



Comparative Analysis of Selected Psychological and Motor Fitness Variables between Different positioned University Men Football Players

Dr. R.Chinnaiyan

Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu, India.

Received 25th November 2016, Accepted 29th December 2016

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to find the compare the selected psychological and motor fitness variables namely sports competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance between different positioned university men football players. For this purpose of the study, forty men football players studying in the Department of physical education and sports sciences, Annamalai university, Annamalai Nagar, Tamil nadu were selected as subjects. The age group of 18 – 24 years were selected. Among them, twenty men offensive football players and twenty men defensive football players were selected. The following psychological and motor fitness variables namely competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance were selected as criterion variables. The selected criterion variables namely competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance were tested by using Rainer Marten's sports competition anxiety test questionnaire, Smith's aggression questionnaire and cooper's 12 min run/walk test respectively. The data were collected with the subjects on selected criterion variables. The independent 't' ratio was used to find out the significant difference, if any between university men offensive and defensive football players separately. In all the cases .05 level of confidence was fixed to test the significance, which was considered as an appropriate. It was concluded from the results that there was no significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on selected psychological variables namely sports competition anxiety and aggression. There was a significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on cardio respiratory endurance.

Keywords: Psychological, Motor Fitness, Football Players.

© Copy Right, IJRRAS, 2016. All Rights Reserved.

Introduction

Training is the process of preparation for some task. The term "training is widely used in sports. But there is some disagreement among coaches and sports scientists regarding the meaning of the word. Sports training is a scientifically based and pedagogically organised process which through planned and systematic effect on performance ability and performance readiness aims at sports perfection and performance improvement as at the contest in sports competition. Butcher considers physical education as "an integral part of total education process which has its aim the development of physically, mentally, emotionally and socially fit citizen through the medium of physical activities which have been selected with a view of realizing these outcomes.

Methodology

The purpose of the present study was to find the compare the selected psychological and motor fitness variables namely sports competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance between different

positioned university men football players. For this purpose of the study, forty men football players studying in the Department of physical education and sports sciences, Annamalai university, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu were selected as subjects. The age group of 18 – 24 years were selected. Among them, twenty men offensive football players and twenty men defensive football players were selected. The following psychological and motor fitness variables namely sports competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance were selected as criterion variables. The selected criterion variables namely sports competition anxiety, aggression and cardio respiratory endurance were tested by using Rainer Marten's sports competition anxiety test questionnaire, Smith's aggression questionnaire and cooper's 12 min run/walk test respectively. The data were collected with the subjects on selected criterion variables. The independent 't' ratio was used to find out the significant difference, if any between university men offensive and defensive football players separately. In all the cases .05 level of confidence was fixed to test the significance, which was considered as an appropriate.

Correspondence

Dr.R.Chinnaiyan
Annamalai University

Analysis of the Data

The different positioned university men football players on each criterion variables were analyzed separately and presented below.

Sports Competition Anxiety

The analysis of covariance on sports competition anxiety of offensive and defensive university men football players have been analyzed and presented in Table I.

Table I. The mean, standard deviation and 't' ratio values between offensive and defensive university men football players on sports competition anxiety

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	't' ratio value
Offensive Players	24.42	0.97	1.98
Defensive Players	25.17	0.98	

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence with df 58 was 2.002).

The table I shows that the mean values on sports competition anxiety for offensive and defensive university men football players were 24.42 and 25.17 respectively. The obtained 't' ratio value on sports competition anxiety 1.98 which was lesser than the table value required for significance with df 58 was 2.002. The results of the study showed that there was no significant

difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on sports competition anxiety.

Aggression

The analysis of covariance on aggression of offensive and defensive university men football players have been analyzed and presented in Table II.

Table II. The mean, standard deviation and 't' ratio values between offensive and defensive university men football players on aggression

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	't' ratio value
Offensive Players	42.34	1.97	1.76
Defensive Players	43.11	1.98	

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence with df 58 was 2.002).

The table II shows that the mean values on aggression for offensive and defensive university men football players were 42.34 and 43.11 respectively. The obtained 't' ratio value on aggression 1.76 which was lesser than the table value required for significance with df 58 was 2.002. The results of the study showed that there was no significant difference between university

men offensive and defensive football players on aggression.

Cardio Respiratory Endurance

The analysis of covariance on cardio respiratory endurance of offensive and defensive university men football players have been analyzed and presented in Table III.

Table III. The mean, standard deviation and 't' ratio values between offensive and defensive university men football players on cardio respiratory endurance

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	't' ratio value
Offensive Players	1426.12	12.94	2.86*
Defensive Players	1325.18	13.16	

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence with df 58 was 2.002).

The table III shows that the mean values on cardio respiratory endurance for offensive and defensive university men football players were 1426.12 and 1325.18 respectively. The obtained 't' ratio value on cardio respiratory endurance 2.86 which was greater than the table value required for significance with df 58 was 2.002. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on cardio respiratory endurance.

Conclusions

1. There was no significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on sports competition anxiety.
2. There was no significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on aggression.
3. There was a significant difference between university men offensive and defensive football players on cardio respiratory endurance

Reference

1. Ardy Friend Berg, *The Fact on File Dictionary of Fitness*, (USA: The Time Minor Publications, 1994).
2. Barry L. Johnson and K. Jack Nelson, *Practical Measurements for Evaluation in Physical Education*, (3rd Edn.) (Delhi: Surjeet Publication, 1988).
3. Bompa, Tudor O., *Training for Sports*, (Champaign, Illinois: The Human Kinetics Publishers, 1999).
4. Clayne R. Jenson and Cynthia C. Hirt, *Measurement in Physical Education and Athletics* (New York: Mac Millan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980).
5. Edwin A. Fleishman, *The Structure and Measurement of Physical Fitness*, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1964).
6. Harrison H, Clarke, *Application of Measurement of Health and Physical Education*, (Englewood cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, Inc. 1976).
7. Hedric, Allen, *Soccer Conditioning Coach*, (U.S : Air Force Academy), *Internet Source*.
8. Jenson, Clyne R. and A. Garth Fisher, *Scientific Basic of Athletic Conditioning*, (Philadelphia: Lea and Feber Publishing Company, 1979).
9. Johnson and Nelson, *Practical Measurement for Evaluation in Physical Education*, 3rd ed. (Delhi: Publication 1982).
10. Johnson, Granville B. *et al.*, *Your Career in Physical Education*, (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishing, 1957).
11. Kornilous, *Contemporary School of Psychology* (London, Robert S. Wood Worth Company. 1931).
12. Sidhu and N.M. Mall, *Modern Perspectives on Physical Education and Sports Science*, (New Delhi: Haram Publication, 1986).
13. Thomas Kirk Cureton and John Brown, *Physical Fitness Appraisal and Guidance*, (U.S.A: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1947).