

Abstract

1
2 In high performance team sports, athletes compete with athletes from other teams (e.g., game,
3 event) but also with teammates (e.g., for playing time). The aim of the present study was to: a)
4 present a conceptual framework to further the understanding of positional competition (i.e., the
5 competition for playing time), and b) present the development and validation process of the
6 Positional Competition in Team Sports Questionnaire (PCTSQ). A conceptual framework
7 representing the inputs (e.g., individual characteristics, group processes, coaching decisions),
8 mediators (e.g., information-related processes, performance-related processes, emergent states)
9 and outputs (e.g., individual outputs, team outputs) of positional competition is proposed. The
10 development of the PCTSQ was conducted over four stages (i.e., item generation, preliminary
11 item analysis, scale refinement using CFA and ESEM, estimation of validity and reliability),
12 which included data collected from two samples (i.e., 221 undergraduate Kinesiology students
13 and 812 U Sports/NCAA team sport athletes). The questionnaire was reduced from 127 to 25
14 items, measuring positional competition across seven dimensions. The CFA and ESEM outputs
15 revealed an acceptable fit of the final version of the PCTSQ. In addition, acceptable internal
16 consistency scores for all dimensions of the scale and initial evidence of convergent validity
17 were demonstrated. The PCTSQ is a novel scale to assess positional competition for playing time
18 in team sport, which may aid researchers and practitioners to assess competitive processes within
19 high performance team sports.

20

1 Advancement of a Conceptual Framework and Instrument to Assess Positional Competition in
2 Sport Teams: The Positional Competition in Team Sports Questionnaire

3 Competition, as a social process, has been at the center of research attention in social
4 sciences for over a century (Johnson & Johnson, 2003), likely due to its omnipresence in day-to-
5 day life. Individuals encounter competition in organizations (e.g., for promotion), in schools
6 (e.g., for grades), and even during leisure time (e.g., in video games). Additionally, one realm in
7 which competition is frequently experienced is sports (Stanne, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999).
8 Coakley and Donnelly (2004) argued that competition is an integral part of sports. The
9 organization of sports is competitive, with organized leagues that provide structure and a
10 sequence to competitive events (e.g., a schedule when a team is playing another team, rankings).

11 Competition manifests itself in sport in a variety of ways. Likewise, people will engage in
12 competition in sports for a variety of different reasons, both intrinsic and extrinsic, instrumental
13 and affective. For example, Deutsch (2000) pointed out that friends might engage in a weekly
14 tennis match for the pure enjoyment of the competition. It is the engagement in the mutually
15 pleasurable/profitable activity that is the driving force of participation. In contrast, a professional
16 runner might engage in a competitive run for the sole purpose of winning and the financial
17 rewards associated with it. The reason for the engagement is the excellence in performance in
18 comparison to others. Typically, excellence in sport is often measured through the assessment of
19 one's abilities in comparison to another (Stanne et al., 1999).

20 In a sports context, Chelladurai (2012) defined these two approaches to competition as
21 the pursuit of pleasure and the pursuit of excellence. The *pursuit of pleasure* describes activities
22 in which participants engage for participation's sake. In such egalitarian sports, everybody gets
23 the chance to participate regardless of ability level. For example, athletes in a recreational soccer

1 may participate for the sake of enjoyment of the sport. In this context, the distribution of playing
2 time may be kept somewhat equal between athletes of different ability levels to give everyone
3 the chance to enjoy participation. On the contrary, the *pursuit of excellence* is characterized by
4 comparison. Individuals engage in the pursuit to win. Chelladurai (2012) calls the pursuit of
5 excellence ‘serious business’, which is exclusive in nature. That is, only selected athletes who
6 meet the ability requirements at a high-performance level may participate in the pursuit of
7 excellence. For example, on a professional soccer team, winning is an important component of
8 the overall evaluation of the coaches’ and players’ performances. In such a context, only the best
9 performing players will receive playing time to maximize the odds of winning.

10 Another important consideration about the pursuit of excellence is that competition does
11 not only take place between teams (i.e., inter-team) but also within a team (i.e., intra-team).
12 Typically, high performance teams (i.e., teams who follow the pursuit of excellence) will have
13 more players on the roster than actual playing positions available. In this case, athletes are
14 required to compete for playing time against their own teammates (Rees & Segal, 1984; Van
15 Yperen, 1992). Although there is considerable anecdotal evidence for this competition within a
16 team (e.g., Botterill, 2012), until recently the evaluation of this phenomenon in sport teams has
17 been absent from the sport psychology literature.

18 Martens (1979) argued that constructs in the realm of social psychology, such as
19 competition, should be examined in the context in which they occur. Fittingly, Harenberg,
20 Riemer, Karreman, and Dorsch (2016a) conducted a qualitative exploration of competitive
21 processes within university sport teams. The authors interviewed eight full-time Canadian
22 University Sport (U Sports) coaches from various team sports. The findings revealed two types
23 of competitive processes within teams. First, *situational competition* describes competitive

1 practice situations that vary in group size (e.g., one vs. ones, three vs. twos), scoring limit (e.g.,
2 first to seven goals), and/or time restrictions (e.g., a predetermined timeframe). These situations
3 occur on a regular basis during practices. Coaches typically structure these competitive situations
4 intentionally for developmental (e.g., tactical) and motivational (e.g., increasing the intensity and
5 enjoyment) reasons. Although there is usually a winner in situational competition, the
6 consequences for losing are minor to none, organizational (e.g., collection of equipment) or
7 physical (e.g., a set of pushups) tasks. As Chelladurai (2012) suspected, the findings indicated
8 that coaches use situational competition for overall improvement of abilities and other positive
9 team outcomes in order to pursue excellence.

10 Another process described by the coaches was *positional competition*, the vying for
11 playing time between teammates in a particular position (Harenberg et al., 2016a). There are
12 usually several players per position on the roster of high performance sport teams. Thus, athletes
13 need to compete for a scarce resource (i.e., playing time) against a specific reference group (i.e.,
14 players in the same position). Yet, in contrast to situational competition with a set end point (e.g.,
15 a score limit, expiry of time), positional competition is an ongoing group process between
16 teammates. That is, the competition for playing time does not end at a particular moment (e.g.,
17 end of a game). It is rather a continuous process of comparison that only ends when a) an athlete
18 leaves a team, or b) there is only one athlete for a particular position. Harenberg et al. (2016a)
19 note that positional competition is a process that may have important implications for team
20 functioning, yet it has not yet been examined empirically in the current sport psychology
21 literature.

22 To gain a better conceptual understanding of positional competition, Harenberg, Riemer,
23 Karreman, and Dorsch (2016b) examined athletes' perspectives of positional competition using a

1 qualitative phenomenological approach. The authors interviewed 16 Canadian University Sport
2 (U Sports) athletes in team sports. The results demonstrated that positional competition is a
3 multi-dimensional (e.g., information- and performance-related facets), ongoing group process
4 that occurs between teammates competing for the same playing time in a particular position. The
5 authors highlighted the adaptive potential of the process but also underline the need for a more
6 structured approach to researching positional competition in a sport context. To carefully study
7 this construct, it first needs to be clearly operationalized and conceptualized (Nunnally &
8 Bernstein, 1994). Hence, the first purpose of the present study is to advance a definition and
9 conceptual framework of positional competition in team sport, based on the qualitative evidence
10 and relevant literature.

11 **Defining Positional Competition**

12 The first step to measuring a construct is to define the construct being measured
13 (Tenenbaum, Eklund, & Kamata, 2012). According to the findings of Harenberg et al.'s (2016a,
14 2016b) studies, positional competition is defined as the process of teammates vying for the same
15 limited playing time in one position. It is a team process that is dynamic (i.e., varies in intensity)
16 and ongoing (i.e., does not have a clear end point), consequently lasts longer than a particular
17 static situation, and involves all agents of sport teams (e.g., the athlete, teammates, coaches).
18 There are four important considerations that accompany the definition of positional competition.
19 First, positional competition only occurs between players in the same position (Rees & Segal,
20 1984; Van Yperen, 1992). Players in different positions (e.g., a forward and a goalie) do not
21 compete directly for the same limited playing time. Second, high performance athletes desire the
22 most amount of playing time and are encouraged to strive for more playing time. This
23 competition may lead to superior outcomes because it may push individual athletes to perform to

1 higher standards, thus enhancing collective performance resources (Chelladurai, 2012). Third,
2 positional competition is an ongoing process (Harenberg et al., 2016a, 2016b). There is no
3 definite winner or loser. Rather starting/playing status may fluctuate over time. Also, positional
4 competition begins and ends with the membership on a team, given that there are more players
5 than available playing positions. Once an athlete has joined a team, vying for playing time begins
6 and can last over multiple weeks, months, and seasons, until the athlete leaves the team. Lastly,
7 positional competition always occurs with the awareness of the coach. The (head) coach is a
8 central agent in positional competition because of the associated reward power of the distribution
9 of playing time (Laios, Theodorakis, & Gargalianos, 2003).

10 **Conceptualizing Positional Competition**

11 One needs to have a clear conceptual understanding of a phenomenon before one can
12 measure it empirically (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). A theoretical framework provides a good
13 starting point in understanding a complex phenomenon (Tenenbaum et al., 2012). As such, the
14 following section provides a conceptual framework of positional competition that builds largely
15 on the qualitative studies conducted by Harenberg et al. (2016a, 2016b) and relevant literature.
16 The conceptualization of positional competition will follow the Input-Mediator-Output (IMO)
17 framework. As Mathieu et al. (2008) outlined, the IMO framework provides three main
18 advantages in describing group processes compared to other traditional framework (e.g., Input-
19 Process-Outcome, IPO, McGrath, 1964): First, the framework considers that group processes
20 never fully develop as separate entities but are consistently influenced by emergent states. That
21 is, these emergent states can be seen as cognitive, motivational, and affective states that are
22 dynamic and consistently influence inputs, mediators, and outcomes of team functioning (Marks,
23 Matthieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). An example of a common mediator for an emergent state in sport is

1 cohesion (e.g., Paradis & Loughhead, 2012), which develops dynamically and affects several
2 constructs related to team functioning (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002; McEwan &
3 Beauchamp, 2014; Paradis & Martin, 2012). Second, the IMO framework views the individual
4 nested within the group. Team members, with their individual characteristics, are influenced by a
5 team's group processes (e.g., leadership, social norms), which are nested in the larger
6 organizational structure of the team (e.g., organizational characteristics). Lastly, the IMO
7 framework captures the dynamics of group processes (i.e., they change over time). That is,
8 groups are entities that consistently fluctuate in their effectiveness and social fabric, due to
9 various internal and external influences (Carron & Eys, 2012). A larger discussion of the
10 conceptual differences between the IMO and IPO frameworks is provided elsewhere (Mathieu et
11 al., 2008).

12 In a sport context, the IMO model is well suited for the description of group processes.
13 For example, McEwan and Beauchamp (2014) illustrated its applicability to the
14 conceptualization of teamwork. Models using the IMO framework may capture the dynamics of
15 changing processes within sport teams more accurately. Moreover, these processes may progress
16 in episodic cycles (e.g., week-to-week) and may develop over a longitudinal perspective (e.g.,
17 season-to season). Positional competition, much like teamwork, is conceptualized as a dynamic
18 process within teams. It changes over episodic cycles (e.g., from pre-season to mid-season) and
19 may develop longitudinally (e.g., by changing compositions of the team from season to season).
20 Hence, positional competition will be conceptualized using the IMO framework. A model of
21 positional competition is described below and visually displayed in Figure 1.

22 *Inputs of Positional Competition*

1 Building on Mathieu et al.'s (2008) work, the anticipated sources of inputs of positional
2 competition are threefold: 1) *individual inputs*, 2) *team inputs*, and 3) *environmental inputs*.

3 Among the *individual inputs*, a multitude of cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors
4 may influence positional competition. The cognitive appraisal of the competence of other players
5 might play an important role in formulating emotional and behavioral responses to positional
6 competition (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005). In addition, the competitiveness of an athlete (e.g.,
7 enjoyment and desire to strive for success in competition; Gill & Deeter, 1988) may influence
8 positional competition. For example, competitive athletes may respond to positional competition
9 with increased motivation and performance (Harenberg et al., 2016b). The expectations and
10 goals set by the athlete (e.g., being a substitute player, desired playing time minutes, being a
11 regular starter) may influence athletes' behavior in positional competition as well.

12 The individual athletes are nested within teams that have specific *team inputs* to
13 positional competition. These are mainly structural, behavioral, and/or psychological processes
14 within the team. In particular, Carron and Eys (2012) describe several factors (e.g., group size,
15 leadership structure, task interdependence) that may influence group processes. For example,
16 teams may establish certain norms (i.e., standards that regulate group members' behavior;
17 Forsyth, 1999) that influence positional competition. That is, athletes may have established a
18 common set of certain behaviors that are acceptable (e.g., being respectful to competitors) and
19 not acceptable (e.g., trying to injure competitors) in positional competition (Harenberg et al.,
20 2016b). Such team norms may influence how an athlete responds motivationally and
21 behaviorally to positional competition. These responses have been documented in previous
22 literature (Harenberg et al., 2016b; Boroumand, Eys, & Benson, 2018). Another important factor
23 of the team is the group composition (i.e., the players who are selected for the team, which

1 comprise the team resources and talents). In a university sport context, the coach selects players
2 to join the team. The individual ability of the recruited players influences positional competition.
3 In addition, the coach assigns a position (i.e., a physical location on the field) and a task role
4 (i.e., set of behaviors associated with the position) to each player (Carron & Eys, 2012). The
5 overlap in position dictates the group of competitors for playing time (e.g., forward vs. forward).

6 Lastly, the *environmental inputs* describe factors external to the team that may influence
7 positional competition. For example, organizational structures or sport rules may influence how
8 playing time competition is carried out. In youth organizations, competitors for playing time may
9 be assured a set amount of playing time despite differences in playing ability. In professional or
10 university sport, this might not be the case. In addition, depictions of competition for playing
11 time in the media (e.g., televised discussions of playing time decisions by experts) may influence
12 how players experience positional competition. Lastly, some sports permit unlimited
13 substitutions (e.g., volleyball, basketball, hockey) whereas other sports limit the amount of
14 players to enter the game (e.g., soccer).

15 **Mediators – Processes and Emergent States**

16 Mediators in the proposed framework are comprised of processes and emergent states,
17 which interact in a team environment. Yet, the distinction between the two is important. In the
18 present conceptualization, positional competition is described as a team process, which manifests
19 in observable behaviors that reflect the nature of team member interaction, which in turn
20 influences group outcomes. Some of these observable behaviors include the setting of individual
21 goals related to playing time and seeking out communication with the coach to understand the
22 hierarchy structure within the team. As such, the processes in the present model reflect
23 information-related and performance-related perceptual processes associated with positional

1 competition. Emergent states are by-products of team experiences, which are mutually related to
2 inputs, processes, and outputs (Marks et al., 2001; McEwan & Beauchamp, 2014). For example,
3 conflict may arise as a by-product of the positional competition between established and new
4 team members (Boroumand et al., 2018; Harenberg et al., 2016b), which in turn may influence
5 behaviors and perceptions associated with positional competition. Yet, teams engaging in
6 positional competition may not always experience conflict.

7 **Processes.** Athletes described two groups of processes of positional competition:
8 *information-related* (self-evaluation, feedback from teammates, feedback from coaches) and
9 *performance-related* (teammates pushing each other to get better, and development of own
10 ability) processes (Harenberg et al., 2016b). First, *information-related processes* reflect the
11 desire of an athlete to gain information on his/her ability and competency relative to teammates
12 in the same position. The three sub-processes for information-related processes can be self-
13 evaluation, feedback from teammates, and feedback from the coach. These three sources of
14 information are central to describing information-related processes in the proposed framework.

15 Individuals tend to seek out self-evaluative information by comparison when objective,
16 nonsocial standards are absent (Festinger, 1954). This is usually the case for the distribution of
17 playing time in interdependent team sports as some performance criteria may not be objectively
18 measurable (e.g., tactical positioning). Thus, athletes will derive information of their ability in
19 comparison to other athletes. In particular, Harenberg et al. (2016b) suggested that self-
20 awareness (i.e., an athlete's perception about his/her capabilities when competing against
21 teammates) and performance expectations (i.e., an athletes' understanding of expected behavior
22 when competing against teammates) are processes of self-evaluation during positional
23 competition.

1 Another source for information-related processes is the feedback that an athlete receives
2 from teammates. In particular, athletes tend to praise teammates for good performance aspects or
3 share constructive feedback on how to enhance collective performance (Harenberg et al., 2016b).
4 Through this process, athletes may gain further insights into their ability level in relation to the
5 competitors in their position.

6 The interaction with the coach is another central source for information-related processes
7 in positional competition. In particular, there are three sub-processes in positional competition
8 with regards how to gain information from their coach: evaluation, communication, and selection
9 (Harenberg et al., 2016b). Coaches constantly evaluate their athletes' performances in a
10 quantifiable (e.g., through the use of statistics) or non-quantifiable (e.g., video analysis) way.
11 The information derived from these sources will usually be shared with athletes during
12 individual or team meetings. Another central role of the coach is to provide communication of
13 progress. The athletes derive information on how they have progressed in the competition for
14 playing time from the coach. This information may be reflective of how the athlete has
15 progressed, where the athlete can still make some improvements, and how the athlete's current
16 performance ranks compared to other players in the same position.

17 The other main set of processes of positional competition—*Performance-related*
18 *processes*—describes perceptions of performance enhancement in the process of competing for
19 playing time. In particular, Harenberg et al. (2016b) identified two sub-processes. The first sub-
20 process is the perception that teammates push each other to get better. That is, athletes strive to
21 play and by doing so they must constantly perform to a superior degree than their positional
22 competitors. The perception of being pushed and/or being able to push teammates is a key

1 component of contributing to the overall team's performance and is very much encouraged by
2 coaches (Harenberg et al., 2016a).

3 The second sub-process is the development of one's abilities through forced
4 improvement and learning from competitors. When athletes are competing for playing time, each
5 other's performances are usually the reference point. If an athlete wishes to earn playing time,
6 he/she needs to rise to and/or exceed the level of the competition in relation to their teammates in
7 a particular playing position. Performance improvements are necessary to compete for playing
8 time. During this process, athletes closely monitor the progress and strengths of competitors.
9 From this monitoring, athletes may gain valuable insights into their performances and how they
10 may improve further.

11 **Emergent States.** Two emergent states are included in the model (yet others may exist):
12 cohesion and conflict. Cohesion has been defined as "a dynamic process that is reflected in the
13 tendency of a group to stick together and remain united in pursuit of its instrumental objectives
14 and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs" (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 1998, p.
15 213). Cohesion is manifested in social (i.e., attraction to group/integration in group for
16 interpersonal and affective activities and behaviors) and task (i.e., attraction to group/integration
17 in group for instrumental objectives and behaviors) components. In the organizational literature,
18 Tjosvold, Johnson, and Johnson (2003) suggest that the quality of the relationship between
19 competitors in interdependent settings plays a central role in the constructiveness of competition.
20 Accordingly, cohesion is an integral team process that may be associated with positional
21 competition in sport (Harenberg et al., 2016b). As such, cohesion is integrated as an emergent
22 state influencing the processes of positional competition.

1 A second emergent state is intrateam conflict (i.e., “a dynamic process that occurs
2 between interdependent parties as they experience negative emotional reactions to perceived
3 disagreements and interference with the attainment of their goals”, Barki & Hartwick, 2004, p.
4 234). Similar to cohesion, conflict within teams may be experienced through social and task
5 contexts (Paradis, Carron, & Martin, 2014a, 2014b). An extensive amount of literature has linked
6 competition to intragroup conflict in educational and business settings (Deutsch, 2000; Tjosvold,
7 Johnson, Johnson, & Sun, 2006). In sport, conflict was reported as an emergent process that may
8 result in or influence competition for playing time in sport teams (Harenberg et al., 2016a,
9 2016b). Consequently, conflict is considered as an emergent state in the model of positional
10 competition.

11 **Outputs of Positional Competition**

12 The anticipated outputs of positional competition are behavioral, affective, and social
13 states within a team. In particular, these states may be visible at an individual and team level.
14 Competition within a team is a process geared towards the performance enhancement of the
15 team. As such, behavioral states may be an increase in performance excellence of individuals
16 (Stanne et al., 1999) and performance coordination efforts between competitors (Harenberg et
17 al., 2016b). From an affective perspective, positional competition may be linked to individuals’
18 adaptive (e.g., heightened confidence, enjoyment) or maladaptive (e.g., frustrations, anxiety)
19 emotions (Harenberg et al., 2016b). On a social level, positional competition may be used to
20 create competence hierarchies within the team (Boroumand et al., 2018). A key concept related
21 to hierarchies is status within the team (Jacob & Carron, 1998), particularly pertaining starting or
22 non-starting playing status. In general, positional competition may be understood as a necessary,
23 inevitable process that may influence the task effectiveness of the group. Athletes may help each

1 other, by competing, to make sure the selected player in each position brings the best
2 performance for the team.

3 It should be noted here that the presented framework conceptualizes positional
4 competition as a dynamic process that changes over *episodic cycles*. Teams may transition from
5 cycle to cycle (e.g., from game to game; McEwan & Beauchamp, 2014). Based on the results
6 (e.g., win or loss) and other contextual factors, inputs, mediators, and outputs of positional
7 competition may vary in intensity. Lastly, it should be noted that positional competition develops
8 over the course of a season. For example, in times of hierarchy uncertainty (e.g., preseason)
9 positional competition may be experienced differently than at the end of the season. Much like
10 other team processes (e.g., team effectiveness), positional competition changes over time as the
11 team matures throughout a season and may be influenced by changes to the composition of the
12 team (e.g., addition/removal of players, player injuries, coaching changes; (Matthieu et al., 2008;
13 McEwan & Beauchamp, 2014).

14 **Measurement Development**

15 Based on the conceptual framework presented above, the next aim of the present study is
16 to outline the creation of an instrument (i.e., a questionnaire) to measure the identified processes
17 of positional competition: The Positional Competition in Team Sports Questionnaire (PCTSQ).
18 The development of the instrument is described in four phases. The first phase describes the
19 generation of items and procedures to establish face and content validity (i.e., the expert and/or
20 researcher's judgment or ratings that the content of a self-report measure or item captures some
21 or all aspects of the psychological construct of interest; Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2009). The
22 second phase describes procedures of item revision and deletion to reduce redundancy. Phases
23 three and four describe procedures to enhance factorial and construct validity, demonstrate

1 measurement reliability through internal consistency, and assess convergent validity (i.e., the
2 extent to which constructs are related that should theoretically share a relationship; e.g., Paradis,
3 Carron, & Martin, 2014b).

4 **Phase 1 – Item Generation and Content Validity**

5 The goal of the first stage in the development of the PCTSQ was to generate items that
6 reflect the processes of positional competition. To accomplish this, data on coaches' and
7 athletes' perspectives of positional competition (Harenberg et al., 2016a, 2016b) and the existing
8 literature on competition within sport teams were examined. A preliminary list of 108 items were
9 generated and given to seven experts (female: $n = 4$) to assess the item content relevance (Dunn,
10 Bouffard, & Rogers, 1999) for positional competition. This group was comprised of four
11 researchers: two full professors, an associate professor, and a PhD student in the field of sport
12 psychology. All of these members had extensive experience in research and measurement
13 development of psychometrically sound instruments. In addition, one applied sport psychologist
14 (Masters-level trained) was part of the group. The individual was employed full-time to work
15 with high performance athletes in applied consulting. Lastly, two full-time head coaches of
16 university team sports were part of the group of experts. The group was comprised of individuals
17 that had experience in sport psychology and/or coaching ranging from 5 to 21 years.

18 *Content Validity.* The experts received a paper copy of the initial list of generated items
19 and proposed dimensions. Under each item, experts were invited to provide qualitative feedback
20 and suggestions for rewording via comment boxes. Moreover, experts provided quantitative
21 feedback (e.g., rating of readability, clarity, and applicability of each item on a 7-point Likert
22 scale, ranging from 1-very hard to 7-very easy) on each item. The comments and quantitative
23 scores (i.e., a score ≤ 4 by any of the experts, which is the midway point of the scale) were

1 evaluated for the revision of items. Similar procedures have been employed by previous research
2 (e.g., Cheung & Power, 2012). In general, experts agreed with the created dimension structure
3 and set of items (i.e., only few of the items were rated ≤ 4). About 5.5% of the items ($n = 6$) were
4 slightly revised in content. The experts commented on the comprehensiveness of the created
5 items in reflecting each sub-dimension. For example, for the dimension *Improvement*, items
6 reflecting more concrete performance parameters (e.g., learning team tactics, improving mental
7 preparation) were added. Other items were reworded. For example, in the dimension *Push by*
8 *Competitors*, the initial wording was changed from referring to the comparison group as
9 ‘competitors’ to ‘teammates in my position’. The intention for this change was to clarify the
10 comparison group in positional competition. The resulting version of the questionnaire had 127
11 items reflecting 13 facets (listed in Figure 1 under Phase 1 & 2) of positional competition. The
12 connection between the processes captured in the framework and the dimensions in the
13 questionnaire can be found in Figure 2. A detailed list of all dimensions and items are outlined
14 elsewhere and thus not repeated here (see Harenberg, 2014). Each facet was represented by at
15 least seven items to allow for a reduction of redundant items. All items had the same preface
16 (i.e., “Think about the competition for playing time that you have with your teammates who play
17 in the same position. In this competition...”) and were measured using a seven-point Likert scale
18 with “Strongly Disagree” (1) and “Strongly Agree” (7) as extreme points.

19 **Phase 2 – Preliminary Item Analysis**

20 After obtaining ethical approval, the set of 127 items was administered to 221
21 undergraduate Kinesiology students (male $n = 66$; mean age = 20.77 years, $SD = 2.74$ years;
22 mean year of study = 2.34, $SD = 1.20$) at a Canadian university. The participants were recruited
23 from an undergraduate sport psychology class. The participation was voluntary and the students

1 did not receive any class credit for completing the questionnaire. Most of the participants had
2 participated (97.3%) in competitive sports (e.g., local, high school, provincial level). Following
3 recommendation by DeVellis (2017), data analyses (using SPSS) included a) the examination of
4 distribution of responses, b) item mean and standard deviation, c) inter-item correlation, d) item-
5 to-total correlations, and e) internal consistency (i.e., Cronbach's α , composite reliability;
6 Peterson & Kim, 2013). These procedures were used to assess the variability in responses, the
7 reliability of subscales, and preliminary factorial validity. Furthermore, the dimensions were
8 correlated with each other to gather information regarding dimensional factor structure and
9 parsimony.

10 Initial analyses suggested some dimensional modifications. Due to high correlations
11 between the dimensions *Improvement*, *Push Self*, and *Responsibility to Perform* (all $r > .90$)
12 these dimensions were combined and renamed *Effort to Improve*. Conceptually, these three
13 dimensions reflect effort-related process within an athlete. Furthermore, the dimensions *Coach*
14 *Feedback* and *Coach Recognition* correlated highly ($r > .90$) and were combined and renamed
15 *Coach Communication*. Finally, the dimensions *Feedback from Peers* and *Peer Recognition* ($r =$
16 $.83$) were combined to *Peer Communication*.

17 Inter-item correlations and item-to-total correlations were used to limit item redundancy
18 and ensure the item ideally correlated the highest with its proposed dimension, as opposed to
19 another dimension. If individual items correlated highly ($r > .80$) they were considered
20 redundant, and one was deleted. All item-to-total correlations $< .50$ were considered weak and
21 such items were deleted (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Teel, 1989). It was the objective to eliminate
22 items that correlated weakly on their intended dimensions. However, it was also the intention to
23 have a sufficient number of items reflecting the specific dimension in its conceptual entirety. The

1 resulting structure of the questionnaire had nine dimensions (see Figure 2) with 58 items, with
2 each dimension having at least five items. All internal consistency values were satisfactory (i.e.,
3 Cronbach's α and composite reliability $>.7$; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

4 **Phase 3 – Scale Refinement**

5 In the third phase of the questionnaire development, the PCTSQ was administered to its
6 target population (i.e., university-level team sport athletes) and the resulting data were subjected
7 to confirmatory factor analysis (using maximum likelihood estimation). The participants were
8 recruited via their coaches. Once the coach granted permission for the team's participation,
9 athletes were presented with a paper-based questionnaire at a convenient time for the team (e.g.,
10 after practice). While the athletes were advised that participation was voluntary, all invited
11 athletes completed the questionnaire. In total, 812 U Sports or NCAA athletes (female $n = 389$;
12 mean age = 20.30, $SD = 1.97$; mean experience = 2.57 years, $SD = 1.31$ years) from 36 teams
13 participated. The athletes competed in soccer ($n = 262$, 32.3%, 12 teams), football ($n = 201$,
14 24.8%, 4 teams), hockey ($n = 178$, 21.9%, 8 teams), volleyball ($n = 156$, 19.2%, 11 teams), or
15 basketball ($n = 15$, 1.8%, 1 team). The large sample sizes permitted the researchers to draw
16 random subsamples from the entire sample to test and refine the structure of the PCTSQ. This
17 procedure is similar to the development process of other measures in sport psychology (e.g.,
18 Team Sport Performances Processes Questionnaire; Karreman, 2010; Athlete Satisfaction
19 Questionnaire; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Hedayat and Sinha (1991) argue that two random
20 subsamples can be considered different and distinct if they differ in the vector structure (i.e.,
21 same subjects, order of subjects) and if the same set of units from the population (or large
22 sample) were employed. Therefore, two random samples drawn from a larger sample may be
23 considered different and distinct.

1 Prior to analyses, cases with missing data were deleted listwise ($n = 73$, 8.9%). The
2 remaining 739 cases were examined; item distributions, means, and standard deviations were
3 calculated to ensure sufficient variability. At this point, no further items needed to be deleted.
4 The sample was randomly split in half. The first half of the sample ($n = 370$) was used for the
5 refinement of the factor structure. The second sample ($n = 369$) was used to confirm the resulting
6 factor structure.

7 The 58 items in nine proposed dimensions were subjected to both Exploratory Structural
8 Equation Modeling (ESEM) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using MPlus and AMOS.
9 These structural equation models were chosen over other statistical techniques (e.g., exploratory
10 factor analysis) because of an existing theoretical structure (as outlined in the framework) of the
11 dimensions of positional competition (Finch, Immekus, & French, 2016). A key advantage of
12 using ESEM is that items are permitted to cross-load on several factors, whereas CFA forces
13 these cross-loadings to be 0 (Myers, Ntoumanis, Gunnell, Gucciardi, & Lee, 2018). As such,
14 ESEM is a less restrictive estimation of model fit. However, Marsh and colleagues (2014) note
15 that “in preliminary analyses at the level of individual items, researchers should compare ESEM
16 and CFA measurement models based on the constructs to be considered” (p. 104). As such, CFA
17 was calculated in addition to ESEM. The following goodness-of-fit indices were considered for
18 all structural equation models (i.e., ESEMs, CFAs) in the present study: χ^2/df ratio (acceptable
19 fit 2-3, good fit < 2; Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003), Incremental Fit Index
20 (IFI, acceptable fit >.90, good fit > .95; Jaccard & Wan, 1996), Nonnormed Fit Index (NNFI or
21 Tucker Lewis Index, acceptable fit > .90, good fit > .95; Bentler & Bonnet, 1980), Comparative
22 Fit Index (CFI, acceptable fit > .90, good fit > .95; Bentler & Bonnet, 1980), and Root Mean
23 Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA, acceptable fit .05-.08, good fit .00-.05; Schermelleh-

1 Engel et al. (2003). For a description of the mathematical principles of each indicator, please see
2 Schermelleh-Engel et al. (2003).

3 Initial results suggested changes were warranted to the scale. First, high correlations ($r >$
4 $.80$) between the dimensions *Push by Teammates* and *Peer Communication* suggested collapsing
5 these dimensions into one, together reflecting behavioral and communication processes received
6 from teammates. The same was found for the dimensions *Push Teammates* and *Feedback to*
7 *Teammates*. These were collapsed to one dimension reflecting behavioral and communication
8 processes from an athlete to the teammates.

9 Next, the scale refinements were made based on the following criteria: (a) the factor
10 loadings of the items to its respective dimensions ($> .60$ considered very good; Comery & Lee,
11 1992), (b) the modification indices ($MI > 10$; Byrne, 2016), and (c) the assessment of inter-item
12 correlation ($r > .80$; Kline, 1993). The criteria were assessed by considering the output of the
13 ESEM and CFA. Application of these criteria led to an elimination of 33 items, resulting in a
14 questionnaire structure with 25 items, reflecting seven dimensions. Each dimension consisted of
15 three or more items, as suggested by Marsh (2007).

16 The internal consistency of each dimension was then assessed. All dimensions yielded
17 acceptable Cronbach's α values ($\alpha = .69 - .90$) and composite reliability (.71 - .90) values.
18 Following recommendations by Smith, McCarthy, and Anderson (2000), the seven revised
19 dimensions were correlated with the nine dimensions from the previous factor structure to
20 examine whether the original factors were sufficiently represented by the revised factors. For the
21 dimensions that were not combined with another dimension a strong correlation to the original
22 structure was found ($r > .90$). For the dimensions that were combined out of two dimensions,
23 slightly weaker, but nonetheless sufficient, correlations ($r > .80$) were found.

1 Finally, the factor structure was examined with the first subsample using ESEM. The
2 results indicated a satisfactory fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.67$, NNFI = .90, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .065, CI_{90%} =
3 .057 - .073). The CFA output demonstrated acceptable goodness of fit indicators ($\chi^2/df = 2.54$,
4 IFI = .92, NNFI = .90, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .065, Confidence Interval, CI_(90%) = .059-.071). The
5 results of the steps outlined above indicate that the proposed structure of the PCTSQ reflects the
6 intended content of the prior structure appropriately, is internally consistent, and valid in its
7 factorial structure.

8 **Phase 4 – Confirming Validity and Reliability**

9 The data of the second subsample ($n = 369$) of CIS/NCAA athletes from high
10 performance team sports were used at this stage of the present study.

11 **Reliability.** The internal consistency values for the dimensions are provided in Table 1.
12 The Cronbach's α values ranged from .81 to .87 and composite reliability values ranged from .75
13 to .90. According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), a sufficient cutoff for Cronbach's α and
14 composite reliability is .7. Therefore, the results indicate acceptable levels of internal
15 consistency.

16 **Correlations between subscales.** None of the correlations among the subscales (see
17 Table 1) surpassed a value of $r > .60$. Only four correlations exceeded the value of $r > .50$, with
18 the dimensions *Push by Teammates* and *Push Teammates* being the highest ($r = .57$). The highest
19 explained variance between dimensions is 32.7%. Therefore, uniqueness of each dimension can
20 be assumed.

21 **Factorial validity.** Before the factorial structure of the scale was examined, intraclass
22 correlation coefficients (ICC) were calculated to check whether the data was nested within
23 teams. Muthén and Satorra (1995) suggest that an ICC above .20 warrants a multi-level approach

1 to factor analysis. However, none of the ICCs of the items yielded a value above .16. As such,
2 the data were analyzed at the individual level.

3 To confirm the final structure of the PCTSQ, we conducted exploratory structural
4 equation modelling (ESEM) followed by CFA. For the present study, ESEM was calculated in
5 MPlus 7.2 using a target rotation with the purpose of confirming the established factor structure
6 from Step 3 (Marsh et al., 2014). ESEM revealed a good overall model fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.91$, NNFI =
7 .95, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .050, CI_{90%} = .041 - .058). The items loaded well on their intended
8 factors (see Table 2, factor loading > .50) with the exception of one item (i.e., item 21 – my
9 coach selects the starting lineup based on prior performance, factor loading = .48). Cross-
10 loadings were acceptable (<.24). Overall, the results confirmed the hypothesized structure of the
11 PCTSQ.

12 As a follow-up, a CFA with maximum likelihood estimation of the hypothesized factor
13 structure was conducted in AMOS. The factor loadings of the items were satisfactory (>.58; see
14 Table 2). The CFA output demonstrated satisfactory goodness of fit indicators of the proposed
15 factor structure ($\chi^2/df = 2.26$, IFI = .94, NNFI = .93, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .059, CI_(90%) .052-
16 .065).

17 **Convergent Validity.** To examine convergent validity, measures of performance and
18 satisfaction were collected. In particular, the subscales *Individual Effort* and *Interplayer*
19 *Coordination* from the Team Sport Performances Processes Questionnaire (Karreman, 2010)
20 were collected. The processes reflect the individual's perspective of own expended effort as well
21 as the coordination of effort with teammates. Moreover, *Satisfaction with Training and*
22 *Instruction* by the coach (Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998) was
23 measured. The scales were both administered as part of the questionnaire used in phase 3. All

1 scales had acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha > .70$). As anticipated, the correlations
2 between the measures and the dimensions of positional competition indicated significant positive
3 relationships ($r = .14 - .54$, see Table 1).

4 **Discussion**

5 The purpose of the present study was two-fold: a) to advance a conceptual framework of
6 positional competition and b) to develop and validate a measure of positional competition in high
7 performance team sports. The conceptualization of positional competition is based from the
8 current literature on competition within sport teams and the qualitative findings from previous
9 works (Harenberg et al., 2016a, 2016b) and presents a novel framework that may aid in the
10 understanding of the competition within a team. The aim of the questionnaire development phase
11 was to find the most parsimonious and psychometrically sound instrument to measure positional
12 competition in high performance team sports. The resulting scale of 25 items across seven
13 dimensions provides an instrument that is, to our knowledge, the first questionnaire to measure
14 positional competition in a high performance team sport context. It is a relatively short and
15 usable scale for a variety of team sport contexts (e.g., in different high performance team sports).

16 The PCTSQ represents two salient themes: (a) *information-related processes*, and (b)
17 *performance-related processes*. The *information-related processes* are based on the premise that
18 an athlete who engages in positional competition has a need for self-evaluation of his/her own
19 abilities in relation to the other competitors (Festinger, 1954; Tesser, 1988). These processes are
20 reflected in four dimensions (i.e., *Comparison*, *Self-Awareness*, *Coach Recognition*, *Selection*).
21 *Comparison* and *Self-Awareness* are dimensions that describe information gained through
22 internal perceptual processes of the individual. The dimensions *Coach Recognition* refers to the

1 information that an athlete gains through the feedback from a coach. The dimension *Selection*
2 describes the information a player gains through the process of being selected to play by a coach.

3 The *performance-related processes* are based on the concept that competition within
4 interdependent groups is used constructively to enhance effort by the competitors involved
5 (Chelladurai, 2012; Tjosvold et al., 2003, 2006). This idea was described by athletes and coaches
6 as ‘pushing each other to get better’ (Harenberg et al., 2016a, 2016b). Consequently, there are
7 two dimensions that reflect this notion (i.e., *Pushing Teammates*, *Push by Teammates*). The
8 dimensions *Pushing Teammates* describes perceptions of an athlete that s/he is encouraging
9 (through physical performance or verbal guidance) other competitors for the same position to
10 elevate their performance. Conversely, *Push by Teammates* describes the perception that an
11 athlete’s competitors for a position encourage him/her (through physical performance or verbal
12 guidance) to perform better. Finally, the dimension *Effort to Improve* is the perception that the
13 athlete is working to foster his/her abilities while competing for playing positions.

14 An important conceptual consideration of the scale is that it measures perceptions
15 regarding the involvement of three agents in the process of positional competition: (a) the
16 individual athlete, (b) teammates in a particular position, and (c) the coach. By competing
17 against others, the athlete gains more insight into his/her own capabilities. Teammates provide
18 normative information on how one is to compete. Teammates also guide the athlete on how to
19 develop his/her abilities further. The coach provides positive feedback and determines who will
20 play. The involvement of those three agents is important because they all influence how
21 positional competition is carried out within the team. Generally, all of these agents follow the
22 same collective goals (e.g., being successful as a team) and are interdependent in their
23 collaborative effort to achieve these goals.

1 From a technical perspective, an important consideration when constructing the scale was
2 restricting the reduction of each dimension to no less than three items. It is recommended that
3 multiple indicators (i.e., more than two) should be incorporated into the structure of each
4 measured dimension (Bollen, 1989; Marsh, 2007). Yet, factors with three items may yield
5 insufficient internal consistency in measuring psychological variables (e.g., Watson & Clark,
6 1997). However, for the present scale three dimensions were reduced to three items to prevent
7 redundancy in item wordings. It should be noted that the eliminated items, surprisingly, did not
8 correlate with each other to the extent that a deletion was necessarily required ($r < .80$, Kline,
9 1993). However, in the interest of uniqueness of the items and the brevity of the scale, the items
10 were deleted respectively. Despite Watson and Clark's (1997) concern about the internal
11 consistency of three-item factors, two of the three-item dimensions (i.e., *Self-Awareness*, *Coach*
12 *Recognition*) demonstrated good internal consistency scores (α & composite reliability $> .80$).
13 One of the three-item dimensions still demonstrated acceptable internal consistency scores
14 (*Selection*; $\alpha = .81$, composite reliability = $.75$). Taken together, these scores provide evidence
15 for sufficient internal consistency. However, future research should evaluate whether these
16 scores can be replicated in other samples.

17 Significant positive correlations between all dimensions of positional competition,
18 perceptions of performance, and satisfaction provided preliminary evidence of convergent
19 validity. Although the range of correlations was quite large ($r = .14 - .54$), we observed higher
20 correlations between dimensions that conceptually should be related. More specifically, when we
21 consider Table 2, we observe that the perception of individual effort is more highly correlated to
22 *Effort to Improve* than to any other dimension of the PCTSQ. Furthermore, we see that the
23 performance dimension *Inter-Player Coordination* and the inter-player dimensions in the

1 PCTSQ (i.e., *Push teammates* and *Push by Teammates*) share the highest correlation. Finally, the
2 *Satisfaction with Training and Instruction* dimension, which describes the satisfaction with the
3 coach's input into the development of the player, correlated highest with the coaching-influence
4 dimensions (i.e., *Coach Recognition, Selection*) of the PCTSQ. Weaker correlations were found
5 between *Effort to Improve* and *Coach Recognition* and *Selection*. Taken together, these
6 correlations make conceptual sense and provide preliminary evidence of the convergent validity
7 of the PCTSQ. These initial results provide promising evidence for confident utilization of the
8 scale going forward. However, considering that validity testing is an ongoing process (Carron,
9 Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985), researchers and psychometricians should continue to further
10 assess the validity of the scale with different samples.

11 To our knowledge, the PCTSQ is the only instrument that measures competition for
12 playing time within sport teams. Other instruments measuring competition in sports focused on
13 competitive anxiety (e.g., CSAI-2, Martens, Burton, & Vealey, 1990), motivational climate (e.g.,
14 PMCSQ-2, Newton, Duda, & Yin, 2000), and competitiveness (e.g., SOQ, Gill & Deeter, 1988).
15 The only scale that takes competition within a team into account is the Peer Motivational
16 Climate in Youth Sport Questionnaire (PeerMCYSQ, Ntoumanis & Vazou, 2005). In this
17 questionnaire, a dimension named 'intrateam competition' measures the promotion of inter-
18 individual competition by the peer group. It is measured with three items (i.e., On this team,
19 most athletes try to do better than their teammates; On this team, most athletes encourage each
20 other to outplay their teammates; On this team, most athletes look pleased when they do better
21 than their teammates). Although these items are comparable to the dimension '*Comparison*' in
22 the PCTSQ, there are conceptual key considerations that differ between the instruments. First,
23 the PeerMYCSQ was conceptualized for youth sport, the PCTSQ was conceptualized for high

1 performance (e.g., university) sport. Secondly, the PeerMYCSQ conceptualized competition
2 within a team as a facet of ego-oriented motivational climate and did not specify why the athletes
3 were trying to out-compete each other. The PCTSQ is a measurement instrument of a multi-
4 dimensional model of competition for playing time. Lastly, the PeerMYCSQ refers to ‘most
5 athletes’ and does not specify which athletes are referred to. Building on the assumption that
6 positional competition occurs between players that occupy the same playing position (Rees &
7 Segal, 1984; Van Yperen, 1992), the PCTSQ examines the competition that occurs between
8 athletes in the same position. For these conceptual differences, we argue for the use of the
9 PCTSQ to measure competition for playing time in high performance team sport.

10 The PCTSQ was designed for high performance sport teams with a focus on
11 intercollegiate team sports. The qualitative and quantitative phases included athletes from
12 different interdependent sports (i.e., soccer, football, basketball, volleyball, hockey). This might
13 make the scale more suitable for these particular team sports. From an applied perspective,
14 researchers and applied consultants could use the scale to evaluate the perceptions of positional
15 competition within a team. This information could be helpful in working with coaches and
16 athletes to enhance positive performance outcomes associated with positional competition.
17 Anecdotal evidence (see Botterill, 2005) indicates that the structure of positional competition is a
18 vital element of creating high-performance environments. Empirical evidence collected via the
19 PCTSQ might provide deeper insights into such environments.

20 In the sport context, emergent states, such as cohesion, have been considered key
21 influencing processes into the constructiveness of positional competition (Tjosvold et al., 2003;
22 Harenberg et al., 2016b). It is entirely possible that teams who stick together, socially and
23 instrumentally, find ways to mitigate some of the possible negative consequences of positional

1 competition (e.g., envy). Future research is clearly needed to test this relationship. In addition,
2 the coach plays an integral role in positional competition (Chelldurai, 2012). For example, the
3 group composition, and the way a coach develops a team and encourages and establishes the
4 norms around athletes engaging in positional competition may play a key role in its
5 constructiveness (Harenberg et al., 2016a). Yet, there is an absence of quantitative evidence as,
6 to our knowledge, this strategy is not reflected in any scales examining coaches' leadership style
7 or behavior. As such, the connection between the coaching dimensions in the PCTSQ (i.e., coach
8 recognition, selection) might provide a significant contribution to understand the role of the
9 coach in positional competition.

10 There are some conceptual limitations of the PCTSQ, which ideally should be addressed
11 by future research. The present scale has been generated for high performance sport teams in
12 which playing time is distributed competitively. The data in the present study was exclusively
13 collected from university teams. This limits the generalizability to other populations (e.g., high
14 performance youth sport, professional sport). Future research needs to examine the usability,
15 validity, and reliability of the PCTSQ in these populations. A second limitation is that this scale
16 was designed primarily for team sports. However, competition could also take place between
17 athletes in individual sports (Evans, Eys, & Wolf, 2013). The competition within individual
18 sports has different characteristics. For example, in most individual sports, there is a measure
19 (e.g., time) that provides more objectivity to the competition between athletes. Based on the
20 results, the coach makes decisions as to who is going to participate in a specific event. For
21 example, a university track and field coach may select only a few athletes of the team to compete
22 in the upcoming meet. Yet, there are no decisions about to the extent to which an athlete can
23 contribute to an event (e.g., with distribution of playing time, substitutions). Therefore, we can

1 assume that the competition in individual sport teams might look different than in team sports.
2 This should also be examined by further research. A final main limitation is that this scale
3 explicitly focuses on the competition for playing time within a team. Qualitative studies
4 (Harenberg et al., 2016a, 2016b) demonstrated that there are other competitive processes that
5 might take place within a sport team (e.g., competitive situations). Furthermore, athletes might
6 also compete for formal roles (e.g., captaincy) or recognition beyond the team boundaries (e.g.,
7 rookie of the year). There is a definite need for further exploration of competitive processes
8 within sport teams.

9 In summary, the present paper outlined the advancement of a framework of positional
10 competition and the development of the PCTSQ. The steps taken in the development of the scale
11 revealed initial evidence of content, factorial, and convergent validity as well as sufficient
12 internal consistency reliability. From our perspective, the 25-item, seven-dimension scale is a
13 unique instrument to measure positional competition in a team sport context that can be used
14 with confidence going forward. It will provide key insights into the nature of positional
15 competition in various environments (e.g., collegiate, professional) within sports.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 The authors wish to acknowledge Miranda Kaye for her assistance with the statistical analyses.

References

- 1
2 Barki, H. & Hartwick, J. (2004). Conceptualizing the construct of interpersonal conflict.
3 *International Journal of Conflict Management, 15*, 216-244. doi: 10.1108.eb022913
- 4 Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of consumer
5 susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research, 15*(4), 473-
6 481. doi: 10.1086/209186
- 7 Bentler, P., & Bonett, D. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of
8 covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*, 588-606.
9 doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
- 10 Bollen, K. A. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Wiley.
- 11 Botterill, C. (2005). Competitive drive: Embracing positive rivalries. In S. Murphy (Ed.), *The*
12 *sport psych handbook* (pp. 37-48). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 13 Boroumand, S., Eys, M. & Benson A. J. (2018). How status conflict undermines athletes'
14 willingness to help new teammates. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 30*, 358-365.
15 doi: 10.1080/10413200.2017.1384939
- 16 Byrne, B. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 17 Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in
18 sport: A meta analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 24*, 168-188.
19 doi: 10.1123/jsep.24.2.168
- 20 Carron, A. & Eys, M. (2012). *Group dynamics in sport*. Morgantown, WV: FIT.
- 21 Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to
22 assess cohesion in sport teams: The Group Environment Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport*
23 *Psychology, 7*(3), 244-266. doi: 10.1123/jsp.7.3.244

- 1 Chelladurai, P. (2012). Leadership and manifestations. In S. Murphy (Ed.), *The Oxford*
2 *handbook of sport and performance psychology* (pp. 328-341). Oxford, UK: Oxford
3 University Press.
- 4 Cheung, H. N. & Power, M. J. (2012). The development of a new multidimensional depression
5 assessment scale: Preliminary results. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, *19*, 170-178.
6 doi: 10.1002/cpp.1782
- 7 Coakley, J. C. & Donnelly, P. (2004). *Sports in society*. Toronto: McGraw Hill.
- 8 Comery, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.).
9 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 10 Deutsch, M. (2000). Cooperation and competition. In M. Deutsch & P. T. Coleman
11 (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 21-40). San Francisco, CA: Bass.
- 12 DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development – theory and applications*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- 13 Dunn, G. H., Bouffard, M., & Rogers, W. T. (1999). Assessing item content-relevance in sport
14 psychology scale construction research: Issues and recommendations. *Measurement in*
15 *Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *3*, 15–36. doi:10.1207/s15327841mpee0301_2
- 16 Evans, B., Eys, M., & Wolf, S. (2013). Exploring the nature of interpersonal influence in elite
17 individual sport teams. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *25*(4), 448-462.
18 doi: 1080/10413200.2012.752769
- 19 Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117-140.
- 20 Finch, W. H., Immekus, J. C., & French, B. F. (2016). *Applied psychometrics using SPSS and*
21 *AMOS*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- 22 Forsyth, D. R. (1999). *Group dynamics*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- 1 Gill, D. L., & Deeter, T. E. (1988). Development of the sport orientation questionnaire. *Research*
2 *Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 59(3), 191-202. doi:10.1080/02701367.1988.10605504
- 3 Hagger, M., & Chatzisarantis, N. (2009). Assumptions in research in sport and exercise
4 psychology. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10(5), 511-519.
5 doi: 10.101615.psypport.2009.01.004
- 6 Harenberg, S. (2014). *As iron sharpens iron: Understanding competitive processes in elite sport*
7 *teams* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Regina, Regina, SK, Canada). Retrieved from
8 <http://ourspace.uregina.ca/handle/10294/5583>.
- 9 Harenberg, S., Riemer, H., Karreman, E., & Dorsch, K. (2016a). Competitive processes in elite
10 sport teams: An exploration of coaches' perspectives of intrateam competition. *International*
11 *Sport Coaching Journal*, 3(2), 156-169. doi: 10.1123/iscj.2016-0056
- 12 Harenberg, S., Riemer, H., Karreman, E., & Dorsch, K. (2016b). As iron sharpens iron? Athletes'
13 perspectives of positional competition. *The Sport Psychologist*, 30(1), 55-67.
14 doi: 10.1123/tsp.2014-0131
- 15 Hedayat, A. S., & Sinha, B. K. (1991). *Design and inference in finite population sampling*. New
16 York, NY: Wiley.
- 17 Jaccard, J. & Wan, C. (1996) *Lisrel approaches to interaction effects in multiple regression*.
18 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 19 Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2003). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills*.
20 Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- 21 Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). New developments in social interdependence theory.
22 *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 131, 285-358.

- 1 Jacob, C. S., & Carron, A. V. (1998). The association between status and cohesion in sport
2 teams. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 16, 187-198.
- 3 Karreman, E. (2010). Social psychology of athletic teams: Understanding the relationships
4 between cohesion, leadership, satisfaction, and team performance. *Unpublished Dissertation*,
5 *University of Regina, Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies, Regina, SK, Canada.*
- 6 Kline, P. (1993). *The handbook of psychological testing*. London: Routledge.
- 7 Laios, A., Theodorakis, N., & Gargalianos, D. (2003). Leadership and power: Two important
8 factors for effective coaching. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 150-154
- 9 Marks, M. A.,
10 Matthieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of
11 team processes. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26, 356-376.
12 doi: 10.2307/259182
- 13 Marsh, H. W. (2007). Application of confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation
14 modeling in sport and exercise psychology. In G. Tenenbaum & R. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook*
15 *of sport psychology*. New York: John Wiley.
- 16 Marsh, H. W., Morin, A. J. S., Parker, P. D., & Kaur, G. (2014). Exploratory structural equation
17 modeling: An integration of the best features of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis.
18 *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 10, 85-110.
19 doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153700
- 20 Martens, R. (1979). About smocks and jocks. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1, 94-99.
- 21 Martens, R., Vealey, R. S., & Burton, D. (1990). *Competitive anxiety in sport*. Champaign, IL:
Human Kinetics.

- 1 Mathieu, J. M., Maynard, T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A
2 review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, *34*,
3 410-476. doi: 10.1177/0149206308316061
- 4 McEwan, D. & Beauchamp, M. R. (2014). Teamwork in sport: A theoretical and integrative
5 review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *7*, 229-250.
6 doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2014.932423
- 7 McGrath, J. E. (1964). *Social psychology*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- 8 Muthén, B. O. & Satorra, A. (1995). Complex sample data in structural equation modeling.
9 *Sociological Methodology*, *25*, 267-316. doi: 10.2307/271070
- 10 Myers, N. D., Ntoumanis, N., Gunnell, K. E., Gucciardi, D. F., & Lee, S. (2018). A review of
11 some emergent quantitative analyses in sport and exercise psychology. *International Review*
12 *of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*(1), 70-100. doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317356
- 13 Newton, M., Duda, J. L., & Yin, Z. (2000). Examination of the psychometric properties of the
14 Perceived Motivational Climate in Sport Questionnaire-2 in a sample of female athletes.
15 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *18*(4), 275-290. doi: 10.1080/026404100365018
- 16 Ntoumanis, N. & Vazou, S. (2005). Peer motivational climate in youth sport: Measurement
17 development and validation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *27*(4), 432-455.
18 doi: 10.1123/jsep.27.4.432
- 19 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 20 Paradis, K. F., Carron, A. V., & Martin, L. J. (2014a). Athlete perceptions of intragroup conflict
21 in sport teams. *Sport and Exercise Psychology Review*, *10*(3), 4-18.

- 1 Paradis, K. F., Carron, A. V., & Martin, L. J. (2014b). Development and validation of an
2 inventory to assess conflict in sport teams: The Group Conflict Questionnaire. *Journal of*
3 *Sports Sciences*, 32(20), 1966-1978. doi:10.1080/02640414.2014.970220
- 4 Paradis, K. F., & Loughead, T. M. (2012). Examining the mediating role of cohesion between
5 athlete leadership and athlete satisfaction in youth sport. *International Journal of*
6 *Sport Psychology*, 43, 117-136.
- 7 Paradis, K. F., & Martin, L. J. (2012). Team building in sport: Linking theory and research to
8 practical application. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 3(3), 159–170.
9 doi:10.1080/21520704.2011.653047
- 10 Peterson, R. A. & Kim, Y. (2012). On the relationship between coefficient alpha and composite
11 reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 194-198. doi: 10.1037/a0030767
- 12 Rees, C. R. & Segal, M. W. (1984). Intragroup competition, equity, and interpersonal attraction.
13 *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(4), 328-336. doi: 10.2307/3033635
- 14 Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire
15 (ASQ). *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 127-156. doi: 10.1123/jsep.20.2.127
- 16 Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural
17 equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of*
18 *Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- 19 Smith, G. T., McCarthy, D. M., & Anderson, K. G. (2000). On the sins of short-form
20 development. *Psychological Assessment*, 12(1), 102–111. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.12.1.102
- 21 Stanne, M., Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1999). Does competition enhance or inhibit motor
22 performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(1), 133-154.
23 doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.1.133

- 1 Tenenbaum, G., Eklund, R. C., & Kamata, A. (2012). *Measurement in sport and exercise*
2 *psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 3 Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. *Advances in*
4 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 21(1), 181-227. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60227-0
- 5 Tjosvold, D., & Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. (2003). Can interpersonal competition be
6 constructive within organizations? *The Journal of Psychology*, 137(1), 63-84.
7 doi: 10.1080/00223980309600600
- 8 Tjosvold, D., Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Sun, H. (2006). Competitive motives and
9 strategies: Understanding constructive competition. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and*
10 *Practice*, 10(2), 87-99. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.10.2.87
- 11 Van Yperen, N. (1992). Self-Enhancement among major league soccer players: The role of
12 importance and ambiguity on Social Comparison Behavior. *Journal of Applied Social*
13 *Psychology*, 22(15), 1186-1198. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb02359.x
- 14 Watson, D. & Clark, L. (1997). Measurement and mismeasurement of mood: Recurrent and
15 emergent issues. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68(2), 267-29.
16 doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6802_4

1 Table 1

2

3 *Dimension Internal Consistency, Means, Standard Deviations, and Bivariate Correlations*

4

Dimension	α /CR	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. PC - Effort to Improve	.87/.86	6.08 (.75)									
2. PC - Push by Teammates	.88/.86	.57**	5.33 (.99)								
3. PC - Push Teammates	.86/.83	.52**	.55**	5.40 (.97)							
4. PC - Comparison	.86/.88	.56**	.31**	.43**	6.01 (.97)						
5. PC - Social Awareness	.86/.82	.47**	.32**	.47**	.44**	5.54 (.92)					
6. PC - Coach Recognition	.84/.90	.47**	.43**	.34**	.12**	.32**	5.25 (1.21)				
7. PC - Selection	.81/.75	.37**	.33**	.24**	.13**	.26**	.56**	5.30 (1.25)			
8. PF – Individual Effort	.81/.82	.47**	.25**	.27**	.38**	.28**	.21**	.21**	6.18 (.76)		
9. PF – Interplayer Coordination	.72/.73	.46**	.52**	.54**	.27**	.29**	.36**	.24**	.40**	5.60 (.70)	
10. AS – Training and Instruction	.88/.88	.36**	.31**	.14**	.14**	.22**	.59**	.44**	.22**	.32**	5.09 (1.37)

5 Note: $N = 369$, ** $p < .01$, all dimensions are measured on a 7-point Likert scale, PC = Positional Competition, PF = Performance, AS = Athlete Satisfaction.

6

Table 2

Item Descriptives and Factor Loadings

Sub-scale	Item	M (SD)	CFA	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. EI	1 I am getting better at fulfilling my responsibilities as a player in my position.	5.92 (.93)	.72	.52	.09	.12	.08	.01	.01	.09
	8 I challenge myself to be a better player.	6.32 (.90)	.78	.71	.01	.11	.13	-.09	.04	-.11
	15 I am pushing myself to improve the skills required in my position	6.19 (.90)	.81	.82	.02	-.10	-.04	.12	-.04	.15
2. PbT	22 I am pushing myself to improve upon my weaknesses as a player.	6.22 (.86)	.79	.71	.01	-.02	.03	.04	.14	-.10
	2 my teammates in my position push me to work hard every day.	5.58 (1.19)	.77	.22	.72	-.04	-.01	-.07	-.08	.09
	9 my teammates in my position encourage me when I am making progress as a player.	5.49 (1.14)	.76	-.10	.90	.00	.12	.02	-.01	-.02
	16 my teammates in my position point out aspects I am doing well in our position	5.38 (1.25)	.76	.07	.59	.12	-.06	.10	.07	-.04
	23 my teammates in my position push me to work on my weaknesses as a player.	5.32 (1.21)	.82	-.05	.65	.09	-.04	.13	.17	.00
3. PT	3 I provide guidance for my teammates in my position.	5.36 (1.22)	.69	-.01	-.19	.79	.02	.07	.06	.03
	10 I am pushing my teammates in my position to reach beyond their expected performance level.	5.36 (1.11)	.76	.14	.02	.63	.03	.01	.02	.02
	17 I am pushing my teammates in my position to work on their weaknesses as players.	5.30 (1.20)	.78	.06	.25	.56	-.01	.01	-.04	.05
	24 I talk to my teammates how they can do better in our position.	5.18 (1.31)	.76	-.11	.11	.77	.02	.04	-.05	.00
4. COM	4 I am constantly trying to be ahead of my teammates in my position.	6.11 (1.17)	.71	.08	-.09	.17	.67	-.09	.05	-.05
	11 I try to outperform my teammates in my position.	6.09 (1.13)	.82	.00	-.05	.04	.82	-.01	.02	.03
	18 I strive to show that I am better than my teammates in my position.	5.79 (1.26)	.85	-.09	.03	-.07	.86	.10	-.01	-.03
	25 I try hard to perform better than my teammates in my position.	6.04 (1.13)	.86	.09	.04	-.09	.82	.05	-.05	.06
5. SA	5 I know how well I perform compared to my teammates in my position	5.33 (1.12)	.77	.00	-.03	.02	.01	.80	-.03	-.02
	12 I know what I am capable of in relation to my teammates in my position.	5.79 (1.02)	.81	.18	.06	.15	-.01	.62	-.08	-.02
	19 I know where my performance ranks in comparison to my teammates in my position.	5.57 (1.18)	.75	-.07	-.02	-.06	.07	.80	.09	.03
6. CR	6 my coach acknowledges when I am performing well in my position.	5.25 (1.34)	.86	.00	.01	.06	-.02	.05	.85	-.01
	13 my coach acknowledges when I compete hard as a player.	5.46 (1.36)	.87	.07	.07	-.08	-.01	.01	.81	.03
	20 my coach compliments me on good plays that I make in my position.	5.33 (1.40)	.89	.03	.01	.01	.03	-.04	.84	.08
7. CS	7 my coach <u>does not</u> select the athletes to play that perform the most consistent.	5.26 (1.58)	.67	.00	-.07	.07	.00	-.07	.00	.72
	14 the best performing players get playing time.	5.41 (1.38)	.85	.00	.04	-.01	.00	.05	.01	.81
	21 my coach selects the starting lineup based on prior performance.	5.27 (1.46)	.58	-.01	.05	.02	.03	.02	.13	.48

Note: EI - Effort to Improve, PbT - Push by Teammates, PT - Push Teammates, COM - Communication, SA - Self-Awareness, CR - Coach Recognition, CS – Coach Selection, CFA = Factor Loadings from CFA, 1. – 7. = Factor Loadings from ESEM

Figure 1

A Conceptual Framework of Positional Competition




Figure 2

Steps of Dimension Reduction

