PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND TRAITS IN MALE HANDBALL PLAYERS – OPTIMISM, ATHLETE ENGAGEMENT AND MENTAL ENERGY

Joško Sindik¹, Ana-Mary Bauer Čuk²

^{1,2} Institute for Anthropological Research, Zagreb, Croatia

Original scientific paper

Abstract

The main goal of the research is to determine the differences in certain dimensions in the battery of the psychological questionnaires within Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT) in male handball players, according to their club, age group, winning medals and membership in junior national team. Second goal was to determine the profiles of male handball players in all examined psychological characteristics in MSSPT. The purposeful sample of 127 male handball players was examined, members of the teams Prvo plinarsko društvo, Metalac (Zagreb) and Zamet (Rijeka). In this study, three instruments from the battery MSSPT are used: Mental Energy Scale (MES), Athletic Engagement Scale (AES) and Optimism Scale (OS). The results revealed that the most significant differences are found in dimensions of MSSPT between the players of different age groups, while no differences are found according to winning medals in junior state championship, or according to the membership in the junior national team. K-means clustering revealed two profiles of male handball players with higher means in all other psychological characteristics.

Keywords: psychological profiles, male handball, sport performance

INTRODUCTION

Being a dynamic sports game, handball imposes high-level demands on the athletes. Highly intensive motor activity of the game requests high level of basic and specific motor abilities, such as explosive strength, agility and speed, along with other relevant elements of sport sport-related fitness and characteristics (morphological, psychological, motor. etc.) (Rogulj, Nazor, Srhoj & Božin, 2006). Numerous studies have been conducted in order to explore important psychological characteristics of athletes that could essentially determine their sport efficiency. These studies were focused on athletes' motivation (Seifriz, Duda & Chi, 1992; Mead, Drowatzky & Hardin-Crosby, 2000) as well as psychological characteristics, such as athletes' traits and moods (Berger, Grove, Prapavessis, & Butki, 1997). Psychological characteristics are strongly influenced by cultural and social environment athletes are situated in (Kran & Baird, 2005). Except in essential mainly motivational factors, athletes' behaviors in critical situations during a competition or training process or in situations which emphasize anxiety are particularly important (Dunn & Nielsen, 1996; Wiggins, 1998).

In this study, several psychological characteristics have been chosen to be examined among male handball players, within new battery of potential measuring instruments called Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT), used for the first time in the study of Sindik, Missoni & Horvat (2015), but without examination of construct validity of some guestionnaires within the battery MSSPT. One of the abovementioned characteristics is Mental energy (ME), which is a construct that describes specific biological processes involved in the capacity of brain neurons to do physical work, i.e. to perform physical activity. ME is related to one's mood or motivational and cognitive processes (Sindik, Botica & Fiškuš, 2015) so selfreported feelings could be the best method for assessing mood (O'Connor, 2006). One's performance during a sport competition requires complete focus upon the task, i.e. trying to achieve desired outcome. Attention allows selection of information, sensations and perceptions that are relevant in the moment. Namely, vigilance and choice reaction time are convenient for assessing mental energy (Lieberman, 2006). Sleepiness, fatigue, alertness are associated with mood states etc. corresponding to mental energy. Therefore, the tests of reaction time and vigilance are approximately equivalent to the sensitivity. In previous research of the Sindik et al. (2015), ME used for estimating mood within is Multidimensional Inventory of Sport Excellence (MUSI). However, ME could be perceived as stable psychological characteristic. Hence, it is included in both batteries, MUSI and MSSPT. Athlete's engagement (AE) in sport environment is a concept studied by Lonsdale, Hodge & Jackson (2007_a). In the elite sport context, the antecedents (basic psychological needs) and consequences (dispositional flow) of AE were identified (Hodge, Lonsdale & Jackson, 2009). Expert performance results from a long-term systematic engagement in a deliberate practice in a certain sport domain (Lonsdale, Hodge & Raedeke, 2007_b). Examining the role of AE in different competitive levels may appear as very important factor in understanding their motivation for improving their skills, or to be persistent in practicing their sports (Martin, 2008; Ericsson, Krampe & Tesch-Römer, 1993). Self-reported measures of athletes' cognitive engagement are extremely important in understanding the multidimensional nature of engagement in different sport environments (Appleton et al., 2006). Several studies became focused on development of measurement tools to assess athletes' perceived engagement with sports activities (Lonsdale et al., 2007_a; Lonsdale, Hodge & Raedeke, 2007). In an exploratory study, New Zealand elite athletes have been examined, which resulted in developing the Athlete Engagement Questionnaire (AEO) consisting of four dimensions: confidence, dedication, vigor and enthusiasm (Lonsdale et al., 2007). Lately, Lonsdale et al. (2007_b) examined the proposed factor structure of AEQ using a larger sample of New Zealand and Canadian elite athletes, revealing aood psychometric properties. Finally, Optimism is defined as expectancies in the future. While pessimists are more doubtful, hesitant and anticipate disaster, optimists assume adversity can be handled successfully (Seligman, 1990). Optimism appeared as a very important feature in the project related to development of psychological talents in U.S. Olympic champions (Gould, Dieffenbach & Moffett, 2001).

Only one study (Sindik, Missoni & Horvat, 2015_b) was already published about psychological are included constructs which in Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT) battery. One pilot study was conducted on a sample of members of one (the most successful) handball team (Prvo plinarsko društvo from Zagreb), applying three instruments from MSSPT were used for the first time. The results show that no differences were found between age groups of handball players regarding optimism and personality traits. Seniors perceived themselves to be mentally prepared better than younger players. The youngest handball players (age of 12) were the most motivated, confident and concentrated when compared to other age groups (Sindik et al., 2015b). This study is the extension of this pilot study (Sindik et al., 2015b). *First goal* of the research is to determine the differences in certain dimensions in the battery of the psychological questionnaires within MSSPT in male handball players, according to their club, age group, winning medals and membership in junior national team. Second goal was to

determine the profiles of male handball players in all examined psychological characteristics in MSSPT.

METHODS

Subjects

The research was conducted in the beginning of 2015 on a purposeful sample of 127 male subjects, members of three handball teams: Prvo plinarsko društvo (N=78) and Metalac (N=14) from Zagreb, with Zamet (N=14) from Rijeka. Average subjects' age was 14.20±4.14 years, while their experience of training handball was 5.38±3.67 years. Only three players had won a medal in senior state championship, 22 of them had won medals in junior state championship, 7 of them had won medals on junior European championship, while 18 of them are members of junior national team.

Measuring instruments

Three instruments from Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT) are used. The theoretical frameworks of these three instruments are obtained from belonging measuring instruments, but with significant modifications: Revised Life Orientation Test (LOT-R; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), Athlete Engagement Questionnaire (AEQ; Lonsdale, Hodge & Jackson, 2007) and Mental Energy Scale (MES; Sindik et al., 2015). MES consists of 14 items based on self-evaluation of the level of mental energy (Sindik et al., 2015). Optimism Scale (OS), a 10-item scale that assesses individual levels of optimism, follow the framework of LOT-R (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). Athlete Engagement Scale (AES) follow AEQ framework, comprising 16 items which measure the aspects of AE: dedication, selfesteem, enthusiasm and energy (Lonsdale at al., 2007_a). Five-point Likert-type scale is used in all questionnaires (from 1-Absolutely disagree to 5-Absolutely agree). All belonging subscales revealed satisfying reliability in range from 0.62 to 0.87 (Croanbach's alpha).

Procedure

According to the Ethical Codex of the Croatian Psychological Chamber, psychologists conducted the measurement of psychological characteristics. The subjects voluntarily and anonymously took part in the research, with the consent of their coaches, clubs' managements and the signed parents' informed consent for the players younger than 18 years of age.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using the statistical program IBM SPSS 20.0, while all statistical significances are commented on the

level of p<0.05. Kruskal-Wallis test and t-tet were used to determine the differences for independent variables in research, while nonhierarchical method of K-means clustering is used to determine the profiles of handball players.

Among all the dimensions of MSSPT, the only statistically significant difference between the clubs (from different levels of the sport excellence) is found for the dimension *Energy lowing pressure*, where the highest means have the players from the club PPD Zagreb, while the lowest mean is found for MRK Metalac (Table 1).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Differences in the dimensions of Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT), according	J
to the club	

Club		Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis test		
	Metalac	-0.158	0.780			
enthusiasm and energy	Zagreb	0.026	0.992	0.213		
	Zamet	-0.004	1.104			
	Metalac	-0.123	1.047			
dedication	Zagreb	0.049	0.969	0.871		
	Zamet	-0.070	1.075			
	Metalac	0.279	1.240			
self-esteem	Zagreb	0.067	0.899	0.139		
	Zamet	-0.252	1.107			
	Metalac	-0.092	1.198			
energy as motivator	Zagreb	0.124	1.023	0.095		
5,	Zamet	-0.235	0.832			
	Metalac	0.313	1.106			
energy as strength while errors	Zagreb	-0.043	1.034	0.346		
	Zamet	-0.031	0.880			
	Metalac	-0.322	1.178			
energy lowing pressure	Zagreb	0.142	1.014	0.026*		
	Zamet	-0.183	0.851			
	Metalac	-0.207	1.338			
energy as stable performance	Zagreb	0.072	1.003	0.381		
	Zamet	-0.075	0.842			
	Metalac	0.330	0.906			
optimism/ happiness	Zagreb	-0.057	1.073	0.214		
	Zamet	0.014	0.852			
optimism/ energy	Metalac	0.542	1.121			
	Zagreb	-0.131	0.986	0.060		
	Zamet	0.106	0.941			
Leave de difference estatisticalle significant et y 0.05						

Legend: difference statistically significant at p<0.05

Statistically significant differences between age groups are revealed in four dimensions (Table 2). In dimension *Enthusiasm and energy*, the youngest age group (<=12) shows highest mean, while the lowest is found in the oldest (>18) age group. In the *Self-esteem*, players 17-18 years old show highest means (in 15-16 years

age group mean was lowest). In the dimension *Energy as motivator*, highest mean is found for the youngest age group (<=12), while boys from the age group 15-16 years show lowest mean. In *Energy lowing pressure*, players aged 17-18 showed highest mean, while the oldest (>18) age group had the lowest mean.

Table 2: Differences in the dimensions of Multidimensional Scale of Sports' Psychological Talents (MSSPT) according to players' age group

enthusiasm and energy $< =12$ 0.237 0.550 13-14 0.197 0.833 15-16 0.516 1.451 0.029* 17-18 0.0640 1.416 dedication $<=12$ 0.010 0.930 13-14 0.322 0.804 15-16 0.358 1.357 0.129 17-18 0.160 0.933 >18 -0.342 0.966 self-esteem $<=12$ 0.207 1.007 13-14 0.025 0.884 15-16 0.501 1.201 0.049* 17-18 0.319 0.972 >18 -0.217 0.634 energy as motivator $<=12$ 0.278 1.032 13-14 0.141 0.821 15-16 0.551 1.031 0.003** 17-18 0.108 0.736 >18 -0.546 0.918 energy as strength while errors $<=12$ 0.039 0.971 13-14 0.285 1.233 15-16 0.855 1.233 15-16 0.085 0.974 0.231 15-16 0.309 0.343 energy lowing pressure $<=12$ 0.141 1.066 13-14 0.208 1.069 15-16 0.305 0.625 0.004** 17-18 0.449 0.364 >18 0.449 0.364 >18 0.449 0.364 >18 0.442 0.795 energy as stable performance <=12 0.210 0.780 15-16 0.031 1.272 0.159 15-16 0.042 0.795 <=12 0.210 0.780 optimism/ happiness 13-14 0.140 0.946 15-16 0.031 0.278 <=12 0.210 0.780 <=12 0.220 0.751 <=14 0.138 1.092 <=15 0.024 0.996 <=15 0.024 0.996 <=14 0.028 0.645			Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis test
enthusiasm and energy <=12					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	enthusiasm and energy	<=12	0.237	0.550	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		13-14	0.197	0.833	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		15-16	-0.516	1.451	0.029*
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		1/-18	-0.041	1.11/	
dedication <=12		>18	-0.640	1.416	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	dedication	<=12	-0.010	0.930	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		13-14	0.322	0.804	0.420
$ 7-18 0.160 0.933 \\ >18 -0.342 0.966 \\ \hline \\ self-esteem < <12 0.207 1.007 \\ 13-14 -0.025 0.884 \\ 15-16 -0.501 1.201 0.049* \\ 17-18 0.319 0.972 \\ >18 -0.217 0.634 \\ \hline \\ energy as motivator < <12 0.278 1.032 \\ 13-14 0.141 0.821 \\ 15-16 -0.551 1.031 0.003** \\ 17-18 -0.108 0.736 \\ >18 -0.546 0.918 \\ \hline \\ energy as strength while errors < <12 -0.039 0.971 \\ 13-14 -0.285 1.233 \\ 15-16 0.085 0.974 0.231 \\ 17-18 0.574 0.702 \\ >18 0.309 0.343 \\ \hline \\ energy lowing pressure < <12 -0.141 1.066 \\ 13-14 0.208 1.069 \\ 15-16 0.305 0.625 0.004** \\ 17-18 0.449 0.364 \\ >18 -0.701 0.945 \\ \hline \\ energy as stable performance < <12 0.130 0.898 \\ 13-14 -0.095 1.099 \\ 15-16 0.031 1.272 0.159 \\ 17-18 0.128 0.764 \\ >18 -0.442 0.795 \\ \hline \\ optimism/ happiness \\ 13-14 0.140 0.946 \\ 15-16 -0.452 1.486 0.055 \\ 13-14 0.123 0.458 \\ >18 -0.560 0.961 \\ \hline \\ optimism/ energy < <12 0.024 0.996 \\ 13-14 0.138 1.092 \\ -17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ >18 -0.089 0.645 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ >18 -0.089 0.645 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ >18 -0.089 0.645 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ >18 -0.089 0.645 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 1.092 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 0.751 \\ 17-18 0.100 - 1.092 \\ \hline \\ energo - 200 - 2$		15-16	-0.358	1.357	0.129
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		1/-18	0.160	0.933	
Self-esteen 3-14 - 0.025 0.884 13-14 - 0.025 0.884 15-16 - 0.501 1.201 0.049* 17.18 0.319 0.972 >18 - 0.217 0.634 energy as motivator < =12 0.278 1.032 13-14 0.141 0.821 15-16 -0.551 1.031 0.003** 17.18 - 0.108 0.736 >18 - 0.546 0.918 energy as strength while errors $<=12 - 0.039$ 0.971 13-14 - 0.285 1.233 15-16 0.085 0.974 0.231 17.18 0.574 0.702 >18 0.309 0.343 energy lowing pressure $<=12 - 0.141$ 1.066 13-14 0.208 1.069 15-16 0.305 0.625 0.004** 17.18 0.449 0.364 >18 -0.701 0.945 energy as stable performance $<=12 0.130 0.898$ 13-14 - 0.095 1.099 15-16 0.031 1.272 0.159 17.18 0.128 0.764 >18 -0.701 0.945 energy as stable performance $<=12 0.210 0.780$ optimism/ happiness $13-14 0.140 0.946$ 15-16 -0.452 1.486 0.055 17.18 0.123 0.458 >18 -0.560 0.961 optimism/ happiness $13-14 0.138 1.092$ 5-16 -0.269 1.042 0.751 17.18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645	colf acta and	>10	-0.342	0.966	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	sen-esteem	<=IZ	0.207	1.007	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		15-14	-0.025	0.004	0.040*
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		17 10	-0.501	1.201	0.049
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		17-10 \18	0.213	0.972	
energy as inclusion $< < 12$ 0.2776 1.032 13-14 0.141 0.821 15-16 -0.551 1.031 $0.003**$ 17-18 -0.108 0.736 >18 -0.546 0.918 energy as strength while errors $< =12$ -0.039 0.971 13-14 -0.285 1.233 15-16 0.085 0.974 0.231 17-18 0.574 0.702 >18 0.309 0.343 energy lowing pressure < 12 -0.141 1.066 13-14 0.208 1.069 15-16 0.305 0.625 $0.004**$ 17-18 0.449 0.364 >18 -0.701 0.945 energy as stable performance < 12 0.130 0.898 antificity -0.711 0.945 0.159 optimism/ happiness $13-14$ 0.140 0.946 $15-16$ 0.031 1.272 0.159 $17-18$ 0.128 0.764 518 -0.422 1.486 0.055 0.961 0.961 0.961 0.961 optimism/ happiness $13-14$ 0.138 1.092 $a = 12$ 0.024 0.996 $13-14$ 0.138 1.092 $a = 12$ 0.2024 0.996 $a = 12$ 0.210 0.751 $a = 12$ 0.210 0.751 $a = 12$ 0.160 0.9645	oporquias motivator	/10	0.217	1 032	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	energy as motivator	13_1/	0.270	0.821	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		15-14	-0 551	1 031	0 003**
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		17_18	-0.331	0.736	0.005
energy as strength while errors <=12		×18	-0.100	0.750	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	energy as strength while errors	/-12	-0.040	0.910	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	energy as strength while enors	13-14	-0.035	1 233	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		15-16	0.085	0.974	0 231
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		17-18	0.574	0 702	0.251
energy lowing pressure<=12-0.1411.06613-140.2081.06915-160.3050.625 $0.004**$ 17-18 0.449 0.364>18 -0.701 0.945energy as stable performance<=12		>18	0.309	0.343	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } 13-14 & 0.208 & 1.069 \\ 15-16 & 0.305 & 0.625 & 0.004^{\star\star} \\ 17-18 & 0.449 & 0.364 \\ >18 & -0.701 & 0.945 \\ \hline \\ energy as stable performance & <=12 & 0.130 & 0.898 \\ 13-14 & -0.095 & 1.099 \\ 15-16 & 0.031 & 1.272 & 0.159 \\ 17-18 & 0.128 & 0.764 \\ >18 & -0.442 & 0.795 \\ \hline \\ energy as balance & <=12 & 0.210 & 0.780 \\ energy as balance & <=12 & 0.210 & 0.780 \\ energy as balance & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	energy lowing pressure	<=12	-0.141	1.066	
15-16 0.305 0.625 0.004** 17-18 0.449 0.364 >18 -0.701 0.945 energy as stable performance <=12		13-14	0.208	1.069	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c } 17-18 & 0.449 & 0.364 \\ > 18 & -0.701 & 0.945 \\ \hline \\ energy as stable performance & <=12 & 0.130 & 0.898 \\ 13-14 & -0.095 & 1.099 \\ 15-16 & 0.031 & 1.272 & 0.159 \\ 17-18 & 0.128 & 0.764 \\ > 18 & -0.442 & 0.795 \\ \hline \\ energy a barbox & 13-14 & 0.140 & 0.946 \\ 15-16 & -0.452 & 1.486 & 0.055 \\ 17-18 & 0.123 & 0.458 \\ > 18 & -0.560 & 0.961 \\ \hline \\ optimism/ energy & <=12 & 0.024 & 0.996 \\ 13-14 & 0.138 & 1.092 \\ 13-14 & 0.138 & 1.092 \\ 15-16 & -0.269 & 1.042 & 0.751 \\ 17-18 & 0.100 & 1.092 \\ > 18 & -0.089 & 0.645 \\ \hline \end{array}$		15-16	0.305	0.625	0.004**
>18 -0.701 0.945 energy as stable performance <=12		17-18	0.449	0.364	
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$		>18	-0.701	0.945	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	energy as stable performance	<=12	0.130	0.898	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		13-14	-0.095	1.099	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		15-16	0.031	1.272	0.159
>18 -0.442 0.795 optimism/ happiness <=12		17-18	0.128	0.764	
<=12		>18	-0.442	0.795	
optimism/ happiness 13-14 0.140 0.946 15-16 -0.452 1.486 0.055 17-18 0.123 0.458 >18 -0.560 0.961 optimism/ energy <=12		<=12	0.210	0.780	
15-16 -0.452 1.486 0.055 17-18 0.123 0.458 0.458 >18 -0.560 0.961 0.996 optimism/ energy <=12	optimism/ happiness	13-14	0.140	0.946	
17-18 0.123 0.458 >18 -0.560 0.961 optimism/ energy <=12		15-16	-0.452	1.486	0.055
>18 -0.560 0.961 optimism/ energy <=12 0.024 0.996 13-14 0.138 1.092 15-16 -0.269 1.042 0.751 17-18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645		17-18	0.123	0.458	
optimism/ energy <=12 0.024 0.996 13-14 0.138 1.092 15-16 -0.269 1.042 0.751 17-18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645		>18	-0.560	0.961	
13-14 0.138 1.092 15-16 -0.269 1.042 0.751 17-18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645	optimism/ energy	<=12	0.024	0.996	
15-16 -0.269 1.042 0.751 17-18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645		13-14	0.138	1.092	
17-18 0.100 1.092 >18 -0.089 0.645		15-16	-0.269	1.042	0.751
>18 -0.089 0.645		17-18	0.100	1.092	
		>18	-0.089	0.645	

Mean Std. Deviation Kruskal-Wallis test

There were no statistically significant differences revealed in the dimensions of MSSPT, according to winning medals in junior state championship, or according to actual (or previous) membership in the junior national team.

	Cluster		
	1	2	
enthusiasm and energy	-0.338	0.108	
dedication	-0.184	0.032	
self-esteem	0.008	-0.009	
energy as motivator	-0.414	0.124	
energy as strength while errors	0.178	-0.037	
energy lowing pressure	-0.188	0.064	
energy as stable performance	-0.075	0.022	
optimism/ happiness	-0.369	0.102	
optimistic energy	-0.108	0.016	
Number in cluster	21	101	
Metalac	0	11	
Zamet	10	24	
PPD Zagreb	11	66	
Younger (<17)	4	97	
Older (≥17)	17	4	

Table 3: K-means cluster analysis – male handball players, grouped according to their psychological characteristics

The results of K-means clustering revealed two profiles of male handball players. In the first cluster, relatively small number of handball players are grouped, with higher means in *Selfesteem* and *Energy as strength while making errors.* In first cluster, older handball players are grouped, while in the second cluster younger players are grouped (with higher means in all other psychological characteristics).

Age group appeared to be a key factor for differentiating male handball players according their psychological characteristics. However, even when statistically significant differences are found, there is no clear age trend in certain psychological characteristics. Energy focused on lowing pressure is the highest in top-level team PPD Zagreb and lowest in team (Metalac) which is included in lowest rank of the competition. Higher requests in higher levels of competition could explain differences in this psychological feature. Some previous studies indicate that concentration skills (such as mental energy) are improving with age (Nideffer & Bond, 2012; Kovářová & Kovář, 2010), what is not proved in this study. One of the explanations of the absence of clear differences could be that (independently of competition level), all handball players share general satisfaction with sport (Soyer, 2012) and/or satisfaction with life (Pavot & Diener, 1993). However, the motivation and mental preparation are often useful indicators. which differentiate between elite and sub-elite athletes (Weinberg & Gould, 2003; Soyer, 2012), while AE, ME and optimism are conceptually very close to these constructs. The motivation could be mirrored in these three concepts (AE, ME and optimism).

The advantage of this study is the use of these (new) measuring instruments, providing the insight in differences between Croatian male handball players of various age and competition level. The main lack of the research is the fact that it is still pilot study. In spite of including players from different competition levels, according to their age, this is still heterogeneous sample of participants. The sample of participants has to be additionally stratified by of athletes' sports development stages (especially in younger age groups), and has to be larger and more representative for the population of handball players in future research. However, even this differentiation (by gender, level of sport excellence, type of sport, age group), which is used in this study, could be regarded as useful information for sport coaches, as well as for sport psychologists. Namely, orientation standards obtained in this study could serve as the start point to develop individualized training programs to improve studied psychological characteristics (Nideffer & Bond, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The results revealed that the most significant differences are found in dimensions of MSSPT between the players of different age groups, while no differences are found according to winning medals in junior state championship, or according to the membership in the junior national team. Only one difference is found between the teams that play in different completion levels (Energy focused on lowing pressure is the highest in top-level team PPD Zagreb). K-means clustering revealed two profiles of male handball players. In the first cluster are older players with higher means in Self-esteem and Energy as strength while making errors, while in the second cluster are grouped younger players with higher means in all other psychological characteristics.

Acknowledgements

We are especially grateful to the athletes from all the clubs, who actively contributed in this research, or provide support for it. Moreover, special thanks to the Secretary General of the Zagreb Handball Federation Kazimir Ilijaš, LL.M., to Una Kavran, Mkin (trainer), ivan Vranković, trainer, and to Morana Katalinić, trainer, for their help in organizing and conducting the research.

REFERENCES

- 1. Appleton, J., Christenson, S., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. Journal of School Psychology, 44, 427–445.
- 2. Berger, B. G., Grove, J. R., Prapavessis, H., & Butki, B. D. (1997). Relationship of swimming distance, expectancy, and performance to mood states of competitive athletes. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 84, 1199-1210.
- 3. Dunn, J. G. H., & Nielsen, A. B. (1996). A classificatory system of anxiety-inducing situations in four team sports. Journal of Sport Behavior, 19(2), 111-131.
- 4. Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. Psychological Review, 100(3), 363-406.
- 5. Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K., & Moffett, A. (2001). The Development of psychological talents in U.S. Olympic champions. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- 6. Hodge, K., Lonsdale, C., & Jackson, S. (2009). Athlete Engagement in Elite Sport: An Exploratory Investigation of Antecedents and Consequences. The Sport Psychologist 23, 186-202.
- 7. Lieberman, H.R. (2006). Mental Energy: Assessing the Cognition Dimension. Nutrition Reviews, 64 (7), 10-13.
- Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Jackson, S. (2007a). Athlete engagement: II. Development and initial validation of the Athlete Engagement Questionnaire. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 38, 471–492.
- 9. Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Raedeke, T. (2007b). Athlete engagement: I. A qualitative investigation of relevance and dimensions. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 38, 451–470.
- 10. Martin, A.J. (2008). Motivation and engagement in music and sport: Testing a multidimensional framework in diverse performance settings. Journal of Personality, 76(1), 135-170.
- 11. Mead, T. P., Drowatzky, J. N., & Hardin-Crosby, L. (2000). Positive and negative stimuli in relation to tennis players' reaction time. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 90, 236-240.
- 12. O'Connor, P.J. (2006). Mental Energy: Assessing the Mood Dimension. Nutrition Reviews, 64(7), 7-9.
- 13. Pavot, W., & Diener, E.F. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. Psychological Assessment, 5, 164-172.
- Rogulj, N., Nazor, M., Srhoj, V., Božin, D. (2006). Differences between competitively efficient and less efficient junior handball players according to their personality traits. Kinesiology, 38(2), 158-163.
- 15. Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimist from neurotic (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(6), 201-228.
- 16. Seifriz, J.J., Duda, J. L., & Chi, L. (1992). The relationship of perceived motivational climate to intrinsic motivation and beliefs about success in basketball. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14, 375-391.
- 17. Seligman, M. (1990). Learned optimism. NY: Knof.
- Sindik, J., Botica, A., Fiškuš, M. (2015). Preliminary psychometric validation of the Multidimensional Inventory of Sport Excellence: attention scales and mental energy. Montenegrin Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 4 (2), 17-28.
- Sindik, J., Missoni, S., Horvat, V. (2015). A comparison of psychological skills and traits in male handball players of different age groups. U: Book of Proceedings XVIII International Scientific Conference FIS Communications 2015. Pantelić, S. (Ed.). Niš, Srbija, 15.-17.10.2015., pp 293-298. Niš,: Faculty of sport and physical education, University of Niš.
- 20. Soyer, F. (2012). The Effects of Positive and Negative Emotionality on the Satisfaction of Sport: A Research on Elite Athletes. Collegium Antropologicum, 36(3), 937-943.
- 21. Srhoj, V. (2002). Situational efficacy of anthropomotor types of young female handball players. Collegium Antropologicum, 26(1), 201-210.

- 22. Weinberg, R. S, & Gould, D. (2003). Foundations of sport and exercise psychology. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 23. Wiggins, M. S. (1998). Anxiety intensity and direction: Pre-performance temporal patterns and expectations in athletes. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 10, 201-211.

PSIHOLOŠKA OBILJEŽJA I CRTE KOD RUKOMETAŠA – OPTIMIZAM, SPORTSKI ANGAŽMAN I MENTALNA ENERGIJA

Sažetak

Osnovni cilj istraživanja bio je utvrditi razlike u nekim dimenzijama baterije psiholoških upitnika u okviru Višedimenzionalne skale psiholoških sportskih talenata (VSPST) kod rukometaša, u odnosu na pripadnost klubu, dobnoj skupini, osvajajnju medalja i članstvu u juniorskoj reprezentaciji. Drugi je cilj bio utvrditi profile muških rukometaša u svim ispitanim psihološkim karakteristikama u VSPST. Ispitan je namjerni uzorak od 127 rukometaša, članova momčadi Prvo plinarsko društvo, Metalac (Zagreb) i Zamet (Rijeka). U ovom istraživanju, korištena su tri instrumenta iz baterije VSPST: Skala mentalne energije (MES), skala sportske angažiranosti (AES) i Skala optimizma (OS). Rezultati su pokazali da su najznačajnije razlike pronađene u dimenzijama VSPST između igrača različitih dobnih skupina, a nisu pronađene razlike prema osvajanju medalja na juniorskom državnom prvenstvu, ili prema članstvu u juniorskoj reprezentaciji. K-means klasteriranje otkrilo je dva profila rukometaša. U prvom su stariji igrači s većim samopoštovanjem i energijom koja se pokazuje kao snaga nakon počinjenih pogrešaka, dok su u drugom klasteru grupirani mlađi igrači s većim prosjecima u svim ostalim psihološkim karakteristikama.

Ključne riječi: psihološki profili, muški rukomet, sportska izvedba

Corresponding author: doc. dr. sc. Joško Sindik, Institute for Anthropological Research, Ljudevita Gaja 32, Zagreb E-mail: <u>josko.sindik@inantro.hr</u>