

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMPONENTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT IN BODY-CONTACT SPORT ATHLETES

Dr. Amarjit Singh Gill

Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education, R.K. Arya College, Nawanshahr, Punjab, India

ABSTRACT

The researchers of this study aims to know about the role of Social Support in Body-Contact Sport Athletes. For this purpose, the investigators had selected Forty only (N=40) male district level body-contact sport athletes of 20 to 25 years of age to act as subjects. 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. To measure the level of social support of the subjects, the social support scale constructed by Zimet et al. (1988). One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to compare the body-contact sport athletes. 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. It is concluded from the above findings that insignificant differences among body-contact sport athletes on the variable social support.

KEYWORDS: Social Support, Body-Contacts Sports, Athlete.

INTRODUCTION:

The socio-psychological dynamics of a body-contact sport athlete are important components of sports psychology that emerged as a distinct scientific discipline, a specialization within the psychology. In recent years there have been many studies of the relationship among adjustment, social support, and psychological well-being or life satisfaction (Hardy, Richman, & Rosenfeld, 1991; Malinauskas, 2008; Petrie, 1992, 1993; Ryska & Yin, 1999; Smith, Smoll, & Ptacek, 1990). Social support is an integral aspect of the social environment and a well known and widely recognised concept associated with positive health practices that influence an athlete's life satisfaction. Social support is defined by Cohen, Underwood, and gottlieb (2000) as the social resources that persons perceive to be available or that are actually provided to them by non-professionals in the context of both formal support groups and informal helping relationships. Social support is another parameter of present investigation which is defined by

(Cohen, 2000) as the comfort, assistance, well-being, and information that individuals receive from formal or informal contacts with societal organization or the other people. 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). Social support has also been defined as a those social interactions or relationships that individuals with actual assistance or that embed individuals within a social system believed to provide love, caring or sense of attachment to a valued social group (Hobfoll, 1988).

SELECTION OF SUBJECTS:

For this purpose, the investigators had selected Forty only (N=40) male district level body-contact sport athletes of 20 to 25 years of age to act as subjects. 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.

Sr. No	Body-Contact Sport Athletes	Sample
1.	Football	10
2.	Wrestling	10
3.	Handball	10
4.	Judo	10
		N= 40

SELECTION OF TOOLS:

To measure the level of social support of the subjects, the social support scale constructed by Zimet et al. (1988).

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to compare the body-contact sport athletes. 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:

Table 1

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among body-contact sport with regard to sub-parameter Family

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-ratio	P-value Sig.
Between Groups	151.150	3	57.20	2.62	.307
Within Groups	2064.470	36	21.18		
Total	2234.670	39			

*Significant at 0.05

F_{0.05} (3, 96)

It can be observed from table 1 that insignificant differences have been found with regard to the sub-parameter family among body-contact sport as the P-value (Sig.) .067 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($P > 0.05$). Since F-value was found insignificant, therefore, there is no need to apply post hoc test.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among body-contact sport with regard to sub-parameter Friends

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-ratio	P-value Sig.
Between Groups	167.90	3	5.60	2.404	.372
Within Groups	2172.00	36	22.70		
Total	2386.000	39			

*Significant at 0.05

F_{0.05} (3, 96)

It can be observed from table 2 that insignificant differences have been found with regard to the sub-parameter friends among body-contact sport as the P-value (Sig.) .072 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($P>0.05$). Since F-value was found insignificant, therefore, there is no need to apply post hoc test.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among body-contact sport with regard to sub-parameter Other Significant Persons

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-ratio	P-value Sig.
Between Groups	8.10	3	2.90	.10	.95
Within Groups	2686.000	36	27.52		
Total	2604.910	39			

*Significant at 0.05

F_{0.05} (3, 96)

It can be observed from table 3 that insignificant differences have been found with regard to the sub-parameter other significant persons among body-contact sport as the P-value (Sig.) .955 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($P>0.05$). Since F-value was found insignificant, therefore, there is no need to apply post hoc test.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among body-contact sport with regard to sub-parameter Social Support

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-ratio	P-value Sig.
Between Groups	214.10	3	71.37	.57	.18
Within Groups	11473.10	36	119.52		
Total	11687.30	39			

*Significant at 0.05

F_{0.05} (3, 96)

It can be observed from table 4 that insignificant differences have been found with regard to the parameter social support among body-contact sport as the P-value (Sig.) .618 was found higher than the 0.05 level of significance ($P>0.05$). Since F-value was found insignificant, therefore, there is no need to apply post hoc test.

CONCLUSIONS:

It is concluded from the above findings that insignificant differences among body-contact sport athletes on the variable social support.

References

- Hardy, C. J., Richman, J. M., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (1991). The role of social support in the life stress/injury relationship. *Sport Psychologist*, 5, 128-139.
- Mummery, W.K., Schofield, G., & Perry, C. (2004). Bouncing back: The role of coping style, social support and self-concept in resilience of sport performance. *Athletic Insight*, 6(3), 1-18.
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Ptacek, J. T. (1990) Conjunctive moderator variables in vulnerability and resiliency research: Life stress, social support and coping skills, and adolescent sport injuries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 360-370.
- Cohen, S., Underwood, L.G., & Gottlieb, B.H. (2000). *Social support measurement and intervention*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, S., Underwood, L. G., & Gottlieb, B. H. (2000). *Social support measurement and intervention: A guide for health and social scientists*. New York: Oxford University Press.