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#### Abstract

To investigate the relationship between the selected personality profile and also the position of the players in the professional female basketball players was the aim of this study. The sample contains 107 professional Iranian female basketball players, who completed the Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI2Rf). The personality profile of the basketball players included specific clinical problems and PSY-5 profiles. The One-way statistical method of ANOVA was used to examine the differences of the personality among the groups of the players in five different positions $(\mathrm{p}=0.01)$. The results have shown, that the five personality factors aggressiveness, shyness, interpersonal passivity, low positive emotions, and inefficacy were significantly different in various positions (point guard, shooting guard, small forward, power forward and center).
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## 1 -INTRODUCTION

For many years, there was an increasing interest in the investigation of the athlete's personality. This belief, that a relationship exists between the personality and the physical abilities, was an assumption, which was long kept by the educators, the coaches, the trainers, and the others, who were involved in the exercise. And this subject was frequently discussed. Some of the above persons or groups believe, that the personality can play an important role in developing a skilled person or player [1,2].

The athlete's personality was examined by researchers in many different ways. For example, many have studied the differences of the personality between the athletes and also the non-athletes [3-5]. The others studied the players of a team and also the individual sports [6-8]. The differences of the personality have been found between the successful and unsuccessful players [9] and also between the athletes in different sports [5,10]. There were some studies, which have examined on the relationship between the position of the players and the athletes' personalities. [11-13].

Schaubhut et al. (2006) studied the North American professional football player's personality profile and also examined on the differences in the different positions and also offence vs. defense; cpi260 was used in this study. The results showed some differences of the personality among the players in different positions [13].

Five types of players are known in basketball: point guards, shooting guards, small forwards, power forwards, and center. They are different in a basketball game according to their positions in the playground as well as their playing roles in the defense and offence team tactics. So the positions in the basketball game are the important parts of a general strategy. And according to the positions of the play, it is necessary to divide the players, in order to improve the offence and defense abilities and also increase the efficiency.

Two researchers in Slovenia, who were busy with the different dimensions of psychological states in the young basketball players, studied some of the basketball's positions like guards, forwards, and center [14].

The relationship between the personality profile in the professional basketball players and their positions in the team has been not adequately studied. This study also tried to fill this gap in the literature by examining the personality profile of the professional female basketball players. Furthermore, the two items, testing of the personality in the talent identification process and also understanding the athlete's personality for predicting the future athletic success ,can help the educators to select the members of their teams.
In this study, we examined the differences in the selected personality profiles of the professional Iranian female basketball players in five different positions.
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## 2. METHODS

## 2.1 participants

The participants included 107 Iranian female basketball players. The sample made up of 105 players, who were classified in 26 point guards, 26 shooting guards, 18 small forwards, 17 power forwards, and 20 centers. Their coach selected their positions of the play. It was also the position of the play in the national championship matches. The average age of the athletes, who wanted to participate in the study as volunteers was $23.54 \pm 1.28$ years.

### 2.2 Instrument

Psychological profile of the basketball players were assessed using Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI2Rf- revised 2008). It consisted of 12 clinical scales, 25 problems of the specific scales, and 5 PSY-5 Scales.
2.3 Data analysis methods

The data were analyzed with descriptive statistics and one sample $t$ test. The statistics were calculated using SPSS 6.0 package. The statistical method was One-way ANOVA.

## 3. RESULTS

As there was an only slow difference among median, mode and mean in all scales and as skew coefficient and coefficient of kurtosis, is the distribution of data was normal and the mean can be used as a measure of central tendency (Table 1, 2, 3). One-way ANOVA was used to compare the means of the personality trait with an emphasis on the clinical specific problems and PSY-5 profiles of players in different positions.

Table 1-Statistical indexes and analysis of variance for clinical scale in five different basketball positions

| Clinical profile | Position | mean | Standard deviation | Significant level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Internalizing Dysfunction | point guard | 13.80 | 8.60 | 0.606 |
|  | shooting guard | 13.88 | 5.92 |  |
|  | small forward | 11.16 | 6.24 |  |
|  | power forward | 13.76 | 3.63 |  |
|  | Center | 12.75 | 4.25 |  |
| Thought Dysfunction | point guard | 7.30 | 4.23 | 0.426 |
|  | shooting guard | 8.03 | 4.62 |  |
|  | small forward | 7.50 | 3.36 |  |
|  | power forward | 5.82 | 3.57 |  |
|  | Center | 8.20 | 4.26 |  |
| Behavioral Dysfunction | point guard | 6.76 | 3.99 | 0.833 |
|  | shooting guard | 7.42 | 3.52 |  |
|  | small forward | 7.16 | 3.58 |  |
|  | power forward | 7.76 | 2.86 |  |
|  | Center | 6.60 | 3.28 |  |
| Demoralization | point guard | 6.88 | 4.76 | 0.894 |
|  | shooting guard | 7.69 | 4.20 |  |
|  | small forward | 7.38 | 4.39 |  |
|  | power forward | 6.70 | 2.88 |  |
|  | Center | 7.75 | 3.72 |  |
| Somatic Complaints | point guard | 8.46 | 3.69 | 0.211 |
|  | shooting guard | 9.61 | 4.43 |  |
|  | small forward | 7.61 | 2.68 |  |
|  | power forward | 8.11 | 2.82 |  |
|  | Center | 5.70 | 1.72 |  |
| Low Positive Emotions | point guard | 5.11 | 3.02 | 0.011** |
|  | shooting guard | 5.00 | 2.48 |  |
|  | small forward | 3.55 | 1.68 |  |
|  | power forward | 6.29 | 1.40 |  |
|  | Center | 5.70 | 2.17 |  |
| cynicism behavior | point guard | 8.23 | 2.38 | 0.739 |
|  | shooting guard | 8.96 | 2.30 |  |
|  | small forward | 8.94 | 2.64 |  |
|  | power forward | 8.70 | 2.22 |  |
|  | Center | 8.15 | 2.83 |  |
|  | point guard | 5.42 | 3/28 |  |


| Antisocial behavior | shooting guard | 5.84 | 3.13 | 0.962 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | small forward | 5.66 | 3.74 |  |
|  | power forward | 5.23 | 2.65 |  |
|  | Center | 5.25 | 3.02 |  |
| Ideas of Persecution | point guard | 4.42 | 2.98 | 0.452 |
|  | shooting guard | 6.07 | 2.52 |  |
|  | small forward | 4.38 | 2.17 |  |
|  | power forward | 3.47 | 2.21 |  |
|  | Center | 4.45 | 3.25 |  |
| Dysfunctional Negative Emotions | point guard | 7.26 | 3.67 | 0.959 |
|  | shooting guard | 7.80 | 2.93 |  |
|  | small forward | 7.77 | 3.24 |  |
|  | power forward | 7.94 | 2.62 |  |
|  | Center | 7.70 | 2.83 |  |
| Aberrant Experiences | point guard | 6.46 | 3.45 | 0.256 |
|  | shooting guard | 7.15 | 3.40 |  |
|  | small forward | 6.61 | 2.85 |  |
|  | power forward | 5.00 | 3.18 |  |
|  | Center | 7.00 | 2.73 |  |
| hippomanic activation | point guard | 9.07 | 3.80 | 0.412 |
|  | shooting guard | 9.53 | 2.76 |  |
|  | small forward | 10.16 | 2.87 |  |
|  | power forward | 8.82 | 2.53 |  |
|  | Center | 10.35 | 2.08 |  |

Fig. 1 shows the mean clinical scales of MMPI2RF profiles for the selected positions including point guards, shooting guards, small forwards, power forwards, and center. Power forward was on average higher than low positive emotion scale compared to the other positions. Conversely the minimum amount of this scale was devoted to small forward position.


Figure 1: clinical profiles in five different basketball positions

Table 2-statistical index and analysis of variance for specific problems

| Specific problem | position | mean | standard deviation | significant level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Malaise | point guard | 5.00 | 1.49 | 0.889 |
|  | shooting guard | 4.84 | 1.68 |  |
|  | small forward | 5.11 | 1.27 |  |
|  | power forward | 4.64 | 1.36 |  |
|  | center | 4.85 | 1.27 |  |
| Gastrointestinal complaints | point guard | 0.5 | 0.90 | 0.108 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.34 | 1.38 |  |
|  | small forward | 0.83 | 0.92 |  |
|  | power forward | 1.11 | 1.21 |  |
|  | center | 0.95 | 1.14 |  |
| head pain complaints | point guard | 2.38 | 0.98 | 0.890 |
|  | shooting guard | 2.42 | 1.41 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.27 | 1.07 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.11 | 1.16 |  |
|  | center | 2.15 | 1.22 |  |
| neurological complaints | point guard | 3.46 | 2.01 | 0.274 |
|  | shooting guard | 3.65 | 2.05 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.94 | 1.58 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.70 | 1.96 |  |
|  | center | 3.90 | 1.77 |  |
| Cognitive complaints | point guard | 3.15 | 2.46 | 0.838 |
|  | shooting guard | 3.03 | 2.42 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.44 | 1.82 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.70 | 1.96 |  |
|  | center | 2.80 | 1.73 |  |
| Suicidal Ideation | point guard | 1.07 | 1.23 | 0.123 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.30 | 1.12 |  |
|  | small forward | 0.66 | 0.76 |  |
|  | power forward | 0.58 | 0.61 |  |
|  | center | 1.10 | 1.02 |  |
| helplessness-Hopelessness | point guard | 1.15 | 1.04 | 0.662 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.30 | 1.73 |  |
|  | small forward | 1.38 | 1.46 |  |
|  | power forward | 1.64 | 1.11 |  |
|  | center | 1.60 | 1.09 |  |
| self-doubt | point guard | 1.00 | 1.13 | 0.934 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.26 | 1.28 |  |
|  | small forward | 1.22 | 1.01 |  |
|  | power forward | 1.11 | 1.16 |  |
|  | center | 1.10 | 1.11 |  |
| Inefficacy | point guard | 3.53 | 1.72 | $0.008^{* * *}$ |
|  | shooting guard | 4.53 | 1.74 |  |
|  | small forward | 3.83 | 2.45 |  |
|  | power forward | 5.64 | 1.69 |  |
|  | center | 3.80 | 2.19 |  |
| Stress | point guard | 2.50 | 1.44 | 0.984 |
|  | shooting guard | 2.69 | 1.61 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.55 | 1.65 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.70 | 1.49 |  |
|  | center | 2.70 | 1.17 |  |
| Anxiety | point guard | 1.69 | 1.46 | 0.651 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.50 | 1.20 |  |
|  | small forward | 1.55 | 1.04 |  |
|  | power forward | 1.41 | 1.01 |  |
|  | center | 2.00 | 1.58 |  |
| Anger Proneness | point guard | 3.46 | 1.47 | 0.872 |
|  | shooting guard | 3.50 | 44.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 66.3 | 41.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 29.3 | 44.1 |  |
|  | center | 20.3 | 36.1 |  |
| Behavior-restricting Fears | point guard | 15.3 | 82.1 | 0.552 |
|  | shooting guard | 3.07 | 31.2 |  |
|  | small forward | 72.3 | 44.2 |  |
|  | power forward | 58.3 | 58.1 |  |
|  | center | 70.2 | 94.1 |  |


| Multiple specific Fears | point guard | 73.3 | 18.2 | 0.214 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | shooting guard | 34.4 | 43.2 |  |
|  | small forward | 61.3 | 97.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 88.3 | 3.11 |  |
|  | center | 90.2 | 37.1 |  |
| Juvenile conduct problems | point guard | 42.1 | 17.1 | 0.714 |
|  | shooting guard | 57.1 | 33.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 88.1 | 88.2 |  |
|  | power forward | 58.1 | 1.06 |  |
|  | center | 15.1 | 26.1 |  |
| substance abuse | point guard | 72.0 | 93.0 | 0.611 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.03 | 39.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 93.0 | 43.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 17.1 | 13.1 |  |
|  | center | 30.1 | 41.1 |  |
| Aggression | point guard | 42.3 | 2.06 | 0.496 |
|  | shooting guard | 19.4 | 72.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 35.3 | 72.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 76.3 | 20.1 |  |
|  | center | 60.3 | 81.1 |  |
| Activation | point guard | 4.03 | 34.2 | 0.203 |
|  | shooting guard | 57.3 | 57.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 22.4 | 92.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 82.3 | 87.1 |  |
|  | center | 90.4 | 51.1 |  |
| family problems | point guard | 57.2 | 94.1 | 0.709 |
|  | shooting guard | 34.2 | 17.2 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.11 | 67.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 76.1 | 43.1 |  |
|  | center | 35.2 | 84.1 |  |
| interpersonal passivity | point guard | 88.3 | 19.2 | 0.009*** |
|  | shooting guard | 73.3 | 75.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 77.2 | 86.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 76.4 | 67.1 |  |
|  | center | 70.4 | 55.1 |  |
| social avoidance | point guard | 84.2 | 64.1 | 0.307 |
|  | shooting guard | 88.2 | 2.01 |  |
|  | small forward | 50.2 | 33.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 52.3 | 62.1 |  |
|  | center | 45.3 | 73.1 |  |
| Shyness | point guard | 30.2 | 59.1 | 0.008*** |
|  | shooting guard | 53.2 | 63.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 77.1 | 76.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 52.3 | 15.2 |  |
|  | center | 60.1 | 31.1 |  |
| Disaffilativeness | point guard | 30.1 | 78.0 | 0.460 |
|  | shooting guard | 1.07 | 97.0 |  |
|  | small forward | 38.1 | 33.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 88.0 | 16.1 |  |
|  | center | 50.1 | 46.1 |  |
| Aesthetic-literary interests | point guard | 84.2 | 28.1 | 0.341 |
|  | shooting guard | 61.2 | 41.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 66.2 | 28.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.00 | 45.1 |  |
|  | center | 85.2 | 56.1 |  |
| Mechanical-Physical interests | point guard | 92.3 | 93.1 | 0.919 |
|  | shooting guard | 15.4 | 82.1 |  |
|  | small forward | 83.3 | 46.1 |  |
|  | power forward | 64.3 | 49.1 |  |
|  | center | 95.3 | 79.1 |  |



Figure 2: Profile for specific problems
Figure 2 illustrates the mean specific problem scales of MMPI2RF profiles for five different positions. Power forwards scored on average higher than the other positions on some of scales including shyness, inefficacy and interpersonal passivity.

Table 3-statistical index and analysis of variance for PSY-5 profiles

| PSY-5 profiles | position | Mean | Standard deviation | Significant level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggressiveness | point guard | 3.62 | 8.19 | 0.056* |
|  | shooting guard | 2.59 | 8.92 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.52 | 9.83 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.75 | 7.23 |  |
|  | center | 2.96 | 7.65 |  |
| Psychoticism | point guard | 4.11 | 7.30 | 0.330 |
|  | shooting guard | 4.01 | 7.50 |  |
|  | small forward | 3.30 | 6.88 |  |
|  | power forward | 3.63 | 2.35 |  |
|  | center | 3.92 | 7.60 |  |
| Disconstraint | point guard | 4.42 | 7.73 | 0.768 |
|  | shooting guard | 2.50 | 6.84 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.28 | 6.94 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.64 | 7.35 |  |
|  | center | 2.66 | 6.65 |  |
| Neuroticism | point guard | 3.74 | 7.53 | 0.510 |
|  | shooting guard | 3.04 | 8.80 |  |
|  | small forward | 4.01 | 8.66 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.95 | 7.41 |  |
|  | center | 2.34 | 8.35 |  |
| Introversion | point guard | 2.65 | 5.92 | 0.226 |
|  | shooting guard | 2.93 | 5.65 |  |
|  | small forward | 2.16 | 4.66 |  |
|  | power forward | 2.81 | 6.82 |  |
|  | center | 2.72 | 5.80 |  |



Figure 3: pathology profile of PSY-5 personality Scales
As it can be observed in figure 3, the mean profile of PSY-5 scales and the small forward had the highest score, on average, in aggressiveness scale.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study can help to the professional organizations and also the sport psychology literature. MMPI2RF scales were used to identify the clinical behaviors of the professional basketball players in different positions, who may be successful at point guard, shooting guard, small forward, power forward and center positions. This study showed, there were some personality differences among the players with different positions. According to the fourth Table and the obtained F value, the results indicated an important difference ( $\mathrm{p}=0.01$ ) in some factors like aggressiveness, shyness, inefficacy, low positive emotions and interpersonal passivity among the basketball players in the five different positions. Low positive emotions, interpersonal passivity, and shyness were some of the significant points, which play important roles in powering the forward position. Nevertheless the aggressiveness was remarkable in the small forward position.

Table 4- One-way ANOVA to compare the personality profile of the basketball players in five positions

| personality scales | Significance <br> level | F <br> value | Mean of <br> square | Degree of <br> freedom | Sum of <br> square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low Positive | $011^{* *} .0$ | 44.3 | 64.18 | 4 | $\mathbf{5 9 . 7 4}$ |
| Emotions |  |  |  |  |  |

Therefore, when the variances were homogenous, an LSD post hoc study was used to determine the differences between each two positions of the Iranian female professional basketball players. Because of this point the point guards and power forwards' profiles were compared like the following:

It can be observed the profile of the differences in the basketball players, the important difference in inefficacy $(p=0.01)$ and shyness $(p=0.01)$ between the point guards and power forwards in the fifth and sixth Tables.

Also, there were differences between the small and power forwards and finally between the power forwards and centers.

Many factors are involved in playing point guard positions. Some of these factors include, how the coach wants his/her point guard to operate, for example the style of the play, the abilities and talents of the teammates around the point guard, and the skills, temperament, experience and qualities of the leadership of the point guard are the important ones. The point guard must know his role in a team; whether we expect him to be an assistant, or a scorer. If the team has some excellent scorers, they also like to be the good assistant ones. If nobody exists as a strong scoring in the team, the point guard should be a scorer. These days it is important for the point guards to act as a good leadership and guide the team. And the power forward is usually responsible for scoring in a basketball team. A power forward should be a big and strong one and also should be able to clear some space under the basket. Although many great power forwards do not score lots of points today, they lead their teams. Power forwards are often good shot blockers. The results were in the same direction with the characteristics of each position. As the point guard is the team leader, and he/she is often known as a quarterback in football, he/she is considered as an efficient player [15].

The statistics show, that the center and small forward positions score more than power forwards. Because of this point it seems logical, that these two groups in some features like inefficacy and shyness have some important differences.

Table 5- the least significant defense (LSD) in the post hoc study: the comparison of the basketball player's inefficacy feature in the five different positions

| Difference | Sig. level | Center | Power forward | Small forward |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point guard | $26 .-0$ | $10 .-2$ | Shooting guard | Point guard |
| Shooting guard | 73.0 | $10 .-1$ | $29 .-0$ | -1 |
| Small forward | 03.0 | $81 .-1$ | 70.0 |  |
| Power forward | 84.1 |  |  | 243.0 |
| Center |  | $005.0^{*}$ | $007.0^{*}$ | 072.0 |

Table 6-LSD the post hoc study: the comparison of the basketball player's shyness feature in five different positions

| Difference | Sig. level | Center | Power forward | Small forward | Shooting guard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Point guard | Point guard | 70.0 | $22 .-1$ | 52.0 | $23 .-0$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shooting guard | 93.0 | $99 .-0$ | 76.0 |  |
| Small forward | 17.0 | $75 .-1$ |  | 144.0 |
| Power forward | 92.1 |  | $* 003.0$ | 023.0 |
| Center |  | $* 001.0$ | 746.0 | 064.0 |

According to the Tables 7 and 8 and also the difference in the basketball player's profile, it can concluded, there was a significant difference in aggressiveness ( $\mathrm{p}=0.05$ ) and interpersonal passivity ( $\mathrm{p}=0.01$ ) respectively between small forwards and power forwards and also between small forwards and center positions.

With the shooting guard, the small forward is often the most versatile player in a basketball team. The small forward is often a great defensive player. The combination of the two features, height and quickness, can allow them to be the best scorers in the team. These days the small forward and the shooting guard have almost the same positions in many teams, so they're called "wing" players. The shooting guard in the basketball game has the main responsibility for making long outside shots including the three-point shot. The shooting guard should be a good passer and also be able to help the point guard by handling the ball.

The results of this study have shown no significant difference in the Iranian female shooting guard's profile. This is maybe because of this point, that they can play in different positions or actually they're interchangeable. Many teams have also players, that the can try different setups such as a three guard offense.

Usually the center is the biggest member of a basketball team o even the taller. In the NBA, many centers are 7 feet tall or even taller. The center can be a best scorer, but needs to be a strong rebounder and shot blocker. In many teams, the center is the last line of defense. Nowadays, many teams have won in other positions with their great players, but a strong center is still a prized basketball position in any basketball team.

As small forwards are the penetrating players and more aggressive than the centers and power forwards (low post players), this significant difference in their personality profile have a relationship with their roles in the team[16,17].

Table 7- LSD the post hoc test: the comparison of the basketball player's aggressiveness feature in five different positions

| Difference Sig. level | center | Power forward | Small forward | Shooting guard | Point guard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Point guard | 54.0 | 95.0 | $64 .-1$ | $73 .-0$ |  |
| Shooting guard | 27.1 | 68.1 | $91 .-0$ |  | 375.0 |
| Small forward | 18.2 | 59.2 |  | 318.0 | 073.0 |
| Power forward | $41 .-0$ |  | $* 011.0$ | 070.0 | 302.0 |
| Center |  | 672.0 | $* 025.0$ | 151.0 | 539.0 |

Table 8- LSD the post hoc test: the comparison of the basketball player's interpersonal passivity feature in five different positions

| Difference | Sig. level | center | Power forward | Small forward | Shooting guard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Point guard

According to the Tables 9 and 10 it can be concluded, there is an important difference in low positive emotions $(\mathrm{p}=0.01)$ between small forwards and the other positions.

Table 9-LSD the post hoc test: the comparison of the basketball player's low positive emotions feature in five different positions

| Difference |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sig. level | center | Power forward | Small forward | Shooting guard | Point guard |
| Point guard | $58 .-0$ | $17 .-1$ | 55.1 | 11.0 |  |
| Shooting guard | $70 .-0$ | $29 .-1$ | 44.1 |  | 859.0 |
| Small forward | $14 .-2$ | $73 .-2$ |  | $* 046.0$ | $* 031.0$ |
| Power forward | 59.0 |  | $* 001.0$ | 078.0 | 108.0 |
| Center |  | 441.0 | $0.006^{*}$ | 314.0 | 400.0 |

The significant difference in low positive emotions between small forwards and other positions can have a relationship with the player's role in a team as well as their versatility. In addition, this finding about small forward position is in the same direction with the results of the previous profiles in this research.
The results have shown, there was a relationship between the personality profile and also the position of the play in the Iranian professional female basketball players.

Also the related literature about the players' personality profiles in different fields of sport was reviewed. In the study, which performed in Slovenia [14] some elements like anxiety trait, striving for power, negative performance orientation and stress reduction were significantly different, and these confirmed, that the significant differences was between the different types of players in some psychosomatic dimensions. Bruce et al. used the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) to ascertain the personality traits of the offensive, defensive, and mid-field players. The results showed, that the male offensive players were going to be more tough-minded, aggressive, and extroverted than field players [18]. Schaubhut et al. (2006) studied the personality profile of the North American professional football players. The results showed some differences of the personality in the players with the different positions[13].

The great issue about basketball is, it can be played flexibly according to the needs and resources of each team. Therefore, at the end, each coach must decide the duties of each player and also the role of each position. The prediction of the athletic achievement from the personality traits was one of the earliest approaches, which is one of the most attractive applications of applied sport psychology[19,20]. However, the academic literature, which supports this practice, has been equivocal, and made many coaches and sport teams be skeptical about the predictive potential [21].Nevertheless, the use of the personality-based assessment tools becomes more common among the professional sports teams today, as they search for any advantage in the identification and prediction of an athlete's opportunity for the long-term success. [22-25].

One limitation is, that the number of the players in this research is not sufficient. Moreover, since early ages, the Iranian female basketball teams were not from the talent feature point of view identified. In the next research we are going to examine the personality in different positions and also the measures of the performance.

## 5. Acknowledgment

The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to the Iranian female basketball players for their participating in this study.

## REFERENCES

1)Robert, R. Y. \& David R. H. (1997). Personality, exercise and psychological well-being: Static relationships in the community. Personality and Individual Differences, 22(1), 47-53.
2) Kirkcaldy B. D., . Shephard R. J and Siefen R. G. (2002). The relationship between physical activity and selfimage and problem behaviour among adolescents.Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology,37(11)544-550.
3)Curry, L.A., Snyder, C.R., Cook, D.L., Ruby, B.C., \& Rehm, M. (1997). Role of hope in academic and sport achievement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73(6), 1257-1267.
4)Reiss, S., Wiltz, J., Sherman, M. (2001). Trait motivational correlates of athleticism. Personality and Individual Differences, 30, 1139-1145.
5)Eagleton, J.R., McKelvie, S.J., \& De Man, A. (2007). Extraversion and neuroticism in team sport participants, individual sport participants, and nonparticipants. Perceptual \& Motor Skills, 105, 265-275.
6)Dennis M., Marvin Z. , Michael K. (1998).Personality characteristics of male and female participants in team sports Personality and Individual Differences, 25( 1), 119-128
7)Luparini, M., Guidoni, G., la Malfa, G.P., \& Rossi, R. (1989). Evaluation of personality profiles in athletes from diverse disciplines using the 16PF Test by Cattell. Movimento, 5(2), 107-110.
8)Han D. H. , Kim J. H., Lee Y. S., Joeng S., Bae S. J., Kim H. J., Sim M. Y., Sung Y. H. and Lyoo I. K. (2006). Influence of temperament and anxiety on athletic performance. Journal of Sports Science and Medicine 5, 381-389.
9)Schurr, K.T., Ruble, V.E., \& Nisbet, J. (1984). Myers-Briggs Type Inventory characteristics of more and less successful players on an American football team. Journal of Sport Behavior, 7(2), 47-57.
10)McKelvie, S.J., Lemieux, P., \& Stout, D. (2003). Extraversion and neuroticism in contact athletes, non contact athletes, and non-athletes: Journal of Sport Psychology 5(3),19-27.
11)Cox R. H. \& Yoo H. S. (1995) .Playing position and psychological skill in American football. Journal of sport behavior.
12)Cox, R.C. (1998). Sport Psychology: Concepts and Applications (4th ed.). Boston, MA: WCB McGraw Hill.11
13)Schaubhut N. A., Donnay D. A.C., and Thompson R. C.(2006)Personality Profiles of North American Professional Football Players .Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology
14)Aleš V., Brane D.(1999).Differences between young basketball players playing the guard and wing position in chosen anthropometric ,motoric and psychologic. Theories of human motor performance and their reflections in Practice, 402-405.
15)Coaches clip board (2001).http://www.coachesclipboard.net(access2011).
16) Duksters(2009).http://www.ducksters.com/sports/basketball position .php
17)Ken atkins(1952).basketball offences and plays. United States: human kinetics
18)Bruce D. K. (1982) Personality profiles at various levels of athletic participation.Personality and Individual Differences 3(3), 321-326
19)Aidman, E.V. (2007). Attribute-based selection for success: The role of personality attributes in long term predictions of achievement in sport. The Journal of the American Board of Sport Psychology, 3, 1-18.
20)Cooper, L. (1969). Athletics, activity, and personality: A review of literature. Research Quarterly, 40, 17-22.
21)Deaner, H., \& Silva, J.M. (2002). Personality and sport performance. Psychological Foundations of Sport ,48-65
22)Piedmont, R.L., Hill, D.C., \& Blanco, S. (1999). Predicting athletic performance usingthe five factor model of personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 27, 769-777.
23)Gee C. J., Marshall J. C. \& King J. F. (2010). Should coaches use personality assessments in the talent identification process? A 15 year predictive study on professional hockey players. International Journal of Coaching Science 4 (1),1-10.
24)Spieler, M., Czech, D.R., Joyner, A.B., Munkasy, B., Gentner, N., \& Long, J. (2007).Predicting athletic success: factors contributing to the success of NCAA division IAA collegiate football players. Athletic Insight, 9.
25)Beedie, C.J., Terry, P.C., \& Lane, L.M. (2000). The profile of mood states and athletic performance: Two etaanalyses. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 12, 49-68.


[^0]:    *Corresponding Author: Faranak Tayari, physical education and sport science faculty, central Tehran branch, Islamic azad university and Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine.

