Vol 6 Issue 6 Dec 2016 ISSN No :2231-5063

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Golden Research Thoughts

Welcome to GRT

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595 **ISSN No.2231-5063**

Golden Research Thoughts Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board.Readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.aygrt.isrj.org

GRT Golden Research Thoughts

ISSN: 2231-5063 Impact Factor : 4.6052(UIF) Volume - 6 | Issue - 6 | December - 2016

"MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS IN SPORTS: A STUDY AMONG TRACK AND FIELD, HOCKEY AND SWIMMING ATHLETES AT INTER SCHOOL LEVEL"

Muhammed Jamshad. KC.[1] , Shanil. C[2] and Mohammed Sameer C[3]

[1]Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department Of Physical Education and Sports, Pondicherry University.

[2]Physical education lecturer, MES medical college, Perinthalmanna.

[3]Assistant Professor, Moulana Arts and Science College, Kuttayi, Kerala.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to find out the motives for competition among athletes in sports of track & field, hockey and swimming at inter school level.The subject of this study were 450 male athletes of inter school level in the age group of 14-18 years chosen randomly from different districts in Kerala. The motives for competition (Blood &Suinn 1982) were administered as a tool to measure the motivational categories of the subjects. Descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation were used for summarizing the raw data. ANOVA was done for finding significant mean difference in scores of different groups with respect to each parameter. The level of significance was kept at 0.05. P value less than 0.05 is considered to be statistically significant.The finding of the study reviles that the athletes in various sports groups such as track& field, hockey and swimming shows significant difference in all the motivational categories. It is seen that the variable, self-mastery, physical fitness and health, self direction/awareness and understanding reasons are the highest motives for competition. Fear of failure and Independence / individuality is the lowest motives for competition among the athletes in these groups. It is evident that track& field athletes have highest motives for competition compared to athletes in swimming and hockey. And helps to exhibit higher performance in sports competition.

KEYWORDS:*Motivational Factors, track and field athletes, hockey, swimming.*

INTRODUCTION

Sports have become an integral part of society.In the few decades sports competitions have gained tremendous popularity all over the world. The popularity of sports competition is still increasing at fast pace and this happy trend is likely to continue in the future also.Competition is a life-line of modern sport. Without competitive sprit working at the heart of sport, no standards in performance can be set, neither participant would put in harder effort nor spectators show any enthusiasm, nor there do any thrill in playing.The television and press are giving much more coverage to sports competition and have become effective medium to carry competitions to millions and millions of people around theworld (Singh, 1991). Sports competition is basically a process of performance comparison among sports person or teams. Its main objective is to determine the winner. Competition represents a special type of physical and psychic load which is in dispensable for performance improvement. Due to psychic factors the load during acompetition is much more than during

the training.

Consequently the stimulus for adaptation to high or maximum loading is more effective than that which can be reproduced in training. Just as important howeverthat competition is the most specific training that existsto master emotional excitement and insuch a way that it helpsthe athlete surpass present limits of performance. Competition is the only means of adapting to the stressor of competition and to avoid its particular stress simply increases the stress potential of the next one.

Competition provides some sort of satisfaction to this need of the inner self of man. The higher level of participation the greatest satisfaction is derived. Competitiveness has been found to be a learned drive. However to promote this drive the early experiences of children are required to be structured in such a way that success is twisted by the participants. Success motives for whole hearted involvement in training and reduce stress, while failure can be highly stress producing.

Motives lead to activity in relation to environment. Those modes of activity which give satisfaction reducing tension and meeting needs to be repeated and those which fail to do so are dropped. Motivation is the direction and intensity of effort (Gill, 1986). Motivation is an internal energy force that determines all aspects of our behavior; it also impacts on how we think, feel and interact with others. In sport, high motivation is widely accepted as an essential prerequisite in getting athletes to fulfill their potential.

Motives which originate in the process of transformation of the unusual into usual physical loadmay be exceptionally steady (Puni, 1980). The above information indicates that athlete may select various sports and perform well in them for a group of reason.Moreover if the coach can learn just what motivates a given athlete at a given time he or she can expose better performance.This direct and direct board approach is generally superior to motivational tactics used by many coaches for years.Now a day's many coaches used some motivational quotes for screw up the players before and during practice as well as competition. These quotes will help the athlete for buildup positive effect towards the competition.This would help the players to exhibit better performance.

A study conducted by Sangwan (1984) administered cattell's motivation analysis test on 603 subject to find out the differences, if any in the motive structure of high performing sprinters and low performing sprinters comparable on certain physical variables i.e. Age, height and weight. The results showed that high performing sprinters scored significantly higher on MAT variables (total motivation) of home parental and pugnacity as compared to low performing sprinters. However no significant differences were found between high performing sprinters and also between middle performing sprinters on any of the ten motivation dimensions.

It is believed that the 'new' athlete a politeness and perhaps better informed than in past,will more likely be motivated if this moderate approach is used than if some pretense is employed.Sports psychologists have learnt, the balance between those motives associated with pure interest and enjoyment. Affiliation is found to be the strongest motives expressed by the athletes Alderman and wood (1976).

Perceived task involved climate was negatively associated to coaches performance expectations, relayed to more positive affective relations from coaches and parents, and was highly associated to both enjoyment and performance satisfaction (Michael, 1995). Such findings suggest that the socialization influence of coach and parent to have a profound impact on the adoption of mastery or social comparison participation orientation in young athlete.Gillet & Rosnet (1995) conducted a study on athletes at the district level displayed less intrinsic motivation and less external regulation than athletes at the regional level. District level athletes also exhibited less intrinsic motivation, less interjected regulation, and less external regulation than national level athletes.

The present study will enhance the knowledge in the field of sports and games.The study will help to understand the motives for competition among athletes at the inter school level.The study will be surely beneficial for physical educators and coaches to find out the motives to participate in different sports and games by the students

METHODOLAGY

Subjects

The participants of the study were 450 inter school level athletes of various schools of Kerala. Athletes from the categories Hockey (150), swimming (150) and track & field (150) were only included in the study. The participant's age ranged from 14 to 18 years.

Selection of test items

The test item selected for this study was motives for competition developed by Youngblood and Suinn (1982), which is a 19 dimension scale. Among the 19 dimension only 8 dimensions like, social approval, competition, self-mastery, fear of failure, physical fitness and health, success and achievement, competing conditions and crowds were included in the present study..

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparison of social approval scores of athletes in Track & field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 1: ANOVA results of Social approval score of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	14.43	3.14	BG	101.92	2	50.96	5.272	0.005**
H	13.35	2.84	WG	4320.58	447	9.67		
S	13.51	3.33	T	4422.5	449			

** Significant at 1% level (p<0.01)

From Table 1 shows the ANOVA result of track and field, hockey and swimming athletes on social approval. The result shows that track and field athletes having statistically significant mean difference on social approval(F=5.272, P=0.005<0.01). Since ANOVA has shown significance result, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 2

Table 2: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of social approval scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T &F	H	1.08	0.011*
T&F	S	0.92	0.038*
H	S	0.16	0.905ns

* Significant at 5% level(p<0.05), ns: not significant (p>0.05)

From Table 4.2, it is seen that athletesin Hockey and Swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average social approval scores.

Comparison of competition scores of athletes in Track & field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 3: ANOVA results of Competition score of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	13.45	3.09	BG	208.44	2	104.22	10.374	<0.0005**
H	11.92	3.13	WG	4490.59	447	10.05		
S	13.25	3.28	T	4422.03	449			

** Significant at 1% level (p<0.01)

From Table 4.3, it is seen that the highest average Competition score is reported for athletes in Track & field(AM=13.45, SD=3.09) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=13.25, SD=3.28) and Hockey(AM=11.92,

SD=3.13). These observed mean differences in Competition scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=10.374, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 4

Table 4: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of Competition scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	1.53	<0.0005**
T&F	S	0.20	0.861ns
H	S	1.33	0.001**

** Significant at 1% level(p<0.01), ns: not significant(p>0.05)

From Table 4, it is seen that athletes in Track & field and Swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average Competition scores.

Comparison of self-mastery scores of athletes in Track & field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 5: ANOVA results of self-mastery scores of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	14.71	3.16	BG	157.42	2	78.71	8.693	<0.0005**
H	13.49	2.57	WG	4047.10	447	9.05		
S	13.42	3.27	T	4204.52	449			

**: Significant at 1% level(P<0.01)

From Table 5, it is seen that the highest average self-mastery scores is reported for athletes in Track & field(AM=14.71, SD=3.16) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=13.42, SD=3.27) and Hockey(AM=13.49, SD=2.57). These observed mean differences in self-mastery scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=8.69, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 6.

Table 6: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of self-mastery scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	1.22	0.002**
T&F	S	1.29	0.001**
H	S	6.67	0.982ns

**: significant at 1% level(P<0.01), ns: not significant(P>0.05)

From Table 4.6, it is seen that athletes in Hockey and Swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average self-mastery scores.

Comparison of Fear of failure scores of athletes in Track &field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 7: ANOVA results of fear of failure scores of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	13.43	3.00	BG	205.03	2	102.52	11.17	<0.0005**
H	11.77	2.75	WG	4103.36	447	9.19		
S	12.59	3.31	T	4308.39	449			

**: Significant at 1% level(P<0.01)

From Table 7, it is seen that the highest average fear of failure scores is reported for athletes in Track& field(AM=13.43, SD=3.00) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=12.59, SD=3.31) and Hockey(AM=11.77, SD=2.75). These observed mean differences in fear of failure scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=11.17, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 8.

Table 8: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of fear of failure scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	1.65	<0.0005**
T&F	S	0.84	0.057ns
H	S	.813	0.068ns

**: significant at 1% level(P<0.01), ns: not significant(P>0.05)

From Table 8, it is seen that athletes in Track & field and Hockey differ significantly with respect to their average fear of failure scores.

Comparison of physical fitness and health of athletes in Track &field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 9: ANOVA results of physical fitness and health scores of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	15.15	3.43	BG	485.56	2	242.78	19.98	<0.0005**
H	12.65	3.33	WG	5430.94	447	12.15		
S	13.49	3.69	T	5916.50	449			

**: Significant at 1% level(P<0.01)

From Table 9, it is seen that the highest average physical fitness and health scores is reported for athletes in Track &field(AM=15.15, SD=3.43) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=13.49, SD=3.69) and Hockey(AM=12.65, SD=3.33). These observed mean differences in physical fitness and health scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=19.98, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 10

Table 10: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of physical fitness and health scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	2.50	<0.0005**
T&F	S	1.66	<0.0005**
H	S	0.84	0.114ns

**: significant at 1% level (P<0.01), ns: not significant(P>0.05)

From Table 10, it is seen that athletes in Hockey and Swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average physical fitness and health cores. Comparison of success and achievement scores of athletes in Track & field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 11: Data and ANOVA results of success and achievement scores of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	14.88	3.42	BG	469.88	2	234.94	20.64	<0.0005**
H	12.40	3.08	WG	5087.81	447	11.38		
S	13.35	3.60	T	5557.70	449			

**: Significant at 1% level (P<0.01)

From Table 11, it is seen that the highest average success and achievement scores is reported for athletes in Track& field(AM=14.88, SD=3.42) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=13.35, SD=3.60) and Hockey(AM=12.40, SD=3.08). These observed mean differences in success and achievement scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=20.64, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 12.

Table 12: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of success and achievement scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	2.48	<0.0005**
T&F	S	1.53	<0.0005**
H	S	0.95	0.053ns

**: significant at 1% level(P<0.01), ns: not significant (P>0.05)

From Table 12, it is seen that athletes in Hockey and Swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average success and achievement scores.

Comparison of competing condition and crowd scores of athletes in Track& field, Hockey and Swimming

Table 13: Data and ANOVA results of competing condition and crowd scores of athletes

Group	AM	SD	SV	SS	df	MS	F	P
T&F	13.89	3.30	BG	244.83	2	122.42	9.18	<0.0005**
H	12.08	3.91	WG	5960.95	447	13.33		
S	12.97	3.72	T	6205.78	449			

**: Significant at 1% level(P<0.01)

From Table 13, it is seen that the highest average Competing condition and crowd scores is reported for athletes in Track& field(AM=13.89, SD=3.30) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=12.97, SD=3.72) and Hockey(AM=12.08, SD=3.91). These observed mean differences in Competing condition and crowd scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also(F=9.18, P<0.01). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out and the details are given in Table 14.

Table 14: Scheffe's Pair-wise comparisons of competing condition and crowd scores

Group 1	Group 2	MD	P
T&F	H	1.81	<0.0005**
T&F	S	0.92	0.094ns
H	S	0.89	0.111ns

**: significant at 1% level(P<0.01), ns: not significant(P>0.05)

From Table 14, it is seen that athletes in Track & field and Hockey differ significantly with respect to their average Competing condition and crowd scores.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to find out the motives for competition among athletes in sports of track & field, hockey and swimming at inter school level.The result of all the motivational categories such as social approval, competition ,self mastery life style ,fear of failure , physical fitness and health, success and achievement and competing condition/crowd scores of track& field, hockey and swimming, athletes shows significant differences ($p<0.01$)

The highest average overall category scores is reported for athletes in T&F (AM=14.38, SD=2.39) followed by athletes in Swimming(AM=13.21, SD=2.75) and Hockey(AM=12.49, SD=1.79). These observed mean differences in overall category scores are statistically significant by using ANOVA also($F=24.73$, $P<0.01$). Since ANOVA shows significance, Scheffe's pair-wise comparisons were carried out.

The following variables such as social approval, self-mastery, physical fitness and health, success and achievement, athletes in hockey and swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average scores. The variable competition of athletes in track & field and swimming do not differ significantly with respect to their average scores.Variable such as fear of failure, competing condition/crowd scores,of athletes in track& field and hockey differ significantly.

Among various motives, more dominant motives for competition among the athletes of various sports groups wereself-mastery and physical fitness and health. Whereas motivational categories of fear of failure was the least motivating.Thus the hypothesis stated the motives for competing athletes in various games and sports will not be of similar nature, all the variables score is significantly differences. Hence it is evident that with the present study on track& field, hockey and swimming male athletes in Kerala age ranging 14-18 years, all the variables scores are significantly different.

It is seen that the track & field athletes have highest average mean scores in all the variables, compared to swimming and hockey. (except self-mastery).The variable self-mastery is reported the highest average score in track& field athletes, followed by hockey and swimming.Hence it is evident that track& field athletes have high motives for competition, comes from intrinsically or extrinsically compared to athletes in swimming and hockey and helps to exhibit better sports performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits and limitations of the present study and on the basis of the results, the following conclusions may be drawn.Athletes in various sports groups such as track& field, hockey and swimming shows significant difference in all the motivational categories. It is seen that the variable,self-mastery, physical fitness and health,are the highest motives for competition.Fear of failure is the lowest motives for competition among the athletes in these groups.

It is evident that track& field athletes have highest motives for competition compared to athletes in swimming and hockey. And it helps to exhibit higher performance in sports competition.

REFERENCES

1.Gill D L (1986) Psychological dynamics of sport, Human kinetics publishers Ltd
2.Puni A T (1980) Sports psychology, Patiala; Netaji Subash National Institute of Sports publications
3.Singh, H. (1991) Science of sports training, New Delhi DVS publications. Warren EW Coaching and Motivation
4.Alderman, R O, and Wood (1976) "An analysis of incentive motivation in young Canadian athletes"(Canadian journal of applied sports sciences , 7:169-176)
5.Michael B, Chicago state university,(1995) Perceived motivational climate, socialization influence and affective responses in little league baseball; journal of sport and exercise psychology 1995 NASPSPA abstracts vol 17 supplement/ 1995
6.Vazou Spiridoula (2006) Predicting young athletes' motivational indices as a function of their perceptions of

the coach- and peer-created climate, Psychology of Sport and ExerciseVolume 7, Issue 2
7.Simpson Stuart D (2007). The effects of synchronous music on 400-m sprint performance, Journal of sports Sciences Volume 24, Issue 10
8.Keegan Richard J. (2009) a qualitative investigation exploring the motivational climate in early career sports participants: Coach, parent and peer influences on sport motivation, Psychology of Sport and ExerciseVolume 10, Issue 3
9.Newton Maria. (2010). Examination of the psychometric properties of the Perceived motivational Climate in sport Questionnaire - 2 in a sample of female athletes, Journal of sport Sciences Volume 18, Issue 4

Muhammed Jamshad. KC.
Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department Of Physical Education and Sports,
Pondicherry University.