



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF AGGRESSION, ANXIETY AND TEAM COHESION OF COLLEGE LEVEL BASKETBALL, HOCKEY AND FOOTBALL PLAYERS

Dr. **Sosamma John**, Associate Professor,
Catholicate College, Pathanamthitta.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to make a comparative analysis of aggression, anxiety and team cohesion among college men basketball, hockey and football players. Thirty basketball players, thirty hockey players and thirty football players were randomly selected who had participated in intercollegiate tournaments from various colleges of Kerala. Their age ranges between 18 and 23 years. The responses were obtained through standardized questionnaire to measure anxiety, aggression and team cohesion. Aggression was measured through the questionnaire developed Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). Anxiety was measured through Spielberger questionnaire. Team cohesion was measured by administering the Group Environment Questionnaire (Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer, 1985). ANOVA and farther Scheffe's post hoc test was used to find out the significance difference. The result showed that there was no significant difference exist between basketball, hockey and football players anxiety, But there was significant difference between basketball and hockey players aggression and team Cohesion.

Keywords: Anxiety, Cohesion, Aggression and Team.

INTRODUCTION

Today, sport and exercise psychologists have begun to research and provide information in the ways that psychological well-being and vigorous physical activities are related. This

idea of psychophysiology, monitoring brain activity during exercise has aided in this research. Also, sport psychologists began to consider exercise to be a therapeutic addition to healthy mental adjustment.

In this modern era of competition the psychological preparation of a team is as much important as teaching the different skills of a game on the scientific lines. The teams are prepared not only to play the games, but to win the games. And for winning the game, it is not only the proficiency in the skills which bring victory but more important is the spirit of the players with which they play and perform their best in the competition.

The increased stress of competitions can cause athletes to react both physically and mentally in a manner that can negatively affect their performance abilities. They may become tense, their heart rates race, they break into a cold sweat, they worry about the outcome of the competition, they find it hard to concentrate on the task in hand.

This has led coaches to take an increasing interest in the field of sport psychology and in particular in the area of competitive anxiety. That interest has focused on techniques that athletes can use in the competitive situation to maintain control and optimize their performance. Once learned, these techniques allow the athlete to relax and to focus his/her attention in a positive manner on the task of preparing for and participating in competition.



Psychology is another weapon in the athlete's armory in gaining the winning edge.

METHODOLOGY

The researcher selected thirty basketball players, thirty hockey players and thirty football players randomly who had participated in intercollegiate tournaments from various colleges in Kerala. Their age ranged from 18 and 23 years. The responses obtained through standardized questionnaire to measure all the three groups' anxiety, aggression and team cohesion. Aggression was measured through the questionnaire developed Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). Anxiety was measured through Spielberg questionnaire. Team cohesion was measured by administering the Group Environment Questionnaire (Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer, 1985). ANOVA and farther Scheffe's post hoc test was used to find out significance difference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The probability level below which the hypothesis is rejected is termed as the level of significance. The 'F' ratios obtained by analysis of covariance were compared to 0.05 level of significance. In analysis of covariance of 'F' ratio 3.15 is needed for significance at the 0.05 level of significance for the degrees of freedom 2 and 57.

TABLE I
COMPUTATION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ANXIETY

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between	22.82	2	11.41	1.13
Within	875.40	57	10.06	

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance $f_{(0.05)(2,57)} = 3.15$

Table I shows the obtained means in anxiety for basketball players were 28.17, hockey players 27.57 and football players 26.93

respectively. The obtained F value on the scores 1.13 was lesser than the required F value 3.15, to be significant at 0.05 level This proved that no significant differences existed among basketball, hockey and football players anxiety.

Table II shows the obtained means in aggression for basketball players were 36.77, hockey players 36.33 and football players 34.13 respectively. The obtained F value on the scores 3.70 was greater than the required F value 3.15, to be significant at 0.05 level This proved that there was significant differences existed among basketball, hockey and football players aggression.

Table II
COMPUTATION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
OF AGGRESSION

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between	119.62	2	59.81	3.70*
Within	1407.50	57	16.18	

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance $f_{(0.05)(2,57)} = 3.15$

Since significant differences were recorded between the groups, the obtained means were subjected to post hoc analysis using Scheffe's post hoc test. The results on post hoc analysis was presented in Table III.

Table III shows the comparisons between basketball, football and hockey players in aggression. There were significant differences between basketball and Hockey players and no significance differences were found in between other groups.

The results presented in Table II proved that there was significant differences among basketball, hockey and football players, as they obtained F value 3.70 was greater than



the required table of 3.15 to be significant at 00.05 level of significance .

post hoc test. The results on post hoc analysis was presented in Table V.

TABLE III
SCHEFFE POST HOC TEST OF TEAM COHESION
AGGRESSION

MEAN			Mean Difference	Required Critical Difference
Basketball	Football	Hockey		
36.77	36.33		0.43	2.59
36.77		34.13	2.63*	2.59
	36.33	34.13	2.20	2.59

* Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The results also proved that there was no significant difference in aggression among basketball players and football players and football players and hockey players.

Team Cohesion

Table IV shows the obtained means in team cohesion for basketball players were 69.30, football players 66.40 and hockey players 64.03 respectively. The obtained F value on the scores 10.02 was greater than the required F value 3.15, to be significant at 0.05 level This proved that there was significant differences existed among basketball, football and hockey players in team cohesion.

TABLE IV
COMPUTATION OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEAM
COHESION (SCORES IN NUMBERS)

Groups	Mean	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squar	F ratio
Basketball	69.30	Between	417.49	2	208.74	10.02*
Football	66.40	Within	1812.47	57	20.83	
Hockey	64.03					

Significant at 0.05 level of significance $f_{(0.05)(2,57)} = 3.15$

Since significant differences were recorded between the groups, the obtained means were subjected to post hoc analysis using Scheffe's

TABLE V
SCHEFFE POST HOC TEST OF TEAM COHESION

MEAN			Mean Difference	Required Critical Difference
Basketbal	Football	Hockey		
69.30	66.40		2.90	2.93
69.30		64.03	5.27*	2.93
	66.40	64.03	2.37	2.93

* Significant at 0.05 level of significances

Table III shows the comparisons between basketballs, football and hockey players in team cohesion. The differences between basketball and hockey players were significant and other comparisons were not significant.

The results presented in Table IV proved that there were significant differences among basketballs, football and hockey players, as they obtained F value 10.02 was greater than the required table of 3.15 to be significant at 00.05 level of significance .

The results also proved that there was no significant difference in team cohesion among hockey players and football players and basketball players and football players.

CONCLUSIONS

There was no significant difference between basketballs, football and hockey players in anxiety.

There was significant difference between basketballs and hockey players in aggression. There was significant difference between basketball and hockey in team cohesion.

The basketball players were significantly more aggressive than hockey players.

The basketball players had more team cohesion than hockey players.



There was no significant difference among basketball and football players in aggression and team cohesion.

The aggression and team cohesion was more in basketball players as compared to football and hockey players.

REFERENCE:

- Ayajit Singh,(1996) Sports Psychology, Delhi: Friends Publications, ppl6.
- Brayant J. Crathy, (1980) Psychology in contemporary Sport 3rd Ed; Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, Inc..
- Charles A. Bucher and Deborah A. Dvest, (1982) Foundations of Physical Education and Sports, Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, Inc., ppl88.
- Jitendra Mohan, et.al. (1986), Psychology of Sports, New Delhi: Friends Publication, pp 67.
- Jones MV, Paull GC, Erskine J,(2002) "The impact of a team's aggressive reputation on the decisions of association football referees", Journal of Sports Science, Dec;20(12),991-1000.
- Kamlesh,M.L.,(1983)Psychologyof Physical EducationandSports,NewDelhi: Metropolitan Book company, Pvt Ltd., pp38.
- Kirker B, Tenenbaum G, Mattson J.,(2000) "An investigation of the dynamics of aggression: direct observations in ice hockey and basketball", Research Quarterly, Dec;71(4),373-86.
- Morgon, (1989) Psychological Assessment in Athletics as cited by Brayanfc J. Crary, Psychology in Contemporary Sports, Champaign : Human Kinetics, pp56.
- Pain MA, and Harwood CG. (2008), "The performance environment of the England youth soccer teams: a quantitative investigation." J Sports Sci. Sep; 26(11):1157-69.
- Sanchez J.C, and Yurrebaso A. (2009), "Group cohesion: Relationships with work team culture." Psicothema. Feb;21(1): pp.97-104.
- Senecal J, Loughead TM, and Bloom GA. (2008), "A season-long team-building intervention: examining the effect of team goal setting on cohesion.", J Sport Exercise Psychology. Apr;30(2):l 86-99.