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Sport psychology provided several new avenues for research, and thereby helped in improving the performance of sport persons. Many psychological factors, directly or indirectly helped the sport persons in improving their performance in the fields. Development of positive attitudes and forming personal values seen to be highly influential factors in improving the performance, of the sport persons.

Group cohesion is also, found as an important variable that influences the performance of sport persons. Of such several factors, that are basically psychological in nature a good number of them had been studied extensively, but the factors like values, self concept, group cohesion etc. were incorporated in very few studies on sport psychology. In present study attempt had been made to examine the effect of group cohesion, that is group success oriented Vs individual success oriented, sex, and type of education on the development of values and self concept, of the Ss.

Personal values form the basis of an individual’s judgments and decisions and have a deep influence on behaviour. In addition, because individuals live within the context of society, certain values are shared with other members of society, and these common social values of the society also fashion and govern behaviour. A person acts in conformity with the rules and regulations or norms of society which are based on social values; from early childhood and through the process of socialization, he has seen taught to do so.

In every society some objects, attitudes, and ideas are considered more important than others. A person who has completed college education may have greater prestige than one who neglects this aspect of life despite the higher economic assets of the latter. This relative worth is determined by the values that exist in society. Values in society undergird and directly influence human behaviour, its forms and the
course that it takes. The answer to the question “What gives prestige in a society?” reveals differences in the intensity or importance ascribed to values.

Social values influence the planned development of society through programmes of promoted change such as community development in two important ways. The first is by creating obstacles in the path of desired change or by facilitating such change. Values in a society can make it easy or difficult for people to adopt new practices and to form and operate any new organizations or groups necessary for the promotion of improved practices. Thus, a society holding values which are strongly negative to the use of contraceptive devices will present serious obstacles to acceptance of family planning practices. The second way in which social values can influence the planned development of society is by influencing the findings of the researcher himself a member of society, filling several roles and having personal values of his own in addition to being a social scientist.

As man interacts with other people in society, he builds up a set of feelings or attitudes in respect of the relative worth of persons, objects or ideas. On the basis of such feelings, he develops likes or dislikes in varying degree of intensity, and ranks these likes and dislikes in the form of a hierarchy-placing as it were a “price tag” on each. Much of these feelings which place differential worth on ideas, objects or persons are learned from childhood and through the process of socialization; others are learned through experience in everyday living. Some of these feelings are deeply fixed and persists through life while others are not so permanent and are frequently replaced by those that give greater satisfaction. These feelings which constitute assumptions of what is right and important are abstract and often unconscious. They are, however, shared by other individuals and groups in society to a varying extent and intensity. The sharing of feelings or attitudes is of vital importance for the operation and functioning of society, for what emerges is a set of feelings or ideas ranked in order of importance or relative worth upon which society agrees. Attitudes held by society that define what society considers correct and of relative importance are referred to as social values. Social values have been defined in various ways by sociologists-as “abstract and often unconscious assumptions of what is right and important” [Young, 1959, p. 70 as cited
in Rogers, 1960, p. 49]; as “relatively enduring awareness plus emotion regarding an object, idea or person” [Green, 1964, p. 142]; as “general enduring preferences that govern behaviour and decision in daily life,” [Woods, 1966, p. 205]; as “ideas as to whether objects or behaviour are good, bad, desirable or the like,” [Bertrand, 1958, P. 35] or as a widely held belief or sentiment that some activities, relationship feelings or goals are important to the communities identity and well being [Broome 1968, p. 54]. However defined, social values to constitute society’s preferences or estimates or worth in respect of material or non-material objects in society. Taken together as a set these attitudes go to form a system which is called Value System of Society.

An individual may develop his own set of ideas, outside of the area of the value system of society, that determines personal likes or dislikes. These personal or individual values function within an individual values system, which usually does not conflict with the value system of society, and operate within the personal sphere of decision making. In addition, individual values may be sufficiently intense to determine change in individual behaviour even if such action deviates from the social norms and violates social values contained in the value system of society. Values are thus powerful determinants of human behaviour in individuals, groups and society as a whole. They are criteria basic to the functioning of any society and give significance and meaning to both type and direction of action. The fulfillment of three conditions are necessary before something can develop into a value for an individual: (a) He must be aware of its existence. (b) His awareness must become a matter of concern to him so that he develops an emotionalized attitude toward it, regarding it as good or bad in some degree and is not indifferent to it. (c) His awareness and attitude must not be merely transitory but must endure in time.

Values and Norms:

Norms are closely associated with values but are clearly differentiated from them. While it has been stated that values are attitude, held by individuals; groups or society as a whole, as to whether material or non-material objects are good, bad,
desirable or undesirable, the rules that govern action directed towards achieving values are called norms. Society has a set of agreed-upon values. Expected behaviour in accordance with these values and to achieve, maintain and support them is referred to as normative behaviour. Religious worship and respect to God usually is considered a value; the observance of religious festivals and performance of rituals and worship and other relevant activities are an important part of the norms of society. Norms are the accepted and approved forms of behaviour that are based on and consistent with dominant social values in society. Thus values and norms go together. A set of social values will always have an accompanying set of social norms or rules that uphold and support values.

**Characteristics of Values:**

The following are the more important characteristics of social values:

1. Values are constructs of society created through the interrelationship of its members. They are socially created rather than determined biologically or inherited.
2. Values are socially shared. While individuals in society may have individual values, the set of values that constitute the value system of society are shared and transmitted among member, and accepted by them. This agreed-upon values system forms the basis for action and functioning in society. Without such a system society would be in a state of chaos. Social values are therefore considered, with great importance and seriousness by society, to be connected with the preservation of common welfare and satisfaction of social needs. While social values are shared, it does not follow that they are held by individuals with equal intensity. Intensity with which values are held may vary considerably. Thus, some individuals may easily violate social values and norms while others who adhere to values with greater intensity may suffer considerably from feelings of guilt for the same act.
3. Values are learned. They are acquired and not inherited. The process of learning and acquisition of social values commences from childhood in the family and through the process of socialization. Values can be transmitted from one group to another.
within a society through various other social processes, and from one society and culture to another through acculturation, diffusion, borrowing, etc.

4. Values are abstract attitudes and assumptions on which there is social consensus about the relative worth of objects in society. These values are conceptually abstracted from various valued items or objects in society.

5. Values are gratifying to people and have an important part in meeting social needs. Three elements involved in consideration of social values have been identified. The first is the object itself; the second, the capacity of the object to satisfy social needs; and the third is the appreciation of the people for the object and for its capacity to provide the desired satisfaction. [Fichter, 1964, p. 293] The object-given value by society must prove gratifying to members of society and must process the capacity to provide the desired satisfaction and elicit appreciation from them.

6. Values tend to be linked together harmoniously to form patterns; these patterns form the value system in society. When harmonious integration of values in society does not exist, social problems arise.

7. Value systems vary from culture to culture in accordance with the relative worth attributed by each culture to its patterns of activity and its goals. Thus cultures vary in their practices, customs and forms of living and functioning.

8. Values frequently represent alternatives and values system consists of ranked alternatives. Values therefore compete with one another, and behaviour is determined by the ranked position or priority level of the value. For example, in some parts of our country games and sports are appreciated more, while in some parts more importance is given to studies only. The main reason is academic achievement helps in earning livelihood, proficiency in game does not. In many countries proficiency in games fetch even more money than expertise in academics.

9. Values may differ in their effects upon the individual and society as a whole. The values of a sup-group within society may be in conflict with those of society as a whole and work against its interests and welfare. Neglecting studies and concentrating more on games and sports might be more beneficial in many societies such as – cricket in West Indies; tennis in USA; or football in Brazil; but in India such possibility is just one in million people.
10. Because of their importance to individuals and society, values involve emotions, and people often sacrifice and even enter into conflict to uphold them. For example, the fighting for “a cause” involves values changed with emotion.

11. Values exert strange influence on the development of individuals and society in at least two important ways:

First, by making it easy or difficult for people to accept new practices, to form new types of organizations and operate in new ways. Since, Cricket is more popular in our country, if the boy spends time in playing cricket is encouraged. But in educated and upper class families, playing kabaddi is not approved whole heartedly. Even the international games like hockey and football are not encouraged much. Among the lower stratum, cricket, badminton, tennis etc. are not affordable, hence, kabaddi playing boys are also approved. This is because of differences in value.

Secondly, values encourage development in varied fields, including sports and games. It could be brought through research.

12. While values and norms are learned, many become internalized and form a part of the subconscious of the individual. As a result, some reactions of individuals based on such values are virtually automatic. Values of chivalry and respect for women and the aged are examples of such automatic responses.

**Social Values in Personality Organisation:**

Three levels of social values have been identified as influencing personality organisation; (1) abstract sentiments, (2) moral norms and (3) the self as social value.

1. Abstract sentiments or ideals are found in all cultures. In India a “unity in diversity” refers to a mutual respect and tolerance for differing religions and other beliefs; while in the U.S.A., sentiments are expressed as “the American way.”
2. Moral norms in personal experience become an individual's reaction to a group or social demand that he acts in the collective interest of the group or society. Thus, a man normally does not take anything that does not belong to him, even though his need may be acute, because of moral norms against thievery. Conformity is demanded as long as moral norms do not change. Moral norms are more stable in personal experience than are abstract sentiments and usually take precedence over the latter. However, every moral norm is justified in terms of some abstract sentiment. Moral norms of non-violence in general are accepted by the country as a whole; however, a soldier's wartime killing is justified by such abstract sentiments as "love of country," or "preservation of our way of life."

3. Through interaction in society, each person builds up a concept of himself, which becomes his primary concern and forms an important motivating force for individual behaviour. An individual is not so motivated in his action by the rightness or wrongness of a particular act as by the thought "this is the kind of thing that I, because of what I am, would do or would not do. "Conduct is considered moral and/or ethical if it is in agreement with one's self-concept. Thus, the moral responsibilities of caring for an invalid dependent may be joyfully accepted by one individual, accepted with some resentment by another and totally rejected by a third, because of varying self-concepts.

In each level of values, there are inconsistencies which society resolves by justifications in terms of other values, as in the example of killing during periods or war. In some cases, inconsistencies are simply ignored.

Self Concept:

There are two major approaches that can be used in studying the individual. One is to observe or to measure the objective dimensions of an individual's make up and conduct, and the other is to inquire into the subjective aspects of his personal experience. The label self concept has been widely used to identify the subjective states, even though the self embodies far more than just a conceptual frame work.
Some primitive men apparently assumed that the self was a man within the man. Such animistic conceptions, some observed in Freud’s descriptions of Id, Ego, and Superego.

However, it was William James’ persistent concern with relations among conscious elements led him directly to the puzzling psychological question of the self. “In every person’s stream of consciousness there is a dichotomy between the me and the not – me; at the same time it is I who am aware of this dichotomy. With characteristic sensitivity to his inner life, James divided the self into I, the knower and me, the known. The me is simple an object like any object we might be conscious of, although it is obviously of supreme interest. It is the I, the active sense of personal identify, that poses the real puzzle” (Miller, G.A 1966; pp. 90-91).

Thus, William James is credited with, for introducing a systematic presentation of the concept of self. But if Perry is true this credit must go to charles S. Pierree (see Perry, 1935; pp. 171-172).

Though there was considerable interest in the study of self during 1890 to 1910, in the following three decades constructs concerning self did not receive much attention from the behaviourists and functionalists who were dominating during that period. Hilgard (1949) described the condition accurately, who said, “the introspectionists were unable to handle the self and of course such a ‘mentalistic’ construct was ‘anathema’ to behaviourists. Disinterest in the study of self among the psychologists did not remain for a longer period. Philosopher and psychologist William James and sociologist Charles Cooley wrote extensively on the self. Cooley believed that one’s self ideal has three elements the imagination of our appearance to the other person, the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification (Cooley, 1922; p. 184).

After 1940, resurgence of interest in the self concept, by personality theorists, mental hygienists, sociologists and clinical psychologists, is seen. For example, Freud himself assigned greater importance to ego development and functioning and of
course, the neo-Freudians stressed the importance of the self picture and the ego ideal. Clinical psychologists found behaviouristic models apparently too limited to account for phenomena they were observing and they were ready to entertain psychoanalytic ideas, particularly of the revised variety. Sociologists upheld the views of Cooley and made attempts to establish the relationship between the self and social factors. Developmental psychologists and personality theorists assigned importance to self-referent constructs.

Self: Its Meaning

Like many other psychological constructs the term self also carries different meanings. There are numerous examples where self is spoken of in the singular. The 'self concept', a person's identity', 'one's self picture' and so on are all common expressions. In the writings of From (1939); Lecky, (1945); Mead (1925); and Reogers (1959) the self is viewed as a single entity, concept, gestalt or collage of perceptions.

In contrast to this position is one suggesting that self be viewed as multiple in character. Theorists such as Allport (1955) and Erikson (1959a; 1959b) pointed out that the person does recognize a continuing identity over time. Multiplicity of meanings of the term has been emphasized by Baldwin (1897); James (1961); and Sullivan (1953) also.

It is not feasible to quote all the views about self-concept hence, only a few are given below.

"Self is the sum total of conscious processes which run their course under conditions laid down by bodily tendencies" (Titchner, 1896).

According to William James, the self or me is, "an empirical aggregate of things objectively known. The (Ego or) I which knows them ... is a thought, at each moment different from that of the last moment...." (William James, 1961).
Allport went to the extreme of suggesting eight different meaning of self, thereby suggesting multiplicity of meanings attached to the term. Allport suggested eight aspects of the self. They are – bodily sense, self identity, ego enhancement, ego-extension, rational process, self image, propiate striving and the knower (See Allport, 1943; 1961).

In associationistic psychology the self was somehow compounded of ideas, each separate, each ignorant of its mates, but sticking together and calling each other up according to certain laws (Miller, 1967).

Recently, the usage of the term self has been classified roughly into those which refer to self as the object of the person’s own knowledge and evaluation (English and English, 1958).

Under the first category the following views can be included.

"Who moves the mental life…? The mover is always the self" (Adler, Cf. Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956).

"Self is that part of mental life which carries out psychic, mental or psychological acts" (Jung, Cf. English and English, 1958).

Horney described self ‘as dealing with the forces of resistance in therapy’ (Horney, 1942, p. 269).

There are many elements of experience which the self can not face……..(Rogers, 1951, p. 40).

Under the second category of self concept falls Snygg and Coombs’ (1949 p. 58) phenomenal self, which “includes all those parts of the phenomenal field which the individual experiences as part or characteristic of himself”. Jung’s conscious ideal personality ( Progoff, 1953, p. 84), and Adler’s self ideal which becomes available to
consciousness after psychotherapy are some of the instances (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956; p. 233). Munroe’s self image (Munroe, 1955; p. 609); Roger’s self concept (Rogers, 1951; p. 139); and McClelland’s symbolized portion of the self scheme (McClelland, 1951; p. 544), are further instances of self concept category.

The dichotomy of ‘self as doer’ and ‘self as known to oneself’ proves to be an inadequate basis for classifying the self constructs, because many authors attribute behaviour influencing characteristics to the self concept or to the ideal self concept. Secondly, some author postulate processes which seem to involve self in both in doer and the conceived sense, but which go beyond both senses; are not clearly related to either. Lastly, its categories cannot be meaningfully related to such concepts as motivation, learning, perception, traits or attitudes, which have been found helpful in general behaviour theory and personality theory (See Wiley, 1968, p. 730).

In recent decades, what a person “can call his” has been spelled out in more specific and definite terms. It has been referred to as “his attitude towards self” (Lowe, 1961); as an organized configuration of perceptions of self (Pederson, 1965), and as those perceptions, feelings, attitudes and values which the individual views as part or characteristic of himself (Perkins, 1958). Kinch (1968) referred to concept of self as the “organization of qualities the individual attributes to himself, while Brownfain (1965) thinks it as “system of meaning he has about himself and his relation to the world about him.

Allport (1961) and Jersild (1965) described the self concept excellently. According to Allport (1961), “the self is something of which we are immediately aware. We think of it as the warm, central private region of our life. As such it plays a crucial part in our consciousness (a concept broader than self), in our personality (a concept broader than consciousness), and in our organism (a concept broader than personality). Thus, it is some kind of core in our being”.

“The self as it finally evolves, is made up of all that goes into a person’s experiences of his individual existence. It is a person’s ‘inner world’. It is a composite
of a person’s thoughts and feelings, strivings and hopes, fears and fantasies, his view of what he is, what he has been what he might become and his attitudes pertaining to his worth” (Jersild, 1965).

Thus, one can see that several meanings have been attributed to the concept of self; however, in the present study, the self concept of the individual is represented by the total score obtained by him or her on a self concept scale devised and standardized by Awasthi.

**Kinds of Self Concept:**

William James in “Principles of Psychology” for the first time suggested that a person has many “selves”. For example, commenting on real self, ideal self, and social self he said, “real self is what a person really believes he is; ideal self is the person he aspires to be; and social self is what he believes others think of him and how they perceive him” (James, 1890). Latter studies revealed that the self concept does indeed take different forms (see Hurlock, 1976).

Instead of presenting a detailed account of different kinds of self concept, brief information in the form of explanatory notes is given here; the details are given in Wyley (1962); Wyley (1968); and Hurlock (1976).

The first classification of self concept had four categories namely the basic, the transitory, the social and the ideal.

The basic self concept is the person’s concept of what he really is. It tends to be realistic. It corresponds to Jame’s concept of the “real self”.

James first suggested transitory self concept, when he referred to the “self he hopes he now is” and “the self he fears he now is” (James, 1890). A person has a self concept which he holds for a time and then he relinquishes. Transitory self concept
may be favourable or unfavourable, depending largely on the situation in which the person finds himself momentarily.

The social self-concept is usually referred to as a "mirror image". It is derived from social interactions. Different social self-concepts are built up by different persons. The social self-concept depends on social groups such as home peer or community. It is based on the way the individual believes other perceive him, depending on their speech and actions.

The ideal self refers to what a person would like to be, as contrasted with his perception of what he actually is. It is made up of perceptions of what a person aspires to be and what he believes he ought to be. Almost everyone has an ideal self-concept in addition to his basic and transitory self-concepts.

In addition to these four major categories, attempts were made to measure other types of self-concepts, such as, physical self-concept, psychological self-concept, moral self concept etc. Sarbin (1962) used self and ego synonymously, and enlisted about a dozen variants of self. Some of these are: the physical self, the material self, the interjecting ego, the empirical self, the projective self, the pure ego, the transcendental ego, the social self, the ethical self, the inferred self and so on. Several self concept scales were devised and standardized to measure different kinds of self concepts (Jawa, 1976; Piers – Harris, 1968; Rastogi, 1977; Saraswat, 1988 etc.), and attempts were made to measure different self concept clusters (Morse, 1964; Otto and Healy 1966; Reck, 1980; Sharma, 1969 etc.). The different self-concepts apparently seem to be separate and distinct, but the fact is that they are fused and inter-related strongly. Each self-concept influences the others and is in turn influenced by them.

**Conditions Shaping the Self Concepts:**

It will not be out of place to take an account of the factors influencing the self concepts of an individual. However, a brief account of the factors will be taken here because, the relevant research findings are presented in detail in the next chapter.
Coopersmith (1967) interviewed eighty-five 10 to 12 years old children and their mothers; tested their self-esteem and concluded that, “people develop their self-concepts according to four bases: significance (the way they feel they are loved and approved of by people important to them); Competence (in performing tasks they consider important); Virtue (attainment of moral and ethical standards); and power (the extent to which they influence their own and others' lives). While people may draw favourable pictures of themselves is they rate high on some of these measures and low on others, the higher they rate on all four, the higher they will rate themselves.

A child's self-evaluations are influenced dominantly by the “significant others” in his social world. However, a child is not affected equally by all the people with whom he comes in contact (Sullivan, 1953). Since the mother is normally the principal caretaker of the infant and both parents serve as the primary agents of socialization during a child’s early life, it is not surprising that the parents serve as the primary agents of socialization during a child’s early life. The parents provide the standards with which their own activities are compared (Emmerich, Goldman and Shore, 1971).

The child--training method used in the family plays important role in shaping the child’s developing concept of self. Several studies have shown that, early parental warmth is associated with high self-concepts in later life (see Coopersmith, 1967; Sears, 1970).

The expectations or the aspirations parents have for the child play an important role in the development of self-concept. By the time the child enters school, many parents have high expectations about the quality of his schoolwork and the amount of responsibilities he will assume in the home. When he fails to meet these expectations, parents often criticize, nag and punish. This might result in developing negative self-concept.
Ordinal position in the family assigns various roles; even there are differences in the child training methods used by the parents with different children, and these differences do influence the development of self-concept.

Young children are rarely aware of minority group identification. But when their peers neglect or reject them such awareness is developed, which results in development of negative self-concept. Because parents, siblings and relatives constitute the child’s social world; for the most part young children tend to shown a preference for playmates of their own race or caste and to neglect, though not discriminate against those of other racial or caste groups. Probably, because of such facts Glasner (1961) went to the extent of saying that the child’s concept of himself as a person is “formed within the womb of family relationships.”

The most influential factor in shaping one’s self concept is the socio-economic status of the individual. Developmental psychologists and child development specialists have become increasingly concerned with more precise understanding of the wide-spread and long standing observation that children growing up under adverse socio-economic circumstances tend to show some impairment of psychological development (Riccuinti, 1977). Families in the lowest socio-economic levels in most countries are confronted with such adverse environmental circumstances as poor sanitation and health care, large family size, inadequate food availability, heightened incidence of disease, parental and postnatal malnutrition etc. that may directly influence children’s psychological development as well as their physical growth (Birch and Gussow 1970). Such disadvantageous conditions do influence the development of self-concept.

**Intellectual Capacities and self Concepts:**

How well the individual lives up to the social expectations has a marked effect on his self-concept. Wylie reviewed several studies showing strong relationship between adjustment and self concept (Wylie, 1968, pp. 777-783). Intelligence
provides to a person with the capacity to meet and solve the problems that adjustment to life requires. As the intellectual capacities develop the person constantly alters his awareness of the world and his perceptions of people, of situations and of himself. This is the direct effect of intellectual capacities. Indirectly, intellectual capacities influence the judgements affect his self judgements because they determine what role the social group will permit him to play and how it will treat him. Thus, adjustments are influenced both directly and indirectly by the level of the individual's intellectual capacities, and so also the self-concept.

All people follow much the same pattern of intellectual development, the rate of development and decline varies sharply. There are individual differences and even in the same person physical and mental traits develop at different rates, reach maturity at different ages and then start to decline at different ages and then start to decline at different ages and at different rates (Bayley, 1968; Gessell et al; 1956 etc.). Irregularities in rate of growth both physically and mentally are not uncommon when irregularities are pronounced; for example, when intellectual development is far ahead of physical development, the many adjustment problems that the person must face will have a profound effect on his self-concept.

How a person uses his inherited intellectual capacities determines the quality of his adjustments. And the quality of his adjustments affect his self concept (Bayley, 1968).

This brief introduction regarding the history, nature and development, types of and factors influencing the self-concept makes it clear that self-concept is a multifaceted phenomenon.

**Self**: Theoretical views:

The concept of self has been used to refer to at least a dozen different aspects of personality and yet the researchers have long considered the self to be the
explanatory construct sine qua non. There are nearly as many definitions of self as there are self psychologists, however, the common element in all definitions of self is the character of self as an organizer that imposes a consistency of some order on behaviour.

The self has been postulated in three general ways. At the first place self was treated as a little man inside the man who ordered all activities so that they pretty well suited his imperial self-ship. Secondly, the self is considered as a kind of template or picture in which all ongoing behaviour must fit; and thirdly, it is a summary name for a set of psychological processes.

Cooley (1902) defined the self as, “that which is designated in common speech by the pronouns of first person singular, ‘I’, ‘me’, ‘mine’ and ‘myself’. He noted that what is labelled as self produces stronger emotions than what is labeled as non-self and that is only through subjective feelings that the self can be identified. The belief that one has control over events produces the feeling state. Even cognitive discrimination such as noting one’s own body different from that of others also produces that feeling state. Cooley’s “looking-glass self” refers to an individual perceiving himself in a way that others perceive him.

According to Freud (1905) the personality is made up of three major systems: the Id, the Ego, the Super-ego. Each of the systems has its own functions, properties, components, operating principles, dynamics and mechanisms. However, Id, ego and superego interact so closely with each other that it is more or less impossible to disentangle their effects and assess their relative contributions to human behaviour. In Freud’s opinion behaviour is the product of the interaction among id, ego and superego.

Self, according to Jung (1923), is the midpoint of personality. All the other systems are constellation around self. The functions of the self is to hold the other systems together and provide the personality with unity, equilibrium and stability. Jung called self as the goal of life, for which people strive constantly but rarely reach to it.
Well in accord the archetypes the self motivates human behaviour and causes one to search for wholeness especially through the avenues provided by religion.

Adler (1927) introduced “creative self”. The doctrine of creative self asserts that humans make their own personalities; they construct them out of raw material of heredity and experience. The creative self gives meaning to life; it creates the goal as well as means to the goal. It is the active principle of human life and not unlike the older concept of soul.

Cooley’s “looking glass self” was expanded upon by George Mead (1934). He noted that the self arises in social interaction at an out-growth of the individual’s concern about how others react to him. In order to anticipate other people’s reaction so that he can behave accordingly, the individual learns to perceive the world as they do. By incorporating estimates of how the “generalized other” would respond to certain actions, the individual acquires a source of internal regulation that serves to guide and stabilize his behaviour in the absences of external pressures. Mead believes that there are as many selves as there are social roles.

Allport (1937) believed that the structure and dynamics of personality are same. All the self or ego functions be called as appropriate functions of the personality. Allport identified seven aspects in the development of the proprium or self-hood. They are, bodily sense, self identity, ego-enhancement, ego extension, rational process self image and appropriate striving. These seven aspects, rational thinking, cognitive style and the function of knowing are all true and vital portions of personality; and they have in common a phenomenal warmth and a sense of importance. Together, they might be said to comprise the “proprium”. Allport, making clear the developmental process of personality proposed three stages. The first stage covers the first three years of life, during which a sense of bodily self, a sense of continuing self identity and self esteem or pride appear. The extension of self and self image make their appearance during the age four to six years. Sometimes during six to twelve years of age the child develops self awareness, and it is during adolescence intentions, long range purposes and distant goals emerge.
The only motive that organism possesses, according to Goldstein (1940) is the self actualization. Goldstein believes that drives such as hunger, sex, power, achievement and curiosity are merely manifestations of the sovereign purpose of life, that is to actualize oneself. Self actualization is the creative trend of human nature. It is the organic principle by which the organism becomes more fully developed and more complete. In other words, self actualization or self realization means fulfillment of needs. People have different innate potentialities, that shape their ends and direct the lines of their individual growth and development. It is because of this, though self-actualization is a universal phenomenon in nature, the specific ends towards which people vary from person to person.

In determining the potentialities of individual, according to Goldstein, it can best be done by finding out what the person prefers and what he or she does best. Their preferences correspond to their potentialities.

Humans are capable of developing ideas about themselves as organisms because many of their organic processes become conscious. The sum total of these conceptions constitutes the symbolic self (Angyal, 1941). However, the symbolic self is not always a reliable representation of the organism that what a person thinks about himself or herself rarely yields a true picture of reality. The relative segregation of the symbolic self with the organism is perhaps the most vulnerable point of the human personality organization, because the symbolic self may falsify and distort the reality of the biosphere.

Lecky (1945) defined personality as an “organization of values that are consistent with one another”. The self-concept is the nucleus of the personality. The organization of the personality is considered to be dynamic as it involves a continuous assimilation of new ideas and rejection or modification of old ideas. The self-concept, as the nucleus of personality plays a key role in determining what concepts are acceptable for assimilation into the overall personality organization. There is one major motive, the striving for unity. A threat to the organization of personality produces feelings of distress.
A systematic theory of self was proposed by Rogers (1951). He defined the self, “as an organized fluid, but consistent conceptual pattern of perceptions of characteristics and relationships of the ‘I’ or the ‘me’ together with values attached to those concepts.” He stated that the self-concept includes only these characteristics of the individual that he is aware of and over which he believes exercises control. There is a basis need to maintain and enhance the self. Threat to the organization of self-concept produces anxiety. If the threat cannot be defended against, catastrophic disorganization follows. Roger's views have obviously a great deal in common with those of Lecky (1945) and Snygg and Coombs (1949).

The chronologically presented brief review of the theoretical viewpoints is not complete. There are many others who had contributed significantly in developing a theory of self (e.g. Baldwin, 1897; Erikson, 1959; Fromm, 1939; Hilgard, 1949; Maslow, 1961; Sarbin, 1962; Sullivan, 1953 etc.).

**Team Cohesion: Group Success Vs Individual Success Orientation.**

It is a well established principle in sport that a group of individual working together are far more effective than the same individuals working independent of one another. Sport persons who play these specialized roles rarely score as many points as a shooting guard or forward in a basketball game. Yet, out of desire to be a “team player” these sport persons accept less glamorous roles for the common good of team. Thus, as a group or team evolves, a certain structure develops. This structure varies from group to group and situation to situation. Members of successful team have the ability to work together and also, they enjoy a certain attraction to one another. Teams composed of members who like each other and who enjoy playing together are likely to be more successful than teams lacking this quantity. However, early research on the subject of team cohesion often resulted in contradictory findings. Lenk (1969) reported that Olympic and the world championship rowing teams can experience success despite strong internal conflicts; whereas Klein and Christensen (1969) demonstrated that in three-on-three basketball team performance was related to team cohesion.
Originally, team cohesion was studies by sociologists and social psychologists. From sociological perspective, an effective group is much more than a collection of individuals. Individuals working toward a common goal are much more effective than the same individuals working independently. This observation certainly applies to sport persons teams, such as soccer, basketball etc. Where team success is dependent on how the total team performs as opposed to how individuals perform independently. The nature and meaning of the term group cohesion has been defined in different manner by different scholars. For example, Festinger, Schachter, and Back (1950) defined group cohesion as the total field of forces that act on members to remain in a group. Likewise, team cohesion could be referred as the total field of forces that act on members to remain on a team. Though, Festinger and others provided a good definition of group cohesion it is not fully applicable to the team of sport persons, for two reasons. First, they have not taken into consideration the dynamic nature of team cohesion, and secondly, they have not given a definition which is more suitable in sports field. Carron is prominent sport social psychologist. According to Carron (1982) group cohesion is “a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of goals and objectives”. Foundation of the definition of group cohesion proposed by Carron (1982); could be seen in the model of cohesion given by Cartwright (1968). The model proposes that there are forces that determine the strength and effectiveness of team cohesion. Cartwright labeled these forces as determinants of team cohesion. As a result of a team's or group's ability to work together, Cartwright proposed that there would be certain consequences associated with effective team cohesion.

There are at least two distant and independent dimensions associated with team cohesion; one is related to interpersonal attraction, it is identified as social cohesion. It reflects the degree to which the members of a team like each other and enjoy each other's company. The second dimension is task cohesion. Task cohesion reflects the degree to which members of a group work together to achieve a specific and identifiable task. The task is usually associated with the purpose for which the team or group was formed (see Hagstrom, 1972 and Selvin, 1965; Mikalachi, 1969; Peterson & Martens, 1972). Yukelson, Weinberg and Jackson (1983, 1984) demonstrated that
there might be as many as four dimensions. It is clear then that team cohesion is a multidimensional construct and not a undimensional construct.

There are many determinants of team cohesion. The first one is cooperation and competition. Cooperation is an inseparable part of group cohesion. In a way cooperation and group cohesion are more or less one and the same. In sports cooperation is linked with competition. Deutsch (1968) viewed cooperation and competition as mutually exclusive. Deutsch (1968) defined a cooperative social situation as one in which the goals of the individuals are so linked together that there is a positive correlation between their attainments; that is, individuals can attain their goals if, and only if, the other participants can attain theirs. Closely linked to the notions of cooperation and competition is the concept of individualistic behaviour. Deutsch wrote, an individualistic social situations is one in which there is no correlation between the goal attainments of the participants. Whether an individual accomplishes his or her goal has no influence on whether others achieve their goals.

Team stability is another determinant of team cohesion. Team stability relates to team cohesion in terms of the number or years that a group of athletes remain together. Team stability is also referred as team constancy. It is an important force that remain relatively constant across a certain period of time to be more stable, cohesive and ultimately more successful. It is not easy to decide the exact "period of time", sufficient to call a team stable. Studies by Donnelly (1975), and Donnelly, Corron and Chelladurai (1978) suggest that teams need a certain amount of time to develop an optimal level of cohesion for task performance. The amount of time would likely to vary from team to team and from sport to sport.

An another factor believed to be related to team cohesion and success is the homogeneity of the team. Team homogeneity has to do with how similar teammates are on such factors as cultural background, ethnic background, socioeconomic status and religion. The basic premise is that more homogeneous teams are likely to resist clique formation, to be higher in team cohesion and to ultimately enjoy greater success.
It is easier to develop team cohesion in small groups than large groups. Team size is the last determinant of team cohesion. It can be expected that as a team or group increases in size, cohesion and productivity may decline. This is partially due to decreased communication and depersonalization.

Though group cohesion is important, individual efforts cannot be neglected in the formation and development of self-concept of the sport person. Probably, related to the concept of self, achievement of team is important, but individual achievement is more important. When a team wins, the members of the team are satisfied. Their self-concepts are enhanced. But among them, there is one who acted, as key sport person in fetching the victory perceives himself distinct from others. This is true for all the games. For example, if a football team won the final match, all the teammates egos are elevated. Spectators look at them in different perspectives. Among the players of the team, there are one or two players who score the goal or goals and fetch the victory to their team. They are perceived distinct from the other teammates. They perceive themselves different. All this helps in enhancing the self-concept.

However, there are a few who have the tendency of individual success orientation Because of them the team spirit is threatened, though not directly but indirectly. The efforts, made by them of scoring the goal, results failure (sometimes they succeed, even in the absence of group cohesion ) and the whole team has to pay the price. These people probably have different self-concept than those who behave in conformity with the team.

Aim of Study:

Values and self concepts have special importance in sport psychology, as they influence the performance of sport persons and also non sport persons in one or the other way. Development of values and self concepts depend on many factors which influence the socialization. If those common factors are assumed that they are controlled, do the kind of education, success oriented tendency and sex of the individual influence the development of different values and self concepts ? was the major problem to which scientific answer is to be sought. Thus, the main aim of the
study is to measure the personal values, self concepts and personal success orientation Vs group success orientation of the physical education and non physical education students and to find out sex differences with regards to self concepts and personal values cherished by them. The study also intends to examine the differences in the sports persons and non sport persons’ self concepts and personal values. Finally, the study is directed to search the extent to which personal success oriented sport person and group success oriented sport person differ from each other on self concepts and personal values.

**Objectives of study:**

In the study six different types of self concepts and ten different personal values are treated as dependent variables, and sex, kind of education and success orientation are treated as independent variables, hence, there are many specific objectives.

1. To measure physical self-concept of the Ss and find out whether the male Ss have superior physical self concept or the female Ss have.

2. To examine the difference in the physical self concept of physical education students (PES) and non physical education students (NPES).

3. To study the influence of success orientation on the development of physical self-concept.

4. To search the sex differences in the development of intellectual self-concept.

5. To find out the differences in the intellectual self-concept of PES and NPES.

6. To understand the effect of success orientation on the development of intellectual self-concepts.

7. To measure the social self-concept of the Ss and find out whether the females have developed superior social self concept or the males have.
8. To study the development of social self-concept of PES and non PES Ss and find out whether they differ significantly, on social self-concept, or not.

9. To understand the effect of success orientation on the development of social self-concept.

10. To measure the moral self-concept of the Ss and examine sex differences in the development of moral self-concept.

11. To find out the extent to which PES and NPES differ from each other significantly, on moral self-concept.

12. To understand the influence of success orientation tendency on the development of moral self-concept, and find out whether the personal success oriented (PSO) develop significantly better moral self-concept than that of group success oriented (GSO) Ss.

13. To measure emotional self-concept of the Ss and find out whether the male and female Ss differ from each other or not.

14. To find out whether the PES develop significantly better emotional self-concept than the NPES, or not.

15. To search the extent to which development of emotional self-concept is influenced by the factor of success orientation.

16. To examine sex differences with regards to aesthetic self-concepts.

17. To measure aesthetic self-concept of PES and NPES and test which group has significantly better aesthetic self-concept than other.

18. To find out whether the personal success oriented Ss had significantly better aesthetic self concept than that of the group success oriented Ss or not.

19. To measure religious values of the Ss, and find out who cherish religious values more the males or the females.
20. To examine the difference in the religious values of PES and NPES Ss.

21. To find out whether development of religious values is influenced by the success orientation or not.

22. To measure social values of the Ss and examine who develop superior social values, the male of female Ss.

23. To study the difference in the social values of PES and NPES Ss.

24. To understand the extent to which development of social values is influenced by different types of success orientation.

25. To measure democratic values of the Ss and find out whether the male Ss cherish more democratic values or the females.

26. To examine the difference in democratic values of PES and NPES Ss.

27. To search the difference in the democratic values of personal success orientation and group success oriented Ss.

28. To assess the aesthetic values of male and female Ss and find out, of them who are superior in aesthetic values.

29. Who, the PES or NPES developed superior aesthetic values? To search appropriate answer to this question.

30. Regarding aesthetic values whether the personal success oriented or group success oriented are superior? To get the answer to the question.

31. Are economic values better among females than among males? To measure values of males and females and seek proper answer to this question.

32. To find out whether the PES developed significantly better economic values or NPES had developed.
33. To examine the difference in the economic values of personal success oriented and group success orientated Ss.

34. To measure knowledge values of male and female Ss and examine the sex differences with regards to knowledge values.

35. To examine the difference in the knowledge values cherished by PES and NPES Ss.

36. To study the difference in the knowledge values of personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss.

37. To measure hedonistic values of male and female Ss, and find out whether the sex differences regarding hedonistic values are significant or not.

38. To search difference in the hedonistic values of PES and NPES Ss.

39. To find out the extent to which personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss differ from each other on hedonistic values.

40. Who cherish better power values, the males or the females? To seek the appropriate answer to this question after measuring power values.

41. To search the difference in the power values of PES and NPES Ss.

42. To examine the difference in the power values of personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss.

43. To measure family prestige values and find out whether the male or the female Ss have significantly better family prestige values.

44. To examine the influence of type of formal education on the development of family prestige values.

45. To understand the effect of success orientation on the development of family prestige values.
46. To measure the health values cherished by the Ss; and further search the sex differences regarding the health values.

47. To find out the difference in the health value of PES and NPES Ss.

48. Do personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss differ from each other significantly on health values? To search appropriate answer to the question.

**Hypotheses Tested in the Study:**

Assuming that the other factors are kept controlled, it is hypothesized that,

1. Females have significantly better physical concept than males.

2. Physical self-concept of PES is significantly better than that of NPES.

3. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better physical self-concept than the group success oriented Ss.

4. There do not appear significant difference in the intellectual self concept of male and female Ss.

5. The NPES Ss have significantly better intellectual self-concept than that of the PES.

6. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better intellectual self-concept than the group success oriented Ss.

7. Females are significantly superior to males in social self-concept.

8. Social self-concept of PES is significantly better than that of NPES.

9. Group success oriented Ss develop significantly better social self-concept than the individual success oriented Ss.

10. Females have significantly better moral self-concept than the males.

11. PES and NPES groups of Ss do not differ significantly on moral self-concept.
12. Moral self-concept of group success oriented Ss is significantly better than that of personal success oriented Ss.

13. Females are significantly superior to males in emotional self-concept.

14. Emotional self-concept of PES is significantly better than that of NPES.

15. Emotional self-concept of group success oriented Ss is significantly better than that of personal success oriented Ss.

16. Females are significantly superior to males in aesthetic self-concept.

17. There is no significant difference in the aesthetic self-concept of PES and NPES Ss.

18. Personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss do not differ significantly on aesthetic self-concept.

19. Religious values of females are significantly better than that of males.

20. PES Ss have significantly better religious values than the NPES Ss.

21. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better religious values than the group success oriented Ss.

22. Females have significantly better social values than that of males.

23. Social values of PES are significantly better than that of NPES.

24. Group success oriented Ss have significantly better social values than the personal success oriented Ss.

25. Democratic values are significantly better among males than females.

26. There do not appear any difference in the democratic values of PES and NPES Ss.

27. Democratic values of group success oriented Ss are significantly better than that of personal success oriented Ss.
28. Aesthetic values of females are significantly better than that of males.

29. The PES and NPES Ss do not differ significantly from each other on aesthetic values.

30. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better aesthetic values than group success oriented Ss.

31. Economic values are significantly better among females than males.

32. There is no difference in the economic values of PES and NPES.

33. Personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss do not differ significantly from each other on economic values.

34. Knowledge values are significantly better among males than among females.

35. Knowledge values are significantly better cherished by NPES than PES.

36. There do not appear any significant difference between personal success oriented and group success oriented Ss regarding knowledge values.

37. Females have significantly better hedonistic values than males.

38. There do not appear any significant difference in hedonistic values of PES and NPES.

39. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better hedonistic values than group success oriented Ss.

40. The male cherish significantly more power values than the females.

41. The PES have significantly better power values than the NPES.

42. Power values are significantly more among individual success oriented Ss, than among group success oriented Ss.
43. Family prestige values are cherished significantly better by the females than the males.

44. There do not appear significant difference among PES and NPES regarding family prestige values.

45. Personal success oriented Ss have significantly better family prestige values than group success oriented.

46. Health values are significantly better among the males than among the females.

47. Regarding health values the PES are significantly superior to NPES.

48. There do not appear any significant difference among the personal success and group success oriented Ss.