International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health 2016; 3(6): 190-192

P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38
IJPESH 2016; 3(6): 190-192

www.kheljournal.com
Received: 03-09-2016
Accepted: 04-10-2016

Rohit Kumar
Head and Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education, Kamla Lohtia Sanatan Dharam College, Ludhiana, India

Correspondence
Rohit Kumar
Head and Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education, Kamla Lohtia Sanatan Dharam College, Ludhiana, India

Effect of locus of control among various games at different level of participation

Rohit Kumar

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.

Keywords: Locus, control, various games

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

N	Mean	SD	Std Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
50	70.14	3.56	.50	69.12	71.15

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

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P Value
Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)	5.780	1	5.780	.449	.506
Within Groups	618.240	48	12.880		
Total	624.020	49			

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 vale 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

N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
50	79.60	8.49	1.20	77.18	82.01

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

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P Value
Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)	192.080	1	192.080	2.566	.103
Within Groups	3343.920	48	69.665		
Total	3536	49			

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 vale 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

N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
50	68.38	3.70	.52	67.32	69.43

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

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P-Value
Participation Level (Inter Uni.$ National Level)	27.380	1	27.380	2.033	.160
Within Groups	646.400	48	13.467		
Total	673.780	49			

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 vale 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.

5. References

1. Agugjica a, Sapienza S. Locus of control according to Rotter's S.R.I. in volleyball players. International journal of sports Psychology. 1984; 15:250-258.
2. Aguglia E, Saplenza. Locus of control according to Rotters S.R.I.M. volleyball players. Int. J SP. PSY 1984; 15:250-258.
3. Ander Son AB. combined efforts of interpersonal attraction and goal path clarity cohesiveness of task oriented groups. Journal of personality and social psychology, 1975; 31:68-75.
4. Atkinson JW. Personality dynamics. Annual Review Psychology 1960; 11:255-290.
5. Bandura A. Social learning theory Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, 1977.
6. Bandura A, Schunk DH. Cultivating competence, self-efficacy and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. Journal of personality and social psychology. 1981; 41:586-598.
7. Bandura A. Self-efficacy; toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. Psychological Review 1977; 84:191-215.
8. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behaviour change. Physiological Review. 1997; 84:191-215.
9. Bass BM. The orientation inventory-Palo Alto! CA: consulting psychologists, 1952.
10. Best John W. Research in Education New Delhi, Prentice Hall, 1978.
11. Best John W. Research in Education New Delhi, Prentice Hall India Pvt. Ltd, 1978.
12. Bindhu M, Acharya J. Psychological profile of sports. Schoolchildren. F Icerala. Abslcacf 14th National Conference of Spans Psychology. Mahatma Gandhi Káshi Vidyapic Varanasi 2001, 43.
13. Brown Margaret A, Mahoney Michael J Snort Psychology. Am. Rev. Psyched. 1984; 35:605-625.
14. Carron AV, Chelladurai P. Cohesiveness as a factor in sport performance, Accepted, International review at sports sociology, 1978.
15. Cothi Ekta. mictionaxy of sports & physical education. Published in New Delhi. 1993.
16. Crafty BJ. Social dimensions of physical activity prentice-Hall Inc. 2967.
17. Daino Autonia Personality trails of adolescents tennis players. Int. Jr. Sports Psychology 1965; 16:120-125.
18. David Paul Vokelson. Group Cohesion in Sport: A. Multidimensional Approach, Dissertation Abstracts International 1983, 2278-A.
19. Gruber JJ, Gray GR. Responses of forces influencing cohesion as a function of player status and level of male varsity basketball- competition. Research Quarterly for exercise and sports. 1982; 53:27-36.
20. Gupta N Das, Ghildyal S. Motivaticiftal aspect of individual and team athletics, paper presented at 8th national confereuàe of Sports Psychology, 20-23 March, Kunmun University campus altuora. 1993.
21. Eysenck HJ, Arnold warzburg W. Encyclopedia of Psychology London: Search press, 1972, 178.
22. Harlah Grandy. The Relationship among psychological theoretical constructs of self-efficacy and attributional style with performance of baseball players, 1996.