Research Article

Received: 08 July 2026
Accepted: 01 November 2026
Published: 03 November 2026

Examination of Burnout and Perfectionism Levels in Physically Disabled

Mehmet Özkeskin
Karabük Youth and Sports Provincial Directorate, Karabük, Türkiye

Buşra Özcan
Siirt University School of Physical Education and Sports, Siirt, Türkiye

Ramazan Erdoğan
Munzur University Faculty of Sports Sciences, Tunceli, Türkiye; ramaznerdogan@hotmail.com

Cite this article:

M. Özkeskin et al. (2026). Examination of Burnout and Perfectionism Levels in Physically Disabled and Non-Disabled Basketball Athletes. Revista Cultura Científica, (24), pp. 2233–2246. https://doi.org/10.70517/revcc2624182

2026 © The Author(s). Published by Revista Cultura Científica. This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract

This study comparatively examines athlete burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism among basketball athletes with and without physical disabilities and investigates the relationships between these psychological variables within each group. A cross-sectional correlational survey design was used. The sample comprised 205 athletes, including 86 athletes with physical disabilities and 119 athletes without physical disabilities. Data were collected using a personal information form, the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, and the Turkish adaptation of the Athlete Burnout Questionnaire. Independent-samples t tests and Pearson correlation analyses were used to evaluate the reported scores. Athletes without physical disabilities had significantly higher overall burnout scores and emotional/physical exhaustion scores than athletes with physical disabilities. They also had higher overall perfectionism scores and higher scores for concern over mistakes, perceived family pressure, and personal standards. Within both groups, overall burnout scores were positively correlated with each burnout subscale, and overall perfectionism scores were positively correlated with each perfectionism subscale. However, the burnout subscales were not significantly correlated with one another. Overall burnout was not significantly correlated with overall perfectionism or any perfectionism subscale in either group. Among athletes without physical disabilities, reduced accomplishment was positively associated with concern over mistakes ($r = 0.240$, $p = 0.009$), representing an exception to the otherwise nonsignificant associations between the two constructs. These findings describe differences within the sampled basketball athletes and do not establish that disability status causes psychological differences. Performance expectations, training demands, and environmental conditions are possible explanations that require direct investigation. The results support assessing distinct psychological dimensions separately, while the cross-sectional design, unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and unresolved reporting details require cautious interpretation.

Keywords: Burnout, perfectionism, athletes with physical disabilities, basketball, sports psychology

1. INTRODUCTION

Sport can support physical development, psychological adjustment, and social participation, while intense competition and demanding performance expectations may also expose athletes to substantial psychological strain. Burnout and perfectionism are particularly relevant to understanding these experiences, although comparative evidence concerning basketball athletes with and without physical disabilities remains limited. Freudenberger [1] described burnout in a study of staff experiences, emphasizing exhaustion, depleted energy, and declining motivation. This occupational account provided an early foundation for subsequent research, but its application to athletes requires attention to the distinctive demands and meanings of sport. Raedeke [2] subsequently conceptualized athlete burnout through a sport commitment perspective, distinguishing physical/emotional exhaustion, a reduced sense of accomplishment, and sport devaluation. These dimensions concern related aspects of an athlete's experience, although they need not display identical relationships with every personal or environmental characteristic.

Perfectionism involves demanding standards and critical evaluations of performance, including the way individuals respond to perceived mistakes and expectations from others. In sport psychology, a useful distinction separates perfectionistic strivings, which involve pursuing high personal standards, from perfectionistic concerns, which involve negative reactions to imperfection and perceived external pressure. These dimensions should not be treated as interchangeable indicators of psychological risk. Research on basketball players has associated dimensions of perfectionism with tripartite efficacy perceptions, suggesting that individual standards and concerns may relate to how athletes evaluate their own capabilities and their relationships with others [3]. Research on adult athletes has also examined perfectionism and mental toughness as predictors of intolerance of uncertainty [4]. Such findings connect perfectionism with broader psychological processes, without demonstrating that the same pattern necessarily occurs in every sport or disability group.

Longitudinal evidence further illustrates the importance of distinguishing perfectionism dimensions. Madigan, Stoeber, and Passfield [5] followed 101 junior athletes over three months and examined changes in burnout in relation to perfectionistic strivings and concerns. Their findings associated perfectionistic concerns with increasing burnout and perfectionistic strivings with decreasing burnout over time. These results suggest potentially different risk and protective patterns, although the interpretation depends on the dimensions assessed and the analytical model used. In a meta-analysis of 43 studies, Hill and Curran [6] similarly found that perfectionistic concerns showed positive associations with burnout, whereas perfectionistic strivings generally showed smaller negative or nonsignificant associations. This distinction provides a reason to examine subscale scores rather than relying exclusively on a combined perfectionism score. It also suggests that an overall score may conceal relationships that operate differently across specific psychological dimensions.

For athletes with physical disabilities, burnout and perfectionism need to be considered within the opportunities and demands of their sporting environments. Participation may contribute to identity, social involvement, and well-being, while psychological experiences can vary substantially between individuals and competitive settings. Ferreira et al. [7] systematically reviewed burnout and coping in athletes with disabilities using PRISMA 2020 guidance and searches across six databases. Their review included eight studies and identified associations of burnout with socially prescribed perfectionism and sleep. Coping was examined in relation to motivation, engagement, psychological symptoms, performance, and classification. The limited evidence base in that review supports further investigation without assuming that athletes with disabilities constitute a psychologically uniform group. Differences in access to sport, coaching environments, competition demands, and personal circumstances may be relevant, but those factors require appropriate measurement before their explanatory contribution can be established.

Comparing basketball athletes with and without physical disabilities may therefore contribute to a more differentiated understanding of burnout and perfectionism. However, a comparison organized around disability status cannot, by itself, establish that disability explains any observed difference. Group composition, training arrangements, competitive level, and unmeasured psychosocial characteristics may also influence the findings. Moreover, evidence for a difference in average scores is distinct from evidence for a relationship between burnout and perfectionism within either group. The present study addresses both questions by comparing overall and subscale scores and examining within-group correlations. Its purpose is to describe burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism among the sampled basketball athletes, identify reported differences by disability status, and examine whether these constructs are related within each group. Additional comparisons by gender, weekly training frequency, and employment status provide descriptive context for the principal analyses and are interpreted as exploratory findings.

2. METHODS

The study used a cross-sectional correlational survey design within a quantitative research framework. The sample comprised basketball athletes with and without physical disabilities; the analyses compare reported psychological scores rather than establishing causal effects of disability status. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics regarding the sociodemographic characteristics and sports participation status of the individuals participating in the study. Overall, 32.7% of the

participants were female (n=67) and 67.3% were male (n=138), so male athletes constituted the majority of the sample. Regarding weekly training frequency, 30.2% of participants trained 1–2 days a week (n=62), 33.7% trained 3–4 days a week (n=69), and 36.1% trained 4–5 days a week (n=74). In terms of disability status, 42.0% of participants had physical disabilities (n=86), while 58.0% did not have physical disabilities (n=119). Regarding employment status, 22.4% of participants were employed (n=46), 25.9% were unemployed (n=53), and 51.7% were students (n=106). The average age of the participants was 22.19 ± 3.58 years, ranging from 16 to 29 years. The mean duration of sport participation was 4.65 ± 3.40 years, and participants reported between 1 and 15 years of sport experience.

Table 1. *Sociodemographic And Sport Participation Characteristics Of Participants*

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	67	32.7
	Male	138	67.3
Weekly training frequency	1–2 days	62	30.2
	3–4 days	69	33.7
	4–5 days	74	36.1
Disability status	With physical disabilities	86	42.0
	Without physical disabilities	119	58.0
Employment status	Employed	46	22.4
	Unemployed	53	25.9
	Student	106	51.7
Characteristic		Mean ± SD	Min.–max.
Age (years)		22.19 ± 3.58	16–29
Sport participation (years)		4.65 ± 3.40	1–15

SD = standard deviation. Training-frequency categories are retained as supplied; the overlap between 3–4 and 4–5 days requires clarification.

Ethical approval for this research was granted by the Siirt University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee under decision number 9227, dated 03/06/2025. The source manuscript does not describe recruitment procedures, data-collection dates, participant consent, or, where applicable, parental consent and participant assent for minors; these details require confirmation before publication.

A personal information form prepared for the study collected demographic and sport participation information, including gender, weekly training frequency, disability status, employment status, age, and years of participation in sport. Weekly training categories are reproduced as supplied. Because the categories of 3–4 and 4–5 days overlap, their original definitions require clarification; the recorded group assignments have not been altered.

Perfectionism was assessed using the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, developed by Dunn, Dunn, and Syrotuik [8] and adapted into Turkish by Çepikkurt [9]. The version described in the manuscript contains 19 items rated on a five-point Likert scale, covering concern over mistakes (seven items), personal standards (six items), and perceived family pressure (six items). In Çepikkurt's adaptation, the reported internal consistency coefficients for these subscales were 0.76, 0.76, and 0.77, respectively. The corresponding coefficients in the present study were 0.80, 0.78, and 0.84. These values indicate the internal consistency reported for the current sample; they do not establish equivalence of measurement across disability groups. Perfectionism results are presented as the supplied overall and subscale scores.

Athlete burnout was measured using the Athlete Burnout Questionnaire, developed by Raedeke and Smith [10], which originally contains 15 items rated on a five-point Likert scale. The Turkish adaptation is titled the Athlete Burnout Scale [11]; the present manuscript reports using its 13-item form after the removal of two items. The three dimensions are reduced accomplishment, emotional/physical exhaustion, and sport devaluation. The latter corresponds to the dimension inconsistently translated as sport devaluation or desensitization in the original manuscript; the term sport devaluation is used consistently here. Cronbach's alpha coefficients in this sample were 0.76 for reduced accomplishment, 0.79 for emotional/physical exhaustion, and 0.60 for sport devaluation. The comparatively low coefficient for sport devaluation warrants caution when interpreting associations involving that subscale. The scoring procedure, reverse scoring where applicable, and calculation of the overall burnout score should be confirmed against the instrument instructions and original analysis output.

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 31.0. Descriptive statistics are reported as frequencies (n), percentages, means, standard deviations (SDs), and observed minimum and maximum values. Skewness and kurtosis were examined as descriptive indicators of distributional shape, with values between -1.5 and $+1.5$ treated as the study's screening criterion. Tabachnick and Fidell [12] provide general guidance on evaluating distributional assumptions in statistical analysis; meeting this numerical screening criterion alone does not prove normality or verify every assumption of the analyses. The reported comparisons used independent-samples t tests, and Pearson correlation coefficients were used to examine within-group associations. Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < 0.05$. The manuscript does not specify variance-equality checks, the use of pooled-variance versus Welch tests, handling of missing observations, or adjustments for multiple comparisons. Accordingly, the reported tests are retained, subgroup analyses are treated as

exploratory, and individual p values should be interpreted in the context of the number of comparisons performed.

3. RESULTS

The results describe questionnaire scores rather than clinical diagnoses or established thresholds of psychological impairment. A statistically significant group difference indicates evidence of a difference in the reported score distributions under the specified analysis; it does not, by itself, establish the practical importance of that difference. Likewise, a nonsignificant comparison should not be interpreted as demonstrating equivalence between groups. No equivalence tests or prespecified margins were reported. The subgroup tables retain the original category assignments and numerical estimates so that the findings can be checked against the underlying dataset and statistical output. Interpretation therefore emphasizes the direction and pattern of the reported results, while recognizing the uncertainty arising from the available methodological information and the absence of confidence intervals.

Table 2 summarizes the overall and subscale scores, observed ranges, and distributional indicators for the two instruments. The mean overall burnout score was 2.95 ± 0.36, with observed values ranging from 2.00 to 3.85. The mean overall perfectionism score was 51.97 ± 6.60, with observed values ranging from 38 to 72. All reported skewness and kurtosis values were within the study's prespecified screening interval of -1.5 to $+1.5$. These descriptive results provide no indication of pronounced asymmetry or extreme kurtosis in the combined sample, but do not establish normality within every subgroup or verify independence and equal variances. The two scales use different scoring formats, so their numerical magnitudes should not be compared directly.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics And Distributional Indicators For Study Measures*

Measure	Mean ± SD	Min.–max.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Overall burnout	2.95 ± 0.36	2–3.85	0.062	-0.126
Reduced accomplishment	2.94 ± 0.69	1.5–5	0.080	-0.105
Emotional/physical exhaustion	2.97 ± 0.55	1.4–4.4	0.099	-0.011
Sport devaluation	2.95 ± 0.66	1.25–5	0.261	0.039
Overall perfectionism	51.97 ± 6.60	38–72	0.444	0.085
Concern over mistakes	19.27 ± 3.75	11–33	0.560	0.404
Perceived family pressure	16.33 ± 3.09	10–26	0.503	0.020
Personal standards	16.36 ± 3.28	9–25	0.372	-0.330

SD = standard deviation. Ranges are observed values. Burnout is reported on the supplied mean-score metric; perfectionism is reported on the supplied summed-score metric.

Table 3 shows the results of the independent-samples t tests comparing the levels of athlete burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism among participants based on their physical disability status. A statistically significant difference was found between the groups in terms of the total score of the Athlete Burnout Scale ($t = 4.836$, $p < 0.001$). The mean burnout score for athletes without physical disabilities was 3.05 (SD=0.37), while the mean score for athletes with physical disabilities was 2.82 (SD=0.29). When the subscales were examined, a statistically significant difference was also observed between the groups in terms of emotional/physical exhaustion scores ($t = 4.715$, $p < 0.001$). The mean score for athletes without physical disabilities in this dimension was 3.11 (SD=0.59), while the mean score for athletes with physical disabilities was 2.76 (SD=0.42). No statistically significant difference was found between the groups in the subscales of reduced accomplishment ($t = 1.566$, $p = 0.119$) and sport devaluation ($t = 1.872$, $p = 0.063$). The reduced accomplishment score was 2.85 (SD=0.59) in athletes with physical disabilities and 3.01 (SD=0.74) in athletes without physical disabilities; the sport devaluation score was 2.85 (SD=0.60) and 3.02 (SD=0.69), respectively.

Table 3. *Comparison Of Athlete Burnout And Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Levels According To Disability Status*

Measure / Subgroup	n (W/Wo)	With disability	Without disability	$\lvert t \rvert$	p
Overall burnout	86/119	2.82 ± 0.29	3.05 ± 0.37	4.836	< 0.001
Reduced accomplishment	86/119	2.85 ± 0.59	3.01 ± 0.74	1.566	0.119
Emotional/physical exhaustion	86/119	2.76 ± 0.42	3.11 ± 0.59	4.715	< 0.001
Sport devaluation	86/119	2.85 ± 0.60	3.02 ± 0.69	1.872	0.063
Overall perfectionism	86/119	47.88 ± 4.73	54.92 ± 6.19	8.835	< 0.001
Concern over mistakes	86/119	17.70 ± 2.79	20.41 ± 3.94	5.468	< 0.001
Perceived family pressure	86/119	15.08 ± 2.47	17.24 ± 3.18	5.238	< 0.001
Personal standards	86/119	15.10 ± 2.59	17.27 ± 3.42	4.927	< 0.001

Values are mean ± SD. W/Wo = with/without physical disabilities. The reported t statistics are presented as magnitudes; all supplied means, SDs, sample sizes, and p values are retained. The test specification and original output require verification.

A statistically significant difference was found between the groups in terms of the total score of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale ($t = 8.835$, $p < 0.001$). The mean score of athletes without physical disabilities

was 54.92 (SD=6.19), and the mean score of athletes with physical disabilities was 47.88 (SD=4.73). When the subscales were examined, statistically significant differences were found between the groups in the dimensions of concern over mistakes ($t = 5.468$, $p < 0.001$), perceived family pressure ($t = 5.238$, $p < 0.001$), and personal standards ($t = 4.927$, $p < 0.001$). It was observed that athletes without physical disabilities had higher average scores in these dimensions. The score for concern over mistakes was 17.70 (SD=2.79) in athletes with physical disabilities and 20.41 (SD=3.94) in athletes without physical disabilities; the perceived family pressure score was 15.08 (SD=2.47) and 17.24 (SD=3.18) respectively; and the personal standards score was 15.10 (SD=2.59) and 17.27 (SD=3.42) respectively.

Table 4 shows the results of the independent-samples t tests comparing the levels of athlete burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism among participants according to gender and physical disability status. A statistically significant difference was found in the total score of the Athlete Burnout Scale within both female and male athletes when compared by physical disability status. In female athletes, the mean score for those without physical disabilities was 3.11 (SD=0.41), while the mean score for those with physical disabilities was 2.86 (SD=0.20), and the difference was statistically significant ($t = 2.973$, $p = 0.004$). Similarly, in male athletes, the mean score for those without physical disabilities was 3.02 (SD=0.36), while the mean score for those with physical disabilities was 2.79 (SD=0.33), and the difference between the groups was statistically significant ($t = 3.830$, $p < 0.001$). When the subscales were examined, a significant difference was found between the groups in terms of emotional/physical exhaustion scores in women ($t = 2.430$, $p = 0.018$) and men ($t = 4.041$, $p < 0.001$). The mean score for female athletes without physical disabilities was 3.07 (SD=0.61), and for those with physical disabilities it was 2.74 (SD=0.41); for male athletes, the mean scores were 3.14 (SD=0.58) and 2.77 (SD=0.42), respectively. No statistically significant difference was found between the groups in either women or men in the subscales of reduced accomplishment and sport devaluation ($p > 0.05$).

Table 4. *Comparison Of Athlete Burnout And Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Levels By Gender And Disability Status*

Measure / Subgroup	n (W/Wo)	With disability	Without disability	$\lvert t \rvert$	p
Overall burnout					
Female	28/39	2.86 ± 0.20	3.11 ± 0.41	2.973	0.004
Male	58/80	2.79 ± 0.33	3.02 ± 0.36	3.830	< 0.001
Reduced accomplishment					
Female	28/39	2.96 ± 0.55	3.13 ± 0.71	1.063	0.292
Male	58/80	2.80 ± 0.61	2.94 ± 0.76	1.179	0.240
Emotional/physical exhaustion					
Female	28/39	2.74 ± 0.41	3.07 ± 0.61	2.430	0.018
Male	58/80	2.77 ± 0.42	3.14 ± 0.58	4.041	< 0.001
Sport devaluation					
Female	28/39	2.91 ± 0.54	3.14 ± 0.83	1.288	0.202
Male	58/80	2.81 ± 0.63	2.96 ± 0.60	1.362	0.175
Overall perfectionism					
Female	28/39	48.29 ± 4.52	55.13 ± 6.04	5.056	< 0.001
Male	58/80	47.69 ± 4.86	54.81 ± 6.29	7.204	< 0.001
Concern over mistakes					
Female	28/39	18.29 ± 2.71	21.64 ± 4.40	3.576	< 0.001
Male	58/80	17.41 ± 2.81	19.81 ± 3.58	4.242	< 0.001
Perceived family pressure					
Female	28/39	14.64 ± 2.47	16.38 ± 2.96	2.541	0.013
Male	58/80	15.29 ± 2.46	17.65 ± 3.22	4.667	< 0.001
Personal standards					
Female	28/39	15.36 ± 2.47	17.10 ± 2.95	2.556	0.013
Male	58/80	14.98 ± 2.67	17.35 ± 3.65	4.193	< 0.001

Values are mean ± SD. W/Wo = with/without physical disabilities. The reported t statistics are presented as magnitudes; all supplied means, SDs, sample sizes, and p values are retained. The test specification and original output require verification.

A statistically significant difference was observed in the total score of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale in both women and men according to their physical disability status. In female athletes, the mean score for those without physical disabilities was 55.13 (SD=6.04), while the mean score for those with physical disabilities was 48.29 (SD=4.52), with a statistically significant difference ($t = 5.056$, $p < 0.001$). In male athletes, the mean score for those without physical disabilities was 54.81 (SD=6.29), and the mean score for those with physical disabilities was 47.69 (SD=4.86), with a statistically significant difference ($t = 7.204$, $p < 0.001$). Statistically significant differences were

found in both women and men regarding the dimensions of concern over mistakes, perceived family pressure, and personal standards, depending on the status of physical disability. In all of these dimensions, the mean scores of athletes without physical disabilities were higher. For example, the score for concern over mistakes was 21.64 (SD=4.40) and 18.29 (SD=2.71) for female athletes without and with physical disabilities, respectively; in male athletes, the scores were found to be 19.81 (SD=3.58) and 17.41 (SD=2.81). Similarly, it was observed that athletes without physical disabilities had higher average scores in the dimensions of perceived family pressure and personal standards.

In the comparison based on weekly training frequency (Table 5), it was found that athletes without physical disabilities had higher total scores in terms of athlete burnout across all training-frequency categories, and this difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Similarly, in the emotional/physical exhaustion dimension, it was observed that athletes without physical disabilities had higher average scores across all training-frequency categories ($p < 0.05$). While a significant difference was found only in athletes training 3-4 days a week in the sport devaluation dimension ($p = 0.006$), no statistically significant difference was found between the groups in the reduced accomplishment dimension ($p > 0.05$). In terms of the total score of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, it was observed that athletes without physical disabilities had significantly higher average scores across all training-frequency categories ($p < 0.001$). When the subscales were examined, it was seen that the dimensions of concern over mistakes, perceived family pressure, and personal standards showed significant differences in some training groups, and the corresponding mean scores were higher among athletes without physical disabilities.

Table 5. *Comparison Of Athlete Burnout And Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Levels According To Weekly Training Frequency And Disability Status*

Measure / Subgroup	n (W/Wo)	With disability	Without disability	$\lvert t \rvert$	p
Overall burnout					
1–2 days	25/37	2.83 ± 0.28	3.05 ± 0.36	2.575	0.012
3–4 days	30/39	2.78 ± 0.23	3.06 ± 0.41	3.363	< 0.001
4–5 days	31/43	2.84 ± 0.36	3.04 ± 0.36	2.392	0.019
Reduced accomplishment					
1–2 days	25/37	2.79 ± 0.56	2.97 ± 0.75	1.036	0.304
3–4 days	30/39	3.02 ± 0.56	3.08 ± 0.72	0.419	0.677
4–5 days	31/43	2.75 ± 0.63	2.97 ± 0.77	1.279	0.205
Emotional/physical exhaustion					
1–2 days	25/37	2.82 ± 0.41	3.09 ± 0.58	2.046	0.045
3–4 days	30/39	2.70 ± 0.43	3.02 ± 0.49	2.827	0.006
4–5 days	31/43	2.78 ± 0.41	3.21 ± 0.67	3.192	0.002
Sport devaluation					
1–2 days	25/37	2.88 ± 0.60	3.07 ± 0.71	1.081	0.284
3–4 days	30/39	2.65 ± 0.50	3.09 ± 0.73	2.819	0.006
4–5 days	31/43	3.01 ± 0.66	2.91 ± 0.62	0.635	0.527
Overall perfectionism					
1–2 days	25/37	47.28 ± 5.44	54.46 ± 6.50	4.548	< 0.001
3–4 days	30/39	48.27 ± 4.44	55.56 ± 5.91	5.644	< 0.001
4–5 days	31/43	48.00 ± 4.51	54.72 ± 6.25	5.102	< 0.001
Concern over mistakes					
1–2 days	25/37	18.48 ± 2.96	19.76 ± 4.49	1.249	0.216
3–4 days	30/39	17.60 ± 2.72	22.08 ± 3.00	6.388	< 0.001
4–5 days	31/43	17.16 ± 2.66	19.47 ± 3.79	2.903	0.005
Perceived family pressure					
1–2 days	25/37	13.96 ± 2.49	17.22 ± 2.73	4.770	< 0.001
3–4 days	30/39	15.53 ± 2.47	16.95 ± 3.69	1.809	0.075
4–5 days	31/43	15.55 ± 2.22	17.51 ± 3.10	3.014	0.004
Personal standards					
1–2 days	25/37	14.84 ± 2.56	17.49 ± 3.57	3.189	0.002
3–4 days	30/39	15.13 ± 2.79	16.54 ± 3.52	1.794	0.077
4–5 days	31/43	15.29 ± 2.49	17.74 ± 3.16	3.588	< 0.001

Values are mean $\pm$ SD. W/Wo = with/without physical disabilities. The reported t statistics are presented as magnitudes; all supplied means, SDs, sample sizes, and p values are retained. The test specification and original output require verification.

Table 6 presents comparisons by employment and disability status. Among employed athletes and students, overall burnout scores were significantly higher in athletes without physical disabilities ($p < 0.05$). The corresponding difference among unemployed athletes was not statistically significant ($p = 0.108$). Emotional/physical exhaustion scores were higher among athletes without physical disabilities in each employment category, with reported p values below 0.05. No statistically significant disability-group differences were reported for reduced accomplishment or sport devaluation within these categories. Overall perfectionism scores were significantly higher among athletes without physical disabilities across all three categories (all reported $p < 0.001$). Concern over mistakes differed significantly in unemployed athletes and students, but not in employed athletes ($p = 0.304$). Perceived family pressure and personal standards showed reported differences in every employment category. These comparisons describe disability-group differences within each category; they do not test whether employment status modifies the relationship between disability status and psychological scores.

Table 6. *Comparison Of Athlete Burnout And Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Levels According To Employment And Disability Status*

Measure / Subgroup	n (W/Wo)	With disability	Without disability	$\|t\|$	p
Overall burnout					
Employed	18/28	2.84 ± 0.26	3.10 ± 0.39	2.526	0.015
Unemployed	18/35	2.82 ± 0.35	3.00 ± 0.40	1.634	0.108
Student	50/56	2.81 ± 0.29	3.06 ± 0.36	3.971	< 0.001
Reduced accomplishment					
Employed	18/28	2.94 ± 0.57	3.09 ± 0.83	0.648	0.520
Unemployed	18/35	2.87 ± 0.53	2.96 ± 0.71	0.471	0.640
Student	50/56	2.81 ± 0.63	2.99 ± 0.73	1.324	0.188
Emotional/physical exhaustion					
Employed	18/28	2.81 ± 0.38	3.16 ± 0.66	2.046	0.047
Unemployed	18/35	2.64 ± 0.43	3.03 ± 0.62	2.366	0.022
Student	50/56	2.79 ± 0.43	3.14 ± 0.54	3.701	< 0.001
Sport devaluation					
Employed	18/28	2.76 ± 0.48	3.03 ± 0.73	1.347	0.185
Unemployed	18/35	2.97 ± 0.69	2.99 ± 0.69	0.103	0.918
Student	50/56	2.83 ± 0.61	3.03 ± 0.68	1.598	0.113
Overall perfectionism					
Employed	18/28	47.33 ± 5.36	53.54 ± 5.73	3.675	< 0.001
Unemployed	18/35	47.11 ± 4.90	56.06 ± 6.55	5.100	< 0.001
Student	50/56	48.36 ± 4.48	54.89 ± 6.14	6.195	< 0.001
Concern over mistakes					
Employed	18/28	18.50 ± 2.26	19.54 ± 3.81	1.041	0.304
Unemployed	18/35	17.22 ± 2.39	20.69 ± 4.32	3.151	0.003
Student	50/56	17.58 ± 3.07	20.68 ± 3.77	4.608	< 0.001
Perceived family pressure					
Employed	18/28	14.28 ± 2.74	16.43 ± 2.91	2.501	0.016
Unemployed	18/35	14.83 ± 2.26	17.66 ± 3.58	3.042	0.004
Student	50/56	15.46 ± 2.41	17.37 ± 3.03	3.572	< 0.001
Personal standards					
Employed	18/28	14.56 ± 2.64	17.57 ± 3.75	2.696	0.005
Unemployed	18/35	15.06 ± 2.71	17.71 ± 3.20	3.013	0.004
Student	50/56	15.32 ± 2.56	16.84 ± 3.40	2.572	0.012

Values are mean $\pm$ SD. W/Wo = with/without physical disabilities. The reported t statistics are presented as magnitudes; all supplied means, SDs, sample sizes, and p values are retained. The test specification and original output require verification.

Table 7 shows the results of the correlation analysis on the relationships between athlete burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism variables in athletes with physical disabilities. Statistically significant and positive correlations were found between the total score of athlete burnout and reduced accomplishment ($r = 0.577$, $p < 0.001$), sport devaluation ($r = 0.650$, $p < 0.001$), and emotional/physical exhaustion ($r = 0.414$, $p < 0.001$). Statistically significant and positive correlations were found between the total score of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and the subscales of concern over mistakes ($r = 0.670$, $p < 0.001$), perceived family pressure ($r = 0.555$, $p < 0.001$), and personal standards ($r = 0.575$, $p < 0.001$). No statistically significant relationship was found between overall

burnout and overall sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism or its subscales ($p > 0.05$). The significant burnout correlations in Table 7 involve the overall score and its component subscales. The three burnout subscales were not significantly correlated with one another: reduced accomplishment and exhaustion had $r = -0.165$ ($p = 0.129$), reduced accomplishment and sport devaluation had $r = 0.071$ ($p = 0.519$), and exhaustion and sport devaluation had $r = -0.053$ ($p = 0.625$). Overall burnout was not significantly associated with overall perfectionism or any perfectionism subscale. These nonsignificant findings should not be interpreted as proof that associations are absent in the wider population.

Table 7. *Within-Group Correlations Among Athletes With Physical Disabilities*

Variable		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	r	1							
	p								
2	r	0.577	1						
	p	< 0.001							
3	r	0.414	−0.165	1					
	p	< 0.001	0.129						
4	r	0.650	0.071	−0.053	1				
	p	< 0.001	0.519	0.625					
5	r	0.030	−0.173	0.167	0.072	1			
	p	0.787	0.111	0.125	0.510				
6	r	0.111	−0.059	0.138	0.114	0.670	1		
	p	0.309	0.589	0.207	0.298	< 0.001			
7	r	−0.008	−0.076	0.179	−0.092	0.555	0.082	1	
	p	0.942	0.484	0.100	0.398	< 0.001	0.452		
8	r	−0.058	−0.180	−0.014	0.097	0.575	0.069	−0.027	1
	p	0.596	0.097	0.900	0.375	< 0.001	0.525	0.805	

1 = overall burnout; 2 = reduced accomplishment; 3 = emotional/physical exhaustion; 4 = sport devaluation; 5 = overall perfectionism; 6 = concern over mistakes; 7 = perceived family pressure; 8 = personal standards. Pearson correlations (r) and reported p values are shown; blank cells form the omitted upper triangle. $n = 86$.

Table 8 shows the results of the correlation analysis on the relationships between athlete burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism variables in athletes without physical disabilities.

Table 8. *Within-Group Correlations Among Athletes Without Physical Disabilities*

Variable		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	r	1							
	p								
2	r	0.593	1						
	p	< 0.001							
3	r	0.532	−0.072	1					
	p	< 0.001	0.435						
4	r	0.561	0.045	−0.050	1				
	p	< 0.001	0.624	0.587					
5	r	0.057	0.081	−0.029	0.045	1			
	p	0.538	0.380	0.750	0.629				
6	r	0.093	0.240	−0.168	0.086	0.614	1		
	p	0.313	0.009	0.067	0.351	< 0.001			
7	r	−0.145	−0.174	0.017	−0.087	0.545	−0.032	1	
	p	0.115	0.058	0.851	0.345	< 0.001	0.729		
8	r	0.130	0.033	0.124	0.063	0.593	−0.012	0.091	1
	p	0.157	0.725	0.178	0.498	< 0.001	0.897	0.323	

1 = overall burnout; 2 = reduced accomplishment; 3 = emotional/physical exhaustion; 4 = sport devaluation; 5 = overall perfectionism; 6 = concern over mistakes; 7 = perceived family pressure; 8 = personal standards. Pearson correlations (r) and reported p values are shown; blank cells form the omitted upper triangle. $n = 119$.

Statistically significant and positive correlations were found between the total score of athlete burnout and reduced accomplishment ($r = 0.593$, $p < 0.001$), sport devaluation ($r = 0.561$, $p < 0.001$), and emotional/physical exhaustion ($r = 0.532$, $p < 0.001$). Statistically significant and positive correlations were found between the total score of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and the subscales of concern over mistakes ($r = 0.614, p < 0.001$), perceived family pressure ($r = 0.545$, $p < 0.001$), and personal standards ($r = 0.593$, $p < 0.001$). A statistically significant and positive correlation was also found between reduced accomplishment and concern over mistakes ($r = 0.240$, $p = 0.009$). No statistically significant relationship was found between overall burnout and the overall score or subscales of the Sport-Specific Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale ($p > 0.05$). The significant burnout correlations in Table 8 involve the overall score and its component subscales, rather than correlations among the three subscales themselves.

Pairwise burnout-subscale correlations were nonsignificant: $r = -0.072$ ($p = 0.435$), $r = 0.045$ ($p = 0.624$), and $r = -0.050$ ($p = 0.587$). The positive association between reduced accomplishment and concern over mistakes is a specific exception to the otherwise nonsignificant associations between burnout and perfectionism measures. Because many correlations were examined without a reported multiplicity adjustment, this isolated finding requires cautious interpretation and independent confirmation.

4. DISCUSSION

This study examined burnout and sport-specific multidimensional perfectionism among basketball athletes with and without physical disabilities. The principal reported differences were higher overall burnout and emotional/physical exhaustion among athletes without physical disabilities, together with higher overall perfectionism and scores on all three perfectionism subscales (Table 3). These findings describe the sampled groups and should not be interpreted as evidence that physical disability protects against burnout or that the absence of disability causes greater perfectionism. Performance expectations, training demands, and environmental pressures are plausible contextual explanations, but the study did not directly test these explanations. Gustafsson et al. [13] examined relationships between passion and athlete burnout, while Raedeke and Smith [10] provided the measurement foundation for distinguishing burnout dimensions. These sources support a multidimensional interpretation rather than a causal conclusion about training load from the present data.

No statistically significant overall disability-group differences were reported for reduced accomplishment or sport devaluation. This pattern suggests that a difference in exhaustion does not automatically imply comparable differences across every burnout dimension. Isoard-Gautheur, Guillet-Descas, and Gustafsson [14] examined burnout and subsequent dropout among young elite handball players, demonstrating the relevance of burnout to continued participation. Their longitudinal study concerns a different sport and outcome and therefore provides contextual evidence rather than direct confirmation of the disability-group differences observed here. It remains necessary to investigate which personal, interpersonal, and organizational conditions are associated with particular burnout dimensions in basketball. The comparatively low reliability of sport devaluation in the present sample also limits the strength of conclusions involving that subscale.

Athletes without physical disabilities reported higher concern over mistakes, perceived family pressure, and personal standards, as well as higher overall perfectionism. These dimensions should be interpreted separately because pursuing demanding standards and responding critically to mistakes may have different psychological implications. Stoeber and Otto [15] reviewed positive conceptions of perfectionism and emphasized distinctions between its dimensions. Frost et al. [16] developed a multidimensional account that includes personal standards and evaluative concerns; their study provides a conceptual and measurement foundation, rather than direct evidence that perfectionism causes stress in basketball athletes. Hill, Hall, and Appleton [17] examined coping tendencies as mediators of associations between perfectionism and burnout in junior elite athletes. Together, these studies support examining possible psychological pathways while recognizing that coping and environmental expectations were not measured as explanatory mechanisms in the present study.

The correlation findings require a distinction between overall scores and subscale scores. In both disability groups, overall burnout was positively correlated with each of its three component subscales (Tables 7 and 8). However, the burnout subscales were not significantly correlated with one another. Thus, the present matrices do not support the claim that the three burnout dimensions reinforce one another. Correlations between an overall score and its components also partly reflect their shared item content, which limits their interpretation as independent evidence of psychological interdependence. Similarly, correlations between overall perfectionism and its subscales should not be treated as proof of a relationship between perfectionism and burnout. The measurement study by Raedeke and Smith [10] supports distinguishing burnout dimensions, but it does not resolve the scoring questions in the current dataset.

Overall burnout was not significantly associated with overall perfectionism or any perfectionism subscale in either group. These results differ from the positive burnout–perfectionism associations reported by Alp and Daşkesen [18] among athletes with and without physical disabilities. Differences in samples, sport settings, measurement properties, and analytical choices may contribute to such variation, although the present study cannot determine which explanation applies. Among athletes without physical disabilities, reduced accomplishment was positively correlated with concern over mistakes ($r = 0.240, p = 0.009$). This finding means that a blanket statement of no relationship between any burnout and perfectionism measures would be inaccurate. At the same time, the isolated association should remain exploratory because many correlations were tested. Perfectionistic strivings and concerns are theoretically distinct, and their combination in an overall score may obscure dimension-specific patterns [15, 17].

Çaloğlu and Menteş Yalçın [19] examined burnout among wrestlers in athlete training centers, reporting variation in relation to selected sport participation and demographic characteristics. Their work provides evidence from a different sporting context and should not be presented as a direct replication of the basketball findings. More broadly, differences between sports and training environments reinforce the need to describe sample characteristics carefully and avoid universal explanations based on a single group comparison. The current study did not measure the broader range of contextual variables needed to determine whether similar patterns would occur in athletes participating in other sports or competitive

systems.

Disability-group differences in overall burnout and perfectionism were observed within both female and male athletes (Table 4). These separate comparisons do not establish that gender has no association with burnout, nor do they test a gender-by-disability interaction. Research on passion, motivation, and affect identifies psychological factors relevant to burnout [13, 20], but these sources cannot justify excluding gender as an explanatory variable in the present sample. A formal interaction model and adequate subgroup sizes would be needed to assess whether the magnitude of the disability-group difference varies by gender. The observed subgroup patterns therefore provide descriptive context rather than evidence of equivalent effects across women and men.

The training-frequency and employment comparisons similarly require a limited interpretation. Overall burnout and perfectionism differences were reported across the training-frequency categories in Table 5, but overall burnout did not differ significantly between disability groups among unemployed athletes in Table 6. Differences were also not uniformly significant across every subscale and subgroup. Weekly training frequency measures the number of training days rather than session duration, intensity, or cumulative load. It therefore cannot establish that a higher training load explains the observed psychological differences. Employment categories likewise do not directly measure competing role demands or stress outside sport. The overlap between the supplied training-frequency categories further requires clarification before these subgroup findings can be interpreted confidently.

Psychological resources nevertheless remain relevant topics for further investigation. Kurtulget, Kaplan, and Çepikkurt [21] found negative associations between burnout dimensions and dimensions of mental toughness among basketball players. Biricik [22], studying 378 athletes in Turkish Olympic Preparation Centers, examined resilience in relation to burnout and psychological well-being. These studies suggest useful constructs for future research, but they do not demonstrate that psychological resources were depleted in the present participants. Future work should measure resilience, coping, training demands, and social support directly and test whether they explain differences in burnout or perfectionism. Practical support should respond to individual needs rather than presume psychological vulnerability or resilience from disability status alone.

5. CONCLUSION

The reported findings indicate higher overall burnout, emotional/physical exhaustion, and overall and subscale perfectionism scores among basketball athletes without physical disabilities than among those with physical disabilities in this sample. No significant overall disability-group differences were found for reduced accomplishment or sport devaluation. Within each group, overall burnout was not significantly correlated with overall perfectionism or any perfectionism subscale. One positive association between reduced accomplishment and concern over mistakes was observed among athletes without physical disabilities and warrants replication. Overall-score correlations with component subscales should be distinguished from relationships among separate burnout dimensions. The findings support assessing specific psychological experiences and sporting conditions together, but do not establish causal mechanisms or justify general conclusions about all athletes with or without disabilities. Clarification of the scoring procedures and verification of the statistical output are necessary before the reported estimates are treated as definitive.

6. LIMITATIONS

The cross-sectional design prevents causal inference and does not establish the direction of relationships between psychological variables. The sample included only basketball athletes aged 16–29 years, limiting generalization to other age groups, sports, and competitive settings. Self-report questionnaires may be influenced by social desirability, interpretation of items, or other response biases. Training intensity, session duration, psychological resilience, coaching behavior, and social support were not controlled for. Recruitment procedures, sampling frame, competitive level, disability characteristics, and sport classification were not specified sufficiently to assess selection effects or comparability of the groups. Measurement equivalence between athletes with and without physical disabilities was not tested, and the sport devaluation subscale had a comparatively low internal consistency coefficient of 0.60.

The analyses involved numerous unadjusted comparisons and correlations, increasing the possibility of chance findings. Confidence intervals, effect sizes, variance-equality checks, and degrees of freedom were not supplied. Some reported t statistics and p values require verification against the original output. For example, the value $t = 3.363$ for overall burnout in the 3–4-day training category is reported with $p < 0.001$, whereas a conventional two-sided independent-samples test with those subgroup sizes would yield a value above 0.001. The reported values have been retained pending verification rather than replaced with reconstructed results. In addition, the training categories 3–4 and 4–5 days overlap, and the construction of the overall burnout score needs clarification. These reporting limitations restrict the precision and reproducibility of the conclusions.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Future research should include athletes from additional sports, age groups, and competitive levels to examine how consistently the observed patterns occur. Recruitment criteria, disability characteristics, sport classification where relevant, and training contexts should be described clearly to support meaningful comparisons. Larger, appropriately planned samples would permit estimation of uncertainty and formal testing of interactions rather than reliance on separate subgroup significance tests.

Longitudinal studies should examine changes in burnout and perfectionism over time and evaluate whether specific perfectionism dimensions precede changes in exhaustion, accomplishment, or sport devaluation. Such designs would improve temporal interpretation while still requiring appropriate control of confounding variables. Researchers should verify scoring procedures, report confidence intervals and effect sizes, and consider measurement equivalence across disability groups.

More comprehensive models could include mental toughness, resilience, motivation, coaching behavior, coping strategies, and social support. Training frequency should be distinguished from training duration and intensity, and mutually exclusive frequency categories should be defined before data collection. Employment status should be supplemented with direct measures of competing demands if role strain is a proposed mechanism.

Qualitative or mixed methods research could explore how basketball athletes with physical disabilities understand performance expectations, access to support, and the personal meaning of sport participation. Psychological skills programs addressing recovery, coping, and responses to mistakes may also be evaluated through suitable intervention designs. Recommendations for practice should be individualized and their effectiveness tested, rather than inferred directly from the present group differences.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to this research, reviewed the manuscript, and approved the final version for publication.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to this research.

Funding Information

This research received no external funding from public, commercial, or nonprofit funding agencies.

Data Availability Statement

The data-sharing arrangements for this study have not been specified in the information provided. The authors should confirm whether de-identified data can be made available, identify any access conditions, and provide a repository link or contact procedure where applicable.

REFERENCES

[1] Freudenberger, Herbert J. “Staff Burn-Out.” *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1974, pp. 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x.

[2] Raedeke, Thomas D. “Is Athlete Burnout More than Just Stress? A Sport Commitment Perspective.” *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1997, pp. 396–417. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.19.4.396.

[3] Özkaya, Pınar, and Mustafa Engür. “Basketbolcularda üçlü yeterlik algısının öngörücüsü: Mükemmeliyetçilik.” *Eurasian Journal of Sport Sciences and Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2023, pp. 38–49. https://doi.org/10.47778/ejsse.1229325.

[4] Gümüşoğlu, Ömer, and Hülya Aşçı. “Yetişkin sporcularda belirsizliğe tahammmülsüzlüğün yordanmasında mükemmeliyetçilik ve zihinsel dayanıklılığın rolü.” *SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2020, pp. 96–110. https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.551536.

[5] Madigan, Daniel J., Joachim Stoeber, and Louis Passfield. “Perfectionism and Burnout in Junior Athletes: A Three-Month Longitudinal Study.” *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2015, pp. 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2014-0266.

[6] Hill, Andrew P., and Thomas Curran. "Multidimensional Perfectionism and Burnout: A Meta-Analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2016, pp. 269–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868315596286.

[7] Ferreira, Rodrigo Weyll, Anselmo de Athayde Costa e Silva, Maria Regina Ferreira Brandão, Marília Passos Magno e Silva, Jhonatan Welington Pereira Gaia, and Daniel Alvarez Pires. "Burnout syndrome and coping strategies in athletes with disabilities: a systematic review." *Current Psychology*, vol. 43, no. 12, 2024, pp. 11023–11036. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05186-9.

[8] Dunn, John G. H., Janice Causgrove Dunn, and Daniel G. Syrotuik. "Relationship Between Multidimensional Perfectionism and Goal Orientations in Sport." *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, vol. 24, no. 4, 2002, pp. 376–395. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.24.4.376.

[9] Çepikkurt, Fatma. *Üniversiteli hentbolcuların mükemmeliyetçilik ve kaygı düzeyleri ile başarı hedefleri ve müsabaka sonuçlarına yaptıkları yükleme biçimleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. PhD dissertation, Institute of Health Sciences, Çukurova University, Adana, Türkiye, 2011. Thesis no. 306623. https://libratez.cu.edu.tr/tezler/8977.pdf.

[10] Raedeke, Thomas D., and Alan L. Smith. "Development and Preliminary Validation of an Athlete Burnout Measure." *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2001, pp. 281–306. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.23.4.281.

[11] Kelecek, Selen, Feyza Meryem Kara, F. Zişan Kazak Çetinkalp, and F. Hülya Aşçı. "Sporcu Tükenmişlik Ölçeği'nin Türkçe Uyarlaması." *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2017, pp. 150–161. https://doi.org/10.17644/sbd.311371. [Volume designated 2016; journal publication and DOI metadata dated 2017.]

[12] Tabachnick, Barbara G., and Linda S. Fidell. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 6th ed., Pearson, 2013.

[13] Gustafsson, Henrik, Peter Hassmén, and Nathalie Hassmén. "Are athletes burning out with passion?" *European Journal of Sport Science*, vol. 11, no. 6, 2011, pp. 387–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2010.536573.

[14] Isoard-Gautheur, Sandrine, Emma Guillet-Descas, and Henrik Gustafsson. "Athlete Burnout and the Risk of Dropout Among Young Elite Handball Players." *The Sport Psychologist*, vol. 30, no. 2, 2016, pp. 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2014-0140.

[15] Stoeber, Joachim, and Kathleen Otto. "Positive Conceptions of Perfectionism: Approaches, Evidence, Challenges." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2006, pp. 295–319. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_2.

[16] Frost, Randy O., Patricia Marten, Cathleen Lahart, and Robin Rosenblate. "The dimensions of perfectionism." *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, vol. 14, no. 5, 1990, pp. 449–468. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01172967.

[17] Hill, Andrew P., Howard K. Hall, and Paul R. Appleton. "Perfectionism and athlete burnout in junior elite athletes: the mediating role of coping tendencies." *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2010, pp. 415–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800903330966.

[18] Alp, Ayşegül Funda, and Sonay Serpil Daşkesen. "Bedensel Engelli ve Engelli Olmayan Sporcularda Tükenmişlik ve Mükemmeliyetçilik." *Spor ve Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Dergisi*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.52272/srad.1383306.

[19] Çaloğlu, Mert, and Özlem Menteş Yalçın. "Sporcu eğitim merkezlerindeki güreşçilerin sporcu tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi." *Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2020, pp. 59–73. https://cuspor.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/tr/pub/article/808680.

[20] Lemyre, Pierre-Nicolas, Darren C. Treasure, and Glyn C. Roberts. "Influence of Variability in Motivation and Affect on Elite Athlete Burnout Susceptibility." *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2006, pp. 32–48. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.28.1.32.

[21] Kurtulget, Ebru, Gizem Kaplan, and Fatma Çepikkurt. "Basketbolcularda Tutkunluk ve Zihinsel Dayanıklılığın Tükenmişliği Belirlemedeki Rolü." *Türkiye Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2018, pp. 82–91. https://doi.org/10.32706/tusbid.463998.

[22] Biricik, Yunus Sinan. "Türkiye Olimpiyat Hazırlık Merkezi (TOHM) sporcularının tükenmişlik düzeyleri ile psikolojik iyi oluşları arasındaki ilişkide dayanıklılığın aracılık etkisi." *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sports*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2023, pp. 70–84. https://doi.org/10.22282/tojras.1261258.