



ISSN: 2456-0057  
IJPNPE 2019; 4(1): 520-521  
© 2019 IJPNPE  
www.journalofsports.com  
Received: 08-11-2018  
Accepted: 11-12-2018

**Dr. BV Shrigiriwar**  
Director, Department of  
Physical Education and Sports,  
Annasaheb Gundewar College,  
Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

## A study of overt aggression among handball players: With reference to level of participation

**Dr. BV Shrigiriwar**

### Abstract

Overt aggression among handball players was evaluated on the basis of their level of participation. For the purpose of this study it was decided to select 20 national male handball players (Average age 26.12 years), 20 state level handball players (Average age 23.91 years) and 20 district level handball players (Average age 22.18 years). Purposive sampling technique was used while selecting sample for this study. Aggression inventories with sub-factors namely assault, indirect aggression, irritability, negativism, resentment, suspicion, verbal aggression and guilt respectively was used for data collection. This inventory is prepared by Sultania (2006). Results reveal that overt aggression in state and district level male handball players was significantly higher as compared to national level handball players. It was concluded that controlled aggression is the key aspect for performance in handball.

**Keywords:** Impulsive aggression, Handball, Participation level

### Introduction

Overt aggression is one of many types of aggression. Overt aggression is loss of emotional control and is related to physiology of hyper activity or arousal. It is a violent act which intends to dominate other person by means of verbal and non-verbal abuse or physical ways. Another term for overt or impulsive aggression is hostile aggression. According to Baron and Richardson (1994) [1], aggression is a kind of behaviour with sole aim to injure or harm another person.

In sports aggression can have its positive as well as negative effects. According to general theory aggression is detrimental for sports performance but in contrary to this Widmeyer and Birch (1984) [9] believed that controlled aggression has beneficial effect on sports performance. There is clear distinction of aggression in sports. One is termed as hostile or overt aggression and other one is instrumental aggression. In sport settings instrumental aggression is good for sports performance while overt aggression is considered to be harmful for sports performance. One such sports which involves lot of physical and social interaction is handball. Due to its worldwide popularity researchers namely Srhoj (2002) [7], McKelvie *et al.* (2003) [6], Ziv and Lidor (2009) [10], Cavala *et al.* (2013) [2], Karcher and Buchheit (2014) [5], Ferrari *et al.* (2018) [3] conducted various studies for identification of factors responsible for optimum performance. Still no such study is carried out in India in which overt aggression of male handball players is analysed in the light of their level of participation. Hence the present study was planned.

### Objective

The objective of the present study was to comparatively evaluate the magnitude of overt aggression among male handball players on the basis of their level of participation.

### Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that overt aggression in state and district level male handball players will be significantly higher as compared to national male handball players.

### Methodology

The following methodological steps were taken in order to conduct the present study.

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. BV Shrigiriwar**  
Director, Department of  
Physical Education and Sports,  
Annasaheb Gundewar College,  
Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

### Sample

For the purpose of this study it was decided to select 20 national male handball players (Average age 26.12 years), 20 state level handball players (Average age 23.91 years) and 20 district level handball players (Average age 22.18 years). Purposive sampling technique was used while selecting sample for this study.

### Tools

Aggression inventories with sub-factors namely assault, indirect aggression, irritability, negativism, resentment, suspicion, verbal aggression and guilt respectively was used for data collection. This inventory is prepared by Sultania (2006) [8]. The reliability of this inventory is 0.67 while the validity is 0.45. Higher scores indicate greater overt aggression

### Procedure

Aggression Inventory prepared by Sultania (2006) [8] was administered to selected male handball players as per their convenience and in a quiet and peaceful environment. Scoring of response was conducted as per description provided in the manual. One Way ANOVA and LSD test were used to compare data between three study groups. Result depicted in table 1 and 2 respectively.

### Analysis of Data

**Table 1:** One-Way ANOVA Dependent Variable - Overt Aggression Independent Variables - Level of Participation

Groups	N	Overt Aggression	
		Mean	S.D.
National Male Handball Players	20	23.35	5.20
State Level Male Handball Players	20	29.20	7.40
District Level Male Handball Players	20	32.65	4.28
F=13.21, $p < .01$			

The calculated  $F=13.21$  as shown in table 1 indicate significant difference in overt aggression of male handball players with varying levels of sports participation at .01 level of significance. The obtained result shown in table 1 was also confirmed by Least Significant Difference Test presented in table no. 2.

**Table 2:** Least Significant Difference Test with Significance Level.05

Mean (I)	Mean (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)
National Male Handball Players	State Level Male Handball Players	-5.85*
	District Level Male Handball Players	-9.30*
State Level Male Handball Players	District Level Male Handball Players	-3.45

\* Significant at .05 level

Perusal of mean difference between various study groups gives following results:

- National male handball players ( $M=23.35$ ) exhibited significantly lesser magnitude of overt aggression as compared to state ( $M=29.20$ ) and district level male handball players ( $M=32.65$ ). The mean difference of 5.85 and 9.30 between groups were statistically significant at .05 level.
- Overt aggression in state and district level male handball players was not found to differ significantly with each other. The non significant mean difference of 3.45 also

proves this finding statistically.

- On the basis of analysis of data, following results are obtained

### Results

- Overt aggression in national male handball players was significantly lower as compared to state and district level male handball players.
- Statistically non significant difference was observed in overt aggression in state and district level male handball players.

### Discussion

Results are in accordance with the facts reported in previous studies. Hanegby and Tenenbaum (2001) [4] reported that aggressive behaviour in the form of verbal abuse to opponent is detrimental for performance in tennis. This is not surprising because overt aggression in uncontrollable outburst which leads to drop in concentration level. Due to overt aggression a player is distracted from performing his basic rightly.

### Conclusion

On the basis of results it may be concluded that overt aggression in state and district level male handball players was distinctly higher as compared to national level male handball players. It may also be concluded that national level male handball players control their anger and emotions more meaningfully and channelise their full potential towards desired goals.

### References

1. Baron RA, Richardson DR. Human aggression (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press, 1994.
2. Čavala M, Trninić V, Jašić D, Tomljanović M. The influence of somatotype components and personality traits on the playing position and the quality of top croatian female cadet handball players. Collegium Antropol. 2013; 37(2):93-100.
3. Ferrari W, Vaz V, Sousa T, Couceiro M, Dias G. Comparative analysis of the performance of the winning teams of the handball world championship: senior and junior levels. Int. J. Sports Sci. 2018; 8:43-49.
4. Hanegby R, Tenenbaum YG. Blame it on the racket: Norm-breaking behaviours among junior tennis players. Psychology of Sport and Exercise. 2001; 2:117-134.
5. Karcher C, Buchheit M. On-court demands of elite handball, with special reference to playing positions. Sports Med. 2014; 44:797-814.
6. McKelvie SJ, Lemieux P, Stout D. Extraversion and neuroticism in contact athletes, no contact athletes and non-athletes: A research note. Athletic insight. 2003; 5:19-27.
7. Srhoj V. Situational efficacy of anthropomotor types of young female handball players. Collegium Antropologicum. 2002; 26(1):201-210.
8. Sultania MK. Aggression Inventory. National Psychological Corporation, Agra, 2006.
9. Widmeyer WN, Birch Y, JS. Aggression in professional ice hockey: A strategy for success or reaction to failure? Journal of Psychology. 1984; 117:77-84.
10. Ziv G, Lidor R. Physical characteristics, physiological attributes, and on-court performances of handball players: A review. Euro J Sport Sci. 2009; 9:375-386.