



ISSN: 2456-4419

Impact Factor: (RJIF): 5.18

Yoga 2018; 3(2): 743-744

© 2018 Yoga

www.theyogicjournal.com

Received: 01-06-2018

Accepted: 05-07-2018

**Dr. C Rajasingh Hariston**

Director of Physical Education,  
St. John's College,  
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli,  
Tamil Nadu, India

## Comparison of achievement motivation among football playing position

**Dr. C Rajasingh Hariston**

### Abstract

The present study intent to find the level of motivation among different position of football players. To obtain the purpose of the present study 100 (35 offence, 30 Midfield and 35 defense) football players were selected as participants randomly from the affiliated colleges of Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India who had played in Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Intercollegiate Soccer Tournaments. The age of the subjects ranged from 17-24 years. Achievement motivation was selected as criterion variable. It was assessed with Sports Achievement Motivation Test developed by Kamlesh (1990) [4] was administered to measure the achievement motivation of the players. One way Analysis of covariance used to find the difference among football player position. Scheffe's post hoc test used to find the which playing position be better in achievement motivation. All the statistical were test at 0.05 level of significance. It was concluded that Offense, midfield and defense players in soccer had significant differences on the selected variables namely achievement motivation.

**Keywords:** Football players, achievement motivation

### Introduction

Football is one of the most well-known sports in the world right now. Each player in the football academy will receive training and be chosen for the best position on the team. Each participant actually possesses a unique set of skills and abilities. A player might give his team a chance to win a competition by choosing the right position. This circumstance unquestionably benefits the team. However, if a player plays in the wrong position, it will be a significant issue. The player's optimal position can be determined by his own aptitude, talent, and level of motivation (Gerhana, Zulfikar, Nurrokhman, Slamet, & Ramdhani, 2018) [3]. According to Atkinson, (1974) [1] and McClelland, (1961) [5] achievement theory, is a positive attribute where some people value success more than failure, or vice versa. The pursuit of a motivator that will enable the athlete to succeed, increase performance, and carry out his primary duties under ideal circumstances is the goal of sport achievement motivation. Competitiveness, or the desire to perform at a higher level, is a common expression of the achievement motivation (Weinberg, & Gould, 2019) [6]. The present study intent to find the level of motivation among different position of football players.

### Methodology

To obtain the purpose of the present study 100 (35 offence, 30 Midfield and 35 defense) football players were selected as participants randomly from the affiliated colleges of Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India who had played in Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Intercollegiate Soccer Tournaments. The age of the subjects ranged from 17-24 years. Achievement motivation was selected as criterion variable. It was assessed with Sports Achievement Motivation Test developed by Kamlesh (1990) [4] was administered to measure the achievement motivation of the players.

### Test Administration

In the SMAT questionnaire there are twenty test items. Among them, for questions 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 and 20, the expected answer is 'a'. For the questions 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 18 and 19 the expected answer is 'b'.

### Correspondence

**Dr. C Rajasingh Hariston**

Director of Physical Education,  
St. John's College,  
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli,  
Tamil Nadu, India

For correct statement 2 marks and for incorrect zero mark are awarded (Kamlesh, 1990)<sup>[4]</sup>.

**Statistical Analysis**

One way Analysis of covariance used to find the difference among football player position. Scheffe’s post hoc test used to find the which playing position be better in achievement motivation. All the statistical were test at 0.05 level of significance.

**Analysis of Data**

Table 1 shows the summary of mean and standard deviation of Achievement motivation among offense, middle and defense players in soccer.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Players	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement Motivation	Offense	35	21.14	4.29
	Midfield	30	20.67	3.08
	Défense	35	25.83	5.79

The one-way ANOVA was calculated on the selected variables among three different positions of play and the results have been presented in table 2

**Table 2:** One-Way ANOVA

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Achievement Motivation	Between	551.12	2	275.56	13.103	.000
	Within	2039.92	97	21.03		

Table 2 reveal that the obtain F ratio 13.103 > than the required table ‘F’ value with df 2 and 97 is 3.09 at 0.05 level of confidence. Statistical results clearly shows that significant difference exist among the offense, midfield and defense football players on achievement motivation. To find out which of the three paired means had a significant difference, the Scheffe’s post-hoc test was applied and the results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Scheffe’s Post Hoc Test

Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	CI Value
Achievement Motivation	Offense	Midfield	0.47	2.84
	Offense	Defense	-4.68*	2.73
	Midfield	Defense	-5.16*	2.84

The table 3 shows that the mean difference in achievement motivation between offense and defense players; and middle and defense players are 4.68 and 5.16 respectively which are higher than the confidence interval value of 2.73 and 2.84 respectively at 0.05 level of confidence.

The result of the study indicates that there is significant difference between offense and defense players: and middle and defense players on achievement motivation. However, the mean value of defense players was found to be higher than middle and offense players on achievement motivation.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

The results of this study substantiate the observations and findings which have been recorded earlier by researchers in

allied fields. The findings of the study support those which are reflected in the research works of Christian (1975)<sup>[7]</sup>; Viriden (1972)<sup>[8]</sup>; Bakker (1986)<sup>[9]</sup> and others. However, due to rare nature of the present investigation much comparison could not be made.

**The statistical results drawn the following results such as**

- Offense, midfield and defense players in soccer had significant differences on the selected variables namely achievement motivation.
- Defense players was found to be higher than middle and offense players on achievement motivation.

**Reference**

1. Atkinson JW. The mainsprings of achievement-oriented activity. Motivation and achievement; c1974. p. 13-41.
2. Barker J, Jones M, Greenlees I. Assessing the immediate and maintained effects of hypnosis on self-efficacy and soccer wall-volley performance. Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology. 2010;32(2):243-52.
3. Gerhana YA, Zulfikar WB, Nurrokhman Y, Slamet C, Ramdhani MA. Decision support system for football player's position with tsukamoto fuzzy inference system. In MATEC Web of Conferences. EDP Sciences. 2018;197:1-6.
4. Kamlesh ML. Manual of sports achievement motivation test. NIS Scientific journal. 1990;13(3):28-39.
5. McClelland DC. The achieving society New York Free Press; c1961.
6. Weinberg RS, Gould D. Foundations of sport and exercise psychology, 7E. Human kinetics; c2019.
7. Block SR, Winfield JB, Lockshin MD, d'Angelo WA, Christian CL. Studies of twins with systemic lupus erythematosus: a review of the literature and presentation of 12 additional sets. The American journal of medicine. 1975 Oct 1;59(4):533-52.
8. Viriden R. The molecular weights of two forms of carbamoyl phosphate synthase from rat liver. Biochemical Journal. 1972 Apr;127(3):503-8.
9. Bakker RT. The dinosaur heresies: New theories unlocking the mystery of the dinosaurs and their extinction. William Morrow; c1986.