



A Study of Relationship between Personality and Intelligence with Subjective Well-Being of Football Players

Lega Sushil¹ and Santosh²

¹CCS HAU Hisar INDIA

²Guru Dronacharya College of Education, Bhuna INDIA

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 30th December 2013, revised 25th January 2014, accepted 20th February 2014

Abstract

40 male Football players who have at least participated in inter-collegiate of K.U.K. and CDLU Sirsa or participated in inter-district tournaments of Haryana state were considered the subjects of the study. Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.) by H.J. Eysenck and S.B.G. Eysenck, Hindi version, B.S. Gupta, General Mental Ability Test developed by S. Jalota and PGI General well-being measured by Dr. Santosh K. Verma and Amita Verma, Chandigarh were used as tool. According to the objective of the study Mean, Standard Deviation and 't'-test were used to compute the data. The study shows that the low well-being group has more 'N' traits as compared to high well being group. The high well-being group has more 'E' traits as compared to high well being group. On the basis of intelligence high well-being group are not significant different from low well-being group.

Keywords: Personality, football, well being.

Introduction

Personality has been viewed from various angles and as such its definitions have never been fixed. They have been changing from time to time. Some defines personality as the pattern of behaviour in a certain way: for others, personality constitutes the intelligence of mind¹. The word personality is derived from the Latin word 'PERSONA' which means 'MASK'. The modern concept of personality is the extension of same concept, which takes into accounts all physical, psychological- and social characteristics of the individual while describing his personality². The personality in its modern scientific sense is the sum total of various characteristics of the individual, which indicates towards a particular behaviour pattern of the individual³.

The term intelligence is vague and ambiguous in its meaning. According to the dictionary, intelligence is the "The capacity to acquire and apply knowledge". Intelligence is acting according to the situation in hand, with use of what has been learned before, but also with due regards to what is the novel in the present situation⁴.

Well-being is a somewhat malleable concept which is to do with people's feeling about everyday life activities⁵. Such feelings may range from negative mental states or psychological strains such as anxiety, depression, frustration, emotional exhaustion, unhappiness, dissatisfaction to a state which has been identified as positive mental health^{6,7}. Campbell distinguished three types of well-being affect, certain, and satisfaction It may be defined as the subjective feeling or contentment. happiness, satisfaction with life's experiences and or one's role in the world of work,

sense of achievements, utility, belongingness, and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry etc.

Methodology

Sample: 40 male Football players who have at least participated in inter-collegiate of K.U. Kurukshetra and CDLU Sirsa or participated in inter-district tournaments of Haryana state were considered the subjects of the study. These subjects were selected randomly on the basis of their availability. These players were mostly from the district of Hisar, Fatehabad and Sirsa.

Tool used: The following tools were used for this study: i. Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.) by H.J. Eysenck and S.B.G. Eysenck, Hindi version, B.S. Gupta⁸, ii. General Mental Ability Test developed by S. Jalota⁹, iii. PGI General well-being measured by Dr. Santosh K. Verma and Amita Verma, Chandigarh¹⁰

Collection of data: For conducting the data for this study, the investigator visited various colleges of CDLU Sirsa, Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra and the players of inter district Football tournaments. Thereafter, the answer sheet of General Mental Ability Test by S. Jalota was distributed among randomly chosen Football players in colleges. Time duration for answering the questions excluded that devoted for giving of instruction and clarifying the doubts was 20 minutes. After the completion of stipulated time period, all those sheets were collected and scoring was done. After a gap of two days the investigator described the Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.) to the same 40 Football players and instructed them

accordingly, after collecting the administered sheets, the investigator gave them a short break of ten minutes and distributed the PGI General well-being measure test developed by Dr. Santosh and Amita Verma. Thus, the data was collected from 40 Football players and the scoring of all the tests was done and the scores computed.

According to the objective of the study Mean, Standard Deviation and 't'-test were used to compute the data.

Results and Discussion

In order to compare personality 'N' factor of Football players with high and low well-being the significance of difference mean personality score of Football players having high and low well-being was computed which is given in table-1.

Table-1
Comparison of Personality 'N' Factor of Football Players with High and Low Well-Being

Respondents	N	Mean	SD value	T value
High well being	20	9.08	2.85	7.55*
Low well being	20	13.89	2.03	

*Significant at 0.01 levels

As shown in table-1, the mean score of high well-being Football players is 9.08 and mean of low well-being Football players is 13.89. Similarly S.D. of high and low well-being Football players is 2.85 and 2.03 respectively. So the mean scores of low well-being group is higher than that of high well-being group and the value of 't' is computed 7.55 which is highly significant at 0.01 level of significance. It further shows that low well-being group is significantly different from high well-being group on the basis of personality 'N' factor. This easily can be explained as the low well-being group has more 'N' traits as compared to high well being group.

In order to compare personality 'E' factor of Football players with high and low well-being, the significance of difference mean personality score of Football players having high and low well-being was computed which is given in table-2:

Table-2
Comparison of Personality 'E' Factor of Football Players with High and Low Well-Being

Respondents	N	Mean	SD value	T value
High well being	20	12.76	3.89	6.36*
Low well being	20	7.91	1.52	

*Significant at 0.01 levels

As shows in table-2 above, the 't'-value obtained is 6.36. The mean score of high and low well-being Football players is 12.76 and 7.91. S.D. of high and low well-being is 3.89 and 1.52 respectively. So the mean scores of high well-being group and

the value of 't' is computed 6.36 which is highly significant at 0.01 level of significance. It further shows that high well-being group is significantly different from low well-being group on the basis of personality 'E' factor. This easily can be explained as the high well-being group has more 'E' traits as compared to high well being group.

In order to compare intelligence of Football players with high and low well-being the significance of difference between mean personality score of Football players having high and low well-being was computed which is given in table-3:

Table-3
Comparison of Intelligence of Football Players with High and Low Well-Being

Respondents	N	Mean	SD value	T value
High well being	20	111.97	13.03	1.88
Low well being	20	106.43	9.523	

NS-not significant

As shown in table-3 above, the mean score of high and low well-being Football players is 111.97 and 106.43 respectively. The 't' scores obtained is 1.88 it indicates that the 't' ration between the means of two groups is not significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It further shows that high well-being group has not significant different from low well-being group on the basis of intelligence.

Discussion: After the interpretation of the data obtained from 40 male Football players the difference between mean personality 'N' score of Football players having high and low well-being was found. The mean score of high well-being Football players is 9.08 and mean of low well-being Football players is 13.89 similarly, S.D. of high and low well-being Football players is 2.85 and 2.03 respectively. So the mean scores of low well-being group is higher than that of high well-being group and the value of 't' is computed 7.55 which is highly significant at 0.01 level of significance. It further shows that low well-being group is significantly different from high well-being group on the basis of personality 'N' factor. This easily can be explained as the low well-being group has more 'N' traits as compared to high well being group.

In order to compare personality 'E' factor, the 't'-value obtained is 6.36 the mean score of high and low well-being Football players is 12.76 and 7.91 S.D. of high and low well-being is 3.89 and 1.52 respectively. So the mean scores of high well-being group and the value of 't' is computed 6.36 which is highly significant at 0.01 level of significance. It further shows that high well-being group is significantly different from low well-being group on the basis of personality 'E' factor. This easily can be explained as the high well-being group has more 'E' traits as compared to high well being group.

In order to compare intelligence, the mean score of high and low well-being Football players is 111.97 and 106.43 respectively.

The 't' scores obtained is 1.88 it indicates that the 't' ration between the means of two groups is not significant even at 0.05 level of significance. It further shows that high well-being group has not significant different from low well-being group on the basis of intelligence.

Conclusion

The study was conducted on 40 male Football players. The mean scores of low well-being group is higher than that of high well-being group. It further shows that low well-being group is significantly different from high well-being group on the basis of personality 'N' factor. This easily can be explained as the low well-being group has more 'N' traits as compared to high well being group. In order to compare personality 'E' factor, high well-being group is significantly different from low well-being group on the basis of personality 'E' factor. This easily can be explained as the high well-being group has more 'E' traits as compared to high well being group. In Intelligence the 't' ration between the means of two groups is not significant. It shows that high well-being group has not significant different from low well-being group on the basis of intelligence.

References

1. Ntoumanis N., Vazou S., and Duda J.L., Peer-created motivational climate. In S. Jowette, and D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport*, 145–156, Champaign, IL, US: Human Kinetics (2007)
2. Bawa G.S. and Debnath K., Personality Profiles and Differences in Personality Traits between National Women Football and Gymnastics Teams, *Research Bi-annual for Movement*, 8(1), 16-22 (1989)
3. Sharma S.S. and Shukla B.R.K., Psychological Study Regarding Personality Characteristics of Individual team Sports. *Abstracts Congress of Sports Sciences*, Netaji Subhas National Institute of Sports, Patiala (1982)
4. Kumar Mahesh. Study of intelligence among sport persons in context to contact, semi-contact and non-contact games, C.R.M. Jat College, Hisar (2002)
5. Biddal S.J.H., Emotion, mood and Physical Activity. In S.J.H. Biddle, K.R. Fox, and S.H. Boutcher (Eds.), *Physical activity and psychological well-being*, 63-87. London: Routledge (2000)
6. Sandvik E., Diener E. and Seidlitz L., The assessment of well-being: A comparison of self-report and non-self-report strategies, *Journal of Personality*, 61, 3 17-342 (1993)
7. Ismail A.M. Salama Younes, S. Hanrahan and C. Roncin, Development a short French measure of the Psycho-social well-being for old adult, 4th European Conference on Positive Psychology, Opatija, Croatia, 1-4 (2008)
8. Eysenck H.J., Nias O.K., Cox D.N. Sports and Personality Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy, *An International Review Journal*, 4(1), 56 (1982)
9. Jalota S.S., *Manual of Group Test for General Mental Ability*, 225, Sector 16-A Chandigarh (1972)
10. Verma Santosh K. and Verma Amita, PGI General Well Being Measure (standard questionnaire), Chandigarh (1989)