

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SELF CONCEPT AND PERSONALITY TRAITS AMONG INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM GAME PLAYERS AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL

(Received on: 25 July 2014, Reviewed on: 14 Aug 2014 and Accepted on: 02 Oct 2014)

**Dr. Ashutosh Bhandari**, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Physical Education,  
B.V.R.I.Bichpuri, Agra (U.P.)



### Abstract

The purpose of the study was to compare the players belonging to individual and team games in relation to self-concept and personality traits. Another purpose of the study was to characterize interuniversity level players by self concept and personality traits responses. The subjects were fifty male players of interuniversity level, twenty five each category i.e. individual and team games. The self concept scores were obtained by using Self Concept Questionnaire (SCQ) by Dr. Raj Kumar Saraswat. The personality traits scores of the subjects were obtained by using 16 P.F. Questionnaire prepared by Raymond Cattle. To compare the self concept and personality traits of the groups mean, standard deviation, mean difference and uncorrelated t-test was employed. The level of significance was set at 0.05. The t-test showed that there was no significant differences were found in mean differences among the individual and team games in relation to self concept and personality factors

**Keywords:** Reserved, Outgoing, Intelligent, Emotionally stable and Humble.

### Introduction

Sports psychology is of recent origin. There is a great advancement of games and sports now-a-days which was not prevalent in the past. The word sport was added to psychology. Sports scientists truly hold the belief that an individual is a thinking animal as well as a performing one. It should then follow that attempting to synthesize and analyze the interactions of various aspects of sports performance and the multi-dimensional nature of intelligent behavior is a productive undertaking. Cratty confirms that intellectual involvement and intelligent decision-making on the part of an athlete is a matter of experience. Cratty says, "The fledging athlete may not be qualified and may be reluctant to offer intellectual input whereas the more seasoned performer may have been both qualified and useful as a thinker about the sport in which he/she is participating." It is believed that the most helpful type of intellectual behavior in which an athlete may engage is intellectual flexibility, the willingness to cast off inappropriate but previously employed methods, strategies and skills. Self Concept is learned by an individual inference from his unique experiences. The individual perceptions of feeling of others towards him strongly influence his self image. In turn, self concept may prove the most powerful motivation for specific behavior. Personality Traits – In everyday life no one, not even psychologists doubt that underlying the conduct of a mature person there are characteristic disposition in

traits. We usually think personality as being made up of traits. Psychologists have defined traits as a mode of behavior.

Traits are not creations in the mind of the observer, nor are they verbal fictions; they are accepted biophysical facts, actual psychological dispositions. There are specific qualities of behavior or adjustable pattern, such as reactions to frustration, ways of meeting problems, aggressive or defensive behavior and outgoing or withdrawing behavior in presence of others. The traits are outward signs of dynamic forces that act and interact in an infinite number of ways. That is why the integration of these traits or personality is never the same in any two individual. Each of us has a unique system that determines and reflects own characteristics behavior and thought. All the psychological variables differ from individual to individual. In the present study the investigator made an effort to compare self concept and personality traits among individual and team games.

### Methodology

#### Selection of Subjects

Fifty male subjects were selected from Lakshmbai National Institute of Physical Education, Gwalior. Twenty five subjects from individual games and twenty five from Team games who had represented the Intervarsity in their respected games. All subjects were residing in the institute campus. The age level of the subjects ranged from 17 – 25 years.

#### Criterion Measures

The following criterion measures chosen to test the hypothesis were:

The self-concept scores of the subject were obtained by using Self-Concept Questionnaire (SCQ) by Dr. Raj Kumar Saraswat. The personality traits scores of the subjects were obtained by using Sixteen Personality factors (16 PF) Questionnaire developed by Raymond B. Cattell.

#### Collection of data

Administration of Self –Concept Questionnaire:

The Self-Concept questionnaire was distributed to the subjects. The direction was read out by the researcher at a dictation speed to make the subject understand about what they were exactly required to do so. All the doubts or queries were clearly explained by research scholar. The self concept inventory provides six separate dimensions of self concept viz. Physical, social, temperamental, educational, moral and intellectual self-concept. It also gives a total concept score. The operational definitions of self concept dimensions measures by this inventory were Physical, Social, Temperamental, Educational, Moral and Intellectual. Each

item was provided with five alternatives. Responses are obtained on test booklet itself. There was no time limit but generally, 20 minutes were found sufficient for responding to all the items. The research scholar supervised the group and verifies that they were responding in a desired way. The respondent was provided with five alternatives to give his responses ranging most acceptable to least acceptable description of this self-concept. The alternatives or responses were arranged in such a way that the scoring system for all the items remained the same i.e. 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 whether the items were positive or negative. If the respondent put (✓) mark for first alternative the scores was 5, the second alternative the score was 4, third alternative the score was 3, the fourth it was 2 and the last alternative the score was one. The sum scores of all the forty eight items provided the total self-concept of an individual. A high score on this inventory indicates a high self-concept, while a low score indicates a low self concept. The scores of each item were transferred to the front page against that item. All the scores of eight items given in that column were added up which represented that particular dimension of self concept.

**Administration of 16 P.F. Test**

Sixteen Personality Factors questionnaire were taken as criterion measure to compare the personality traits of individual and team games players. In view that it is an objective test and gives the most extensive coverage of individual characteristics and it is widely used in games and sports. It is an objectively scored test. All the subjects had been given necessary instructions on the basis of instruction given in the manual of sixteen personality factors and as well as in a questionnaire test booklet in the front page. Subject had been told that no answer is wrong or right. They had to express their frank opinion as per what they felt about themselves as per each question of the questionnaire. The scoring of completed answer sheet was done according to the method described in the manual. The card board stands scoring keys were used, one covered factors (traits) A, F, H, L, N, Q1 and Q3 and other factors B, E, G,I, N, Q, Q2 and Q4. Before using the scoring stencils each answer sheet was checked to ensure that there were no odd, non-score able responses. After checking stencil it was made to fit over the answer sheet and the scores visible through holes were counted as indicated by numbers printed adjacent to the hole. Those scores were summed up and total score was entered in the space indicated by arrow on the stencil for each factor. The raw scores were converted into 'stens' with the help of norms in the test manual. One should consider stens of 5 or 6 as average 4 or 7 slightly deviant (Respectively in a low and a high direction) 2, 3, 8 and 9 strongly deviant and 1 or 10 extreme, all these being placement of the person, relative to the defined population, on which the standardization are based.

**Statistical Procedure**

To compare the Self-Concept and Personality Traits among individual and team games players, mean, standard deviation and uncorrelated t-test was applied. The level of significance was set at 0.05 level.

**Findings**

In order to determine the significance of difference on self concept and Personality Traits between individual and team games subjects, t- test were applied. The result pertaining to the self concept and Personality Traits have been presented in Tables:

TABLE NO 1  
COMPARISON OF VARIOUS P.F. OF INDIVIDUAL  
AND TEAM GAME PLAYERS

Players	Mean	S.D.	D.M.	S. E.	t' ratio
<b>Factor 1</b>					
Individual	167.7	12.07			
Team	163.6	17.95	4.12	4.32	0.95
<b>Factor 2</b>					
Individual	4.64	1.29			
Team	4.64	.848	0	.306	0
<b>Factor 3</b>					
Individual	3.76	1.44			
Team	4.0	1.095	0.24	1.80	
<b>Factor 4</b>					
Individual	4.56	.897			
Team	4.60	.632	.04	.216	.185
<b>Factor 5</b>					
Individual	4.68	.881			
Team	4.80	.692	.12	.223	.538
<b>Factor 6</b>					
Individual	4.52	1.024			
Team	4.76	.818	.24	.214	1.121
<b>Factor 7</b>					
Individual	5.2	1.058			
Team	5.4	.894	.2	.273	.731
<b>Factor 8</b>					
Individual	4.8	1.46			
Team	5.36	1.13	.56	.368	1.521
<b>Factor 9</b>					
Individual	4.92	1.57			
Team	5.48	1.38	.56	.417	1.342
<b>Factor 10</b>					
Individual	5.24	.75			
Team	5.6	.692	.36	.202	1.782
<b>Factor 11</b>					
Individual	5.04	2.32			
Team	5.56	2.00	.52	.612	.849
<b>Factor 12</b>					
Individual	5.0	1.35			
Team	5.56	1.17	.56	.444	1.261
<b>Factor 13</b>					
Individual	4.48	1.62			
Team	5.48	.5	1.0	.337	2.967
<b>Factor 14</b>					
Individual	5.2	1.13			
Team	5.88	1.17	.68	.324	2.098
<b>Factor 15</b>					
Individual	4.8	1.44			
Team	6.12	1.43	1.32	.403	3.275
<b>Factor 16</b>					
Individual	6.48	1.44			
Team	7.12	1.42	.64	.402	1.592
<b>Factor 17</b>					
Individual	5.48	.854			
Team	6.16	.787	.68	.230	2.956

\* significant t<sub>(0.05) (48)</sub> = 2.021

In the light of findings of the study, it was hypothesized that the individual and team games shall not have significant difference in self concept and personality traits, i.e. Factor A (Reserved v/s Outgoing), Factor B (Less Intelligent v/s More Intelligent), Factor C (Affected by feeling v/s Emotionally stable), Factor E (Humble v/s Aggressive), Factor F (Sober v/s Happy-go-lucky), Factor G (Expedient v/s Conscientious) Factor H (Shy v/s Venturesome), Factor I (Tough minded v/s Tender minded), Factor L (Trusting v/s Mistrusting), Factor M (Practical v/s Imaginative), Factor N (Unsophisticated v/s Calculating), and Factor Q3 (Undisciplined v/s Strong in own emotions) is accepted and whereas in case of Factor O (Placid v/s Apprehensive), Factor Q1 (Conservative v/s Experimenting), Factor Q2 (Group dependent v/s Self sufficient), Factor Q4 (Relaxed v/s Tensed) is rejected.

### Conclusions

In relation to self concept, no significant difference was found in individual and team games players.

Whereas no significant difference was found in personality traits i.e. Factor A (Reserved v/s Outgoing), Factor B (Less Intelligent v/s More Intelligent), Factor C (Affected by feeling v/s Emotionally stable), Factor E (Humble v/s Aggressive), Factor F (Sober v/s Happy-go-lucky), Factor G (Expedient v/s Conscientious) Factor H (Shy v/s Venturesome), Factor I (Tough minded v/s Tender minded), Factor L (Trusting v/s Mistrusting), Factor M (Practical v/s Imaginative), Factor N (Unsophisticated v/s Calculating), and Factor Q3 (Undisciplined v/s Strong in own emotions) among individual and team games players. Whereas significant difference was found in personality trait i.e. Factor O (Placid v/s Apprehensive), Factor Q1 (Conservative v/s Experimenting), Factor Q2 (Group Dependent v/s Self Sufficient), Factor Q4 (Relaxed v/s Tensed) among individual and team games players.

### References

- Darlene A. Kelly (1966). The Relative Effectiveness of Selected Mental Practice Technique in High School Girls Acquisition of Grass Motor Skill, Complete Research in Health, Physical Education and Recreation Vol-8; p.118.
- Gangopadhyay, S.R. (2002). Sports Psychology, (published by S.R. Gangopadhyay), p.3.
- George, Grovios (July 1989). The Effect of Mental Rehearsal on the Reaction Time of Top level Sports Participation, Dissertation Abstract International; p.98.
- Singer, Roert N. (1976). Physical Education Foundation, (New York : Rincjhart & Winston) p. 242.
- Singh, Ajmer. (2001). Modern Text Book of Physical Education, Health and Sports, (Kalyani Publisher), p.79.
- Bryant, J. C. (1975). Movement Behavior and Motor Learning. London: Henry and Kempton Publisher. p.35.
- Jack H. Liewellyn (1982). A Psychology of Coach: Theory and Application. Delhi: Surjeet Publisher. p.17.
- Kumar, Rawat Ashish (2008). Effect of Autogenic training and progressive muscular training on various techniques in judo,

Kunwar, Raj (2006). Effect of Mental Training on selected Skills in Judo, Unpublished Master Thesis, LNIPE Gwalior.

Uneståhl, L E, (1979). The use of Sport Psychology in Scandinavia. In P. Klavara & J. Daniel (Eds.): Coach, Athlete and the Sport Psychologist, Champaign, Ill: Human Kinetics. p.17.