

Research Paper

**COMPARISON OF PERSONALITY TRAITS AMONG
ATHLETES AND BASKETBALL PLAYERS****M.Rakeela Naseerin¹ & Dr.A.Praveen²**

1. Research Scholar.tamilnadu Physical Education and Sports University, chennai
2. Assistant professor, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Pondicherry University,
Puducherry-605014,
rakeela.nas@gmail.com, sbmathavan@live.com

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to compare the personality traits of Athletes and Basketball players. To achieve this purpose of the study the investigator selected forty five (N=45) athletes and sixty basketball players aged between eighteen to twenty five from various colleges of Thiruchirapalli, Thanjavur, Karaikudi and Nagarcioi. The Eysenck personality questionnaire was used to collect the data, it comprises of two factors namely Extroversion (E) and the Neuroticism (N). The collected data were statistically analysed by 't' ratio. The findings of the results showed that the athletes are found to be better than the basketball players on personality traits.

Key: Basketball, Athlete, Personality traits.

Introduction

Kamlesh says that the important dimension of personality are enumerated under physique, mind and intellectual, emotional stability and sociability. Personality is composed of a unique pattern of traits. These traits are called modalities. Such as somatic, motivational, aptitudes, needs, physiology, temperament attitudes, interest and morphology. Personality is a vital factor in the wholeness of every human being. As in all other aspects of man's life, personality plays a predominant role in the physical activities in which man likes to take

an active part. Development of personality through sports is an established fact. Physical, intellectual, moral and social values of sports are undesirable. It is here that sports play an important role. Thus human behavioral adjustments are influenced by participating in sports. Experts have often claimed that participation in many forms of sports favor the development of personality. Some sports psychologists believe that the certain personality traits were developed by participating in sports and games. All the important personality traits such as self-control, self-confidence, unselfishness, courage, perseverance, quick

decision, sense of fair play, sense of justice, courtesy, truthfulness, alertness, loyalty, teamwork, co-operation, obedience to leader, ability to mix with others, quality to face defeat or victory, sportsmanship, control of emotions are being developed in the field by participating in games and sports. So opportunities of cultivating these characteristics are available in game situation. The playground is a good laboratory to develop all these personality traits. Hence physical education plays a predominant role in molding the personality of youth. Physical education and its competitive activities should help to maintain the principle that struggle is important in the development of the personality. There are a number of general athletic traits which are important for coaches to understand the best method of developing the traits, so that we can design effective training programme for their athletes. Every player has his unique personality. Different sports require some specific personality traits. It has been observed that some personality traits have been quite useful to achieve better performance in particular sports event. Yet certain trends need to be developed as personality marks while the players are in the training programme.

Methodology

Sixty basketball players and forty five athletes aged between eighteen and twenty five years from six colleges in Thiruchirapalli, Sivangangai, Kanyakumari and Thanjavur districts were selected as subjects. Out of this ten players and fifteen athletes were selected from Alagappa

University college of Physical Education, Karaikudi; ten players and ten athletes from Holy Cross College, Thiruchirapalli; ten players and ten athletes from S.R.C. College, Thiruchirapalli; ten players from Indira Gandhi College, Thiruchirapalli; ten players and ten athletes from Holy Cross College, Nagarcioi. They were selected as subjects. To collect the data from the subjects Eysenck personality Inventory was used to find out the personality traits of the athletes and basketball players. The Eysenck personality inventory questionnaire was administered separately on different dates to the different teams. The subjects were reminded not to cause undue delay in answering all questions but to give immediate response and to pass on to next question. The investigator went around supervising the subjects and clearing the doubts. The subjects were requested to encircle “yes” or “no” and not to omit any of the questions. The subjects were constantly motivated throughout the period of the investigation to ensure their willing co-operation. Each subject was given half an hour for answering the questionnaire. The time was fixed according to the instruction in the manual. Before collecting the questionnaire the investigator checked whether the subjects have answered all the questions. The scoring of their response forms were done in accordance with the instruction given in the manual. The given key was used for the purpose. This was to determine whether the factor extroversion or neuroticism was present or absent. All the questions have only two responses as “yes” and “no”. Scoring was done with the prescribed key clearly, after counting the

total number of extroverts or neuroticism separately as to what quantitative level was a factor present. The 'Lie' score was also counted so as to decide whether the total score was to be considered for statistical analysis or not. Hence responses showing more than five lie scores were discarded and the score of such subjects were not included in the statistical treatment of the data. To find out the significant difference between the athletes and basketball players 't' ratio was applied.

Table- 1

The means, standard deviations, standard error of the means, difference between the means and t-ratio of athletes and basketball players for factor – e (extroversion)

Groups	Means	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	Difference between means	t-ratio	t-value
Athletes	14.33	2.48	0.39	1.87	3.83	1.99
Basketball Players	12.46	2.13	0.30			

The required t-value was 1.99 at 0.05 level.

Table – 2

The means, standard deviations, standard error of the means, difference between the means and t-ratio of athletes and

basketball players for factor–n (neuroticism)

Groups	Means	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the Mean	Difference between means	t-ratio	t-value
Athletes	13.65	4.098	0.65	4.01	0.53	1.99
Basketball Players	14.06	3.14	0.44			

The required t-value was 1.99 at 0.05 level

Discussion and findings

The obtained t-ratio was 3.82 and the required t-value was 1.99 for the degrees of freedom 88 ($N_1 + N_2 - O_2$) at 0.05 level of significance as given by Clarke and Clarke. Since the obtained t-ratio of 3.82 was greater than the required t-value of 1.99, the

The obtained t-ratio was 0.53 and the required t-value 1.99 for the degree of freedom 88 ($N_1 + N_2 - 2$) at 0.05 level of significance as given by Clarke and Clarke. Since the obtained t-ratio of 0.53 level was less than the required t-value of 1.99 the researcher's hypothesis was rejected and the test was insignificant.

researcher's hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference between athletes and basketball players in Extroversion (Factor E).

The mean of athletes were 13.65 and the mean of basketball players were 14.06 for factor – N. Hence the mean score of basketball players were greater than the mean score of Athletes 9.065 given by Eysenck and Eysenck. So both these athletes and basketball players were falling in the category of neuroticism. Since the mean of basketball players were more than that of mean of athletes it was concluded that the basketball players were more neurotic than athletes.

Conclusion

The obtained t-ratio was 3.82 and the required t-value was 1.99 for the degree of freedom 88 ($N_1 + N_2 - 2$) at 0.05 level of significance in the extroversion factor. As the obtained t-ratio of 3.82 was greater than required t-value of 1.99, significant difference exists in Extroversion factor between athletes and basketball players. Hence the investigator's hypothesis was accepted. According to table that the mean of athletes were 14.33 and the mean of basketball players were 12.46 respectively. The mean scores of athletes and basketball players were greater than the mean score of 9.065 (Eysenck Scale).

Hence both athletes and basketball players fall under the category of Extroversion. Hence it is proved that both groups of athletes and basketball players were Extroverts. Since the mean of athletes were greater than the mean of basketball players it is proved that the athletes were more Extroverts than basketball players.

The obtained t-ratio was 0.53 and the required t-value was 1.99 for the degree of

freedom 88 ($N_1 + N_2 - 2$) AT 0.05 level of significance. As the obtained t-ratio was 0.53 was lesser than the required t-value of 1.99 the researcher hypothesis was rejected and the test was insignificant. The table showed the mean of basketball players were 14.06 for factor-N. Hence the mean score of basketball players were greater than the mean score of athletes 9.065 (Eysenck Scale). So both these athletes and basketball players were falling under the category of neuroticism. Since the mean of basketball players were greater than the mean of athletes it is concluded that the basketball players were more neurotic than athletes.

Reference

1. Clarke, David H and H.Harrison Clarke. Research Processes in Physical Education, Recreation and Health. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978.
2. Eysenck, S.B.C. and H.J.Eysenck.A Factor Analytic Study of the Lie Scale of the Junior Eysenck Personality Inventory. London: Pergamon Press, 1963.
3. Arlott, John. The Oxford Companion to Sports and Games. London: Oxford University Press, Ely House, 1973.
4. Bird, Anne Marie and Bernette K. Cripe.Psychology and Sports Behaviour. Saint Louis: Mosby College Publishing, 1986.
5. Bucher, Charles A. And A. Deborah Wuest.Foundations of Physical Education and Sports. Saint Louis: Times Mirror/ Mosby College Publishing, 1987.
6. Butt, Dorcas Susan. Psychology of Sport: The Behaviour, Motivation, Personality and Performance of Athletes. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1987.

7. Cratty, Bryant J. Psychology and Physical Activity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey Prentice Hall, 1978.
8. Kamlesh, M.L. Psychology of Physical Education and Sports. New Delhi: Metropoliton, 1983.
9. Mechikoff, A, Robert. Sports Psychology for Women. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1987.
10. Mongal, S.K. General Psychology. Ludhiana: R.P. Tandon, Prakash Brothers Book Market, 1988.