

A Comparative Study of Personality Dimensions and Socio Economic Status Among University Players



Physical Education

KEYWORDS: Personality Dimensions, Socio Economic status

Dr. Satinder Paul

Assistant Professor, Akal college of Physical Education, Maustana sahib, Sangrur (Punjab)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate personality dimensions & socio-economic status of university players. A total of eighty samples in which 40 girls & 40 boys were selected from RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur. The age of the samples ranged from 18-25 years & all the samples were selected from random basis. For the purpose of tapping psychoticism, extraversion & neuroticism, PEN inventory prepared by B.J. Eysenck was preferred. To know the socio-economic status of players, SES inventory developed by Helode & Agashe (2003) was used. Result found that boy's university players have shown high extraversion than girl's university players where girls university players have shown more neurotic than boys university players, and there were no significant difference has been found boys & girls university players on the dimension of psychoticism. Another result was showing that the socio-economic status of players does not affect the personality dimensions of the players

INTRODUCTION

Personality is the overall pattern of psychological characteristics that makes each person a unique individual. Individual differences are obvious in sport and understanding such personality factors can help to explain sport and exercise behavior. The goal of sport personality research is to provide accurate and reliable information about individual differences in sport and the implications of such personality differences for sport performance and behavior.

Personality is the individual's unique psychological make up, or more formally, "the underlying, relatively stable, psychological structures and processes" that organize human experience and shape a person's action and reactions to the environment (Lazarus & Monat). Thus, defined, personality denotes characteristic or consistent individual difference in behavior. Personality can be described as the sum total or overall pattern of various characteristics related to social behaviors, such as introversion, independence or aggressiveness. Personality also includes perceptual and cognitive characteristics, such as the ability to concentrate of focus attention.

Methodology:-

To conduct the study of Eighty subjects in which 40 girls and 40 boys from Nagpur University, in Coaching Camp before the tournament. The age group of the sample ranged from 18-25 years & all the samples were selected on random basis. To measure personality dimensions of selected subjects, PEN inventory developed by B.J. Eysenck has been preferred. The Hindi version of this inventory prepared by Mennon (1978) was used. This inventory is highly reliable and valid for measuring personality dimensions of the players.

To assess socio economic status, SES inventory prepared by Helode & Agashe (2003) was used.

Result & Discussion

Table No. 1

Comparison between Boys and Girls University Players on Personality Dimensions

	Boys University players (N=40)		Girls University players (N=40)		MD	't'
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
P	8.25	3.03	7.15	4.06	1.10	1.37
E	12.60	2.63	10.65	3.23	1.95	2.95
N	8.55	2.74	9.87	2.76	1.32	2.15
L	8.87	1.93	8.60	2.34	0.27	0.57

From Table No. 1 result indicate that on the psychoticism dimension university boys players are more psychotic ($m=8.25$) compared to university girls players ($m=7.15$). But no significant differences have been found on psychoticism dimension between the groups. While comparison made on extrovert personality dimension university boys players are show more extroverted ($m=12.60$) compared to university girls players ($m=10.65$) the 't' value is 2.95 that show there is significant difference at .01 level. Another comparison has been made on the dimension of neuroticism. The result shown that Nagpur university girls' players have been more neurotic ($m=9.87$) compared to university boys players ($m=8.55$) the 't' value is 2.15, which shown that there is significant difference at .05 levels. Last comparison has been made on the dimension of lie score (social desirability) Result found that there is no significant difference in both group.

Table No. 2

Comparison between High SES and Low SES University Players on Personality Dimension

	High SES Group (N=22)		Low SES Group (N=21)		MD	't'
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
P	8.04	3.25	8.38	2.92	0.33	0.35
E	11.72	2.97	11.19	3.88	0.53	0.51
N	9.22	2.68	9.88	2.43	0.15	0.19
L	8.72	2.00	8.91	1.73	0.01	0.02

From Table no. 2 show that no significant difference found on the dimension of psychoticism. The 't' value is less than means both the group are equal on psychoticism dimension. The next comparison made on extroversion dimension, result shown that high SES group is more extrovert ($m=11.72$) compared to low SES group ($m=11.19$) but again 't' value is less than 1 means that is no significant difference has been found. Another comparison has made on neuroticism dimension. Result found that there is no significant difference between both groups. Last comparison made on the dimension of lie score. Result found that both the groups are equal on this dimension.

Conclusions

Boy's university players shown high extroversion dimension compared to girls university players. Girl's university players are more neurotic compared to boy's university players. There were no significant difference has been found between boys and girls university players on the dimension of psychoticism. Comparison made according to socio economic status of players, the result showed that socio economic status of the players does not affect the personality dimension of the players.

REFERENCE

1. Dr. Kamlesh, M.L. Psychology in Physical Education, 3rd Edition Metroplitan Co., New Delhi. (1998) | 2. Dr. Agashe, C.D. & Karkare, A.Y. Personality profiles of Tribal & Non-Tribal Sport Persons-Vyayam-Vidnyan., Vol.-36 No. 2, May 2003. | 3. Dr. Sahani S.P.: Psychology and its application in sports, D.V.S. Publication New Delhi. (2005) | 4. Shivram-krishnan, S: Psychology of Sports, 1981, p274. | 5. Sandhu, G.S.: Psychology of Sports, Friends Publication, Delhi (1992) | 6. Sahani S.P.: Psychology and its application in sports, p.11-13, (2005) |