*** SPORT AND PERFORMANCE**

PERSONALITY INFLUENCE OF THE FOOTBALLER IN THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE FOOTBALL GAME

DRĂGAN AURELIAN¹, PLOIESTEANU CONSTANTIN¹, CIOLCĂ SORIN²

Abstract

The personality of the football player contributes in decisive mode to him affirmation in the football of great performance and it cans to manifest a strong influence over the display of the football game.

Purpose: The aim of the research activity consists in to find the effective solutions concerning the affirmations of the footballers, through the utilisation of the specific methods and techniques of psycho-sociologistical training.

Methods and procedures: For to achieve what we proposed through the aim of the research, we used the next methods: the method of the observation; the experimental method; the statistical methods; the method of the discussion.

Results: The aplication at players of the methods of knowledge of the personality improves the strokes of personality, of motivation, temper, specific but and general thinking.

Discusions: The questions of the psychological test constitute important locate points in the establishment of the strategy of improvement concerning the personality.

Conclusions: The implication of the coach in the improvement of the personality strokes of the footballer contributes to the sporting performance.

Key words: neurosis; aggressivity; low spirits; irritability; oneself control.

Introduction

All the specialists agree with the characteristics concerning the personality of the football player, as the firmness, combativity, perseverence, tranquil, possession of oneself must be permanently educate through special trainings and games constituted. An adequate physical preparation, for example, will grow the efficiency of the attack and defence actions expressed through aggressive spirit and intention of combat, but and through the dosage of the effort through the achievement of the economic game which will push the team from attack in the opposite half on the short road and with minimum individual or collective effort (T.O., Bompa, 2002).A football team is a group with aim, in which the personality of each membre is at alike of important, while the result is not something else than theresult of the efforts of each from the players (M. Giacomini, 2009).

Purpose.The purpose of each activity of research consists in to find efficacy solutions concerning the affirmation of the players, through the utilisation of the specific methods and technics pf psycho-sociological training. He included in special mode discusions before achieved with the players, in the time and after the development of the trainings and official contests.The hypothesis of the research is the next: we suppose that the active involving of the coach

in to improve the problems concerning the personality of the players will conduct at the growth of the efficiency for the preparation of the preadolescents and teenagers footballers.

Research methods and procedures

In the view of the achievement of this research, we used the next research methods: the observation method, the experimental method, the method of the discussion, the statistical method, the method of the graphical representations. As methods of knowledge concerning the personality of the football players we used two kinds of methods: clinical method (the observation, the discussion, the biographycal method the anamnesis) and psychometrical methods or experimental (the experiment, the test and the questionnnaire). The experimental team is constitute from the young footballers who belong to F.C. Otelul Galati and are borned in 1993, coach Rogea Mitică. The witness team is constitute from the young players who belong to F.C. Dunărea Galati and are borned in 1993, coach Balaban Sorin. We mention that the players from the two groups, both the experimental team and the witness team, started to practise the football play from at 8-9 years, and they passed through more much phases of selection, so, we can say the the experiment was applied of the best players of them age. Through the next personality test applied we reflected: the neurosis, the aggressivity, the depresion,

Email: aureldragan62@yahoo.com

¹Physical Education and Sport Faculty, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, ROMANIA ²National University of Physical Education and Sport Bucharest, ROMANIA

Received 10.03.2011 / Accepted 22.04.2011

the iritability, the sociabily, the oneself possession, the extravertit, the introvertit, the masculine and the

Table	1 The personality te	st
No.	QUESTION	SCORE
1.	Do you make often	123456
	reproach concerning at the	
	behaviour on you have	
	him?	
2.	Do you believe that it	123456
	spend more many for the	
	social asistance ?	
3.	Do you believe that	123456
	through questions with	
	general character it cans	
	give an arranged estimate	
	?	
4.	Do you have often	123456
	concerns face of the	
	failures ?	
5.	Dou you feel untired and	123456
	incomparable?	
6.	Do you feel in mood to	123456
	you subjugate of the strict	
	discipline ?	
7.	Do you can express the	123456
	feelings face of the others	
	?	
8.	Do you have sometimes	123456
	the fear face of the	
	personal aggressivity?	
9.	Do you have often	123456
	involvings in disputes	
	concerning the justice ?	
10.	Are there little persons for	123456
	you who can be in fact	
	dears ?	
11.	Do you have tracemotions	123456
	when you must play in the	
	front side of the numerous	
	public ?	
12.	Do you have difficulties	123456
	to recognize the guilty ?	
13.	Do you have protests	
	when for a product you	123456
	must give more money	
	than you know how much	
	it costs ?	
14.	Do you can speak frank	123456
	with others about your	
	intimate life ?	
15.	Do you have sometimes	1.2.3.4.5.6

womanly (H. Siewert, 2001).

	the impression that the	
	world stealthily sees you	
	for as than it speaks you	
	on at back ?	
16.	Do you thinks that it's	123456
	correct that the people	
	must to fight for make	
	career ?	
17	Are you a jealous person?	123456
18	Do you have distinct	123456
10.	habits such as to gnaw	1
	the pails or the extremities	
	of pencils ?	
10	Do you have comptimes	122456
19.	Do you have sometimes	123430
	panis or neau, migrene	
20	migraines ?	10010
20.	Do you have timidity face	123456
	of the people crowd ?	
21.	Do you give way	123456
	sometimes only for to	
	avoid the conflictual	
	situations ?	
22.	Do you speak at partyies	123456
	with more world ?	
23.	Are you involve in little	123456
	accidents ?	
24.	Do you feel irritation and	123456
	hesitation when you take a	
	decisive decision?	
25.	Do you often look for a	123456
	change in your relations	
	with the membres of the	
	family ?	
26	Do you know more	123456
20.	persons who are your	12
	opponents and who want	
	to make you displeasure?	
27	Do you can stimulate the	123156
21.	good mood of the party are	123430
	good mood of the partners	
20	when they are angry ?	1 2 2 4 5 6
28.	Do you believe that the	123456
	inness ensurings are	
•	expensive ?	
29.	Do you listen with	123456
	pleasure the counsels of	
	the others ?	
30.	Do you feel more good in	123456
	the reserve position, than	
	when you are in field ?	

Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH

Vol. 11, ISSUE 2, 2011, Romania

Our JOURNAL is nationally acknowledged by C.N.C.S.I.S., being included in the B+ category publications, 2008-2011. The journal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPORTDiscus, INDEX COPERNICUS JOURNAL MASTER LIST, DOAJ DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCES JOURNALS

31.	Are you often preoccupy	123456
32	Do you believe that you	123456
52.	have sufficient personal	12
	trust for to tolerate a	
	defeat ?	
33.	Do you have often the	123456
	same anxieties ?	
34.	Do you respect with	123456
	strictness certain	
	behaviour rules ?	
35.	Do you make movement	123456
	excepting the nours of	
36	Do you think that the	123456
50.	others consider that you	12
	are unpredictable ?	
37.	Are you an impulsive	123456
	person?	
38.	Do you involve with	123456
	pleasure in discussions ?	
39.	Do you feel often	123456
	abandoned by the persons	
10	from around ?	
40.	Do you think that the	123456
41	Triends betray your trust ?	1 2 2 4 5 (
41.	Do you have angers	123456
42	Do you have often pains	123456
.2.	for the reason of the	1
	indigestion ?	
43.	Are you rather negligently	123456
	?	
44.	Do you sometimes treat	123456
	roughly on the others ?	
45.	Do you have often the	123456
	thought that you can to	
16	are unexpectedly ?	1 2 2 4 5 6
40.	inclination for to get	123436
	together things about	
	which you think that they	
	can be useful ever ?	
47.	Do you have concerns for	123456
	politics ?	
48.	Are you sometimes	123456
	terrible of jealous ?	
49.	Are you always in a good	123456
	mood ?	1.0.0.1
50.	LDo you think that your	1.2.3.4.5.6
	life has a server 9	
51	life has a sense ?	1 2 2 4 5 6

	-	
	concerning your	
	personality ?	
52.	Do you have concerns	123456
	about the good of the	
	public ?	
53.	Do you found easy	123456
	something for to make	
	when you are alone ?	
54.	Do you have often	123456
	concerns about one and	
	the same thought ?	
55.	Are you easy nerves	1.2.3.4.5.6
	concerning the	
	unimportant facts ?	
56	Do you wish to relish the	123456
50.	sorts of foof in place of to	1
	finish as more fast the	
	meal?	
57	Do you say frankly the	122156
57.	opinions?	12
50	Do you have within	122456
38.	Do you have criticisms	1234
	sometimes about the	
50	attitude of the colleagues?	1.2.2.4.5.6
59.	Do you think that you are	123456
	considered by the persons	
	from around as a	
	presumptuous person ?	
60.	Do you think that you are	123456
	un polite when you speak	
	at telephone ?	
61.	Do you feel more good	123456
	when you listen the	
	sentiment music ?	
62.	Do you think that the red	123456
	light is adapted for the	
	dynamic activities ?	
63.	Do you accept the wishs	123456
	of the family sooner that	
	personal wishs ?	
64.	Are you happy when you	123456
	obtain what you want	
	from at the others in the	
	situation when you are	
	sentimentally ?	
	Do you can kill in need	123456
65.		
65.	for to defend you ?	
65. 66.	for to defend you ?Doyoulookwith	123456
65. 66.	for to defend you ? Do you look with admiration at the nice	123456
65. 66.	for to defend you ? Do you look with admiration at the nice persons ?	123456
65. 66. 67.	for to defend you ? Do you look with admiration at the nice persons ? Do you offer importance	123456
65. 66. 67.	for to defend you ? Do you look with admiration at the nice persons ? Do you offer importance of the fact for to be	123456

Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH Vol. 11, ISSUE 2, 2011, Romania

Our JOURNAL is nationally acknowledged by C.N.C.S.I.S., being included in the B+ category publications, 2008-2011.

			, 0	0 1	,	
TI ' I'' I I' EI CDODTD'	DIDEV CODEDMI	CHIC TOTIDNAT	MACTED LICE DOA	I DIDECTODU OF ODEN	ACCEC TOUDWALC C.I.	CIC I .
I ne iournal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPUK I Discus	S. INDEX COPERNI	US JUUKNAI	7 MASTER LIST. DUA	AJ DIKECTORY OF OPEN	ACCESJOURNALS, Cap	v. Gale Cengace Learning
···· j······ ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··· ··	.,					,,

68.	Are you active fun of any	123456
	sporting team ?	
69.	Do you have concerns that	123456
	you don't can pay the	
	debts ?	
70.	Do you come out from	123456
	house with pleasure ?	
71.	Do you like the children ?	123456
72.	Do you have cares for	123456
	long time when you listen	
	bad news ?	
73.	Do you like to be at least	123456
	at one time chief ?	
74.	Do you have attraction	123456
	concerning the affirmed	
7.5	players ?	
75.	Do you have a healthy	123456
7(sieep ?	1 2 2 4 5 6
/6.	Don t you can tolerate on	123456
	une indoient or irritating	
77	De veu rece under sileree	1 2 2 4 5 6
//.	bo you pass under silence	123456
	instead to denounce them	
78	Do you whish to be	123456
70.	enroled as voluntary if the	12
	contry cans be attacked ?	
79.	Is there in your life	1.2.3.4.5.6
	unpleasant thinks on	
	which you don't whish	
	knowed?	
80.	Do you meet sooner with	123456
	good disposition each day	
	from life ?	
81.	Do you think that the	123456
	sincerity cans contribute	
	to a atmosphere of more	
	good life ?	
82.	Are you angry as effect of	123456
	the crowd ?	
83.	Do you smoke ?	123456
84.	Do you sometimes think	123456
	that you can more good	
	conduct more on the	
	persons from around than	
0-	others ?	1.0.0.
85.	Do you feel good when	123456
01	you are at home ?	
86.	Do you like to be	123456
	considered sooner as a	
1	satisfied by oneself person	

	and with trust in personal	
	forces ?	
87.	Do you like the others	123456
	company when you come	
	out from house ?	
88.	Do you have the stamps,	123456
	articles from press	
	concerning a certain	
	theme ?	
89.	Do you have the	123456
	impression when you	
	listen the speach of the	
	coach that he speak direct	
	with you ?	
90.	Do you whish to buy a car	123456
	by instalments ?	

In this personality test, each question had indicated six possibilies of answer, for intensities in a graduated growth, marked so: 1 = as of little; 2 = in a certain measure; 3 = more much yes than no; 4 = probably that it's yes; 5 = I hope that it's yes; 6 = certainly that it's yes.

Table 2. The statistical indicators for neurosis

Results

1. Neurosis

The statistical indicators	Tl experin tea	he mental 1m	The witness team		
	T 1	T ₂	T 1	T ₂	
The arithmetical average	26,94	22,63	27,19	26,44	
The standard deviation	4,75	4,43	5,00	5,16	
Maximum	39	33	40	40	
Minimum	24	19	21	20	
Amplitude	15	14	19	20	
Coefficient of variation	17,63	19,58	18,39	19,52	

BExperimental team

Type 1. Neurosis - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH Vol. 11, ISSUE 2, 2011, Romania

Our JOURNAL is nationally acknowledged by C.N.C.S.I.S., being included in the B+ category publications, 2008-2011. The journal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPORTDiscus, INDEX COPERNICUS JOURNAL MASTER LIST, DOAJ DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCES JOURNALS, Caby, Gale Cengace Learning

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D21(%)
The experimental team	26,94	22,63	-4,31	-16,00
The witness team	27,19	26,44	-0,75	-2,76

Table 3. The difference between tests – neurosis

At the experimental team it registers a subtraction with 16% (4,31 points) face of the initial test. At the witness team, at the final test, it registers a subtraction with 2,76% (0,75 points) face of the initial test. The both teams are relative homogenous, because the coefficient of variation has values between 10-20%.

 Table 4. The difference between the arithmetical

averages of the teams – neurosis

The team and the differences	T_1	T_2
The experimental team	26,94	22,63
The witness team	27,19	26,44
Experiment - witness	-0,25	-3,81
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-0,92	-14,41

At the initial test, the level of the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 0.92 % (0.25 points) more little than the aritmetical average of the witness team.

At the final test, the value of the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 14,41 % (3,81 points) more little than the average of the witness team (Drăgan, A., 2009).

2. Aggressivity

Table 5. The statistical indicators for aggressivity

The statistical indicators	Tl experii tea	'he The witnes imental team		
	T 1	T ₂	T ₁	T ₂
The arithmetical average	35,44	31,31	36,25	34,56
The standard deviation	5,14	4,71	4,82	4,21
Maximum	42	38	44	40
Minimum	26	22	30	28
Amplitude	16	16	14	12
Coefficient of variation	14,50	15,04	13,30	12,18



Type 2. Aggressivity - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 6. The difference between tests – aggressiv	`able 6. T	The difference	e between	tests -	aggressivi	ity
---	------------	----------------	-----------	---------	------------	-----

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D21(%)
The experimental team	35,44	31,31	-4,13	-11,65
The witness team	36,25	34,56	-1,69	-4,66

At the experimental team, at the final test, it registers a subtraction with 11,65 % (4,13 points) face of the initial test. At the witness team, at the final test, it registers a subtraction with 4,66 % (1,69 points) face of the initial test. We observe that the both teams are relative homogenous, because the coefficient of variation has values between 10-20%.

 Table 7. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams – aggressivity

8	00	·
The team and the differences	T_1	T ₂
The experimental team	35,44	31,31
The witness team	36,25	34,56
Experiment - witness	-0,81	-3,25
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-2,23	-9,40

At the initial test, the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 2,23 % (0,81 points) more little than the average level of the witness team.

At the final test, the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 9,4 % (3,25 points) more little than the average of the witness team.

3. Depresion

The statistical indicators	The experimental team		The witness team		
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₁	T ₂	
The arithmetical average	36,13	31,50	36,56	35,19	
The standard deviation	5,14	5,42	4,37	4,45	
Maximum	42	39	43	42	
Minimum	26	21	26	25	
Amplitude	16	18	17	17	
Coefficient of variation	14,23	17,21	11,95	12,65	

Table 8.	The statistical indicators for depresion	
1 4010 01	The statistical matcators for acpresion	



Type 3. Depresion - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests Table 9. The difference between tests – depresion

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D ₂₁ (%)
The experimental team	36,13	31,50	-4,63	-12,81
The witness team	36,56	35,19	-1,37	-3,75

At the final test applied at the experimental team it registers a subtraction with 12,81 % (4,63 points) face of the initial test. At the witness team, at the final test, it observes a subtraction with 3,75 % (1,37 points) face of the initial test. The both groups are homogenous, because the coefficient of variation has values between 10-20%.

Table 10. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams – depression

The team and the differences	T ₁	T ₂
The experimental team	36,13	31,50
The witness team	36,56	35,19
Experiment - witness	-0,43	-3,69
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-1,18	-10,49

At the initial test, the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 1,18 % (0,43 points) more little than the average of the witness team. Also, at the final test, the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 10,49 % (3,69 points) more little face of the aritmetical level of the witness team.

4. Irritability

The statistical indicators	Tl experii tea	he mental Im	The witness team	
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₁	T ₂
The arithmetical average	28,06	23,88	28,63	27,19
The standard deviation	5,41	4,73	4,40	4,31
Maximum	35	31	41	40
Minimum	21	18	24	23
Amplitude	14	13	17	17
Coefficient of variation	19,28	19,81	15,37	15,85

Table 11.	The statistical	indicators	for	irritability
-----------	-----------------	------------	-----	--------------



Type 4. Irritabilty - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 12. The difference between tests – irritability

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D ₂₁ (%)
The				
experimental	28,06	23,88	-4,18	-14,90
team				
The witness	28.63	27 10	1.44	5.03
team	28,05	27,19	-1,44	-5,05

At the experimental team, at the final test, it registers a subtraction of 14,9 % (4,18 points) face of the initial test. At the witness team, at the final test, we observe a subtraction with 5,03 % (1,44 points) face of the initial test.

The both teams are relativ homogenous, because the coefficient of variation has values between 10-20 %.

 Table 13. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams – irritability

-		
The team and the differences	T_1	T ₂
The experimental team	28,06	23,88
The witness team	28,63	27,19
Experiment - witness	-0,57	-3,31
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-1,99	-12,17

The initial level concerning the arithmetical average of the experimental team is with 1,99 % (0,57 points) more little than the average of the witness team. At the final test, the value of the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 12,17 % (3,31 points) more little face of the aritmetical average achieved by the witness team.

5. Sociability

Table 14. The statistical indicators for sociability

The statistical indicators	Tl experi tea	he mental 1m	The witness team		
	T 1	T ₂	T 1	T ₂	
The					
arithmetical	32,56	36,63	31,56	33,06	
average					
The standard	5 78	6.01	3 44	3 36	
deviation	5,70	0,01	5,77	5,50	
Maximum	42	45	36	37	
Minimum	22	25	25	26	
Amplitude	20	20	11	11	
Coefficient of variation	17,75	16,41	10,90	10,16	



Type 5. Sociability - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 15. The difference between tests – sociability

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D21(%)
The experimental	32,56	36,63	4,07	12,50

team				
The witness team	31,56	33,06	1,50	4,75

At the experimental team, we observe at the final test that it registers a growth with 12,5 % (4,07 points) face of the initial test. Also, at the final test concerning the witness team it registers a growth with 4,75 % (1,5 points) face of the initial trial. The both groups are relativ homogenous, as effect of the fact that the coefficient of variation has the values between 10-20 %.

 Table 16. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams – sociability

The team and the differences	T_1	T ₂
The experimental team	32,56	36,63
The witness team	31,56	33,06
Experiment - witness	1,00	3,57
(Experiment - witness) (%)	3,17	10,80

At the initial trial, the value of the aritmetical average at the experimental team is with 3,17 % (1 point) more great than the level of the average concerning the witness team.

At the final test, the arithmetical average at the experimental group is with 10.8 % (3.57 points) more great than the average of the witness team.

6. Oneself control

Table 17. The statistical indicators for oneself control

The statistical indicators	The experimental team		The witness team	
	T 1	T ₂	T 1	T ₂
The arithmetical average	36,94	41,31	36,31	37,81
The standard deviation	5,04	5,39	3,81	4,00
Maximum	43	48	40	42
Minimum	28	32	29	30
Amplitude	15	16	11	12
Coefficient of variation	13,64	13,05	10,49	10,58

Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH Vol. 11, ISSUE 2, 2011, Romania

Our JOURNAL is nationally acknowledged by C.N.C.S.I.S., being included in the B+ category publications, 2008-2011. The journal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPORTDiscus, INDEX COPERNICUS JOURNAL MASTER LIST, DOAJ DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCES JOURNALS, Caby, Gale Cengace Learning



Type 6. Oneself control - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 18. The difference between tests – oneself control

Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D ₂₁ (%)
The experimental team	36,94	41,31	4,37	11,83
The witness team	36,31	37,81	1,50	4,13

At the experimental team, at the final test, it registers a growth with 11,83 % (4,37 points) face of the initial test.

At the final test achieved at the witness team we observe a growth with 4,13 % (1,5 points) face of the initial test.

Also, both the experimental team and the witness team are relativ homogenous, because the coefficient of variation has values between 10-20%.

Table 19. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams - oneself control

The team and the differences	T ₁	T_2
The experimental team	36,94	41,31
The witness team	36,31	37,81
Experiment - witness	0,63	3,50
(Experiment - witness) (%)	1,74	9,26

It observes that at the initial test, the level of the arithmetical average achieved at the experimental group is with 1,74 % (0,63 points) more great than the value of the average of the witness team.

At the final test, the value of the aritmetical average measured at the experimetal team is with 9,26 % (3,5 points) more great than the level of the arithmetical average achieved at the witness team.

7. Extravert - introvert

Table 20. The statistical indicators for extravert-introvert

The statistical indicators	The experimental team		The witness team	
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₁	T ₂
The arithmetical average	35,56	31,06	35,94	34,38
The standard deviation	5,09	4,96	4,17	4,15
Maximum	42	39	42	41
Minimum	23	19	28	26
Amplitude	19	20	14	15
Coefficient of variation	14,31	15,97	11,60	12,07



Type 7. Extravert – introvert - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 21. The difference between tests – extravert - introvert

Team	T_1	T ₂	D ₂₁	D21(%)
The experimental team	35,56	31,06	-4,50	-12,65
The witness team	35,94	34,38	-1,56	-4,34

At the final test achieved at the experimental team it registers a subtraction with 12,65 % (4,5 ponits) face of the initial test. At the witness team, we observe at the final test a subtraction with 4,34 % (1,56 points) face of the initial test. Also, the both groups are homogenous as effect of the fact that the coefficient of variation has the values between 10-20 %.

Table 22. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams - extravert - introvert

The team and the differences	T_1	T ₂
The experimental team	35,56	31,06
The witness team	35,94	34,38
Experiment - witness	-0,38	-3,32
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-1,06	-9,66

At the initial test applied at the experimental team, the level of the arithmetical average is with 1,06 % (0,38 points) more little than the value of the

arithmetical average of the witness team. At the final test, the value of the arithmetical average at the experimental team is with 9,66 % (3,32 points) more little than the level of the arithmetical average measured at the witness team.

8. Masculine – womanly

Table 23. The statistical indicators for masculine - womanly

The statistical indicators	The experimental team		The witness team	
	T ₁	T ₂	T ₁	T ₂
The arithmetical average	35,50	30,13	35,81	33,50
The standard deviation	5,72	5,35	3,76	3,72
Maximum	45	39	41	38
Minimum	23	19	31	28
Amplitude	22	20	10	10
Coefficient of variation	16,11	17,76	10,50	11,10



Type 8. Masculine – womanly - the levels of the arithmetical averages at the initial and final tests

Table 24. The difference between tests – masculine - womanly

1114	woma	iiiy		
Team	T ₁	T ₂	D ₂₁	D ₂₁ (%)
The experimental	35,50	30,13	-5,37	-15,13
team The witness	25.01	22.50	0.01	<u> </u>
team	35,81	33,50	-2,31	-6,45

References

- **BOMPA T.,O., 2002,** *Periodisation the theory and the methodology of the training,* Publishing House EX PONTO, C.N.F.P.A., Bucharest, 37-40.
- GIACOMINI, M., 2009, *The technical guide for the schools of football*, Italia, 135-141.

At the experimental team, at the final test it observs a subtraction with 15,13 % (5,37 points) face of the initial trial. At the witness team, at the final test it registers a subtraction with 6,45 % (2,31 points) face of the initial test. Also, the boths teams are homogenous because the coefficient of variation has the value between 10-20 %.

 Table 25. The difference between the arithmetical averages of the teams – masculine - womanly

The team and the differences	T ₁	T ₂
The experimental team	35,50	30,13
The witness team	35,81	33,50
Experiment - witness	-0,31	-3,37
(Experiment - witness) (%)	-0,87	-10,06

At the initial test, the value of the arithmetical average measured at the experimental team is with 0,87 % (0,31 points) more little than the value of the average of the witness team. At the final test, the level of the arithmetical average achieved at the experimental team is with 10,06 % (3,37 points) more little than the level of the average of the witness team.

Discussion

This research reflects the fact that the personality of the football player contributes in a decisive mode to him affirmation in the football of high performance. The questions of the test constitute important points for to locate and to establish the strategy of improvement of the personality. We can say that to apply at the players the methods of knowledge of the personality it means to improve the strokes of personality, of motivation, temper, specific thinking, but and general thinking (Ploiesteanu, C., 2005).

Conclusions

The involving of the coach in to improve the personality strokes of the footballer contributes at the improvement of the sporting performances, but and the school performances. We propose the efficacy interweaving of the technics of training with the elements of physical preparation according to the age of the footballers. The selection of the footballers musts to be more much centred round on the elements of the physical preparation. Also, we propose as each coach to achieve still at the age of the selection, psychilogical record cards which can to help him in to obtain from time performances.

PLOIESTEANU, C., 2005, Lecture of base, Academica Publishing House, Galati, 78-89.

SIEWERT, H., 2001, *Personality tests*, Publishing House Gema Press, Bucharest, 82-96.

Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH

Vol. 11, ISSUE 2, 2011, Romania

Our JOURNAL is nationally acknowledged by C.N.C.S.I.S., being included in the B+ category publications, 2008-2011. The journal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPORTDiscus, INDEX COPERNICUS JOURNAL MASTER LIST, DOAJ DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCES JOURNALS, Caby, Gale Cengace Learning