



# A Comparison of Causal Attribution between Open Skill and Close Skill Women Sports Persons from Various Stadiums and Clubs of Delhi

Kavita Sharma

Daulat Ram College, University of Delhi, INDIA

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in), [www.isca.me](http://www.isca.me)

Received 6<sup>th</sup> September 2014, revised 21<sup>st</sup> October 2014, accepted 17<sup>th</sup> November 2014

## Abstract

*It was aimed to study the causal attribution between open skill and close skill of women sports persons from various stadiums and clubs of Delhi. The study was confined to 100 females, randomly selected (50 open skill + 50 closed) from various venues from South West Delhi. The study was also confined to the losing teams or losers in the Zonal Tournaments. The variable selected for the study was casual Attribution and 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, lack of 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, stadiums, clubs, women, sports.

## Introduction

It is generally believed that sports plays crucial 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<sup>1,2</sup>.

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<sup>3,4</sup>. 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<sup>5</sup>.

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<sup>6,7</sup>.

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<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, the researcher made an effort to compare the causal attribution between open and close skill women sports persons from Delhi region.

**Objectives:** Keeping in mind the purpose of the study following objectives were set: i. To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game women players on causal attribution. ii. To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game women players on selected variables of ability, effort, task

difficulty and luck. iii. To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game women players on internal attribution. iv. To find out the difference between close skill and open skill game women players on external attribution.

**Hypothesis:** Based on the above objectives it was hypothesized that: i. There would be a significant difference between close skill and open skill games on causal attribution. ii. There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on selected variables of ability, effort, task difficulty and luck. iii. There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on internal attribution. iv. There would be a significant difference close skill and open skill games on external attribution

## Methodology

The study was confined to 100 females, randomly selected (50 open skill + 50 closed) from various clubs and stadiums of South West Delhi. The study was also confined to the losing teams or losers in the Zonal tournament. The variable selected for the study was casual Attribution and 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, lack of 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 Zonal level unsuccessful team, open skill and close skill women players had been presented in tables 1 to 7.

Table-1 reveals the mean and SD values of the open skill and close women players on ability, luck difficulty, task difficulty and lack of effort dimensions which was found to be 6, 3.1, 6.35, 5.1 and 4.2, 3.4, 5.5, 3 respectively. Table-2 Reveals significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close women 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-3 evident for insignificant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill women players on the luck dimension. The calculated t value was -.5079 that is less than the tabulated t of 2.02.

**Table-1**

**Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Causal Attribution between Open Skill and Close Skill Women Sports Persons**

S. No.	Groups	Variables	Sample Size	Mean	SD
1	Open Skill	Ability	50	6	2.05
		Luck	50	3.1	1.8
		Task Difficulty	50	6.35	2.27
		Lack of Effort	50	5.1	1.71
		Total		5.137	2.31
2	Close Skill	Ability	50	4.2	2.5
		Luck	50	3.4	1.93
		Task Difficulty	50	5.5	1.39
		Lack of Effort	50	3	1.91
		Total		4.03	2.17

**Table-2**

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

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	6	1.80	0.72	2.4861*
Close Skill	4.20			

**Table-3**

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

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	3.10	0.30	0.59	0.5079
Close Skill	3.40			

**Table-4**  
**Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill women players on Task Difficulty Factor**

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	6.35	0.80	0.59	1.33
Close Skill	5.55			

**Table-5**  
**Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill women players on Effort Dimension**

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	5.10	2.10	0.57	3.64*
Close Skill	3			

**Table-6**  
**Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill women players on Casual Attribution**

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	5.13	1.10	0.35	3.09*
Close Skill	4.03			

**Table-7**  
**Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill women players on Internal Attribution**

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	5.55	1.95	0.47	4.13*
Close Skill	3.60			

**Table-8**  
**Significance of Mean Difference between the open skill and close skill women players on External Attribution**

Variable	Mean	DM	$\sigma$ DM	't'
Open Skill	4.72	0.25	0.51	0.4818
Close Skill	4.47			

Table-4 shows insignificant difference between the mean value of open skill and close skill women players on the task difficulty dimension. The calculated t value was -.507, which was less than tabulated value 2.02. It is clear from table-5 that the effort variable of causal attribution was statistically significant. The calculated 't' value was 3.64 that was greater than the tabulated value 2.02. It can be observed from table-6 that there was a significant difference between the mean value of close skill and open skill women players on causal attribution. The calculated 't' was found to be 3.09 at 0.05 level of significance which was greater than the tabulated value of 2.02. Table-7 reveals significant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill women players on the internal attribution as the calculated 't' value was found to be 4.13 against the tabulated value 2.02. Table-8 reveals insignificant difference between the mean values of open skill and close skill women players on the external attribution as the calculated 't' value was found to be 0.4818 against the tabulated value 2.02.

## Conclusion

The conclusions for the study were: i. Open skill women players attribute their failure to internal causes. ii. There was no significant difference found on external attribution between open skill and close skill women sports persons, thus they

attribute their failure to external causes. iii. Ability dimensions was attributed more significantly by open skill women players. iv. Similarly, open skill players significantly attributed lack of effort dimension. v. Although on luck dimension, the difference was found to be insignificant, but the mean value of close skill women players was found to be higher than the open skill women players. vi. Whereas in task difficulty, the mean value of open skill women players were higher than the close skill women players although the mean difference was insignificant. vii. The open skill women players attribute their failure to unstable cause that is effort which increases the expectation of the athlete that the future outcome may change.

## References

1. M.L. Kamlesh, 'Psychology of Physical Education and Sports', N. Delhi: Metropolitan Book Company, 256-257 (1983)
2. Cox H. Richard, Sport Psychology: Concepts and Applications. (Fifth Edition) New York: McGraw-Hill Companies (2002)
3. Lau R.R. and Russell, Attributions in the sports pages, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **39**, 29- 38 (1980)

4. Brawely and Roberts, Attribution in sports, cited by Silva and Weinberg, *Foundation of Sports Psychology*, 207-209
5. Sheedy J., Attribution Theory: Sport and Female Athletes. *Australian Journal of Sport Sciences*, 3(1), 29-31 (1983)
6. Safton, A Field Investigation of Children's Causal Attribution for Sports Outcomes, *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 49(10), 2985 (1989)
7. Spink K.S. and Roberts G.C., Ambiguity of Outcome and Causal Attributions, *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 237-244 (1980)
8. White P.A., Causal powers, causal questions, and the place of regularity information in causal attribution, *British Journal of Psychology*, 83, 161-188 (1992)