

3.	Pivoting forward	M	4.1	2.0	2.1
		E	4.2	1.7	2.5
4.	Pivoting Backward	M	4.4	2.2	2.2
		E	4.5	1.9	2.6
5.	Pivot by stepping	M	4.5	2.6	1.9
		E	4.6	2.0	2.6

Back pivoting was a little more complicated than the previous one, which is why athletes of both groups recorded an average of 4.4-4.5 execution errors in initial testing. At the end of the pedagogical experiment, the number of mistakes decreased to 2.2 mistakes in the control group and 1.9 mistakes in the experimental group.

Finally, the last pivotal process was that of walking, which was somewhat more complicated in terms of execution technique. Thus, at initial testing, both groups scored between 4.5-4.6 mistakes, as at the end of the pedagogical experiment the number of mistakes was reduced to 2.6 mistakes in the control group and 2.0 in the experimental group.

Therefore, the experimental methodology applied to beginner basketball lessons had a considerable effect on movement assimilation, which in fact are the basis for appropriation of any sports game, including basketball, thus fully confirming the hypothesis advanced at the beginning of the pedagogical experiment.

References

- Ciorbă C. *Baschet pregătire fizică*, Chişinău, Garomont Studio, 2016, - 229 p.
Ciorbă C. *Baschet-curs grafic-lăşi*: Pim, 2006, p.5-20; p.7-123.
Ciocoiu., Hânsa C., Ciorbă C. *Baschet-Galaţi*: SC Videotel SRL, 2007, p.229.
Colibaba-Evuleţ D., Bota I. *Jocurile sportive. Teorie şi metodică*. Bucureşti : Aldin, 1998, p. 5-19; p. 56-91; p. 170-175.
Fleancu J.L., Ciorbă C. *Baschetul la 8-12 ani.- Garuda Art.-Chişinău*, 2001.-P.7-12.
Fleancu J.L. *Baschet. Teorie şi Metodică*. Craiova: Universitaria, 2007.
Hânsa C., Călin L. *Baschet. Tehnică şi tactică*. Galaţi: Fundaţiei Universitare “Dunărea de Jos”, 2004, p. 15.
Нестровский Д.И. Баскетбол теория и методика обучения.-М.:Академия, 2007, 335 с.

Investigation of Humor Styles of National Athletes in Terms of Some Variables

İlimdar Yalçın^a, Murat Özmaden^b, Yasin Yıldız^c

^a Sakarya University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Sakarya, Turkey

^{b, c} Adnan Menderes University, Department of Physical Education and Sport, Aydın, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the humor styles of the national athletes who took part in the Turkish Athletics Federation in 2016 according to some variables. The research group included 176 volunteer national athletes (64 females, 112 males) who are active in various nationality grades (A, B and C) in the Turkish Athletics Federation. In the research study, “Humor Styles Scale”, developed by Martin et al. (2003) and translated into Turkish by Yerlikaya (2003), was used as data collection tool. The data obtained in the study was analyzed by the SPSS 22 packet program. The margin of error in the study was taken as $p < 0.05$. The cronbach alpha value of the study was found to be 0.71. Consequently; when the sub-dimensions with some variables of humor styles of national athletes participating in the research are examined, a statistically significant difference was determined in the self-improving humor style sub-dimension in the gender variable. The level of self-improving humor was higher in women than in men. A statistically significant difference was observed in subscale of aggressive and self-destructive humor styles in age variable. When the educational status variable is examined, it is observed that there is a statistically significant difference in the self-destructive humor style sub-dimension.

Keywords: national athlete, athletics, humor style

1. Introduction

Humor is a concept that has attracted the interest of many thinkers, authors and researchers from different disciplines such as philosophy, literature, psychology, sociology, education and management throughout history and is still being debated (Cemaloğlu et al., 2012, p.695). It is important that the concept which is quite intertwined with human life, is put forward with its various qualities in terms of the understanding of its functioning process. Even if there is a concern for humor today, the fact that everyone is trying to show other humans that humor is their own personality is in fact an indication of how important the topic is (Sayar, 2012, p.11).

Humor is the ability to see the fun direction of events and situations, and the ability of someone to see, perceive, or tell that something is ridiculous (Ilhan, 2005, p.11). Another definition of humor is an effective mechanism used to combat the problems encountered in everyday life and to overcome the situational difficulties (Thorson ve Powell, 1993, p.14). At the same time, the sense of humor is a non-unfriendly and philosophical feeling, a characteristic of joy, the ability of interpretation and understanding or of a person who has realized herself (Cengiz et al., 2016, p.492). According to Yerlikaya (2009), as understood from these definitions, it is understood that humor covers everything that is perceived as humorous, or perceived as funny, but also a broad-framed concept that includes intellectual processes that allow such an entertaining situation to be perceived or created, and our emotional reaction that allows us to enjoy it. The concept of humor has lost its narrow meaning in the 20th century and has begun to make sense of all the phenomena related to laughter. Thus, humor has become a phenomenon used to refer to situation comedies, political criticism and mockery published in all kinds of laughter, jokes, television, and radio. With this state of humor, humor can be both positive and beneficial, as well as aggressive, hostile and harmful (Yerlikaya, 2009, p.14).

Humor can also be used as a means of confronting problems, coping with negative emotions and avoiding troubles (Stieger et al., 2011, p.748).

Humor allows people to communicate more warmly with each other. People are taking a non-serious stand against what they talk or do while using humor (Cimen, 2011, p.5).

Individual differences in the use of humor consist of four dimensions. Two of these dimensions are positive (self-enhancing and participatory) and two are composed of negative (aggressive and self-destructive) humor styles (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2016, p.126).

Participatory humor is positive humor. Individuals with this trait show reduced anxiety, fear and tensions in the communication process, make jokes to entertain people in the environment, and even tell funny things about themselves, in order to create a positive communication environment. However, his/her discourse about himself and others does not contain harsh and degrading expressions (Martin et al., 2003, p.53).

Self-enhancing humor can be defined as the use of humor to deal with adverse situations. It is the type of humor that the person uses to reduce their negative emotions, taking into account the needs of others and himself/herself and coping with stress and other personal problems (Martin et al., 2003, p.54).

Aggressive humor is negative humor. While aggressive humorous individuals express their feelings of anger through humor, they use a language that hurts other individuals. This situation does not provide an improvement to the individuals and affects inter-personal relations negatively. In this way, there is humor that is sarcastic, berserk, rascal, humiliating, sexual or racist (Martin et al., 2003, p.54).

Self-destructive humor is a negative form of humor. Individuals with this humorous style see themselves as a way to humiliate and tease, to be endorsed by the group or to be loved (Martin et al., 2003, p.54).

When the humor concept is considered in the sport environment, the athletes will have a positive contribution to the effective communication as well as helping them to overcome this problem when they encounter any problems with both their teammates and coaches during the training. Humor within the team changes according to the personality traits of the individual, the time of the humor, and the space where the humor is made. Therefore, this situation must be taken into account in order to prevent negative influences in sports environment.

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the humor styles of the national athletes in the Turkish Athletics Federation in 2016 according to some variables.

2. Material and Method

This section includes the research group, the data collection tool, analysis, methods and techniques related to the solution of the data.

The research was based on quantitative research design. In a stage of many elements, the general screening model of scanning the entire universe or a sample taken from it in order to arrive at a general judgment on the universe is suitable for the relational screening model as well as the general screening models since it relies on determining the relationship between the research variables (Karasar, 2012, p.79).

2.1. Research Group

The research group consists of 176 volunteer national sportspersons who are in the sprint and jump groups in the camps for the Olympic candidate team organized by the Turkish Athletics Federation in Antalya and Istanbul in 2016.

2.2. Data Collection Tool

In the research, "Humor Styles Scale", developed by Martin et al. (2003) and translated into Turkish by Yerlikaya (2003), was used as data collection tool. Scale, humor styles are classified in four sub-dimensions. Each subscale consists of 8 items. These are: Self-Improvement Humor (2-6-10-14-18-22-26-30), Participatory Humor (1-5-9-13-17-21-25-29), Aggressive Humor (3-7-11-15-19-23-27-31) and Self Destructive Humor (4-8-12-16-20-24-28-32). These four dimensions are grouped into harmonious-positive humor (Self-Enhancing and Participatory Humor) and incompatible-negative humor (Aggressive Humor and Self-Destructive). On the scale, items 1-7-9-15-16-17-22-23-25-29-31 are scored in the opposite direction. The scale consisting of a total of 32 items is a 7-point Likert-type self-assessment questionnaire which measures the type of humor used by individuals (1) Absolutely not Participating and (7) Totally Participating. The cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the validity-reliability scale were .67 to .78 for university students and .81 for the total score; the test-retest correlation coefficients were found to be between .83 and .88 (Martin et al.,2003; Yerlikaya, 2003).

2.3. Data Analysis

The data obtained in the study was taken from the SPSS 22 package program and the frequency (f) and percent (%) distributions of the variables were calculated. The histograms were checked by evaluating skewness and kurtosis to ensure normal distribution of the data. Therefore, the t-test and variance analysis (Anova) test was used. Tukey test results were used to determine which groups differed significantly. The margin of error in the study was taken as $p < 0.05$. The cronbach alpha value of the study was found as 0.71.

3. Findings

In this section, findings about variables of study are included. Findings showing the distributions of national athletes participating in the survey according to their personal qualities were examined and interpreted.

Table 1: Values of Statistical Distribution Related to the Level of Humorous Sub-Dimensions according to Athletes Gender Variable

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	SS	t	p
Self-Improvement Humor	Woman	64	37.87	7.86	3.13	0.00*
	Male	112	33.83	8.44		
Participatory Humor	Woman	64	30.57	5.38	-0.52	0.58
	Male	112	31.07	6.30		
Aggressive Humor	Woman	64	29.79	6.13	-0.22	0.82
	Male	112	30.01	6.52		
Self-Destructive Humor	Woman	64	29.98	7.52	1.12	0.26
	Male	112	28.65	7.55		

The analysis of the subscales of humor styles of national athletes participating in the research included in Table 1 shows no statistically significant difference in the levels of participatory humor, aggressive humor, and self-destructive humor between women and men ($p > 0.05$), but it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference in self-improvement humor style sub-dimension ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2: Values of Statistical Distribution Related to the Level of Humorous Sub-Dimensions according to the Sportspersons' Age Variable

	Age	N	\bar{X}	SS	F	p
Self-Improvement Humor	16-18	90	34.76	9.13	0.78	0.55
	19-21	37	36.94	6.74		
	22-24	26	35.88	7.44		
	25 and over	23	34.08	9.21		
	Total	176	35.30	8.44		
Participatory Humor	16-18	90	30.57	6.61	0.33	0.80
	19-21	37	31.35	5.47		
	22-24	26	30.57	4.58		
	25 and over	23	31.73	5.73		
	Total	176	30.89	5.97		
Aggressive Humor	16-18 *	90	28.77	7,03	4.37	0.00*
	19-21 *	37	33.10	5,29		
	22-24	26	30.03	5,00		
	25 and over	23	29.26	5,06		
	Total	176	29.93	6.37		
Self-Destructive Humor	16-18 *	90	27.58	7.60	6.59	0.00*
	19-21 **	37	33.70	5.43		
	22-24 *	26	27.88	7.31		
	25 and over	23	29.26	7.94		
	Total	176	29.13	7.54		
	19-21 **	37	33,70	5,43		
	22-24 *	26	27,88	7,31		
	25 and over	23	29,26	7,94		
	Total	176	29,13	7,54		

As seen in Table 2, while there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of humor and participant humor, when the subscales of national athletes' humor styles and age variation are examined ($p>0.05$), it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between aggressive humor for ages 16-18 and 19-21, and between ages 19-21, 16-18 and 22-24 for self-destructive humor level ($p>0.05$).

Table 3: Values of Statistical Distribution Related to Level of Humorous Sub-Dimensions according to Sportspersons' Educational Variable

	Education Status	N	\bar{X}	SS	F	p
Self-Improvement Humor	High school	105	35.19	8.63	0.16	0.94
	University	51	35.80	7.69		
	Postgraduate	20	34.60	9.61		
	Total	176	35.30	8.44		
Participatory Humor	High school	105	30.97	6.26	1.25	0.29
	University	51	31.47	5.02		
	Postgraduate	20	29.00	6.55		
	Total	176	30.89	5.97		
Aggressive Humor	High school	105	29.09	6.80	2.65	0.73
	University	51	31.56	5.46		
	Postgraduate	20	30.20	5.54		

	Total	176	29.93	6.37		
Self-Destructive Humor	High school*	105	27.85	7.46	1.26	0.14*
	University*	51	31.56	6.99		
	Postgraduate	20	29.65	8.08		
	Total	176	29.13	7.54		

The analysis of the sub-dimensions of humor styles of national athletes participating in the research and their educational statuses in Table 3 shows no statistically significant differences in the levels of self-promoting humor, participatory humor and aggressive humor ($p>0.05$); it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between the sportspersons who graduated high school and those with university education in self-destructive humor level ($p>0.05$).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this section, the findings about whether the subscales of 176 national humor styles participating in my study differ according to some variables are discussed and interpreted.

When the results between the gender variables and humor style subscales of the athletes were examined, while there was no statistically significant difference in participant humor, aggressive humor and self-destructive humor level ($p>0.05$), it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the men and the women in the self-improving humor style sub-dimension ($p<0.05$) (Table 1). Female athletes were found to have higher levels of self-promoting humor than men. In his work on university students in 2012, Sayar found a statistically significant difference between the “self-destructive” humor sub-dimension and gender variation (Sayar, 2012, p.129) and in this regard, it supports the result of this study.

When the results of the subscales between the age variable and the humor styles of the athletes were examined, while no statistically significant difference was found between the levels of “self-improving humor” and “participatory humor” ($p>0.05$), it was found there was a statistically significant difference between the ages of 19-21 and between the ages of 19-21 and the ages of 16-18 years and 22-24 years at the level of “self-destructive humor” ($p<0.05$) (Table 2). It was observed that the athletes in the age range of 19-21 years were both higher in “aggressive humor” level and “self destructive” humor level than the other age groups. The high level of humor of the athletes in this age group may be attributed to the neighborhood, family or cultural factors. Looking at a different study, in a study conducted by Özgülap (2015) to examine the relation between humor styles and psychological manifestations, a statistically significant difference was found only in participant humor between age variation and humor style subscales (Ozdolap, 2015, p.53). It was a study contrary to the result of our work because there was no meaningful relationship between aggressive humor and self-destructive humor level. While there was no statistically significant difference in the levels of “self-promoting humor”, “participatory humor” and “aggressive humor” ($p>0.05$), when the results of the sport status variables and humor style subscales were examined it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between the athletes with a university education and those with a university education ($p<0.05$) (Table 3). The educational status of the athletes with university education was found to be higher than the ones with high school education in self-destructive humor level. In the study conducted by Acikgoz (2016) on students in medicine, no statistically significant difference was found between education status variables and humor style subscales (Acikgoz, 2016, p.44). Because there is no meaningful relationship at the level of “self-destructive humor”, it is contrary to the result of our study.

Consequently, as a result of examining the subscales of humor styles of national athletes participating in the study according to various variables, it was determined that the level of “self-promoting humor” of female athletes is higher than that of men. It has been observed that the athletes in the age range of 19-21 are both higher in the “aggressive humor” level and in the “self-destructive humor” level than the other age groups. The educational status of the athletes who were university students was found to be higher than the ones with high school education in self-destructive humor level.

References

1. Açıkgöz, M. (2016). *Çukurova üniversitesi tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık ile mizah tarzları ve mutluluk düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Çağ Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mersin, p.44.

2. Altıncut, Y. & Yılmaz, K. (2016). Öğretmenlerin mizah tarzları ile örgütsel sinizm düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*; (32): pp.122-143.
3. Cemaoğlu, N, Receptoğlu, E., Şahin F., Daşçı, E. & Köktürk, Os. (2012). Mizah davranışları ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(4), pp.694-716.
4. Cengiz, R., Kayhan, M. & Acet, M. (2016). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin mizah tarzları ile algılanan duygusal bezdirme üzerine araştırma. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS)*, 4:(S12), pp.490-501.
5. Çimen, B. (2011). *Devlet ve özel okullarda görev yapan sınıf öğretmenlerinin mizah kullanma yeterlilikleri konusundaki algılarının incelenmesi*. Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimler Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Antalya, p.5.
6. İlhan, T. (2005). *Öznel iyi oluşa dayalı mizah tarzları modeli*. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, p.11.
7. Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 21.Baskı, Ankara, s.79.
8. Martin, RA., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, JJ. & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences of uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: development of the humor styles questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37 (1), pp.48-75.
9. Martin, RA., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Grey, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: development of the humor styles questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), pp.48-75.
10. Özdolap, M. (2015). *Mizah tarzları ve psikolojik belirtiler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. İstanbul Bilim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı, Uygulamalı Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, p.53.
11. Sayar, B. (2012). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin mizah tarzları ile umutsuzluk ve boyun eğici davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Eğitimde Psikolojik Hizmetler Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya, p.11.
12. Stieger, S., Formann, AK. & Burger, C. (2011). Humor styles and their relationship to explicit and implicit self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50 (5), pp.747-750. Doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.025.
13. Thorson, J. A. & Powell, F. C. (1993). Development and validation of a multidimensional sense of humor scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49 (1), pp.13-23.
14. Yerlikaya, E. E. (2003). *Mizah Tarzları Ölçeği'nin (The Humor Styles Questionnaire) Uyarlama Çalışması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana, p.37.

The Strength Development of 16-17-Year-Old Rugby Players through Weight Training Exercises in Annual Training Cycle

Bragarenco Nicolae^a, Tabîrta Vasile^b, Goraşenco Alexandr^c

^{a, b, c} The State University of Physical Education and Sport, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

Abstract

This article reflects the experimental argumentation of the effectiveness of applying the experimental program for the development of muscle strength to 16-17-year-old rugby players in an annual training cycle. Starting from the hypothesis that the use of weight training exercises for strength development, systematized depending on the training stage of 16-17-year-old rugby players, will directly influence the full potential of their muscular force. The experimental program was developed and proposed to the experimental group, which reflects: objectives specific to the training meso-cycle, connection ratio between effort and rest, dosing the means of force development in a training lesson, while the control group followed the traditional training in gym. In both groups were selected and analysed the tested indices for determining the maximum force at the beginning and the end of the pedagogical experiment, the data being mathematically and statistically processed and presented in tabular form. Analysing the final results, we can see that the hypothesis advanced at the beginning of the research has been confirmed, which has allowed to raise the maximum potential of the muscular force through the use of weight training exercises for the development of force, systematized depending on the stage of preparation of the 16-17 years old rugby players in the training process.

Keywords: experimental program, strength development, 16-17-year-old rugby players

Introduction: Sports training is the main means of training athletes in order to participate in competitions and to achieve the planned performances. Sports junior training is a process of training and educating the athletes in order to participate in sports competitions with a high degree of efficiency and training them for high performance. [1].