Indian Journal of Psychological Science, V-5, No. 2, (79-83) ISSN-0976 9218

A Comparative Study of Flow State Between Basketball and Football Players

Mahender Singh Priya Bawa***

Abstract

The present study is an attempt to find out comparison of flow state of basketball and Football players. Sample was taken from 50 basketball and 50 Football female players randomly selected from different colleges of Panjab University. To assess the flow state of subject Jackson & Eklund Flow State Scale-2 (FSS-2) 2004 was used. T-test was used to compare the flow state of Basketball and Football players. Significant difference was found among Basketball and Football players. The results of the study will assist coaches and players to know the Flow State variables and their impact on the performance of female Basketball and Football players.

About Authors : **H.O.D., Department of Physical Education, P.G. Government College-46, Chandigarh.*
***Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.*

Introduction

Understanding the psychological factors that accompany successful athletic performance is a high priority for applied sports psychology, with a major area of focus being mental links to optimal performance. To advance knowledge in this area, it is important to examine specific psychological constructs with theoretical relevance to optimal performance in order to understand what psychological processes might be contributing to quality of performance. Flow is an optimal psychological state that occurs when there is a balance between perceived challenges and skills in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). It is a state of concentration so focused that it amounts to absolute absorption in an activity. Research on flow in sport and exercise has increased in recent years.

Knowledge of factors associated with the attainment of flow is an important goal for those interested in the quality of athletes' experience and performance in competition. Theoretically, flow as an optimal mental state, would be expected to associated with optimal athletic performance as well as providing an optimal experience. Flow is generally viewed as a peak performance state. Hence, an understanding of factors that promote flow states in exercise will inform the strategies of exercise. Flow leads to positive effective reactions, which they equate with enjoyment. There is a consensus that flow is a state in which one is totally absorbed in the task, leading to optimal physical and mental functioning. It is seen as an altered state of awareness in which one feels deeply involved in the activity and where mind and body operate harmoniously.

The present study is an attempt to find out the significance of Flow state of Basketball and Football players. It was hypothesized that there is significant difference between Basketball and Football player's Event Experience Scale scores as measured by the Flow State Scale-2, (FSS-2). The results of present study will assist the coaches and players to modify their training program and will also help them to understand the concept of flow and its effect on sports performance.

Methodology

The subjects for the study were 50 female Basketball and 50 Football players from different colleges of Panjab University. To assess the flow state of subject Jackson & Eklund Flow State Scale-2 (FSS-2) 2004 was used. The flow scales assess nine dimension of flow but in present study we will study six dimensions of Flow i.e. Challenge Skill Balance, Action Awareness Merging, Clear goals, Transformation of time, Unambiguous Feedbacks and Total Flow. In order to examine the study t-test was used and the level of significance was 0.05

Analysis & Results

The comparison between the inter college female Basketball and Football players for the selected Flow State variables were statistically analyzed by using 't' test. The data pertaining to the same is presented in Table no. 1 to Table no. 6.

TABLE 1 : Comparison of scores on Challenge Skill Balance between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	Group	Mean	S D	S E	't' Ratio
Challenge skill balance	Basketball	15.28	2.47	0.35	3.7048*
	Football	16.16	2.69	0.38	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 1 that the Football players have good Challenge Skill Balance (M=16.16) than Basketball players (M=15.28). The calculated 't' values in case of inter college Basketball and Football was found to be statistically insignificance as the value obtained was 3.7048 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 2 : Comparison of scores on Clear Goals between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	Group	Mean	S D	S E	't' ratio
Clear goals	Basketball	16.32	3.22	0.45	2.7056*
	Football	17.76	1.95	0.28	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 2 that the Football players have good Clear Goals (M=17.76) than Basketball players (M=16.32) .The calculated't' values in case of inter college Basketball **and** Football was found to be statistically significance as the value obtained was 2.7056 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 3 : Comparison of scores on Transformation between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	**Group**	**Mean**	**S D**	**S E**	**'t' Ratio**
Transformation of time	Basketball	13.38	2.61	0.37	2.4690*
	Football	14.70	2.73	0.39	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 3 that the Football players have good Transformation of time (M=14.70) than Basketball players (M= 13.38) .The calculated 't' values in case of inter college **Basketball and Football** was found to be statistically insignificant as the value obtained was 2.4690 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 4: Comparison of scores on Unambiguous Feedback between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	**Group**	**Mean**	**S D**	**S E**	**'t' ratio**
Unambiguous feedback	Basketball	15.46	2.89	0.41	2.4748*
	Football	16.78	2.43	0.34	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 4 that the Football players have good **Unambiguous feedback** (M=16.78) than Basketball Players (M=15.46). The calculated 't' values in case of inter college Basketball **and** Football was found to be statistically significance as the value obtained was 2.4748 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 5 : Comparison of scores on Action Awareness Merging between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	Group	Mean	S D	S E	't' ratio
Action Awareness Merging	Basketball	12.72	2.17	0.31	3.0996*
	Football	14.16	2.47	0.35	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 5 that the Football players have good Action Awareness (M=14.16) than Basketball players (M= 12.72) .The calculated 't' values in case of inter college **Basketball and Football** was found to be statistically insignificant as the value obtained was 3.0996 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

TABLE 6 : Comparison of scores on Total Flow between female Basketball and Football Players

Variable	Group	Mean	S D	S E	't' ratio
Total Flow	Basketball	131.62	14.76	2.09	4.3099*
	Football	144.36	14.80	2.09	

*Significant at .05 level
$'t'_{.05}(98)=1.6606$

It is depicted from the Table no. 6 that Football players have good Flow State (M= 144.36) than Basketball players (M=131.62) .The calculated 't' values in case of inter college Basketball and Football was found to be statistically significance as the value obtained was 4.3099 whereas, the tabulated value was 1.6606 at 98 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significance.

Conclusion of the study

It is concluded on the bases of above findings that the significant difference was found between Basketball and Football players on the variables, challenge skill balance, action-awareness merging, clear goals, unambiguous feedback, time transformation and total flow.

References

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience. New York: Harper & Row.

Jackson, S. A., & Eklund, R. C. (2002). Assessing Flow in Physical Activity: The Flow State Scale-2 and Dispositional Flow Scale-2. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 24(2), 133-150.

Jackson, S. A., & Eklund, R. C. (2004). The Flow Scales Manual. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Jackson, S. A., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). Development and Validation of a Scale to Measure Optimal Experience: The Flow State Scale. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18, 17-35.

Kimiecik, J. C. & Stein, G. L. (1992). Examining Flow Experience in Sport Contexts: Conceptual Issues and Methodological Concerns. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology 4(2), 144-160.

Meany, M. (2006). Humour, Anxiety and Csikszentmihalyi's Concept of Flow. Birch, P. and B. Clegg, Creativity Unleashed, http://www.cul.co.uk.

Nijholt, A., Dijk. B. V., & Reidsma, D. (2008). Design of Experience and Flow in Movement-Based Interaction. In: Proceedings of the 1st Motion in Games Workshop, 5277,166 175.

Pates, J., Oliver, R., & Maynard. I. (2001). The Effects of Hypnosis on Flow Sates and Golf-putting Performance. Journal of Applied Sports Psychology, 13(4), 341-354.

Susan A. Jackson, Patrick R. Thomas, Herbert W. Marsh, Christopher J. Smethurst (2001). Relationships between Flow, Self-Concept, Psychological Skills and Performance. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology. 129-153.

Toril, F. (2006). Age Matters: A Study on Motivation, Flow and Self-Esteem in Competing Athletes, Institute for Psychology, University of Tromso.