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Abstract

Introduction: Self-esteem is a widely used concept both in popular language and in psychology. It refers to an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes him or herself (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The most broad and frequently cited definition of self-esteem within psychology is Rosenberg's (1965), who described it as a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the self. Self-esteem is generally considered the evaluative component of the self-concept, a broader representation of the self that includes cognitive and behavioral aspects as well as evaluative or affective ones (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). While the construct is most often used to refer to a global sense of self-worth, narrower concepts such as self-confidence or body-esteem are used to imply a sense of self-esteem in more specific domains. It is also widely assumed that self-esteem functions as a trait, that is, it is stable across time within individuals. Self-esteem is an extremely popular construct within psychology, and has been related to virtually every other psychological concept or domain, including personality (e.g., shyness), behavioral (e.g., task performance), cognitive (e.g., attributional bias), and clinical concepts (e.g., anxiety and depression).

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to compare the self-esteem variable between trainees of Bachelor of Physical Education and Bachelor of Education.

Methodology: The purpose of the study was to assess the level of self-esteem variable between undergraduate Education and Physical Education trainees. The raw data pertaining to self-esteem variable of these Physical Education and Education trainees of Shivamogga and Bhadravathi taluk were selected as subjects on random sampling technique. Totally 120 Subjects were selected, 60 subjects from physical education and 60 students from education. The data was collected by administering standardized questionnaires. Self-esteem assessment questionnaire formulated by Williams (2000) was used to test the level of self-esteem.

Results: To achieve the purpose of the study data collected was subjected to statistical analysis. The mean, standard deviation and t-ration were obtained by using standard statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 20th Version).

Conclusion: Within the limitations of the present study and on the basis of findings in psychological variables, it is observed from the study was self-esteem variables in some areas such as Intelligence, Personality, Success, and Freedom from Guilt is not significant.
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Introduction

Self-esteem is a widely used concept both in popular language and in psychology. It refers to an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes him or herself. The most broad and frequently cited definition of self-esteem within psychology is Rosenberg's (1965), who described it as a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the self (p. 15).

Self-esteem is generally considered the evaluative component of the self-concept, a broader representation of the self that includes cognitive and behavioral aspects as well as evaluative or affective ones. While the construct is most often used to refer to a global sense of self-worth, narrower concepts such as self-confidence or body-esteem are used to imply a sense of self-esteem in more specific domains. It is also widely assumed that self-esteem functions as a trait, that is, it is stable across time within individuals. Self-esteem is
an extremely popular construct within psychology, and has been related to virtually every other psychological concept or domain, including personality (e.g., shyness), behavioral (e.g., task performance), cognitive (e.g., attributional bias), and clinical concepts (e.g., anxiety and depression). While some researchers have been particularly concerned with understanding the nuances of the self-esteem construct, others have focussed on the adaptive and self-protective functions of self-esteem (see for a review of conceptual and methodological issues).

Self-esteem has been related both to socioeconomic status and to various aspects of health and health-related behavior, as has a related construct, self-efficacy. Self-efficacy, a term associated with the work of Bandura, refers to an individual's sense of competence or ability in general or in particular domains. Research on both constructs as they relate to SES and to health will be reviewed below.

The dictionary defines self-esteem as “self-respect” or “self-concept.” The second of these terms implies an excessive amount of self-esteem. For the purposes of this publication, however, our concern is to help children develop a healthy self-respect, through normal accomplishments, in order to approach life without being burdened by fears of competition, failure or success. Childhood self-esteem develops through competence and social acceptance.

Self-esteem is an essential contribution to the life process and is indispensable to normal and healthy self-development, and has a value for survival. Self-esteem promotion can benefit from lifestyle-oriented activities. Its growth takes place in the larger context of relationship, environment related experience, attitude toward self and achievements. People with poor self-esteem often rely on how they are doing in the present to determine how they feel about themselves. They need positive external experiences to counteract the negative feelings and thoughts that constantly plague them. Even then, the good feeling can be temporary.

2. Methodology

The purpose of the study was to assess the level of self-esteem between undergraduate Education and Physical Education trainees. The raw data pertaining to self-esteem of these Physical Education and Education trainees of Shivalingappa and Bhadravathi taluk were selected as subjects on random sampling technique. Totally 120 Subjects were selected, 60 subjects from physical education and 60 students from education. The data was collected by administering standardized questionnaires. Self-esteem assessment questionnaire formulated by Williams (2000) was used to test the level of self-esteem.

3. Statistical Analysis

The raw data pertaining to self-esteem of these Physical Education and Education trainees of different taluk in Shivalingappa district, namely, Shivalingappa and Bhadravathi were selected as subject systematic random sampling was carried out to get sample size of 120 Subjects were selected for comparison 60 subjects from Physical Education and 60 students form Education. To achieve the purpose of the study data collected was subjected to statistical analysis. The mean, standard deviation and t-ration were obtained by using standard statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 20th Version).

4. Results and Discussion

The self-esteem appearance of Physical Education and Education trainees may differ significantly because look at our self of these two trainees group differ remarkably. The self-esteem appearance of Physical Education and Education trainees is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.07 ± 1.07</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.52 ± 1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level. Critical value is 2.0.

Fig 1: Shows the mean value of Self-esteem Appearance between Physical Education and Education trainees.

Perusal of Table 1 and the Fig.1 reveal that self-esteem appearance between Physical Education and Education trainees differ significantly (t – 2.24). The value obtained is greater than the critical value (t – 2.0). The results depict that student of Physical Education are good appearance because they are involving in physical activities regularly. But most of Education trainees would not participate in the physical activity except activity prescribed in the curricula. Since calculated ‘t’ value between Physical Education and Education trainees is 2.24 it is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 2: Shows the mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Self-esteem Competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.13 ± 1.05</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.65 ± 1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level. Critical value is 2.0.

Fig 2: Shows the mean value of Self-esteem Competence between Physical Education and Education trainees.
The ‘t’ value obtained from the data is 2.27 which is theoretical ‘t’ value 2.00 at 0.05 level so ‘t’ is significant. The results clearly indicates that Physical Education trainees are better in competence because they will have very good fitness when compared to Education trainees and it proved that sound mind in a sound body. Since calculated ‘t’ value between Physical Education and Education trainees is 2.27 it is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 3: Shows the mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Self-esteem Intelligence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.77 ± 1.21</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.48 ± 1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at 0.05 level. Critical value is 2.0.

The ‘t’ value obtained from the data is 1.30 which is theoretical value 2.00 at 0.05 level so ‘t’ is not significant. The result indicates that both Physical Education and Education trainees are having same personality at the same level there is no difference in personality aspect. Since calculated ‘t’ value between Physical Education and Education trainees is 1.3 it is not significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4: Shows the mean, standard deviation and ‘t’ value of Self-esteem Personality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.25 ± 1.88</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.88 ± 1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at 0.05 level. Critical value is 2.0.

5. Conclusion

Within the limitations of the present study and on the basis of findings in psychological variables, it is observed from the study was self-esteem variables in some areas such as Appearance and Competence is differ significantly, Physical Education are good appearance because they are involving in physical activities regularly. But most of Education trainees would not participate in the physical activity except activity prescribed in the curricula. And Physical Education trainees are better in competence because they will have very good fitness when compared to Education trainees and it proved that sound mind in a sound body. But there is no significant difference in self-esteem variables such as Intelligence and Personality.
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