

Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat

Department of Higher Education - Government of Gujarat Journal of Multi-Disciplinary - ISSN : 2279-0268



Continuous Issue -25 | July – September 2018

A study of Personality Traits and Self-concept on National level players

ABSTRACT: - "16 PF Questionnaire constructed and standardized by Reymond B. Cattel whereas Self concept Questionnaire constructed and standardized by Rajkumar Saraswat "was administered on 50male school game National level players of Gujarat. The objectives of the investigation were to compare the Personality traits and self-concept among Individual and Team game players. Statistical analysis has been done by T-test and the significance of the result was seen on0.05 level. The T-test showed that there was no significant difference found in mean differences among the individual and team game players in relation to Personality traits and Self-concept.

KEY WORDS: - Comparative Study, Personality traits, Self concept, Individual and Team Game Players.

INTRODUCTION: - Many researchers have been carried out on this topic in sports psychology. Most popular issues in sport Psychology concern the relationship between personality, self concept and sports participation. Certain personality traits and self concept are most important to achieve success in sports. Another popular belief is that certain Personality traits and self concept can be developed or modified through sports participation. Both of these issues have been extensively investigated over the last three decades.

Cattel Postulated that human behavior is a result of Interaction between external situations and individual traits. He has further divided personality traits into three categories on the basis of qualities of personality, temperamental traits (being persistently irritable, easy going or bold), ability traits (such as intelligence and skill, while dealing complex situation), and dynamic traits (such as motivation, interest and attitude). He further subs divided traits into attitudes, sentiments and Urges. Out of different inventories of assessing personality traits, Researcher has preferred 16 PF of Raymond B. Cattel.

Self concept is learned by an individual inference from his unique experiences. The individual perception of others toward him strongly influences his self image. In turn, self concept is a highly complex component of behavior, composed of both cognitive and effective dimension and has at least four orientations: The real self, the perceived self, and the ideas self and the self as perceived by others. Self concept may prove the most by others. Self concept may prove the most powerful motivation for specific behavior. Out of different inventories of assessing. Self concept, Researcher has preferred self concept Questionnaire (SCQ) by Dr. Raj kumar Saraswat.

The study has it's significances like the study would help to prepare and modify psychological training programmers according to the personality traits and self concept of the players. The present study would help teachers of physical education and coaches to motivate players according to their personality traits and self concept. The knowledge of the personality traits and self concept would help the coaches to handle the players of team and individual sports better way. The study would provide valuable literature in sports psychology and physical education. The findings of study would indicate whether specific personality and self concept characteristics motivate and sustain the interest in learning and succeeding in the individual and team games. It may help to promotion of sports coaching and educational efforts. Thus the present research will prove useful in the field of sports and games.

METHODS:-

HYPOTHESIS: - It was hypothesized that there shall not be any significant differences between means of personality traits and self-concept among the individual and team games players at school Game National level.

SAMPLE:- For the purpose of the study fifty male players of Gujarat state, school games National participant players in the academic years 2016-17, individual sports like Athletics, Table-Tennis, Badminton, Lawn Tennis and Gymnastics and team games like Volleyball, Handball, Softball, Kho-kho and kabaddi. The samples were further divided into two groups namely individual and team games based on their participation at National school games as their sports. The average age of the subjects was between 16 to 19 years.

Cattle's 16 PF Questionnaire was used as a tool to collect data on personality factors of individual and team games players of school games National level participants of Gujarat state. The calculation of the questionnaire based on the two scoring keys. With the help of these scoring keys the researcher got the raw scores and then he got the stens score, according to the instructions given in the manual.

Dr. Raj kumar Saraswat's self-concept Questionnaire (SCQ) was used as a tool to collect data on self-concept of individual and team games player of school games National level participant's of Gujarat state. The calculation of the questionnaire was based on five alternatives to give his responses ranging most acceptable to least acceptable description of this self-concept. With the help of this scoring key the researcher the raw scores, according to the instructions given in the manual.

To compare the personality traits and self-concept among individual and team games players, mean, standard deviation and uncorrelated t-test was applied. The level of significance was set at 0.05 levels.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS:- The t-test showed that there was no significant differences were found in mean differences among the individual and team games in relation to 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 (Indiscipline v/s Strong in own emotions) as 't' value was not found to be significant (0.953), (0), (0.133), (0.185), (0.538), (1.121), (0.130), (1.521), (1.342), (1.782), (0.849), (1.261) & (1.592) whereas required value was (2.021) at 0.05 level of significance.

Moreover there was significant difference in case of personality traits 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 the individual and team games as't' value was found to be significant (2.967), (2.098), (3.275) and (2.956).

Table – 1

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE OF MEAN SCORES ON PERSONALITY TRAITS OF	FACTOR 'A' TO 'Q4'
AMONG THE INDIVIDUAL & TEAM GAMES PLAYERS	

Factor	Group Compared	Significant	Mean	Standard	Mean	"t" Ratio
		"t" (0.05)		Deviation	Difference	
Α	Individual Games	2.021	4.64	1.29	0	0
	Team Games	2.021	4.64	0.848		
В	Individual Games	2.021	3.76	1.44	0.24	0.133
	Team Games	2.021	4.00	1.095		
С	Individual Games	2.021	4.56	0.897	0.04	0.185
	Team Games	2.021	4.60	0.632		

		1			
Individual Games	2.021	4.68	0.881	0.12	0.538
Team Games	2.021	4.80	0.692		
Individual Games	2.021	4.52	1.024	0.24	1.121
Team Games	2.021	4.76	0.818		
Individual Games	2.021	5.20	1.058	0.2	0.731
Team Games	2.021	5.40	0.894		
Individual Games	2.021	4.80	1.46	0.56	1.521
Team Games	2.021	5.36	1.13		
Individual Games	2.021	4.92	1.57	0.56	1.342
Team Games	2.021	5.48	1.38		
Individual Games	2.021	5.24	0.75	0.36	1.782
Team Games	2.021	5.60	0.692		
Individual Games	2.021	5.04	2.32	0.52	0.849
Team Games	2.021	5.56	2.00		
Individual Games	2.021	5.0	1.35	0.56	1.261
Team Games	2.021	5.56	1.17		
Individual Games	2.021	4.48	1.62	1.00	2.967 *
Team Games	2.021	5.48	0.50		
Individual Games	2.021	5.20	1.13	0.68	2.098 *
Team Games	2.021	5.88	1.17		
Individual Games	2.021	4.80	1.44	1.32	3.275 *
Team Games	2.021	6.12	1.43		
Individual Games	2.021	6.48	1.44	0.64	1.592
Team Games	2.021	7.12	1.42		
Individual Games	2.021	5.48	0.854	0.68	2.956 *
Team Games	2.021	6.16	0.787		
	Individual GamesTeam GamesIndividual GamesTeam Games	Team Games2.021Individual Games2.021Team Games2.021Individual Games2.021Team Games2.021Individual Games2.021 </td <td>Team Games 2.021 4.80 Individual Games 2.021 4.52 Team Games 2.021 4.76 Individual Games 2.021 5.20 Team Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.36 Individual Games 2.021 5.36 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.60 Individual Games 2.021 5.60 Individual Games 2.021 5.66 Individual Games 2.021 5.56 Individual Games 2.021 5.56 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.88 Individua</td> <td>Team Games2.0214.800.692Individual Games2.0214.521.024Team Games2.0214.760.818Individual Games2.0215.201.058Team Games2.0215.400.894Individual Games2.0215.400.894Individual Games2.0215.361.13Individual Games2.0215.361.13Individual Games2.0215.481.38Individual Games2.0215.481.38Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.042.32Team Games2.0215.061.35Team Games2.0215.061.17Individual Games2.0215.561.17Individual Games2.0215.480.50Individual Games2.0215.201.13Team Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0216.121.43Individual Games2.0216.481.44Team Games2.0216.481.44Team Games2.0215.480.854</td> <td>Team Games2.0214.800.692Individual Games2.0214.521.0240.24Team Games2.0214.760.8180.2Individual Games2.0215.201.0580.2Team Games2.0215.400.8940.24Individual Games2.0215.400.8940.2Individual Games2.0215.400.8940.56Team Games2.0215.361.130.56Team Games2.0215.361.130.56Team Games2.0215.481.380.56Individual Games2.0215.481.380.56Team Games2.0215.600.6920.52Individual Games2.0215.042.320.52Team Games2.0215.061.000.56Team Games2.0215.561.170.56Individual Games2.0215.561.170.56Team Games2.0215.561.170.56Individual Games2.0215.480.500.50Individual Games2.0215.881.170.68Team Games2.0215.881.171.32Individual Games2.0215.881.171.32Individual Games2.0216.481.440.64Team Games2.0216.481.440.64Team Games2.0217.121.421.42Individual Games2.0</td>	Team Games 2.021 4.80 Individual Games 2.021 4.52 Team Games 2.021 4.76 Individual Games 2.021 5.20 Team Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.40 Individual Games 2.021 5.36 Individual Games 2.021 5.36 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.60 Individual Games 2.021 5.60 Individual Games 2.021 5.66 Individual Games 2.021 5.56 Individual Games 2.021 5.56 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.48 Individual Games 2.021 5.88 Individua	Team Games2.0214.800.692Individual Games2.0214.521.024Team Games2.0214.760.818Individual Games2.0215.201.058Team Games2.0215.400.894Individual Games2.0215.400.894Individual Games2.0215.361.13Individual Games2.0215.361.13Individual Games2.0215.481.38Individual Games2.0215.481.38Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.600.692Individual Games2.0215.042.32Team Games2.0215.061.35Team Games2.0215.061.17Individual Games2.0215.561.17Individual Games2.0215.480.50Individual Games2.0215.201.13Team Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0215.881.17Individual Games2.0216.121.43Individual Games2.0216.481.44Team Games2.0216.481.44Team Games2.0215.480.854	Team Games2.0214.800.692Individual Games2.0214.521.0240.24Team Games2.0214.760.8180.2Individual Games2.0215.201.0580.2Team Games2.0215.400.8940.24Individual Games2.0215.400.8940.2Individual Games2.0215.400.8940.56Team Games2.0215.361.130.56Team Games2.0215.361.130.56Team Games2.0215.481.380.56Individual Games2.0215.481.380.56Team Games2.0215.600.6920.52Individual Games2.0215.042.320.52Team Games2.0215.061.000.56Team Games2.0215.561.170.56Individual Games2.0215.561.170.56Team Games2.0215.561.170.56Individual Games2.0215.480.500.50Individual Games2.0215.881.170.68Team Games2.0215.881.171.32Individual Games2.0215.881.171.32Individual Games2.0216.481.440.64Team Games2.0216.481.440.64Team Games2.0217.121.421.42Individual Games2.0

The t-test showed that there was no significant difference was found in mean differences among the individual and team games in relation to self concept as "t" value was not found to be significant (0.953) whereas required value was (2.021) at 0.05 level of significance.

Table - 2

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE OF MEAN SCORES OF SELF CONCEPT BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM GAMES PLAYERS

Group Compared	Significant "t" (0.05)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	"t" Ratio
Individual	2.021	167.7	12.07	4.12	0.953
Games	2.021	163.6	17.95		
Team Games					

CONCLUSIONS:-

Within the limitations of the present study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. 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 (Indiscipline v/s Strong in own emotions) among individual and team games players.

- 2. 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.
- 3. In relation to self concept, no significant difference was found in Individual and team games players.

REFERENCES

- I. Allport F. H., Social Psychology at Personality (Boston: Houghton-MifflinCo, 1924), p. 215.
- **II.** Block J., "A Contrarian View of the five factor approach to Personality description, Psychological Bulletin, p. 117.
- **III.** Clayton Ekthe Dianel, "The Relationship amongAttitude towards physical activity, Personality and self concept" Completed Research in Health, Physical Education and Research 2 (1968): 142.
- **IV.** Duncan: Lauren. E., "Traits and Motives: towards an Integration of two Traditions in Personality", (Harvey Mudd college, University of California, Barkley, 1998), p. 2.
- V. Funder D. C., The Personality Puzzle (3rd edi.), (NewYork. W. Norton, 2004), p. 5.
- VI. Gangopadhyay S.R., Sports Psychology, (published by S.R. Gangopadhyay, 2002), p. 3.
- VII. Hofstee K. B., European Journal of Personality(Vol.8, issue3, Sep.1947), p.149.
- VIII. Kaye Mc Donald, "A Comparison of the personality Traits of Participants and Non Participants in High School Inter Scholastic Tennis Programmer for Girls", Dissertation Abstract International. 31 (Feb. 1971): 3935 - A.
 - **IX.** Marsh W. H., "The structure of Education and language studies", School of Education and language studies, (New south Wales, Australia, 1990).
 - X. Mayers D.G., Social Psychology (New York: Mac Grew Hill, 2002), p. 13.
 - XI. Mayor J. D., Personality: A system approach, (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2007), p. 14.
- **XII.** Roger C. Glyn, Learning Experiences in Sports Psychology (Champaign Illinois's: Human Kinetic Publishers, 1981), p. 75.
- XIII. Singh Ajmer, Modern Text Book of Physical Education, Health and Sports (Kalyani Publisher, 2001), p. 71.
- **XIV.** Tucker Larry A., "Effect of Weight Training SelfConcept", Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport 54: 4 (1986) 389-397.
- **XV.** Xilport W. Gurden, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York: Holt, 1973), p. 259.
- **XVI.** Young L. Mary, "Comparison of Self-Concept of Women High school and college Basketball players", Research Quarterly for Exercise and sports (March 1981): 286.
- **XVII.** Zukerman M and M. kragt, Department of Psychology,(University of Delaware, New York, USA,1997), p. 48.

Prof. Hansaben S. Chauhan Assistant Professor Sheth P.T Arts & Science College Godhara

Copyright © 2012 - 2018 KCG. All Rights Reserved. | Powered By: Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat