

Comparison of Intelligence of High And Low Performing Basket Ball Players

Patil Rohit Vijay¹ Dr. P. N. Deshmukh²

¹Research Scholar, CMJ University, Shillong, Meghalaya

²Reader and Head Department of Sports, Smt. S.D. Sr. College, Lecturer

Abstract – High performing Basket ballplayers have a higher level of intelligence and it is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. We can conclude that intelligence is a correlate of high performance in the game of Basket ball. Probably there is not much difference in performance, or the data taken in this study are small and for a more reliable inference the study be repeated on a larger data. The study has its own limitations which need not be thrown out of consideration. the difference between the self-confidence of the high performing Basket ballplayers and low performing Basket ballplayers is not significant. So even in the game of kabaddi, self-confidence is no correlate of good performance. high performing Basket ballplayers have a little higher self-confidence but since the t-ratio gives a non-significant value ,

Key Words Confidence, Probably, Limitations, Performing

◆

INTRODUCTION

Basket ball is aptly known as the "GAME OF THE MASSES" due to its popularity, simplicity, easy to comprehend rules, and public appeal. The game calls for no sophisticated equipment whatsoever, which makes it a very popular sport in the developing countries. It is basically an outdoor/in-door sport played on court, of late the game is being played on synthetic surface indoors with great success. The duration of the game is 45 minutes for MEN & Junior BOYS with a 5 minutes break in between for the teams to change sides. The duration of the game is 35 minutes with a 5 minutes break in between for WOMEN, GIRLS, Sub-Junior BOYS and Sub-Junior GIRLS.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although the research is widely scattered and conducted by many different authors, the astounding generalization is that the period when the child becomes able to speak in the sentence form of his language and the instrumental use of language in communicating has been mastered, is also the time when his social behaviour starts to become consistent. His typical play activities become social. From the earlier forms of solitary and parallel (side by side) play, he now engages in "role play" ("you be the mother and I'll be the father")

and in genuinely cooperative play (Beaver, 1932; Borne, 1930; . Parten, 1932, 1944; Salusky, 1930; Green, 1933). From the sheerly social interchange that took on the verbal forms of competitive behaviour without being consistently competitive ("I won't; "So did I; "Will all won"), he begins to compete consistently in activities with age mates (Hirota, 1951; Greenberg, 1932; Leuba, 1933). From impassive spectator or amused onlooker at the distress of another, he now begins to manifest consistent sympathy at the distress of another (Lois 3. Murphy, 1937) - a form of behaviour that develops when the child can "put himself in another person's shoes." From lack of responsibility for his own actions ("It isn't my fault, my hand did it"), he not only attempts independent acts but also assumes responsibility for them. From simple perceptual differentiation among people whose skin colour differs from his own, he begins to exhibit responses revealing consistent and invidious comparisons prevailing in his social milieu, hence the first consistent signs of colour prejudice (Clark and Clark, 1947; Horowitz, 1939; Goodman, 1952; Mori and, 1966).

MATERIAL AND METHOD

COMPARISON OF INTELLIGENCE OF HIGH AND LOW PERFORMING BASKET BALLPLAYERS

The level of intelligence of high and low performing Kho Kho players are compared and presented in Table – 1

TABLE – 1

S. No.	Level of Performance	N	Mean	SD	t-	Significance
1.	High	36	78.66	11.15	3.82	0.01
2.	Low	36	68.89	11.0		

It is clear from the above table that high performing Basket ballplayers have a higher level of intelligence and it is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. We can conclude that intelligence is a correlate of high performance in the game of Basket ball.

The selector and coaches should take note of this finding and give it consideration at the time of selection and coaching. Our finding is supported by the studies done by Jacobson (1931) and Jenny (1959)

COMPARISON OF INTELLIGENCE OF HIGH AND LOW PERFORMING BASKET BALLPLAYERS

This comparison has been presented in Table 2

TABLE 2

Comparison of intelligence of high and low performing Basket ballplayers

S. No.	Level of Performance	N	Mean	SD	t-	Significance
1.	High	36	61.33	11.65	0.45	Not significant
2.	Low	36	59.94	12.35		

We find that intelligence score of high performing Basket ballplayers is 61.33 against a score of 59.94 of low performing Basket ballplayers. The difference is not significant statistically which means intelligence is not a correlate of good performance in the game of Basket ball and as such it need not be given much weightage at the time of selection or coaching.

However, it is clear that more intelligent players do have an edge over the less intelligent ones. The t-ratio is not significant in this case, however.

COMPARISON OF SELF-CONFIDENCE OF HIGH AND LOW PERFORMING BASKET BALLPLAYERS

TABLE 3

Comparison of self-confidence of high and low performing Basket ballplayers

S.No	Level of Performance	N	Mean	SD	t-	Significance
1.	High	36	26.66	5.94	0.39	Not significant
2.	Low	36	27.25	6.72		

It is clear from the above table that high performing Basket ballplayers have a little higher self-confidence but since the t-ratio gives a non-significant value , it is concluded that self –confidence is not a correlate of good performance in the game of Basket ball.

COMPARISON OF SELF-CONFIDENCE OF HIGH AND LOW PERFORMING BASKET BALLPLAYERS

This comparison has been made in table-4.

TABLE 4

Comparison of self-confidence of high and low performing Basketball players

S.No	Level of Performance	N	Mean	SD	t-	Significance
1.	High	36	27.83	5.46	0.89	Not significant
2.	Low	36	26.67	5.61		

COMPARISON OF INTELLIGENCE OF BASKET BALLPLAYERS (HIGH PERFORMANCE LEVEL)

This comparison has been made in table-5.

TABLE 5

Comparison of intelligence of Basket balland kadaddi
(high performing players)

S.No	Description	N	Mean	SD	t-	Significance
1.	Basket ballplayers	36	78.66	11.15	6.44	0.01
2.	Basket ballplayers	36	61.33	11.65		

The above table clearly emphasises that Basket ballplayers have a much higher level of intelligence that the Basket ballplayers at the high performance level. t-value of 6.44 is significant at 0.01 level. It is concluded that for Basket ballmore intelligent players are needed or the Basket ballgame requires more intelligence than what is needed in the game of kabaddi.

CONCLUSION

These finding are strange. Probably there is not much difference in performance, or the data taken in this study are small and for a more reliable inference the study be repeated on a larger data. The study has its own limitations which need not be thrown out of consideration. the difference between the self-confidence of the high performing Basket ballplayers and low performing Basket ballplayers is not significant. So even in the game of kabaddi, self-confidence is no correlate of good performance. high performing Basket ballplayers have a little higher self-confidence but since the t-ratio gives a non-significant value , it is concluded that self –confidence is not a correlate of good performance in the game of Basket ball.

REFERENCES

- Raina, V.C. (1948). "Self-refeference in counseling interviews." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 12:153-163.
- Raina, M.K. (1980), *Creativity Research: International Perspective*. New Delhi :
- Ryohlak, J.F. (1959). " self- confidence, ability and the interest value of tasks." *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 94:153-159
- Singer, R.N and Brunk, J.W. (1967). "Relationship of perceptual motor ability and intellectual ability in elementary school children." *Parent and Motor skill*, 24 967-970

Snoddy, L.M. and Shannon, J.R. (1939). "Standardized achievement measurements of athletes and non athletes" *school Rav.*, 48 610-12.

Sternbeg, R.J. (1980), "Sketch of componential sub-theory of human intelligence. " *Behavioural and Brian Sciences*.

Stryker, S. (1980. *Syboic Interactionism: A social structural version*. Menlo Park, California: Ben Jming Cummings.

Sternbeg, R.J. (1981), "The Nature of Intelligence." New York:Appleton Century Crofts.

Thurston, L.L. (1938). *Primary Mental Abilities*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.

Thorrence, P.E. (1962). *Guding Creative. Talent*. N.J.:Prentice-Hall.

Turner, R.H. (1978). "The Role and the Person." *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 :1-23

Vanek, M. and Mosek, V. (1974). "A study on Self-concept and Physical Achievement.

Venek, M. and Mosek, V. (1974). "The Personality of the top level athlete. " *International Journal of Sports Psychology*, 5(2).