



A Comparison of Athletic Players and Basketball Players in Relation to Mental Health

Dr Ramneek Jain

Associate Professor, APEX University, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

Abstract : The goal of this investigation was "To analyze emotional wellness measurements between Athletic Players and basketball players ". Scientist took 48 Athletic Players and 48 Basketball Players from 18 to 25 years for the examination. In the present investigation sort of sex & players have been dealt with as autonomous variable and psychological well-being as reliant variable. The individual gatherings of Athletic Players and Basketball Players were controlled the emotional wellness stock by Jagdish and Srivastava (1983). It was watched that – Athletic Players subjects are discovered more constructive self-assessment, mix of identity, independence and natural authority than male non player subject, and over all psychological wellness there is critical distinction between male player and male non - player subjects. B-ball Player subjects are discovered more constructive self-assessment, mix of identity, independence, and bunch arranged states of mind and natural dominance than female non player subjects, and over all emotional well-being, there is critical distinction between Athletic Players and Basket non – Athletic Players player subjects.

Keywords: Mental health, Athletic Players, Basketball Players.

Introduction:

quite an whereas, it's been traditional info that activity is useful for one's physical successfulness. it's simply been recently, even so, that it's clad to be typical to examine in magazines ANd successfulness bulletins that activity will likewise be of an incentive in advancing sound emotional well-being. the globe Health Organization characterizes psychological well-being as "a condition of prosperity within which the individual understands his or her own explicit capacities, will adapt to the everyday worries of life, will work beneficially and profitably, and might create a commitment to his or her group" (Stephen et al, 2005). Neither mental nor physical successfulness will exist alone. Mental, physical, and social operating ar connected. As of late, there has been proof of exasperatingly high rates of mental sick successfulness considers have discovered that additional elevated amounts of movement were known with bring down rates of unhappiness (Hassmen et al., 2000). a foothold articulation of the International Society of Sport scientific discipline (Singer, 1992) histrion out varied emotional well-being benefits of physical movement from the examination writing, together with diminished state tension, disturbance and uneasiness, mellow to direct discouragement, and different types of stress. AN audit of current writing demonstrates that people WHO take AN interest in sports and sorted out recreational movement appreciate higher emotional well-being, ar additional prepared, and stronger against the concerns of gift day living. Investment in recreational gatherings and socially bolstered physical movement is seemed to diminish stress, uneasiness and discouragement, and reduce aspect effects of Alzheimer's disease sickness (Carcach and Huntley, 2002).

Hypotheses

There will be no significant difference in the level of mental health between Athletic players and Non Athletic Players.

Materials & Methods

Sample Selection : The present investigation was led on 48 Athletic players and 48 Basketball players running in age from 18-25 years. An aggregate of 96 subjects. (College level Students) were chosen for the present research examine. The example choice strategy was utilized as arbitrary inspecting procedure. The territory is constrained to Shekhawati Region. The point by point separation of the example is given underneath:

Area	Athletic Players	Basketball Players	Total
Male Player	24	24	48
Female Player	24	24	48
Total	48	48	96

Autonomous Variables: Sex, Athletics and Basketball Player.

Subordinate Variables: Mental Health. Choice of research device: Mental wellbeing stock (Jagdish and Srivastav, 1983).

The information was gathered from the different universities and games preparing focuses. The subjects were first clarified about the point of the examination consider, from there on emotional wellness stock given by Jagdish and Srivastav (1983) was directed. The subjects 'were guaranteed classification of their reactions.

Results & Discussion

Measurable Comparison of Mental Health Inventory segments between Male Athletic Players and Male Basketball Players.

Area	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Significance
Positive self evaluation	Athletic players	24	33.12	3.72	2.19	0.05
	Basketball Players	24	31.08	2.81		
Perception of reality	Athletic Players	24	25.88	2.86	0.72	NS
	Basketball Players	24	25.20	3.78		
Integration of personality	Athletic Players	24	39.32	3.66	3.50	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	35.36	4.31		
Autonomy	Athletic Players	24	20.52	1.96	2.32	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	19.32	2.44		
Group Oriented attitudes	Athletic Players	24	34.68	4.34	0.64	NS
	Basketball Players	24	33.96	3.55		
Environmental Mastery	Athletic Players	24	33.96	2.52	4.04	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	30.68	3.17		
Over all	Athletic Players	24	187.48	7.14	5.50	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	175.40	8.35		

Table demonstrates contrast between the gatherings of male player and male non – player subjects on the different components of Mental Health Inventory. Just four components are indicating noteworthy distinction between the two gatherings at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels on 48 df review. It is presumed that player subjects are discovered more constructive in self-assessment ($t=2.19$, $p<0.05$), coordination of identity ($t =3.50$, $p<0.01$), self-sufficiency ($t=2.32$, $p<0.01$) and ecological dominance ($t =4.04$, $p<0.01$), than the non player subjects, and over all emotional wellness, there is huge contrast between male player and male non –player subjects. They got "t" estimations of these gatherings are 5.50. Keeping in mind the end goal to be critical at 0.05, the base required estimation of "t" is 2.02. While at 0.01 level it is 2.70. Since then got esteem is bigger than which is required to be huge at 0.01 levels?

Measurable Comparison of Mental Health Inventory segments between Female Athletic Players and Female Basketball Players.

Area	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t-Value	Significance
Positive self evaluation	Athletic players	24	32.19	2.97	3.02	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	29.31	3.54		
Perception of reality	Athletic Players	24	24.75	3.79	0.54	NS
	Basketball Players	24	24.07	4.53		
Integration of personality	Athletic Players	24	37.07	5.53	2.01	0.05
	Basketball Players	24	33.79	5.59		
Autonomy	Athletic Players	24	18.31	2.55	3.14	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	16.19	1.93		
Group Oriented attitudes	Athletic Players	24	35.15	3.80	2.83	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	31.79	4.32		
Environmental Mastery	Athletic Players	24	33.07	3.97	2.11	0.05
	Basketball Players	24	30.79	3.34		
Over all	Athletic Players	24	179.96	8.29	4.84	0.01
	Basketball Players	24	166.75	10.60		

Table 2 demonstrates distinction between the gatherings of Female Athletic Players and Female Basketball Players subjects on the different components of M. H. Stock. Five factors out of six are demonstrating noteworthy contrast between two gatherings at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels on 48 df review. It is inferred that player subjects are discovered more constructive self assessment ($t = 3.02$, $p<0.01$), combination of identity ($t =2.01$, $p<0.05$), independence ($t = 3.14$), assemble situated states of mind ($t = 2.83$, $p<0.01$) and natural authority ($t =2.11$, $p<0.05$) than non player subjects, and over all psychological well-being there is noteworthy contrast between female player and female non – player subjects. They got 't' value of these gatherings are 5.27. With a specific end goal to be critical at 0.05, the base required estimation of 't' is 2.02. While at 0.01 level it is 2.65. Since they got esteem is bigger than which is required to be critical at 0.01 levels.

Conclusion

Male player subjects are discovered more constructive self-assessment, incorporation of identity, self-sufficiency and ecological dominance than Basketball player's subjects and over all emotional wellness there is huge distinction between Male Athletic player and Male Basketball players subjects.

Female Player subjects are discovered more constructive self-assessment, mix of identity, independence, aggregate arranged states of mind and natural dominance than Basketball player subjects and over all emotional wellness there is critical distinction between Female Athletic player and Female Basketball player subjects.

Discussion

The point of the present investigation was to look at psychological well-being measurements amongst Athletic player and Basketball player understudies. It was speculated that there exists huge distinction in the level of emotional well-being between the male Athletic player understudies and the male Basketball players understudies. It was additionally conjectured that there exists huge distinction in the level of emotional well-being between the female Athletic player understudies and the female Basketball player understudies. Discoveries of the present investigation plainly demonstrated that – Male Athletic player subjects are discovered more constructive in self-assessment, joining of identity, independence and natural authority than male Basketball player subjects, and in finished all emotional wellness there is huge distinction between male Athletic player and male Basketball player subjects. These outcomes are additionally in concurrence with the conclusions come to by Morgan (1984), Humphrey et al (2000) and Stephen et al (2005). Female Athletic Player subjects are discovered more constructive in self-assessment, combination of identity, self-governance, gather situated demeanors and natural authority than female Basketball player subjects, and over all psychological well-being, there is huge distinction between female Athletic player and female Basketball player subjects. The consequences of the present examination are somewhat bolstered by the discoveries of McKelvie et al. (1981), Bailey and Moulton (1999) and Hossein et al. (2011). The exploration writing proposes that for some factors there is currently abundant proof that a distinct relationship exists amongst practice and enhanced emotional well-being. This is especially apparent on account of a decrease of uneasiness and sorrow. For these themes, there is presently significant confirmation gotten from more than several examinations with a huge number of subjects to help the claim that —exercise is identified with an alleviation in manifestations of misery and anxiety.|| Sports and physical exercise is connected not exclusively to a help in side effects of discouragement and uneasiness yet it additionally is by all accounts advantageous in improving self-idea, self-viability, certainty, sentiment worth-whileness, capacity to comprehend, capacity to coexist with others, work with others and capacity to take duties and limit with respect to change. None of these connections is the aftereffect of a solitary report. They depend on most, if not all, of the accessible research in the English dialect at the time the meta-scientific survey was distributed. The general positive examples of the meta-logical discoveries for these factors loans more noteworthy certainty that activity has an imperative part to play in advancing sound emotional wellness.

References

1. Bailey, K., Moulton, M., and Moulton, P. 1999. Athletics as a predictor of self-esteem and approval motivation. *TSJ*, **2(2)**: 1-5.
2. Dimeo, F., Bauer, M., Varahram, I., Proest, G. and Halter, U. 2001. Benefits of Aerobic Exercise in Patients Withmajor Depression: a pilot study. *Brit. J. Sports Med.*, **35**: 114-117.
3. Hassmen, P., Koivula, N. and Uutela, A. 2000. Physical Exercise and Psychological Well- being: a population studyin Finland. *Prev. Medicine*, **30(1)**: 17-25.
4. Taylor, M., Pietrobon, R., Pan, D., Huff, M. and Higgins, L. 2004. Healthy People 2010 Physical Activity Guidelines and Psychological Symptoms: evidence from a large nationwide database. *J. Phys. Activity and Health*, **1**: 114-130.
5. Hossein, P. Z., Farhad, R., Fatemeh, M. 2011.Comparing the Mental Health of the Athletic and Non- athletic Physically- disabled People. *IJHPA*, **2(1)**: 6-10.
6. Humphrey, J. H., Yow, D. A. and Bowden, W. W. 2000. Stress in college athletics: Causes, consequences, coping. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Half-Court Press.
7. Jagdish and Srivastava, A. K. 1983. Mental Health Inventory. Varanasi Manavaigyanik Sansthan.
8. Martinsen, E. 1994. Physical Activity and Depression: clinical experience. *APS*, **377**, pp. 23-27.
9. McKelvie, S. J., Simpson-Housley, P., and Valliant, P. M. 1981. Personality in athletic and non-athletic college groups. *Percep. Motor Skills*, **52(3)**: 963-966.
10. Morgan, W.P. 1984. Selected psychological factors limiting performance: A mental health model. *AAPEP*, **18**, 70-80.
11. Sallis, J. and Owen, N. 1999 Physical Activity and Behavioral Medicine. Thousand Oaks, US: Sage.
12. Singer, R. 1992. Physical Activity and Psychological Benefits: a position statement of the International Society

of Sport Psychology (ISSP). *The Sports Psychologist*, 6, pp. 199-203.

13. Stephen, D. E., Humphrey, S. B., Ngcobo, D. J., Edwards and Palavar, K. 2005. Exploring the relationship between physical activity, Psychological well-being and physical self- perception In different exercise groups. *SAJRSPER*, **27(1)**: 75-90.
14. WHO 2005. *Promoting Mental Health: Concepts, Emerging evidence, Practice: A report of the WHO, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse in collaboration with the Victorian Health Promotion Foundation and the University of Melbourne.*

