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Abstract

The purpose of present study was to scrutinize the Effect of Locus of Control among Racket Games at Different Level of Participation. Subjects for data collection has been drawn from the different universities. The sample consists of 150 Male of three Racket games. Further the sample was divided into three different games i.e. Ball Badminton, Badminton and Table Tennis. From each category a sample of 50 was taken to collect the data from different level of participation. With a view to measure the selected variable Locus of Control questionnaire (Dr. N Hasnain and Dr. DD Joshi, 1992) administrate to the subjects. In order to find out the significant mean difference among the group analysis of co-variance have been used and follow up test conducted to evaluate pair wise difference among the adjusted means for different groups.
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1. Introduction

Locus of control operationally has been defined as to have an individual perceives himself or herself in relation to his or her actions, interactions, experiences and outcomes. It also refers to the degree of control, the person judges that he has over his environment. This control is psychological construct having two types of person viz. Internal and external which are described below:

(a) Internal

The persons who attribute the responsibility of anything happening to them on themselves reinforcement that occur relative their reward or punishment are determined by their own actions. Such persons are infernally oriented. This control relates to having sense that one has the power make his own reality. Internal locus of control is tried to feeling that events outside over personal control.

(b) External

The persons who fix the responsibility at events happening to them in life on other forces like fate, luck, chance etc and feel that the force that yields the reward or punishment is beyond their control. Such persons are externally oriented. Previously called locus of control, locus of causality is to extent to which people belief they are responsible for their behavioral out comes. A vast body of psychological literature exits dedicated to this concept in and of itself. Then Weiner’s (1985) clarified and renamed the locus of control dimensions locus of causality. It refers to the construct as locus of causality, ever through in the literature it is generally named locus of control.

2. Material & Methods

2.1 Subjects: The sample consists of 150 Male of three Racket games. Further the sample was divided into three different games i.e. Ball Badminton, Badminton and Table Tennis. From each category a sample of 50 was taken to collect the data from different level of participation.

2.2 Selection of Variables

Locus of control was selected as variable achieve the purpose of present study.
2.3 Criterion of Measurement
With a view to measure the selected variable Locus of control questionnaire (Dr. N Hasnain and Dr. D D Joshi, 1992) administrate to the subjects.

2.4 Statistical Procedure
After the collection of relevant data Arithmetic mean, Standard deviation and ‘t’ value have been used to find out the significance of differences of various variables selected in the study.

3. Results

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics of Locus of Control at different level of participation for Ball Badminton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.14</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>71.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 reveals that Mean± Standard deviation of Locus of control was found to be 70.14±3.56. The lower and upper bound of the Locus of control is 69.12 and 71.15 at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4.2: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Locus of Control at different level of participation for Ball Badminton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>618.240</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>624.020</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicates that a non-significant difference of Locus of Control was found at different level of participation for Ball Badminton as the P value is .506, so null hypothesis of no difference between different levels of participation was accepted at 5% level of significance. It shows that locus of control has no effect on the players at different level of participation in Ball Badminton game.

Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics of Locus of Control at different level of participation for Badminton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>77.18</td>
<td>82.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 reveals that Mean± Standard deviation of Locus of control for Badminton was found to be 79.60±8.49 The lower and upper bound of the Locus of control is 77.18 and 82.01at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4.4: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Locus of Control at different level of participation for Badminton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)</td>
<td>192.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>192.080</td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3343.920</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3536.000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 reveals that a non-significant difference of Locus of Control was found at different level of participation for Badminton as the P value is .506, so null hypothesis of no difference between different levels of participation was accepted at 5% level of significance. It shows that locus of control has no effect on the players at different level of participation in Badminton game.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics of Locus of Control at different level of participation for Table Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.38</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>67.32</td>
<td>69.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that Mean ± Standard deviation of Locus of control was found to be 68.38±3.70. The lower and upper bound of the Locus of control is 67.32 and 69.43 at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4.6: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Locus of Control at different level of participation for Table Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)</td>
<td>27.380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.380</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>646.400</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>673.780</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 reveals that a non-significant difference of Locus of Control was found at different level of participation for Table Tennis as the P value is .506, so null hypothesis of no difference between different levels of participation was accepted at 5% level of significance. It shows that locus of control has no effect on the players at different level of participation in Table Tennis game.

4. Discussion and Conclusion
When we examine the role of Locus control we find that it does not affect significantly the performance of players of different games at individual levels and at different level of participation. But, when we examine the roles of Locus of Control in different games collectively we find this variable significantly affect the players at different level of participation.
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