Comparative study of Causal Attribution among Open Skill and Close Skill Players at MDU University

Mr. Gurpreet Makker[1] Dr. Taraknath Pramanik[2] Dr. Ashok Kr. Singh[3]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education & Sports Sciences, University of Delhi

[2]Assistant Professor, IGIPESS, University of Delhi

[3]Associate Professor, IGIPESS, University of Delhi

Abstract: **The purpose of the study was to determine the Causal Attribution among Open Skill and Close Skill players at Delhi University. The study was confined to 40 males, randomly selected (20 open skill + 20 closed) from Maharishi Dayanand University (MDU). The study was also confined to the losing teams or losers in the Inter University tournament. The variable selected for the study was casual Attribution, for the collection of the data on the selected variable Attribution questionnaire for losers developed by Roberts and Kenvis was used. The questionnaire consisted of 4 questions for the variables namely ability, effort, task difficulty and luck. For the analysis of the collected data descriptive statistics was employed followed by't' test. The results revealed that the mean value for open skill games on the variables ability, effort, task difficulty and luck was found to be 6.00, 3.1, 6.35 and 5.1 respectively, whereas for closed skill was found to be 4.2, 3.4, 5.5 and 3 respectively. Also the group mean for open skill and closed skill games was 5.13 and 4.03, with a standard deviation of 2.31 and 2.17 respectively. Whereas a significant difference was found on the ability factor as the value was found to be 2.44 against the tabulated value 2.02 at 0.05 level of significance. On the variable of luck no significant difference was found as the calculated value was found to be -.507 against the tabulated value 2.02, also no significant difference was found between open and closed skill players on task difficulty dimension as the value was -.50 and finally a significant difference was found on effort variable as the calculated value was 3.649 against 2.02 tabulated value. When compared on the internal attribution variables (ability and effort) as a whole a significant difference was obtained with a value of 4.13 whereas no significant difference was found on external attribution variables (luck and task difficulty) with a value of 0.418.**

Keywords: Casual Attribution, Close Skill, Open Skill, Internal Attribution, External Attribution.

———————— ◆ ————————

INTRODUCTION

It is generally believed that sports play an important role in the socialization of children in that they come in to contact with social order and prevailing social values, and are given a structure within which to act and develop skills in the interest of developing the values held by the society **(Klecber and Roberts, Towards a new theory of Motivation in Sports, the role of Perceived Ability)**

The key in attribution theory is perception, when athletes are asked, "To what do you attribute your great success". They are being asked for their perception. The fact that their perception of why they are successful may completely erroneous is beside the point, The manner in which athletes answer, questions like these reveals their perception biases**. (Edward G. Joffe, ed. Sports Psychology: Principles and its applications; Texas: Wn. C. Brown Publishers, 1989, P. 176)**

Attribution theory and achievement motivation go hand by hand in terms of a cause and effect relationship. Attribution can be considered as personalized internal explanation that is general established reasons for success and failure in an individual athlete, team or coach. The kind of attribution that we make in response to outcome is closely associated with effect or emotion. **(Mechikoff, Sports Psychology for Women, P.51)**

Previous research by Weiner, mainly in educational settings indicated that many of the specific causes people attributed to events fell into categories that could

be described by four factors causal elements. These elements were an individual's ability and effort (internal) and the environment (situation or external) elements of task difficulty and luck. The kinds of attributions that we make in response to outcomes are closely associated with affect, or emotion. An internal attribution generally results in greater affect than an external attribution **(Riemer, 1975; Heckhausen, Meyer and Cook, 1972)**

It is generally seen that the past experiences significantly affect the kind of causal attributions given for success and failure. If the outcome is consistent with past experience, attribution tends to be stable. If the outcome is inconsistent with past experience, attribution tends to be unstable. Given these generalizations it follows that we can predict athlete's future expectations about performance based on the kinds of attribution they give for their present performance. (**Edward G. Jaffe, ed. Sports Psychology: Principles and its applications; Texas: Wn. C. Brown Publishers, 1989, P. 187-190)**

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESIS

The objectives of the study were:

- To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game players on causal attribution.
- To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game players on selected variables of ability, effort, task difficulty and luck
- To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game players on internal attribution.
- To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game players on external attribution.

Based on the objectives the hypotheses of the study were:

- There would be a significant difference between close skill and open skill games on causal attribution.
- There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on selected variables of ability, effort, task difficulty and luck
- There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on internal attribution
- There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on external attribution

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

The study was confined to 40 males, randomly selected (20 open skill + 20 closed) from MDU. The study was also confined to the losing teams or losers in the inter University tournament. The variable selected for the study was casual Attribution, for the collection of the data on the selected variable Attribution questionnaire for losers developed by Roberts and Kenvis was used. The questionnaire consisted of 4 questions for the variables namely ability, effort, task difficulty and luck. For the analysis of the collected data descriptive statistics was employed followed by't' test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data collected on the causal attribution of University level unsuccessful team, open skill and close skill players had been presented in tables 1 to 7.

Table No. 1

Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Causal Attribution among Open Skill and Close Skill Players

S. No.	Groups	Variables	Sample Size	Mean	SD
1	Open Skill	Group		5.137	2.31
		Ability	20	6.00	2.05
		Luck	20	3.1	1.80
		Task	20	6.35	2.27
		Difficulty	20	5.1	1.71
		Lack of Effort			
2	Close Skill	Group		4.03	2.17
		Ability	20	4.2	2.50
		Luck	20	3.4	1.93
		Task	20	5.5	1.39
		Difficulty	20	3.0	1.91
		Lack of Effort			

Table no. 1 reveals the mean and standard values of the open skill and close players on ability, effort, task difficulty and luck dimension which was found to be 6, 3.1, 6.35, 5.1 and 4.2, 3.4, 5.5, 3 respectively

Table No. 2

Significance of Mean Difference between the Open Skill and Players on Ability Dimension

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'

Open Skill	6		0.72	2.4861*
Close Skill	4.20	1.80		

Table No. 2 Reveals that there was a significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close players on the ability factor of causal attribution. The calculated't' was found to be 2.48 at 0.05 level of significance against the tabulated value which was found to be 2.02.

Table No. 3

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on luck dimension

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	3.10	0.30	0.59	0.5079
Close Skill	3.40			

It was evident from the table no. 3 that there was no significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill players on the luck dimension. The calculated t value was -.5079 that is less than the tabulated t of 2.02.

Table No. 4

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on Task Difficulty Factor

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	6.36	0.80	0.59	1.33
Close Skill	5.55			

It is evident from the table no. 4 that there was no significant difference between the mean value of open skill and close skill players on the task difficulty dimension. The calculated t value was -.507, which was less than tabulated value 2.02

Table No. 5

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on Effort Dimension

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	5.10	2.10	0.57	3.64*
Close Skill	3			

It is clear from table 5 that the effort variable of causal attribution was statistically significant. The calculated't' value was 3.64 against the tabulated value 2.02.

Table No. 6

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on Casual Attribution

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	5.13	1.10	0.35	3.09*
Close Skill	4.03			

It can be observed from table no. 6 that there was a significant difference between the mean value of close skill and open skill players on causal attribution. The calculated't' was found to be 3.09 at 0.05 level of significance against the tabulated value of 2.02.

Table No. 7

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on Internal Attribution

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	5.55	1.95	0.47	4.13*
Close Skill	3.60			

Table no.7 reveals that there was a significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill players on the internal attribution as the calculated't' value was found to be 4.13 against the tabulated value2.02.

Table No. 8

Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill players on External Attribution

Variable	Mean	DM	σDM	't'
Open Skill	4.72	0.25	0.51	0.4818
Close Skill	4.47			

Table no.8 reveals that there was no significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill players on the external attribution as the calculated't' value was found to be 0.4818 against the tabulated value2.02

CONCLUSIONS

- The conclusions for the study were:
- Open skill players attribute their failure to internal causes.
- There was no significant difference found on external attribution among open skill and close skill players from both the type of skills attribute failure to external causes.
- Ability dimensions was attributed more significantly by open skill players
- Similarly, open skill players significantly attributed effort dimension.
- Although on luck dimension, the difference was found to be insignificant, but the mean value of close skill players were found to be higher than the open skill

- Whereas in task difficulty, the mean value of open skill players were higher than the close skill players mean although the difference was insignificant
- The open skill players attribute their failure to unstable cause that is effort which increase the expectation of the athlete that the future outcome may change.

REFERENCES

- Brawely and Roberts, “Attribution in sports”, cited by Silva and Weinberg, Foundation of Sports Psychology, P.207-209
- Cratty B. J. Psychological in Contemporary Sports 2nd Edition p.52
- Dan Gutman, ‘Winners into Losses’, Psychology Today (May 1998)
- M.L. Kamlesh, ‘Psychology of Physical Education and Sports’, N. Delhi: Metropolitan Book Company, 1983, P. 256-257
- Rajeski, “The Study of an Attributional Model Achievement in a Sports Related Bicycle go meter task”, Dissertation Abstracts International 40:1, July 1979, P. 156A
- Rawlins, “The Effect of Goal Setting and an Effort Attribution oriented on Intrinsic Motivation and Motor Performance”, Dissertations Abstracts International, P.1650A
- Safton, “A Field Investigation of Children’s Causal Attribution for Sports Outcomes”, Dissertations Abstracts International, 49:10 April 1989, P. 2985A