Dr. Kriti Vashishtha
Assistant Professor Manipal
University Jaipur Add: J-66/A,
Tagore Nagar Ajmer Road,
Jaipur (Rajasthan) – 302021,
India.

Personality and mental health of team and individual game players: A comparative study

Dr. Kriti Vashishtha

Abstract
This study compares the personality and mental health of those individuals who play any team sport or any individual game. For this purpose, 200 sport persons have been selected (100 team game players and 100 individual game players) and they were measured on two major dimensions, which are, hardiness and psychological wellbeing. Further the dimensions of hardiness- control, commitment and challenge; and dimensions of psychological wellbeing- autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, self-acceptance were also compared. It was hypothesized that those who play individual game will be hardier and will have high psychological wellbeing as compare to those who play team sport. This is a factorial design and F ratio has been calculated to test the hypotheses. The tools used were Singh Psychological Hardiness Scale (SPHS) by A. K. Singh (2005) and The Scale of Psychological Wellbeing by Ryff (1989) [9]. Results showed a significant difference in commitment, control and challenge of both the groups and even in all the dimensions of psychological wellbeing except, positive relations with others. This dimension came out to be better for team sport players as compare to the individual game players.

Keywords: Hardiness, psychological wellbeing, team sports and individual games.

Introduction
A healthy mind and healthy body are same sides of the coin and playing any outdoor game not only helps in having a healthy body but also keeps us emotionally, socially and psychologically fit. The games can be divided into various categories like indoor, outdoor, team games, individual games etc., any individual chooses a game based on his/her skills and interest. Few people start playing some game since their childhood but few starts it later in their lives. It has been seen that people who get chance to show their talents and creativity are better prepared for any future problems (Kashani, 2011) [3].
According to Kobasa (1979) [4]. "Hardiness is a personality dimension that is believed to confer resistance against the effects of psychological stress." Kobasa (1979) [4]. conducted a study where he divided a group of male executives into two parts: (i) high stress/high illness group and (ii) high stress/low illness group. Further these groups were tested on personality scale and then differentiated. On the basis of the subjects' responses Kobasa gave three basic dimensions of hardy personality, which are, commitment, control and challenge. Commitment is a "tendency to involve oneself in (rather than experience alienation from) whatever one is doing or encounters" (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982) [5]. Control is a "tendency to feel and act as if one is influential (rather than helpless) in the face of the varied contingencies of life" (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982) [5]. Challenge is a "belief that change rather than stability is normal in life and that the anticipation of changes are interesting incentives to growth rather than threats to security" (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982) [5]. According to Maddi (1990) [6]. "People high in commitment think of themselves and their environments as interesting and worthwhile and thus can find something in whatever they are doing. This stimulates their curiosity and seems meaningful. Persons high in control believe that they can through efforts have an influence on what goes on around them. And persons high in challenge believe that what improves their lives is growth through learning rather than easy comfort and security." Hardy persons possess a strong sense of all three dimension, their day to day work is more fun and absorbing (i.e., commitment), which is their own choice (i.e., control), and a necessary learning agent (i.e., challenge; Maddi, Khoshaba, & Pammeter, 1999) [7].

Correspondence
Dr. Kriti Vashishtha
Assistant Professor Manipal
University Jaipur Add: J-66/A,
Tagore Nagar Ajmer Road,
Jaipur (Rajasthan) – 302021,
India.

Hardy people have good control over their life as they are good examiners and they can evaluate what will be better for them. This doesn't mean that they don't face any problem in life; it's just that they have the ability to cope well with the problems they face. All this allow them to not only have a good sense of self but also a better understanding of their surroundings which enhances their mental health. (Kobasa, Maddi & Khan, 1982) [5].

Wellbeing can be termed as a centered state of being happy, healthy and prosperous. According to Ryan and Deci (2001) [8]. "Wellbeing is a complex construct that concerns optimal experience and functioning". Wellbeing is a general term which defines the condition of an individual or group on various fronts like social, economical, psychological, spiritual, medical and so on. In general terms, wellbeing is considered as high if an individual or group responses positive to an experience. Similarly, if the response is negative, it is considered to be low wellbeing.

Psychological Wellbeing: Ryff (1989a) [9]. Proposed approaching the study of happiness from a different perspective. She suggested that happiness can be examined by employing subjective assessment of personal psychological functioning rather than assessment of affect and general satisfaction. Further she argued that subjective wellbeing research lacked a theoretical basis.

Ryff also drew from life span developmental perspectives such as Buhler's basic life tendencies (Buhler & Marschak, 1968) [1]. positive criteria of mental health. Ryff (1989a) [9]. pointed out that cultural background, history, traditions and beliefs, social classes give way to different competing conception of wellbeing. People who seek too much autonomy may not perceive themselves as well-adjusted (Campbell et. al., 1976) [2]. The six components of wellbeing given by Ryff are: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance.

Autonomy: Derived from a Greek word autos-nomos which means giving oneself to one's own law. Autonomy is the capacity of a rational individual to make an informed, un-coerced, decision. The concept of autonomy is found in moral, political and bioethical philosophy. In moral, autonomy is the ability of an individual to impose objective moral law on one self. Political autonomy refers to the right of one's self-governance. Bioethical autonomy cautions an individual of respecting rights of fellow beings. There is debate over whether autonomy is representative of a kind of "authentic" and "true" self, if at all there exists one. However, there are people who believe that in past few decades a large movement of autonomy has emerged in form of anarchy.

Environmental mastery: The individual's ability to competently assimilate and accommodate his/her environment. It is a state of mind rather than a behavior. It is a sense that we are able to have an influence on the events in our lives, that is, it is not necessary to be in control; it is simply necessary to have the sense that we are capable of acting on our own behalf. An individual's ability to master environment reflects his/her level of maturity, life span development and aging. Thus, it may be said that active participation in and mastery of environment are important constituents of integrated framework of positive psychological functioning.

Personal growth: Personal growth is a process that produces personal changes and progress. It starts from within us. Personal growth and development will happen when one makes firm decisions to understand him/her, improves self-awareness, works on attitude, believes in himself and his potentials, develop skills, set goals and begin with the end in mind.

Positive relations with others: Our relationship with others can be the source of deepest joy and fulfillment in life, but also the greatest sadness. When we are surrounded by positive relationships, we feel better about ourselves but if we are surrounded by negative relationships, we struggle to find our happiness. The ability to love others is viewed as a key component of one's mental health. Thus positive relationship with others leads our way to psychological wellbeing.

Purpose in life: Many people ask themselves about their goal in life, as they ponder the reason for their existence. Purpose in life is an important part of happiness and subjective wellbeing. Life is the expression of the reason for being. The reason represents the intelligence that is within all things. To find purpose in life, one must be attached to something larger than just oneself. What is important to understand is that purpose in life is thought as a variable that provides the conditions from which happiness arises and may contribute to the foundation of overall happiness, which in turn is wellbeing.

Self-acceptance: Self-acceptance is being in adjustment with our true self. It is not a destination but an ongoing journey. It means that we have removed false and limiting beliefs about ourselves, life and others. Lack of self-acceptance generates from false information we keep feeding to ourselves. An ego wowed self gets created and the gap between real and "should be" gets wider and wider. The wider the gap, the bigger is the sense of discomfort. Self-acceptance is necessary for psychological health, personal growth and the ability to know and accept others.

The present study systematically compares whether the individuals playing individual game are hardier or have high psychological wellbeing as compare to those individuals who play any team sport.

Objectives
1. Is there any significant difference between the commitment level of individual and team game players?
2. Is there any significant difference between the control level of individual and team game players?
3. Is there any significant difference between the challenge level of individual and team game players?
4. Is there any significant difference between the total hardiness of individual and team game players?
5. Is there any significant difference between the autonomy of individual and team game players?
6. Is there any significant difference between the environmental mastery of individual and team game players?
7. Is there any significant difference between the personal growth of individual and team game players?
8. Is there any significant difference between positive relations with others of individual and team game players?
9. Is there any significant difference between purpose in life of individual and team game players?
10. Is there any significant difference between self-acceptance of individual and team game players?
11. Is there any significant difference between the total psychological wellbeing of individual and team game players?

Hypothesis

1. There will be a significant difference between the commitment level of individual and team game players.
2. There will be a significant difference between the control level of individual and team game players?
3. There will be a significant difference between the challenge level of individual and team game players.
4. There will be a significant difference between the total hardiness of individual and team game players.
5. There will be a significant difference between the autonomy of individual and team game players.
6. There will be a significant difference between the environmental mastery of individual and team game players.
7. There will be a significant difference between the personal growth of individual and team game players.
8. There will be a significant difference between positive relations with others of individual and team game players.
9. There will be a significant difference between purpose in life of individual and team game players.
10. There will be a significant difference between self-acceptance of individual and team game players.
11. There will be a significant difference between the total psychological wellbeing of individual and team game players.

Methodology

The present research is conducted to compare the hardiness and psychological well-being of individual and team game players. This is a factorial study of 200 players (100 individual game; 100 team game). It shall compute ANOVA (One way analysis of variance) to test various hypotheses mentioned above. Purposive Sampling has been used in the present research. This sampling technique a type of non-probability sampling, used in order to make a study scientifically valid.

Size of Sample: The sample consists of 200 players- 100 individual game and 100 team game. For team games, hockey, football and cricket national level teams have been selected; and for individual games, golf, squash, table tennis have been taken. All subjects are males and the age range is between 25-35 years of age.

Procedure: The present research was conducted to compare the hardiness and psychological well-being of individual and team game players. For this purpose, a sample of 200 male players (100 team game and 100 individual game) was taken from different national level players. All the tools were given to the subjects one by one along with the instructions. All the subjects were males and the test was conducted approx 10-7 days before their final performance. After conducting the tests the tables were made, scores were calculated and results were discussed.

Statistical Analysis One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been used in the present research.

Tools

All the tools used are appropriate for the sample used and for the research conducted.
Tool no. 1- Singh Psychological Hardiness Scale (SPHS) by Arun Kumar Singh (2005)
Tool no. 2- The Scale of Psychological Well-Being by Ryff. (1989) [9].
The tools selected for the study are standardized popular tools that are popularly used in researches and are well tested for their reliability and validity.

Results and Analysis

Hardiness

Hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4: There will be a significant difference between the commitment, control, challenge and total hardiness of individual and team game players.
To test this hypothesis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to check whether team and individual game players differ on hardiness.

Table 1: Means, SD, F and p value of Hardiness in relation to individual and team game players

	Individual Game		Team Game			
	M	SD	M	SD	F	P
Commitment	14.54	2.3	12.3	2.1	49.68	<0.01
Control	13.42	1.8	11.65	1.5	54.12	<0.01
Challenge	13.3	1.9	12.57	1.6	7.83	<0.05
Total Hardiness	41.28	3.9	36.52	3.1	89.75	<0.01

From the above table it can be seen that people playing individual games are hardier than those who play team games. Individual game players have scored more or less similar in all the components of hardiness (i.e. 14.54, 13.42 and 13.3 values of commitment, control and challenge respectively). And, players of team game scored 12.3, 11.65 and 12.57 respectively on commitment, control and challenge. On total hardiness the individual game players have scored the mean of 41.28 and the team game players scored 89.75, which is a large and significant difference ($p<0.01$).

Psychological Well-being

Hypotheses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11: People playing individual games have high autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, self-acceptance and overall psychological well-being than those who play team games.
Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were used to check the fourth hypotheses.

Table 2: Mean, SD, F and p value of Psychological wellbeing in relation to individual and team game

	Individual Game		Team Game			
	M	SD	M	SD	F	p
Autonomy	63.03	13.4	55.78	5.6	4.93	<.01
EM	66.95	9.4	53.79	7.7	116.61	<.01
PG	70.53	8.8	61.05	7.2	68.63	<.01
PRWO	60.35	6.2	70.63	8.5	94.85	<.01
PIL	69.63	9.6	60.89	6.9	54.01	<.01
SA	68.5	8.6	62.89	7.4	24.01	<.01
Total PWB	409.27	46	358.75	21.2	99.23	<.01

Table 2 shows that the mean score of psychological wellbeing in relation to individual game is 409.27 and in relation to team game is 358.75. Even if we compare the mean scores of all the variables of psychological wellbeing, we can see that the mean scores of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance in relation to individual game players are 63.03, 66.95, 70.53, 60.35, 69.63 and 68.5 respectively. And, the mean scores of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance in relation to team game players are 55.78, 53.79, 61.05, 70.63, 60.89 and 62.89 respectively. A large significant difference ($p<0.01$) was seen between individual and team game players on Psychological Wellbeing (Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations With Others, Purpose In Life and Self-Acceptance).

Discussion

This study compared the personality and mental health of those individuals who play either any team sport or any individual game. For this purpose, 200 sport persons were selected (100 team game players and 100 individual game players) and they were measured on two major dimensions, which are, hardiness and psychological wellbeing. Further the dimensions of hardiness- control, commitment and challenge; and dimensions of psychological wellbeing- autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, self-acceptance were also compared. It was hypothesized that those who play individual game will be hardier and will have higher sense of psychological wellbeing as compare to those who play team sport. This is a factorial design and F ratio had been calculated to test the hypotheses. The tools used were Singh Psychological Hardiness Scale (SPHS) by A. K. Singh (2005) and The Scale of Psychological Wellbeing by Ryff (1989) [9].

As per hypothesis 1, there should be significant difference between commitment of individual game players and team game players. From table 1 it can be seen that the mean value for individual game players came out to be 14.54 and for team game players it is 12.3, which makes the mean difference to be 2.24 and the F value came out to be 49.68. These values verify the first hypothesis with high significance level. Individual game players have tendency to involve themselves in the activities in life and have a genuine interest in and curiosity about the surrounding world (activities, things, and other people).

Hypothesis 2 believed that there should be significant difference between the control of individual game players and team game players. From the subjects' responses the F value for this hypothesis came out to be 54.12 with the mean difference of 1.77 which is highly significant. This again verifies the second hypothesis, in other words, those players who play individual game have better control as compare to those who play team game. They are able to handle stress efficiently and have tendency to believe and act as if one can influence the events taking place around oneself through one's own effort.

According to hypothesis 3 there should be significant difference between the challenge level of individual game players and team game players. From table 1 it can been seen that the mean value for individual and team game players came out to be 13.3 and 12.57 respectively. This hypothesis verifies the hypothesis at 0.05 significant level. This means, individual game players are more challenging than team game players. One of the major reasons could be social loafing. Being high on challenge makes the individual game players believe in change, rather than stability, they consider it to be the normal mode of life which constitutes motivating opportunities for personal growth rather than threats to security.

As per hypothesis 4, there should be a significant difference in total hardiness of individual and team game players. From the above discussion it can be seen that all three dimensions of hardiness (commitment, control and challenge) are significant for both the game players; even on the basis of table 1 it can be seen that this hypothesis verifies with a significant mean difference of 4.76 and F value of 89.75. This shows that the individual game players are courageous and motivated to turn stressful circumstances from potential calamities into opportunities for personal growth.

Hypotheses 5 was that there would be significant difference between autonomy of individual and team game players. Table 2 clearly shows that there is a mean difference of 7.31 which definitely shows a significant difference. In other words it shows that team game players are more independent and self-determining as compare to individual game players. Those sportspersons are able to resist social pressure and act and think accordingly.

According to hypotheses 6 individual and team game players should score differently on environmental mastery. And it can be seen in from the scores that environmental mastery of individual game players is significantly high as compare to team game players (p <0.01). This shows that individual game players feel themselves to be competent enough to have control over their environment and can use the surrounding opportunities effectively as compare to team game players.

Similarly for personal growth it can be seen that mean value of individual and team game players are 70.53 and 61.05 respectively, which again verifies hypotheses 7, that is, there will be a significant difference in personal growth of individual and team game players. This shows that the feeling of self-growing, expanding and sense of realizing personal potentials is less in team game players as compare to the individual game players.

According to hypotheses 8, there should be a significant difference in positive relations of individual and team game players. And the scores clearly show a significant difference in positive relations with others, but here the mean value of team game players is 70.63 and for individual game players is 60.35. This makes the team game players more warm, satisfying and trusting in their relationships with others as compare to individual game players. This could be because they are involved in team games where they have to maintain good relations with the other team members so that they can achieve a common goal.

As per hypotheses 9 and 10 there will be a significant difference in purpose in life and self-acceptance of individual and team game players. The result table clearly shows that these hypotheses are significant at p <0.01 level. Which means, individual game players have more sense of directedness, beliefs, aims, objectives and acknowledgement for self as compare to team game players.

From the above discussion, the hypotheses 11 also gets verified, that is, there would be a significant difference between the sense of psychological wellbeing of individual game players as compare to team game players.

The present study can definitely help the coaches of the team games to reduce social loafing and help the players to increase their sense of psychological wellbeing and hardiness. They can help them building high level of commitment, control and challenge in the players.

References

1. Buhler C, Marschak M. Basic tendencies of human life. In C. Bhhler & F. Massarik (Eds.), The Course of human life: a study of goals in the humanistic perspective (pp.). New York: Springer, 1968, 92-102.
2. Campbell A, Converse PE, Rodgers WL. The quality of American life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
3. Kashani MR, Thesis MA. Kish University, Kish, Iran, 2011.
4. Kobasa SC. Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979; (37):1-11.
5. Kobasa SC, Maddi SR, Kahn S. Hardiness and health: A prospective study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1982; 42(1):168-177.

6. Maddi SR. Issues and interventions in stress mastery. In H.S. Friedman (Ed.) Personality and disease. New York: Wiley, 1990.

7. Maddi SR, Khoshaba DM, Pammeter A. The Hardy Organization: Success by turning change to advantage. Consulting Psychology Journal, 1999; 51:117-124.

8. Ryan RM, Deci EL. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Annual Review of Psychology, 2001; 52:141-166.

9. Ryff CD. Beyond Ponce De Leon and Life Satisfaction: New Directions in the Quest of Successful Aging. International Journal of Development. 1989; 12:35-55.