation would not be related to enjoyment in both contexts.

Participants in this study were 214 male and 134 female athletes (Mean age = 19.78 years) from a British university. Players were recruited from a variety of sports. 145 athletes played individual sports (badminton, golf, table tennis, and squash) and 203 participated in team sports (football, basketball, Frisbee, netball, rugby, soccer, volleyball, and water polo). Sports with a high degree of independence were deemed individual sports and sports with a high degree of interdependence were deemed team sports.

Each player completed a two-part questionnaire assessing either the training or competition context. Training was operationalized as athletes' general training in mind. Competition was operationalized by athletes' general competition experience. Goal orientations were measured using the Perception of Success Questionnaire (Roberts, Treasure, & Balague, 1998). This scale consisted of two 6-item subscales measuring task and ego orientations. To measure effort and enjoyment/interest, investigators used two subscales of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Ryan, 1982). Participants recorded their experiences during training or competition. Finally, investigators analyzed trait anxiety,



cognitive and somatic anxiety, by using a modified Sport Anxiety Scale-2 (Smith, Smoll, Cumming, & Grossbard, 2006).

Results showed that there was a medium to large correlations found for task and ego orientations, both showing significance at the .001 level. In the training context, only task orientation and type of sport was positively predicted on the measure of effort. Task orientation also interacted with type of sport in predicting enjoyment ( $p < .001$ ). The overall level of enjoyment was also found to be higher for team athletes than for individual athletes. In the training context, task orientation was the positive predictor in effort and ego orientation was unrelated to effort. These findings were also consistent across both individual and team sports contexts. The findings of this study suggest that athletes from both individual and team sports would benefit from promoting task orientation, a concept often paired with a mastery approach in athletics.

Van de Pol & Kavussanu (2011) investigated goal orientations across training and competition as well using tennis players as participants. The purpose of their study was to examine whether athletes' goal orientations differed across training and competition contexts. Also, to examine whether goal orientations predict effort, enjoyment, and psychological skill use differently across training and competition contexts, and whether goal orientations predict perceived improvement in the two contexts. Investigators hypothesized that tennis players with a task orientation would positively predict all motivational responses in both contexts, and that ego orientation would not be related to these variables in training. It was hypothesized that tennis players with an ego orientation would positively predict effort in competition, and this type of orientation would not be related in predicting perceived improvement and performance.

The participants in this study consisted of 116 (94 male, 22 female) tennis players recruited from 28 tennis clubs in 16 different countries in Great Britain. Ages of players ranged from 16 to 40 years old ( $M = 19.99$  years). Ninety percent of players had a minimum of 3 years of competitive experience.

The players each completed a two-part questionnaire assessing training and competition contexts. Goal orientations in both contexts were measured using the Perception of Success Questionnaire (Roberts et al., 1998) which consisted of two 6-item subscales measuring task and ego goal orientations. Effort and enjoyment interest were measured using Ryan's (1982) Intrinsic Motivation Inventory. Psychological skills, operationalized as goal setting, self-talk, and attentional control, were measured using the Test of Performance Strategies Scale (Thomas, Murphy, & Hardy, 1999). Perceived improvement in training was measured using a 4-item scale assessing technical, tactical, physical, and mental aspects of the athletes' skill improvement in training over the past year. Perceived performance in competition was measured using an adapted 4-item scale to measure perceived improvement over a one-year period (Balaguer, Duda, & Crespo, 1999). This scale was adapted to assess tactical, technical, physical, and mental aspects of the athletes' performance in competition.

Results showed that task oriented tennis players reported higher task orientation in training than in competition. Task oriented players also positively predicted enjoyment and interest, supporting the investigators' initial hypothesis. Task orientation also positively predicted perceived improvement and performance ( $p < .05$ ). This study further suggests that to enhance perceptions of improvement; a task orientation approach is shown to be significant.

Van de Pol et al. (2012) investigated the variability in goal orientations and perceived motivational climate across training and competition using football players as participants. The purpose of their study was to examine whether goals and perceived motivational climate differ, and whether training and competition contexts moderate the relationship. Both this study and previous research found that it was beneficial to look at the distinction between goal orientations and achievement in sports. Van de Pol et al. (2012) addressed the issue that the contextual influence of training and competition on motivational and achievement goals was significant. Investigators hypothesized that both task and ego orientations would show significant within-group variance across training and competition. Also, it was hypothesized that football players in particular would report higher ego orientation in training than in competition. Task orientation was predicted to predict effort and enjoyment positively and negatively predict tension in both contexts. Ego orientation was predicted to positively predict tension in competition.

Participants consisted of 410 (362 male, 48 female) football players recruited from 36 United Kingdom football teams. The mean age of the players was 21.11 years. Each player completed a general questionnaire which was divided into two sections in order to address training in one section and competition in the other. For this questionnaire, players answered questions based upon their thoughts about their football experience in both training and competition contexts. Goal orientations in both contexts were assessed with the Perception of Success Questionnaire (Roberts et al., 1998) which consisted of two 6-item subscales measuring task and ego orientations. Athletes reported when they felt most successful in training and competition contexts. Perceived motivational climate was measured using an adapted version of the Perceived Motivation

Climate in Sport Questionnaire-2 (Newton, Duda, & Yin, 2000). Two types of climate were used: mastery and performance. Each climate was measured on an 8-item scale. Finally, effort (5 items), enjoyment/interest (7 items), and tension (5 items) were measured using the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Ryan, 1982).

Results of this study showed that the football players had higher ratings in ego orientation than in task orientations. The hypothesis that both ego and task oriented athletes would show variance was supported. The significance was explained by both training and competition contexts. The hypothesis that ego orientation would not be related to effort and tension in training and positively predict effort and tension in competition was supported. Task oriented football players evaluated competence in relation to personal standards that effort, enjoyment, and tension positively predicted. The findings suggest that coaches should promote task orientation to athletes and create a mastery climate in both training and competition contexts. Promoting task orientation will help athletes achieve positive motivational consequences. It does not mean that ego orientation is always detrimental. It can be countered by rewarding personal achievement in sports.

Dewar & Kavussanu (2012) investigated the relationship between task involvement and a range of emotions experienced after competition. They examined whether task involvement during a sports match was related to emotions experienced after the match ended and the extent to which perceived performance mediated the relationship. Researchers investigated the relationship between ego involvement and emotions moderated by perceived outcomes. This study addressed the ideal notion that emotions play a part in relation to achievement goals during competition. Task

involvement plays a large part in increasing achievement motivation and is positively related to happiness, pride, and hope. Investigator's hypotheses included: 1) task involvement would be positively related to positive emotions and negatively related to negative emotions, and perceived performance will mediate these relationships, 2) task involvement would be positively associated with perceived performance and positively related to positive emotions and negatively associated with negative emotions, 3) ego involvement would be positively related to positive emotions when athletes perceived high performance and when they won the match and inversely associated with positive emotions when they perceived low performance or lost, and 4) ego involvement will be positively related to negative emotions when perceived performance was low or athletes lost and be unrelated to these emotions when perceived performance was high and athletes won.

Participants consisted of 236 male and 122 female athletes drawn from a number of teams including hockey, volleyball, rugby, basketball, American football, lacrosse, netball, indoor cricket, and water polo. Each athlete completed the Perception of Success Questionnaire (Roberts et al., 1998). This questionnaire measured goal involvement and referred to the athletes' usual achievement related criteria of success (i.e. task or goal orientation). This measure was given after a competition when the athlete could reflect on their experience. Happiness and dejection was one measure of emotion. Emotion was measured using the Sport Emotion Questionnaire (Jones, Lane, Bray, Uphill, & Catlin, 2005). Five items measured happiness and four items measured dejection. The emotions of pride and shame were measured using the State Shame and Guilt Scale (Marschall, Sanftner, & Tangney, 1994). Hope was assessed using the Achievement Emotion

Questionnaire (Pekrun, Goetz, & Perry, 2005). Athletes answered questions pertaining to how they felt about their next match, and this was used to measure levels of hope.

Perceived performance was assessed using a 5-item scale based on a measure of subjective improvement. Perceived performance examined physical, psychological, tactical, and technical aspects of performance (Balaguer, Duda, Atienza, & Mayo, 2002).

The hypotheses were supported and investigators found that task involvement was positively related to perceived performance ( $p < .001$ ) and positive emotions such as happiness ( $p < .001$ ), pride ( $p < .001$ ), and hope ( $p = .002$ ). Ego involvement was positively related to happiness and pride and negatively related to shame. Perceived performance was positively related to happiness, pride, and hope all at the significance level of  $p < .001$ . Results also showed that ego involvement was unrelated to happiness ( $p = .696$ ), pride ( $p = .239$ ), and hope ( $p = .311$ ). As they hypothesized, ego involvement was negatively related to hope at low levels of perceived performance ( $p < .001$ ) and positively associated with hope at high levels of achieved performance ( $p = .024$ ). These results provide further insight into the emotional state of an athlete and will be beneficial to athletes' attainment of intrinsic motivation. Task involvement is positively associated with perceived performance and positively related to positive emotions, providing evidence that task orientation is beneficial to the improvement of motivation among athletes.

Bullard (2012) examined if the goal setting type of 76 division III female student-athletes was related to levels of intrinsic motivation. The Sports Motivation Scale was used to measure intrinsic motivation levels. Results showed that intrinsic motivation was higher among athletes who operated with a task orientation. Also, higher levels of

intrinsic motivation was related to increased participation frequency, commitment, effort, and goal achievement.

### **Purpose**

The previous research described examined the relationship between SES and education and academic achievement motivation and SES. However, research on the relationship between SES and athletic achievement motivation is sparse. The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between these two variables.

Previous literature suggests that investigating the relationship between SES and athletic achievement motivation may allow athletic coaches be able to increase motivation among athletes of lower socioeconomic status by implementing programs aimed at academic retention. Previous research suggests that athletes who take a mastery approach orientation and are task oriented tend to show higher levels of motivation within their sports respectively. Further investigation would allow for a relationship to be examined between goal orientation and SES. Previous literature also suggested that participation in extracurricular activities such as sports is limited due to lack of ability to pay for such activities by low socioeconomic families (Epps, Huston, & Bobbit, 2013). This study aimed to determine if a relationship existed between socioeconomic status and the level of athletic achievement motivation of collegiate athletes.

### **Hypothesis**

It was proposed that one-way ANOVAs would be used to analyze the data. The independent variable was level of socioeconomic status. The dependent variable was level of athletic achievement motivation. The specific hypothesis was as follows:

1.) It was hypothesized that collegiate student athletes from lower socioeconomic status backgrounds would have higher levels of athletic achievement motivation.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

184 collegiate student-athletes (111 female, 73 male, Mean age = 20.73 years, SD = 6.199) participated in this study. Participants were recruited via email at participating universities with collegiate sport programs in Florida and Nebraska. Participants completed a demographic survey and the Sports Motivation Scale through SurveyMonkey.com. Participants included student-athletes who participated in any collegiate sanctioned sport.

### **Materials**

**Demographic Questionnaire.** A demographic survey was used to assess athletes' age, sport, race/ethnicity, gender, level of education, parental education level, parental income level, place of birth, and family composition before college (Appendix A). Each of the demographic measures collected was categorized using the same identifying information collected by the United States Census Bureau.

**Sports Motivation Scale.** The Sports Motivation Scale (Pelletier et al., 1995) was used to assess athletes' level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Appendix B). This scale measured three levels of intrinsic motivation including intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish, and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. Intrinsic statements such as "For the pleasure it gives me to know more about the sport that I practice" and "For the excitement I feel when I am really involved in the activity" were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1= does not correspond at all to 7 = corresponds



exactly). The SMS contained 12 questions that combined to form an overall score for these three intrinsic motivation subscales.

Extrinsic motivation is categorized into 3 categories on the SMS including extrinsic motivation-identified, introjected, and external regulation. Extrinsic statements such as “Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself” and “Because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life” were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1= does not correspond at all to 7 = corresponds exactly). The SMS contained 12 questions that produced an overall extrinsic motivation score that combined to form an overall score for these three extrinsic motivation subscales.

### **Procedure**

The demographic survey and Sports Motivation Scale was uploaded to surveymonkey.com and a link to the study was emailed to individual collegiate athletes participating in any sanctioned university sport. The link contained a consent form in order to complete the survey (Appendix C).

In order to collect data regarding economic status of each university student-athlete, each participant was instructed to report parental income and family composition within the demographic survey. This information was compared to the most recent U.S. Census data in order to categorize the participant into socioeconomic categories including high, middle, or low economic status.

The Sports Motivation Scale was used to examine levels of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation levels among university student-athletes (Pelletier et al., 1995).

### **Analysis**

Data was analyzed using a one-way ANOVA in order to determine the relationship between the independent variable, socioeconomic status as measured by total household income, and the dependent variable, level of athletic achievement motivation. Participants were initially categorized following the U.S. Census Bureau categories high income or low income based on the federal poverty line. Based on empirical data, participants were categorized into three more distinct groups (low economic status, medium economic status, and high economic status) based on household income. Low economic status represented participants who reported an annual parental income of \$0-\$50,000. Medium economic status represented participants who reported an annual parental income of \$51,000-\$79,000. High economic status represented participants who reported an annual parental income of \$80,000 or above. Athletic achievement motivation was analyzed using total score for intrinsic motivation and total score for extrinsic motivation.

### **Results**

The first one-way ANOVA analyzed the relationship between socioeconomic status and intrinsic motivation and did not yield significant results,  $F(2,120) = 1.841, p = .163$ . The second one-way ANOVA analyzed the relationship between socioeconomic status and extrinsic motivation and did not yield significant results,  $F(2,118) = 1.549, p = .217$ . The hypothesis was not supported. Collegiate student athletes from lower socioeconomic status backgrounds did not have significantly higher levels of athletic achievement motivation.

Post-hoc analysis was conducted in order to analyze further trends in the data which revealed that a majority of participants were White/Caucasian individuals in the middle to high income range. Post-hoc analysis also revealed that Hispanic participants scored highest in intrinsic motivation (Mean Intrinsic Score =45.0) compared to other ethnicities including the following: Black (Mean Intrinsic Score= 44.89), Asian (Mean Intrinsic Score =43.0), and White/Caucasian (Mean Intrinsic Score = 42.04). The overall mean scores for extrinsic athletic achievement motivation was highest among Black participants (Mean Extrinsic Score = 40.16) compared to other ethnicities including the following: Asian (Mean Extrinsic Score = 27.5), White/Caucasian (Mean Extrinsic Score = 35.0), and Hispanic (Mean Extrinsic Score = 35.88)

Post-hoc analysis of age showed that 79% of participants were between the ages of 18 years to 22 years old. However, the participant who reported the age of 29 years old had the highest reported overall intrinsic athletic motivation score (Mean Intrinsic Score = 51.0). The highest reported extrinsic athletic motivation scores were reported by participants 23 years old (Mean Extrinsic Score = 38.5).

Post-hoc analysis of parental level of education indicated that a majority of participants reported their mother's education level as "Bachelor's Degree" and father's education level as "Bachelor's Degree."

Post-hoc analysis of household income showed that "Middle Income" participants reported higher scores on intrinsic athletic achievement motivation (Mean Intrinsic Score = 44.16) and extrinsic athletic achievement motivation (Mean Extrinsic Score = 37.88).

### Discussion

The original hypothesis was not supported. The hypothesis indicated that collegiate student-athletes from low SES families would be externally motivated to succeed in order to find success despite economic upbringing. A large majority of the participants (70 participants) reported growing up in high-income families, or families that had a total household income of 80,000 dollars or more earned per year. The original hypothesis was based on the notion that playing sports in college may be used as a way to escape poverty. The highest number of participants within the study did not report living in conditions that would be congruent with the term poverty, which may not have given the study enough data to analyze the targeted population accurately.

Post-hoc analysis revealed that a majority of participants were raised in families whose parents earned a Bachelor's Degree, which may indicate that education has played a large role within the family since a young age. A Bachelor's Degree from both parents may indicate outside factors placed on the participant such as academic motivation in order to succeed in college academics and sports may be a secondary motivation. This level of academic achievement within the family may indicate that the participants had access to a wider variety of resources than low-income families, thus inhibiting the study from collecting an accurate representation of low-income student-athletes.

Further qualitative analysis of the data found that 54% of participants identified as White/Caucasian, 45% identified as Hispanic, 27% identified as Black, and 2% identified as Asian. According to the Federal Safety Net (2016) the U.S. poverty statistics by race are as follows: Black (24.1%), Hispanic (21.4%), Asian (11.4%), and White, not Hispanic (9.1%). Ethnic differences may account for lack of statistical significance. The

qualitative data revealed that out of the participants who reported low-income were as follows: 4.8% Black, 4.8% White/Caucasian, 5.6% Hispanic, and 0.0% Asian. These reports may not be an accurate representation of the study's targeted population. The lack of significant results may be due to participants within the study that did not represent the U.S. student-athlete population as a whole. This may be attributed to the level of institutions from which participants were gathered. Lower income participants may be found at colleges with lower tuition rates such as public universities or junior colleges.

Qualitative data also revealed that 31 participants were born outside of the United States. It would be beneficial for future researchers to include more cultural variables within the study. Cross-cultural views of motivation may differ for participants who were not raised in the United States. It is possible that participants may rate levels of motivation or view motivation differently dependent upon the values within their cultures respectively.

### **LIMITATIONS**

Limitations of this study included the lack of variables analyzed including outside factors that predict success such as social support and a lack of diversity within the participants. Very few participants were from low socioeconomic families (15.1%) versus medium socioeconomic status families (29.4%) and high socioeconomic status families (55.6%). The amount of low SES participants limits the ability to analyze the group that this study was aimed, athletes from low socioeconomic status families. A second limitation includes the level of university athletes that participated. Participants were mostly recruited from private universities, which often have higher rates of tuition.

Higher rates of tuition may provide a barrier for students from lower economic statuses from attending, limiting the number of low SES participants.

### **FUTURE RESEARCH**

Further research should expand to include a vast variety of university structures including junior colleges and public colleges in order to gather a larger sample of participants that represent all socioeconomic statuses. Future research should also include scales to analyze the level of social support that the student-athlete is receiving. Significant results may be found between SES and motivation levels if higher levels of social support were indicated by lower socioeconomic status families.

Further research should also examine the status of the athlete. For example, if the athlete is receiving a scholarship for participation he or she more have different motivators versus an athlete who is trying out for a walk-on position with no financial subsidies.

## Appendix A

**Demographic Survey****Age:** \_\_\_\_\_**Gender:** (Circle one)

M      F

**Race:** (Circle one)

Non-Hispanic White      Black      Asian      Hispanic

**Place of Birth:**

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Country: \_\_\_\_\_

**In which NCAA sport do you participate?** \_\_\_\_\_**What is your level of education at your current university?:** (Circle one)

Freshman      Sophomore      Junior      Senior

**To the best of your knowledge, please fill out/circle the following information:****Level of Parental Education: (Please circle one for each parent)**

Mother: No high school diploma

Father: No high school diploma

High school diploma/no college

High school diploma/no

college

Some college/no degree

Some college/no degree

Bachelor's degree

Bachelor's degree

Master's Degree

Master's Degree

Doctorate degree

Doctorate Degree

**Parental Income per year: (Please report for the category that best describes your family)**

Single Mother Household Income per year: \_\_\_\_\_

Single Father Household Income per year: \_\_\_\_\_

Mother/Father household Income combined per year: \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of people in the household: (please write a number)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Family Composition:** Growing up, please check the box of the relatives living in your household

- Single Mother
- Single Father
- Mother and Father
- Brother \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes, please indicate a number of siblings)
- Sister \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes, please indicate a number of siblings)
- Grandmother
- Grandfather
- Other \_\_\_\_\_



## Appendix B

## Sports Motivation Scale

(Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., Brière, N. M., & Blais, M. R., 1995)

**WHY DO YOU PRACTICE YOUR SPORT ?**

Using the scale below, please indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to one of the reasons for which you are presently practicing your sport.

Does not correspond at all	Corresponds a little	Corresponds moderately	Corresponds a lot	Corresponds exactly		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**WHY DO YOU PRACTICE YOUR SPORT ?**

1. For the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. For the pleasure it gives me to know more about the sport that I practice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I used to have good reasons for doing sport, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. For the pleasure of discovering new training techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I don't know anymore; I have the impression of being incapable of succeeding in this sport.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Because it allows me to be well regarded by people that I know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Because, in my opinion, it is one of the best ways to meet people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Because I feel a lot of personal satisfaction while mastering certain difficult training techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Because it is absolutely necessary to do sports if one wants to be in shape.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. For the prestige of being an athlete.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. For the pleasure I feel while improving some of my weak points.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. For the excitement I feel when I am really involved in the activity.                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. Because I must do sports to feel good myself.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. For the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. Because people around me think it is important to be in shape.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. Because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. For the intense emotions I feel doing a sport that I like.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. It is not clear to me anymore; I don't really think my place is in sport.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. For the pleasure that I feel while executing certain difficult movements.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. Because I would feel bad if I was not taking time to do it.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. To show others how good I am good at my sport.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. For the pleasure that I feel while learning training techniques that I have never tried before.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. Because it is one of the best ways to maintain good relationships with my friends.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. Because I like the feeling of being totally immersed in the activity.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. Because I must do sports regularly.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. For the pleasure of discovering new performance strategies.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. I often ask myself; I can't seem to achieve the goals that I set for myself.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Appendix C

Dear Research Participant:

Your participation in a research project is requested. The title of the study is Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Athletic Achievement Motivation among University Athletes. The research is being conducted by Jaci Wright, a student in the Clinical Psychology Department at Barry University, and it is seeking information that will be useful in the field of Psychology and athletics. The aim of the research is to examine the effect that socioeconomic status has on achievement motivation. In accordance with these aims, the following procedure will be used: A questionnaire called the Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Athletic Achievement Motivation among University Athletes follows this letter. I anticipate the number of participants to be 200.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: Answer the questions on a demographic survey and the Sports Motivation Scale. The questionnaire is estimated to take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects. If you are a student there will be no effect on your grades. There are no known risks involved with this study. You have the option to withhold participation, to remove yourself from the study at any time, and the option to withhold any information that you do not want to report. There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study; however, your participation will contribute to research in the area of Psychology. If you are a student you may be able to receive extra credit for your participation. Print a copy of this cover letter as proof of your participation.

As a research participant, information you provide is anonymous, that is, no names or other identifiers will be collected. SurveyMonkey.com allows researchers to suppress the delivery of IP addresses during the downloading of data, and in this study no IP address will be delivered to the researcher. However, SurveyMonkey.com does collect IP addresses for its own purposes. If you have concerns about this you should review the privacy policy of SurveyMonkey.com before you begin. Data will be kept in a password protected file on my personal computer which also needs a password to access. Data will be kept for 5 years and then the file will be erased.

By completing and submitting this electronic survey you are acknowledging that you are at least 18-years-old and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Jaci Wright, by phone at (308) 340-7609 or by email at [jaci.wright@mymail.barry.edu](mailto:jaci.wright@mymail.barry.edu). You may also contact Dr. Feldman at [dfeldman@barry.edu](mailto:dfeldman@barry.edu). You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, by phone at (305) 899-3020 or by email at [bcook@mail.barry.edu](mailto:bcook@mail.barry.edu).

Thank you for your participation.  
Sincerely,  
Jaci Wright

### References

- Adie, J. W., & Jowett, S. (2010). Meta-Perceptions of the Coach–Athlete relationship, achievement goals, and intrinsic motivation among sport participants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(11), 2750-2773. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00679.x
- American Psychological Association. (2014). Socioeconomic status. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status/>
- Balaguer, I., Castillo, I., Duda, J. L., & Tomás, I. (2009). Análisis las propiedades psicométricas de la versión española del Cuestionario de Clima en el Deporte [Analysis of the psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the Sport Climate Questionnaire]. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte, 18*, 73-83.
- Balaguer, I., Duda, J. L., & Crespo, M. (1999). Motivational climate and goal orientations as predictors of perceptions of improvement, satisfaction and coach ratings among tennis players. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 9*, 381-388.
- Balaguer, I., Duda, J. L., Atienza, F. L., & Mayo, C. (2002). Situational and dispositional goals as predictors of perceptions of individual and team improvement, satisfaction and coach ratings among elite female handball teams. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 3*, 293–308. doi:10.1016/S1469-0292(01)00025-5

- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 371.
- Bradley, R.H., Whiteside-Mansell, L. (1997). Children in poverty. *Handbook of Prevention and Treatment with Children and Adolescents*, 13-58. New York: Wiley.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. *Children and Poverty, 7*(2).
- Bullard, J. (2012) The structure of a team: The influence of goal setting type on intrinsic motivation, group cohesion, and goal achievement orientation of division III female athletes. *The Sport Journal*. Retrieved August 20, 2015.
- Choy, S. (2001). Essay: Students whose parents did not go to college: Postsecondary access, persistence, and attainment. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448899)
- Conroy, D. E., Elliot, A. J., & Hofer, S. M. (2003). A 2 x 2 achievement goals questionnaire for sport: Evidence for factorial invariance, temporal stability, and external validity. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 25*, 456-47.
- Dewar, A. J., & Kavussanu, M. (2012). Achievement goals and emotions in team sport athletes. *Sport, Exercise, And Performance Psychology, 1*(4), 254-267. doi: 10.1037/a0028692
- Duda, J. L., Yin, Z., & Newton, M. (2000). Examination of the psychometric properties of the perceived motivational climate in sport questionnaire - 2 in a sample of female athletes. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 18*(4), 275-290. doi:10.1080/026404100365018

- Epps, S., Huston, A.C., & Bobbit, K.C. (2013). Developmental changes in impacts of an antipoverty experiment on low-income children's structured out-of-school time. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(9), 1763-1774. doi: 10.1037/a0030978
- Federal Safety Net (2016). U.S. poverty statistics. Retrieved from <http://federalsafetynet.com/us-poverty-statistics.html>
- Guiffrida, D. A., Gouveia, A., Wall, A., & Seward, D. X. (2008). Development and validation of the Need for Relatedness at College Questionnaire (NRC-Q). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 251-261.
- Guiffrida, D.A., Lynch, M.F., Wall, A.F., Abel, D.S. (2013). Do reasons for attending college affect academic outcomes?: A test of motivational model from a self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54(2), 121-139. doi: 10.1353/cds.2013.0019
- Hardre, P. L., & Reeve, J. (2003). A motivational model of rural students' intentions to persist versus drop out of, high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 347-356.
- Hollingshead, A.B. (1971). Complementary on the indiscriminate state of social class measurement. *Social Forces*, 49, 563-567.
- Jones, M. V., Lane, A. M., Bray, S. R., Uphill, M., & Catlin, J. (2005). Development and validation of the Sport Emotion Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 27, 407– 431.
- Jowett, S., & Ntoumanis, N. (2004). The Coach–Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q): Development and initial validation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 14, 245–257.

- Karimshah, A., Wyder, M., Henman, P., Tay, D., Capelin, E., & Short, P. (2013). Overcoming adversity among low SES students: A study of strategies for retention. *Australian Universities' Review*, 55(2), 5.
- Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effect of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychology Bulletin* 126: 309-37.
- Li, C., Chi, L., Yeh, S., Guo, K., Ou, C., & Kao, C. (2011). Prediction of intrinsic motivation and sports performance using 2 x 2 achievement goal framework. *Psychological Reports*, 108(2), 625-637.
- Marschall, D., Sanftner, J. & Tangney, J. P. (1994). The State Shame and Guilt Scale. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Morris, R. L., & Kavussanu, M. (2008). Antecedents of approach–avoidance goals in sport. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26, 465–476.
- Neal, J. W., & Neal, Z. P. (2013). Nested or networked? Future directions for ecological systems theory. *Social Development*, 22(4), 722-737. doi:10.1111/sode.12018.
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2005). Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ). User's manual. Department of Psychology, University of Munich.
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., Briere, N. M., & Blais, M. R. (1995). Toward a new measure of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation in sports: the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS). *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 17, 35-53.

- Próspero, M., Vohra-Gupta, S. (2007) First generation college students: motivation, integration, and academic achievement, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31(12), 963-975. doi:10.1080/10668920600902051
- Roberts, G. C., Treasure, D. C., & Balague, G. (1998). Achievement goals in sport: The development and validation of the Perception of Success Questionnaire. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 16, 337– 347. doi: 10.1080/02640419808559362
- Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450– 461. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.43.3.450
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., Cumming, S. P., & Grossbard, J. R. (2006). Measurement of multidimensional sport performance anxiety in children and adults: The Sport Anxiety Scale-2. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 28, 479– 501.
- Thomas, P. R., Murphy, S. M., & Hardy, L. (1999). Test of performance strategies: development and preliminary validation of a comprehensive measure of athletes' psychological skills. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 17, 697-711.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). Social, economic, and housing statistics division: Poverty. *Allegany County, N.Y.* Retrieved September 29, 2015, from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/about/overview/measure.html>.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senècal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1992). The academic motivation scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, amotivation in education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 1003-1017.



- Van de Pol, P. C., & Kavussanu, M. (2011). Achievement goals and motivational responses in tennis: Does the context matter? *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 12(2), 176-183.  
doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.09.005
- Van de Pol, P. K., & Kavussanu, M. (2012). Achievement motivation across training and competition in individual and team sports. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 1(2), 91. doi: 10.1037/a0025967
- Van de Pol, P. K., Kavussanu, M., & Ring, C. (2012). Goal orientations, perceived motivational climate, and motivational outcomes in football: A comparison between training and competition contexts. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 13(4), 491-499.  
doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.12.002
- Van Yperen, N. W., Elliot, A. J., & Anseel, F. (2009). The influence of mastery-avoidance goals on performance improvement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(6), 932-943.  
doi:10.1002/ejsp.590
- Young, A., Johnson, G., Hawthorne, M., & Pugh, J. (2011). Cultural predictors of academic motivation and achievement: A self-deterministic approach. *College Student Journal*, 45(1), 151-163.
- Zimet, G.D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S.G., & Farley, G.K. (1998). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 30-40.
- Zuvarian, S. J. (1989). The ecology of child abuse and neglect: Review of the literature and presentation of data. *Violence Victims* 4, 101-20.