



ISSN: 2456-0057

IJPNPE 2017; 2(2): 2008-2011

© 2017 IJPNPE

www.journalofsports.com

Received: 23-07-2017

Accepted: 24-08-2017

Dr. Satinder KumarAssociate Professor, Department
of Physical Education & Sports,
Guru Nanak Nav-Bharat College
Narur-Panchhat, Punjab, India

Social intelligence and social support in football players: A key to success

Dr. Satinder Kumar

Abstract

The present study was aimed to identify the Social Intelligence and Social Support in Football Players. For this purpose, sixty female Football players of 18 to 22 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 Football players on the sub-variables of Social Intelligence. The findings also show that insignificant differences were present among female Football players on the sub-variables of Social Support.

Keywords: Social intelligence, social support, football

Introduction

In the present era, which is marked with social confrontations due to diminishing social norms, it is difficult to lead a successful life in a society without social intelligence. An individual's social intelligence can be known or measured only from his adjustability. To be well adjusted, an individual has to be intelligent so that he can think rationally, act purposefully and deal effectively with the environment. Social intelligence is the person's ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions [Thorndike, 1920]. It is made of inter and intra personal intelligence. Kaukiainen, *et al.*, (1996) [12] studied social intelligence and empathy as antecedents of different types of aggression and found a statistically significant correlation between indirect aggression and social intelligence. In the case of empathy, the correlations were negative, but not reaching the level of significance. Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987) [6] defined that social intelligence refers to the individual's fund of knowledge about the social world. Marlowe (1986) [15] 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 Jones *et al.* (1997) [11], experienced leadership Kobe *et al.* (2001) [13] and positive interpersonal experience Cheng *et al.* (2001) [8]. As Football 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 Besharat *et al.* (2005) [2]. Social support is associated with better psychological health in general and reduces the negative psychological consequences of exposure to stressful life events Cohen, & Wills (1985) [9]. Wallston *et al.* (1983) [16] 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 Botterill (2004) [4], Bruner (2002) [5]. The coach-athlete relationship may be the most important social sport interaction Mageau, & Vallerand, (2003) [14]. Research on elite youth sport athletes has focused a great deal on sport developmental paths Baker *et al.* (2003) [1]; Ericsson *et al.* (1993) [10] 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 Bloom (1985) [3].

Corresponding Author:**Dr. Satinder Kumar**Associate Professor, Department
of Physical Education & Sports,
Guru Nanak Nav-Bharat College
Narur-Panchhat, Punjab, India

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 Football Players.

Methods

Subjects

The investigators had selected Sixty (N=60) female Football players of 18 to 22 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.

Tools

Table 1: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	32.233	2	15.127	1.359	.069
Within Groups	361.500	57	6.592		
Total	425.733	59			

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 Football players as the P-value

To measure the level of Social Intelligence among subjects, Social Intelligence Questionnaire, constructed by Chadha and Ganesan (1986)^[7] was administered. To measure the level of Social Support among subjects, Social Support Scale constructed by Zimet *et al.* (1988)^[17] was administered.

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.

Results

(Sig.).069 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 2: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	52.100	2	25.550	2.247	.105
Within Groups	638.150	57	11.371		
Total	679.250	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).105 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 3: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	41.533	2	20.267	2.828	.098
Within Groups	418.450	57	7.166		
Total	428.983	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).098 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 4: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	15.133	2	8.067	1.060	.245
Within Groups	423.600	57	7.607		
Total	469.733	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).245 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 5: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	.156
Within Groups	24.500	57	.465		
Total	26.733	59			

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

Football players as the P-value (Sig.).156 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 6: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	.232
Within Groups	112.750	57	2.154		
Total	122.983	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).232 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 7: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	4.702	.230
Within Groups	119.900	57	2.279		
Total	141.333	59			

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 Football players as

the P-value (Sig.).230 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 8: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	.893	.326
Within Groups	150.700	57	2.819		
Total	185.733	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).326 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 9: Significant differences in the results among Female Football Players with regard to Social Intelligence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	819.033	2	404.517	4.106	.458
Within Groups	5315.550	57	98.518		
Total	6224.583	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).458 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 10: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	136.033	2	73.017	3.371	.123
Within Groups	1134.550	57	21.659		
Total	1480.583	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).123 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 11: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	5.349	.129
Within Groups	1261.800	57	19.681		
Total	1532.333	59			

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 Football players as the P-

value (Sig.).129 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 12: Significant differences in the results among Female Football 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	7.133	2	4.067	.159	.678
Within Groups	1756.050	57	25.545		
Total	1634.183	59			

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 Football

players as the P-value (Sig.).678 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p > 0.05$).

Table 13: Significant differences in the results among Female Football Players with regard to Social Support

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	111.733	2	50.867	.471	.645
Within Groups	6254.850	57	107.980		
Total	6457.583	59			

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 Football players as the P-value (Sig.).645 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($p > 0.05$).

Practical application

The study will be considerably helpful to comprehend the Social Intelligence and Social Support level existing among female Football 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.

Conclusion

Summarizing from the above findings we can say that no significant differences were found among female Football 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 Football players on the sub-variables of Social Support i.e., Family, Friends and Other Significant Persons.

References

- Baker J, Cote J, Abernethy B. Sport specific practice and development of expert decision making in team ball sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*. 2003; 15(1):12-25.
- Besharat. A Depiction of Sport Success in Individual and Group Sports Based on Social Intelligence. *The Olympic Quarterly*. 2005; 13(4):96-78.
- Bloom BS. *Developing talent in young people*. New York: Ballantine, 1985.
- Botterill C. The psychology of professional hockey. *Athletic Insight*, 2004, 6(2). Retrieved from, Vol6Iss2/ProfessionalHockey.html.
- 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.
- Cantor N, Kihlstrom JF. *Personality and social intelligence*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- Chadha NK, Ganesan U. *Publication manual for social intelligence scale*. National Psychological Corporation,

Kacheri Ghat, Agra, India. 1986; 4:230.

- Cheng C, Chiu C, Hong Y, Cheung JS. Discriminative facility and its role in the perceived quality of interactional experiences. *Journal of Personality*. 2001; 69(5):765-786.
- Cohen S, Wills TA. Stress, social support and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1985; 98(2):310-357.
- Ericsson KA, Krampe RT, Tesch-Romer C. The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*. 1993; 100(3):363-406.
- Jones K, Day J D. Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1997; 89(3):486-497.
- Kaukiainen A, Bjorkqvist K, Osterman K, Lagerspetz KMJ. Social intelligence and empathy as antecedents of different types of aggression. In C. F. Ferris & T. Grisso (Eds.), *Understanding aggressive behavior in children*. Annals of the New York Academy of Science. 1996; 794:364-366.
- Kobe LM, Reiter-Palmon R, Rickers JD. Self-reported leadership experiences in relation to inventoried social and emotional intelligence. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality and Social*. 2001; 20(2):154-163.
- Mageau GA, Vallerand RJ. The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sport Sciences*. 2003; 21(11):883-904.
- Marlowe HA. Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1986; 78(1):52-58.
- Wallston BS, Alagna SW, DeVellis BM, Dvellis RF. Social support and physical health. *Health Psychology*. 1983; 2(1):367-391.
- Zimet GD, Dahlem NW, Zimet SG, Farley GK. The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1988; 52(1):30-41.