

## HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING IN CHALLENGING SPORTS COMPETITIONS

**Dr. Jayarajan David. D**

*Assistant Director, University of Kerala*

### ABSTRACT

*The present study refers to the human resource assistance made available from parents, personal coaches, friends, sports organization mechanisms, team mates and mission staff, etc., affecting the confidence, long term motivational perspective and bottom line results of the athletes in the most challenging sports competitions. The objective of the study is to profile and highlight the need for behavioral interventions in personal and formal support infrastructure among Indian sportspersons belonging to different sports disciplines. It would help in providing possible suggestions for the refinement of support infrastructure educational systems across various sports disciplines including the national sports organizations.*

### Background

The elite sport context is characterized by the changing roles of parents, coaches, and peers in athlete's lives (Bloom, 1985; Ericsson et.al., 1993). Research targeting the unique and interrelated roles of the coaches, parents, and peers (including teammates) on enhancing the youth elite sport experience is warranted. One approach to understanding how the multiple social influences affect young athletes and their sport experience is to better understand the social support context from the lived experiences of the athletes themselves.

Nicholson and Gallant (2011) reports the findings of an exploratory study in to the perceptions of social support held by elite indigenous athletes playing in the Australian Football League. Indigenous athletes within the AFL appear to require more culturally relevant and specialized support structures than non-Indigenous athletes. The study highlighted that the family and community connections held by Indigenous athletes form an essential network of social support that provides the foundation for indigenous participation and individual success.

### METHODS AND MATERIALS

216 national level sportspersons belonging to badminton, football, volleyball, basketball, swimming and track and field were selected for this study which consists of 126 male sportspersons and 90 female sportspersons. All the sportspersons had been playing at the national level and few in the international level during the last three years. The age of the subjects ranged from 15 to 29 years. Support Infrastructure of the was assessed using the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) by Zimet, G.D., Dahlem, N.W., Zimet, S.G. & Farley, G.K. (1988).

The MSPSS was designed to assess the perceived adequacy of social support from family, friends, and significant others (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). The instrument taps the

individual's perception of socio-emotional support from these sources. The MSPSS comprises 12 items, four items in each of three subscales. Items for each source are scored on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from "very strongly disagree" (1) to "very strongly agree" (7). Each set of items provides an index of support from each source.

The subscale score for each respondent is computed by summing the ratings for each item for each support scale and then dividing the resulting total by 4. For the total score, ratings are summed and divided by 12. Total and subscale scores range from 1 to 7, with high scores indicating a heightened perception of available social support.

The MSPSS has a scoring for the three sub scales and for the total scale. The family subscale score was obtained by summing the scores of items 3, 4, 8, and 11, dividing by four. Similar scoring was applied for the friends subscale (including items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 12) and dividing by seven; and the significant other subscale (including items 1, 2, 5, and 10) and dividing by four. For the overall perceived social support score, all item scores were summed and divided by 12.

The descriptive statistics was used to present the profile of the data on the selected variables. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to find the significance of difference among the sportspersons belonging to different sports disciplines on the selected variables. The t-test was used for comparison between male and female sportspersons on the selected variables. The statistical analysis was tested for significance at 0.05 levels.

## RESULTS

The descriptive statistics of the total sample on support infrastructure as per the data collected on Multidimensional Scale of Social Support is presented in table 1.

**Table 1**

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURE FACTORS FOR THE  
TOTAL SAMPLE OF SPORTSPERSONS

Variable	Mean	S D	Skewness	Kurtosis
MSPSS Family	6.27	0.89	-1.90	4.08
MSPSS Friends	5.84	0.90	-1.25	1.92
MSPSS Sig. Others	5.79	1.12	-1.32	1.57
MSPSS Total	7.42	0.95	-1.17	1.68

Table 1 indicates the mean scores on the sub scales of multidimensional scale of social support for Indian sportspersons indicate mean and standard deviations of  $6.27 \pm 0.89$  for the family support;  $5.84 \pm 0.90$  for the friends sub scale;  $5.79 \pm 1.12$  for the significant others sub scale; and  $7.42 \pm 0.95$  for the total score on MSPSS.

**Table 2**  
COMPARISON ON SUPPORT INFRASTRUTURE VARIABLES BETWEEN  
MALE AND FEMALE SPORTSPERSONS

Variables	Male		Female		t- value	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Family	6.04	1.00	6.59	0.58	4.64*	0.001
Friends	5.73	0.93	5.98	0.84	1.96	0.05
Sig. others	5.63	1.19	6.00	0.98	2.38*	0.02
Total	7.27	1.04	7.64	0.76	2.90*	0.004

\*Significant at 0.05 level.  $t_{.05}(214) = 1.97$

The above table of significance of difference between male and female sportspersons on selected support infrastructure variables as assessed by Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support indicates t - ratios of 4.64, and 2.38 respectively for the subscales of family and significant others, since the obtained t-value was greater than the t - value of 1.97 required for significance at 0.05 level. In case of the sub scale friends, the t - ratio obtained was 1.96, which was deemed not significant as the obtained t - value was lesser than the t - value of 1.97 required for significance.

In case of the total scores for Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, the t - ratio between male and female sportspersons yielded a value of 2.90 which was significant as the obtained value was greater than the required value of 1.97 required for significance at 0.05 level.

The results indicate that in female sportspersons' perceived social support from family and significant others were significantly greater than that of male sportspersons. In case of total scores on perceived social support also, female sportspersons showed significantly greater scores as compared to male sportspersons.

**Table-3**  
COMPARISON ON SUPPORT INFRASTRUTURE VARIABLES BETWEEN  
SPORTSPERSONS BELONGING TO INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM SPORTS

Variables	Individual Sport		Team Sport		t- value	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Family	6.43	0.77	6.14	0.96	2.38*	0.018
Friends	5.95	0.90	5.74	0.89	1.69	0.092

Sig. others	5.78	1.10	5.79	1.13	0.10	0.918
Total	7.54	0.94	7.33	0.94	1.63	0.104

\*Significant at 0.05 level.  $t_{0.05}(214) = 1.97$

The above table of significance of difference between sportspersons belonging to individual and team sports on selected support infrastructure variables as assessed by Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support indicates t - ratio of 2.38 for the sub scale family, which was significant since the obtained t-value was greater than the t - value of 1.97 required for significance at 0.05 level. In case of the sub scale friends, significant others and total scores on MSPSS the t - ratios obtained were 1.69, 0.10 and 1.63 respectively, which were not significant as the obtained t - value was lesser than the t - value of 1.97 required for significance.

The results indicate that in sportspersons belonging to individual sports perceived social support from family significant greater than that of sportspersons belonging to team sports. In case of all other sub scales, friends and significant others, and for the total scores on perceived social support, sportspersons belonging to individual and team sports did not differ significantly.

**Table 4**

POST HOC MULTIPLE COMPARISONS ON SUPPORT INFRASTRUTURE  
'FAMILY' AMONG SPORTSPERSONS BELONGING  
TO DIFFERENT SPORTS DISCIPLINES

		Disciplines				Mean	Std Error	Sig.
BAD	SWM	ATH	BB	FB	VB	Difference		
6.75	6.69					0.06	0.29	1.00
6.75		6.26				0.49	0.22	0.43
6.75			5.86			0.89*	0.22	0.01
6.75				6.40		0.35	0.26	0.87
6.75					6.43	0.32	0.24	0.88
	6.69	6.26				0.42	0.24	0.67
	6.39		5.86			0.83*	0.24	0.04
	6.69			6.40		0.29	0.27	0.95
	6.69				6.43	0.26	0.26	0.96
		6.26	5.86			0.40	0.16	0.26
		6.26		6.40		0.14	0.20	0.99

		6.26			6.43	0.17	0.18	0.97
			5.86	6.40		0.54	0.20	0.21
			5.86		6.43	0.58	0.18	0.07
				6.40	6.43	0.03	0.22	1.00

The multiple comparisons of the mean differences for support infrastructure factor family among sportspersons belonging to different sports disciplines indicated significant differences for badminton and swimming as compared with basketball. The scores for badminton and swimming were significantly higher than the scores for basketball.

## CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

- (i) The descriptive profile for the support infrastructure (human resources) was drawn out.
- (ii) In case of comparison for support infrastructure factors among sportspersons belonging to different sports disciplines, significant differences were observed only for the family sub factor, in which sportspersons belonging to badminton and swimming showed significant difference as compared to basketball.
- (iii) In case of relationship of support infrastructure variables to total score on the entire sub factors of support infrastructure, family, friends and significant others; the total score on support infrastructure correlated significantly.

## REFERENCE :

- ❖ Bloom B S (1985). *Developing Talent in Young People*. New York: Ballantine
- ❖ Holt, N. L., & Hoar, S. (2006). The multidimensional construct of social support. In S. Hanton & S. Mellalieu (Eds.), *Literature reviews in sport psychology* (pp. 199-225). New York: Nova.
- ❖ Jackson, S. A. (1995). "Factors influencing the occurrence of flow state in elite athletes". *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7 (2), 138-166.
- ❖ Weiss, M. R., & Stuntz, C. P. (2004). A little friendly competition: Peer relationships and psychosocial development in youth sport and physical activity contexts. In M. R. Weiss (Ed.), *Developmental sport and exercise psychology: A lifespan perspective* (pp. 165-196). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- ❖ Gould, D., Finch, L. M., & Jackson, S. A. (1993). "Coping strategies used by national champion figure skaters". *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64, 453-468.
- ❖ Smith, A. L. (2003). "Peer relationships in physical activity contexts: A road less traveled in youth sport and exercise psychology research". *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*.