Social Intelligence and Social Support in Basketball Players: A Key to Success

Nishan Singh Deol[1], Davinder Singh[2],*

[1]Department of Physical Education, Punjabi University, Patiala, India
[2]Department of Physical Education, D.A.V. College, Amritsar, India
*Corresponding author: ds_rajput87@yahoo.in

Abstract   The present study was aimed to indentify the Social Intelligence and Social Support in Basketball Players. For this purpose, sixty female basketball players of 20 to 25 years of age were selected. They were further divided into three groups; (i.e., N1=20; District, N2=20; State and N3=20 National). To measure the level of Social Intelligence among subjects, Social Intelligence Questionnaire, constructed by Chadha and Ganesan (1986) was administered. To measure the level of Social Support among subjects, Social Support Scale constructed by Zimet et al. (1988) was administered. One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to find out the intra-group differences. The findings show that no significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Social Intelligence. The findings also show that insignificant differences were present among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Social Support.

Keywords: social intelligence, social support, basketball

Cite This Article: Nishan Singh Deol, and Davinder Singh, "Social Intelligence and Social Support in Basketball Players: A Key to Success." *American Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2015): 66-69. doi: 10.12691/ajssm-3-3-3.

1. Introduction

Scientific Literature shows that social intelligence has always been considered as one of the most important issues of social sciences and humanities particularly in educational and Competitive sports arena. Also, its capabilities and uses over the other kinds of intelligence have often been emphasized. Social intelligence identifies powerful competence for interpersonal interaction; the "new science of relationships" illuminates how the brain actually promotes human connection and communication. Cantor and Kihlstrom [1] defined that social intelligence refers to the individual's fund of knowledge about the social world. Marlowe [2] suggested that individuals who are socially intelligent appear to experience a rich, meaningful life, as opposed to truncated affective experiences. Furthermore, aspects of social intelligence have been found to be associated with enhanced social problem-solving abilities [3], experienced leadership [4] and positive interpersonal experience [5]. As basketball exerts great degrees of pressure and motion on the athletes in the playground, it demands a high rank of alertness and ability in every respect of the player's physique. This is also true that having a reasonable level of social intelligence helps the way toward success in team and group sports [6]. Social support is associated with better psychological health in general and reduces the negative psychological consequences of exposure to stressful life events [7]. Wallston et al. [8] reported that various sources or types of social support contribute to different outcomes in physical health. There have been recent indications that social support resources play an important role in athlete retention and success [9,10,11]. The coach-athlete relationship may be the most important social sport interaction [12]. Research on elite youth sport athletes has focused a great deal on sport developmental paths [13,14] as opposed to psycho-social factors that may influence young athletes. Some of the developmental research has proposed that young athletes specialize in one sport by early adolescence [15] and this elite sport specialization requires numerous physical, psychological, and social sacrifices [16,17]. Social support has been found to relate to athletes' satisfaction with their athletic experience and it has been related to important outcomes in sport and the ability to adapt to new challenges [18]. While considering the paramount importance of psychological variables with regard to team Game sports the investigators focused to analyze the major role of Social Intelligence and Social Support in Basketball Players.

2. Methods

2.1 Subjects

The investigators had selected Sixty (N=60) female basketball players of 19 to 25 years of age to act as subjects. They were divided into three groups; (i.e., N1=20; District, N2=20; State and N3=20 National). The purposive sampling technique was used to select the subjects. All the subjects, after having been informed about the objective and protocol of the study, gave their consent and volunteered to participate in this study.

2.2. Tools

To measure the level of Social Intelligence among subjects, Social Intelligence Questionnaire, constructed by Chadha and Ganesan [19] was administered. To measure the level of Social Support among subjects, Social Support Scale constructed by Zimet et al. [20] was administered.

3. Statistical Analysis

One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to find out the intra-group differences. Where F values were found significant, LSD (Least Significant Difference) Post-hoc test was applied to find out the direction and degree of difference. For testing the hypotheses, the level of significance was set at 0.05.

4. Results

Table 1. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Patience

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	34.233	2	17.117	2.557	.086
Within Groups	381.500	57	6.693		
Total	415.733	59			

4.1. Patience

It can be seen from Table 1 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Patience among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .086 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 2. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Cooperativeness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	51.100	2	25.550	2.247	.115
Within Groups	648.150	57	11.371		
Total	699.250	59			

4.2. Cooperativeness

It can be seen from Table 2 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Cooperativeness among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .115 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 3. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Confidence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	40.533	2	20.267	2.828	.067
Within Groups	408.450	57	7.166		
Total	448.983	59			

4.3. Confidence

It can be seen from Table 3 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Confidence among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .067 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 4. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Sensitivity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	16.133	2	8.067	1.060	.353
Within Groups	433.600	57	7.607		
Total	449.733	59			

4.4. Sensitivity

It can be seen from Table 4 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Sensitivity among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .353 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 5. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Recognition of Social Environment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	1.233	2	.617	1.326	.273
Within Groups	26.500	57	.465		
Total	27.733	59			

4.5. Recognition of Social Environment

It can be seen from Table 5 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Recognition of Social Environment among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .273 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 6. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Tactfulness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	10.233	2	5.117	2.376	.102
Within Groups	122.750	57	2.154		
Total	132.983	59			

4.6. Tactfulness

It can be seen from Table 6 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Tactfulness among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .102 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

4.7. Sense of Humour

It can be seen from Table 7 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable

Sense of Humour among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .013 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 7. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Sense of Humour

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	21.433	2	10.717		
Within Groups	129.900	57	2.279	4.702	.013
Total	151.333	59			

Table 8. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence on the sub-variable Memory

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	5.033	2	2.517		
Within Groups	160.700	57	2.819	.893	.415
Total	165.733	59			

4.8. Memory

It can be seen from Table 8 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Memory among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .415 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 9. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Intelligence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	809.033	2	404.517		
Within Groups	5615.550	57	98.518	4.106	.222
Total	6424.583	59			

4.9. Social Intelligence

It can be seen from Table 9 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the variable Social Intelligence among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .222 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 10. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Support on the sub-variable Family

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	146.033	2	73.017		
Within Groups	1234.550	57	21.659	3.371	.074
Total	1380.583	59			

4.10. Family

It can be seen from Table 10 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Family among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .074 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 11. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Support on the sub-variable Friends

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	210.533	2	105.267		
Within Groups	1121.800	57	19.681	5.349	.067
Total	1332.333	59			

4.11. Friends

It can be seen from Table 11 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Friends among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .067 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 12. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Support on the sub-variable Other Significant Persons

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	8.133	2	4.067		
Within Groups	1456.050	57	25.545	.159	.853
Total	1464.183	59			

4.12. Other Significant Persons

It can be seen from Table 12 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-variable Other Significant Persons among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .853 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

Table 13. Significant differences in the results among Female Basketball Players with regard to Social Support

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	101.733	2	50.867		
Within Groups	6154.850	57	107.980	.471	.627
Total	6256.583	59			

4.13. Social Support

It can be seen from Table 13 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the variable Social Support among District, State and National female basketball players as the P-value (Sig.) .627 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance (p>0.05).

5. Practical Application

The study will be considerably helpful to comprehend the Social Intelligence and Social Support level existing among female basketball players. The sports psychologists and coaches working with these areas will drive benefit from the findings of the present research and they can integrate Social Intelligence and Social Support variables in their training schedule from the very initial stages.

6. Conclusion

Summarizing from the above findings we can say that no significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Social Intelligence i.e., Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour and Memory. Concludingly from the above findings that insignificant differences were present among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Social Support i.e., Family, Friends and Other Significant Persons.

References

[1] Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J.F. *Personality and social intelligence.* New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall. 1987.

[2] Marlowe, H. A. Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*(1), 52-58. 1986.

[3] Jones, K., & Day, J. D. Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 486-497. 1997.

[4] Kobe, L. M., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Rickers, J. D. Self-reported leadership experiences in relation to inventoried social and emotional intelligence. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality and Social, 20*(2), 154-163. 2001.

[5] Cheng, C., Chiu, C., Hong, Y., & Cheung, J. S. Discriminative facility and its role in the perceived quality of interactional experiences. *Journal of Personality, 69*(5), 765-786. 2001.

[6] Besharat et al. A Depiction of Sport Success in Individual and Group Sports Based on Social Intelligence. The Olympic Quarterly. No. 13 (4), 96-78. 2005.

[7] Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. Stress, social support and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310-357. 1985.

[8] Wallston, B.S., Alagna, S.W., DeVellis, B.M., & Dvellis, R.F. Social support and physical health. *Health Psychology*, *2*(1), 367-391. 1983.

[9] Botterill, C. The psychology of professional hockey. *Athletic Insight*, *6*(2). Retrieved from URL: http://www.athleticinsight.com/Vol6Iss2/ProfessionalHockey.html. (2004).

[10] Bruner, M. *An Investigation of the cognitive, social, and emotional development of major junior OHL hockey players* (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Windsor, Canada. 2002.

[11] Halliwell, W. Preparing professional hockey players for player performance. *Athletic Insight*. *6*(2). Retrieved from URL: *http://www.athleticinsight.com/vol6iss2/professional hockeyplayoffperformance.html.* 2004.

[12] Mageau, G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sport Sciences, 21*(11), 883-904. 2003.

[13] Baker, J., Cote, J., & Abernethy, B. Sport specific practice and development of expert decision making in team ball sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 15*(1), 12-25. 2003.

[14] Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.T., & Tesch-Romer, C. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review, 100*(3)*,* 363-406. 1993.

[15] Bloom, B. S. *Developing talent in young people.* New York: Ballantine. 1985.

[16] Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K., & Moffet, A. Psychological characteristics and their development in Olympic champions. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14*(3)*,* 172-204. 2002.

[17] Holt, N. L., & Dunn, J. G. H. Toward a grounded theory of the psychosocial competencies and environmental conditions associated with soccer success. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 16*(3), 199-219. 2004.

[18] Kristiansen, E., Roberts, G. C., & Abrahamsen, F. E. Achievement involvement and stress coping in elite sport. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 18*(4), 526-538. 2008.

[19] Chadha, N.K., & Ganesan, U. *Publication manual for social intelligence scale.* National Psychological Corporation, 4/230, Kacheri Ghat, Agra, India. 1986.

[20] Zimet, G.D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S.G., & Farley, G.K. The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30-41. 1988.