Personality profile of university players

■ **DEEPAK SINGH BHANDARI** AND **H.S. KANG**

See end of the article for
authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :
DEEPAK SINGH BHANDARI
Department of Physical Education
and Sports, Singhania University,
JHUNJHUNU (RAJASTHAN)
INDIA
Email: dbhandari10@yahoo.com

■ **ABSTRACT**
The term 'Personality' has many meaning but in general, its usage is based upon the assumption that there
are consistencies in behaviour which are evidenced by an individual in a variety of situations. Allport
(1938) defines personality as a dynamic organization with in the individual. Cattell (1972) view 'personality'
as a complex set of multiple traits that are identified as inferred on the basis of observed behaviour. In this
study the word personality has the following connotations: Personality is the congregation of the 16
factors of an individual which make him unique in his behaviour. These 16 personality factor are suggested
by Cattell (1972) .

■ **Key Words :** Personality profile players

■ **How to cite this paper** : Bhandari, Deepak Singh and Kang, H.S. (2012). Personality profile of university
players. *Internat. J. Phy. Edu.*, **5** (2) : 173-175.

Many studies shows that personality research in sports setting has been quite popular. According to Mohan (1989), personality has a remarkable importance in sports psychology because it is the core of individual differences and it has bearing on human performance. Frank (1988); Singe (1973); conducted studies on personality of various sportsmen. These studies assessed cognitive strategies, mental practice, anxiety, self confidence level and personality characteristics of players, the present study investigated the personality characteristics of University players.

Objective of the study :
The present study was designed to study the personality characteristics of university players of various sports. The investigator had laid down the following objectives in order to explore the personality characteristics of players of Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar (Uttarakhand).
– To study the personality characteristics of university players.
– To identify the gender discrimination among university players in relation to personality factors.
– To draw the personality profiles of players.

■ **METHODOLOGY**
Sample :
The present study deals with the players of the Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar (Uttarakhand). The investigator has selected 81 players of various games. The selected players were studying in the affiliated colleges of Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar (Uttarakhand). The non sportsmen, 80 is number were randomly selected, who had never participated in sports and were medically fit.

Tools and techniques :
In the present study, the following tools were used to collect the relevant data:

General information questionnaire (1996) :
Prepared by the investigator to collect the detail information of the players like name, age, date of birth, sex, class, section, father's name, father's occupation, income, case, family size, residence and marks obtained in previous examination etc. The tool was used to build a rapport with players.

Sixteen personality factor questionnaire-16 PF (1973) :
It was originally developed by Dr. R.B. Cattell and

adopted by S.D. Kapoor in Hindi version. This test is very comprehensive and attempts to probe the personality through 16 factors.

Procedure :

First of all the General Information Questionnaire was administered to select sample, and match the sample on the nature of game, class, family size, residence and age. The selected sample were then administered with the 16 PF Questionnaire. After testing, the adequate scoring was adopted by the investigator for scoring as well as interpretation.

Imaginative; placid vs apprehensive; conservative vs experimenting; group dependent vs self-sufficient; undisciplined self-conflict vs controlled; relaxed vs tense. Most of the personality factors in both the group were homogeneous and mixed personality configuration on factor B, E, F, G, L, M, Q1, Q2 and Q4, Players were having high sten score on factor O and Q3 and showing placid and score undisciplined self conflict personality characteristics.

■ OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The experimental findings of the present study have been presented in the following sub heads:

A personality profile of players :

The personality profile revealed two prominent trends

i.e. the high sten score and lowd sten score on personality factors. Players were having various personality characteristics like, out going nature, emotionally less stable, tough mindedness, shrewdness, premsia and unidisciplined self conflict. They appeared to be stable without lying on the extreme ends of the personality factors like less intelligence vs more intelligence; humble vs assertive; sober vs happy-go-lucky; trusting vs suspicious and practical vs imaginative.

Significant personality factor :
PF–1: Reserved vs out going :

Table 1 indicates that 't' value between player and non sportsmen was found significant at 0.05 levels. Mean sten value of players showed upward trends on this personality factor but non-sportsmen had judicious mixture of reserved vs out going characteristics. In university players they had out going characteristic in their personality make-up.

PF–3: Affected by feeling vs emotionally stable :

A scrutiny of the Table 1 reveals that both group under consideration differed significantly at 0.01 level. University players were found to be affected by feeling, emotionally less stable they had low tolerance power for unsatisfactory conditions, while, the non players university students had mixed personality trends in relation to affected by feeling vs emotionally stable.

Table 1: Determination and compression of personality factors among of player and non–players							
Sr. No.	Symbols	Personality factors	Sportsman		Non–sportsman		't' Value
			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
1.	A	Reserved Vs out going	7.10	2.31	5.25	1.96	**
2.	B	Less intelligence Vs more intelligence	4.66	2.18	5.86	2.44	--
3.	C	Affected by feeling Vs emotional stable	4.72	1.84	6.12	1.93	**
4.	E	Humble Vs assertive	5.70	1.45	5.38	1.64	--
5.	F	Sober Vs happy–go–lucky	5.96	1.68	5.30	1.84	--
6.	G	Expedient Vs conscientious	6.14	1.74	5.56	1.61	--
7.	H	Shy Vs venturesome	7.73	1.69	5.12	1.62	**
8.	I	Tough minded Vs tender minded	3.92	1.44	7.20	2.01	**
9.	L	Trusting Vs suspicious	4.08	2.11	4.90	2.90	--
10.	M	Practical Vs imaginative	5.12	2.11	5.40	1.26	**
11.	N	Forthright Vs shrewd	7.16	2.01	5.40	1.20	**
12.	O	Placid Vs apprehensive	6.54	1.91	6.12	1.51	--
13.	Q1	Conservative Vs experimenting	6.65	1.51	5.13	1.94	**
14.	Q2	Group dependent Vs self sufficient	5.38	1.89	5.47	1.69	--
15.	Q3	Undisciplined Vs controlled	7.15	2.18	7.51	2.38	--
16.	Q4	Relaxed Vs tense	5.62	1.96	6.28	2.12	--

PF–7: Timid Vs venturesome :

The keen observation of Table 1 shows that computed value were found significant at 0.01 level. The sten score indicated that university player represented upward trend on factor venturesome, non players had calibrated this factor on average level.

PF–8: Tough minded Vs tender minded :

The Table 2 reveals that the computed 't' value between player and non-player are found significant at 0.01 and 0.05 level. Stenine scores in the case of player were found distinctly lower in relation to tough mindedness.

PF–11: Forthright Vs shrewd :

It is evident from the above table that 't' value between player and non-players students were found significant at 0.5 level. Mean score indicated that players had a high sten of nine in this trait, were learnt to be shrewd, calculating, worldly and penetrating.

Non- significante trait :

The personality factor no - 2, 4,5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (B, E, F, G, L, M, O, Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) showed non-significant difference on the corresponding personality trait. There was non-significant difference between university player and no player students in relation to the following personality factors: less intelligence vs more intelligence; humble vs assertive; sober vs happy-go-lucky; expedient vs conscientious; Trusting vs suspicious; practical vs.

Conclusion :

After summarizing the result as given in Table 1 and personality profile, it can be inferred that university players were outgoing, emotionally less stable; more venturesome, tough minded, shrewd, placid and independent, non-player had following characteristics-shyness, tender mindness, apprehensive, controlled behaviour. The group of players and non-players are having developed ego-strength and lead a normal life without showing timed behaviour.

Authors' affiliations:

H.S. KANG, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Gurunanak Khalsa College, YAMUNA NAGAR (HARYANA) INDIA

■ REFERENCES

Allport, G. (1955). Becoming: *Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*. New Haven: Yale University**.**

Allport, G. W. (1938). *Personality A psychological interpretation,* Holt Reinhart and Winston Inc., NEW YORK.

Cattell, R. B. (1972). *Handbook for the 16 P.F.* United Ehampaign III, USA.

Frank, H. F. (1988). Personality profiles of athletes and non ateheltes in developing countries, *J. Sport Phy. Edu.Sports Sci.,* **1**.

Kamlesh, M. L. (1989). Intelligence and achievement motivation in relation to physical fitness of female collegiate athletes proc. IASSPF Con. Madurai (T.N.) INDIA.

Singe, R.N. (1973). Personality differences between and within baseball and tennis players. *Res. Quart.*, **40**: 587-588.

*****