International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS)
December 2015 : 3(4)
ISSN : 2148-1148
Doi : 10.14486/IntJSCS459

Field ***:*** *Sport Sciences*
Type ***:*** *Research Article*
Recieved:*02.11.2015* - ***Accepted:****11.12.2015*

Emotional Intelligence and Will to Win: The Invincible and Invisible Phenomenon in Basketball Sports

Davinder SINGH
Department of Physical Education, D.A.V. College, Amritsar, INDIA
Email: ds_rajput87@yahoo.in

Abstract

This study examined the emotional intelligence and will to win level among female basketball players. A group of fifty (N=50) female inter-college level basketball players of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab were selected for this study. The ***purposive sampling technique was used to*** attain the objectives of the study. 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. Summarizing the findings we can say that significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Emotional Intelligence i.e., Self-awareness, Empathy, Self-development, Value orientation and Altruistic behaviour. However no-significant no significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Emotional Intelligence i.e., Self-motivation, Emotional stability, Managing relations, Integrity and Commitment. Conculdingly from the above findings that insignificant differences were present among female basketball players on the sub-variables of will to win.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Will to Win, Basketball

Introduction

Sport psychology has evolved and advanced to the point where its application has become a key component in the peak performance of athletes in many fields and at many levels of competitive activity. Of all the factors affecting sports performance, it seems that the most important one is the ability of the athlete to identify and assume the appropriate feeling required to perform at his best when he needs to do. Whatever might be the level of skill, strength and experience of an athlete, his performance in the face of stiff competition will be largely influenced by his ability to assume the right emotion and attain an appropriate level of the emotional energy for performing at his optimum. Emotional Intelligence and Will to win has been at the centre of much deliberation over the past few years, not only with research experts, but also with general consultants in the dynamic field of sport psychology. Taking into consideration research material and psychology books, this article aims to discuss Emotional Intelligence and Will to Win and the components which surround this phenomenon, providing implications and conclusions. Furthermore, it aims to offer insight to coaches, scouts, players and psychologists involved in the elite pathway process to reflect upon their talent fostering environment. Research conducted on emotional intelligence and athletic performance illustrates, for instance, that emotional intelligence capacities have a direct effect on self regulation and mindset (Goleman, 1998). Petrides et al. (2004) suggested that people with high levels of emotional intelligence have a natural aptitude for emotional perception and can utilize this to move people to respond positively to them. Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2004) described emotional intelligence as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions. Hein (2000) described emotional intelligence as knowing how to separate healthy feelings from unhealthy ones and how to turn negative feelings into positive ones.

Goleman (1999) asserted that it means managing feelings so that they are expressed appropriately and effectively, enabling people to work together smoothly towards their common goals. Paul (1960) rightly remarked "A winner never quits and the quitters never win". That means if one has the desire to win surely wins. It indicates that where there is a will, there is a way. The psychological build-up is known to create a state of readiness. Kumar et al. (2009). The dismissal performance of Indian players and athletes in international events has been largely attributed to the lack of will to win. It is the factor that makes great competitors. Kumar et al. (2011). This study therefore investigated the applicability of emotional intelligence and will to win to female basketball players and further administered a programme of emotional intelligence on the athletes with a view to establishing its effectiveness or otherwise on their sports.

Materials and Methods

Subjects

A group of fifty (N=50) female inter-college level basketball players of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab were selected for this study. The ***purposive sampling technique was used to*** attain the objectives of the study. 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. They were further divided into (N=10) each playing position i.e. Point guard

(n_1=10), Shooting guard (n_2=10), Small forward (n_3=10), Power forward (n_4=10) and Center (n_5=10).

Tools

- To measure the level of Emotional Intelligence of the subjects, the Emotional Intelligence Scale constructed by Hyde et al. (2001) was administered.
- To measure the level of Will to win was measured by applying Will to win questionnaire prepared by Kumar and Shukla (1998).

Stastical 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

Table1. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Self-Awareness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	114.080	4	28.520	3.517*	.014
Within Groups	364.900	45	8.109		
Total	478.980	49			

It can be seen from table-1 that significant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Self-Awareness among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .01 was found smaller than 0.05 level of significance ($p<0.05$). Since the obtained F-value was found significant, therefore, least significant difference (LSD) Post-hoc test was employed to study the direction and significance of difference between paired means among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) on the sub-parameter Self-Awareness. The results of LSD Post-hoc test have been presented in Table-2.

Table 2. Analysis of Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Self-Awareness

Means		Mean Difference	P-value (Sig.)
Point Guard [18.20]	Shooting Guard [16.60]	1.60	.215
	Small Forward [14.80]	3.40*	.011
	Power Forward [13.90]	4.30*	.002
	Center [16.60]	1.60	.215
Shooting Guard [16.60]	Point Guard [18.20]	1.60	.215
	Small Forward [14.80]	1.80	.164
	Power Forward [13.90]	2.70*	.040
	Center [16.60]	.00	1.000
Small Forward [14.80]	Point Guard [18.20]	3.40*	.011
	Shooting Guard [16.60]	1.80	.164
	Power Forward [13.90]	.90	.483
	Center [16.60]	1.80	.164
Power Forward [13.90]	Point Guard [18.20]	4.30*	.002
	Shooting Guard [16.60]	2.70*	.040
	Small Forward [14.80]	.90	.483
	Center [16.60]	2.70*	.040
Center [16.60]	Point Guard [18.20]	1.60	.215
	Shooting Guard [16.60]	.00	1.000
	Small Forward [14.80]	1.80	.164
	Power Forward [13.90]	2.70*	.040

***Significant at 0.05*

1. It has been observed from the table-2 that mean difference between point guard and shooting guard male basketball players was found 1.60. The P-value (Sig.) .215 revealed that point guard had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

2. The mean difference between point guard and small forward male basketball players was found 3.40. The P-value (Sig.) .011 showed that the point guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Awareness than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

3. The mean difference between point guard and power forward male basketball players was found 4.30. The P-value (Sig.) .002 showed that the point guard female basketball players

had demonstrated significantly better Self-Awareness than their counterpart Power Forward female basketball players.

4. The mean difference between point guard and center female basketball players was found 1.60. The P-value (Sig.) .215 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart center female basketball players.

5. The mean difference between shooting guard and small forward female basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .164 revealed that shooting guard had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

6. The mean difference between shooting guard and power forward female basketball players was found 2.70. The P-value (Sig.) .040 showed that the shooting guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Awareness than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

7. The mean difference between shooting guard and center female basketball players was found 0.00. The P-value (Sig.) 1.00 revealed that shooting guard had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart Center female basketball players.

8. The mean difference between small forward and power forward female basketball players was found .90. The P-value (Sig.) .483 revealed that small forward had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

9. The mean difference between small forward and center female basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .164 revealed that center had exhibited better Self-Awareness though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

10. The mean difference between power forward and center female basketball players was found 2.70. The P-value (Sig.) .040 showed that the center female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Awareness than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

Table 3. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Empathy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	84.280	4	21.070	5.122*	.002
Within Groups	185.100	45	4.113		
Total	269.380	49			

It can be seen from table-3 that significant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Empathy among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .01 was found smaller than 0.05 level of significance ($p<0.05$). Since the obtained F-value was found significant, therefore, least significant difference (LSD) Post-hoc test was employed to study the direction and

significance of difference between paired means among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) on the sub-parameter Empathy. The results of LSD Post-hoc test have been presented in Table-4.

Table 4. Analysis of Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Empathy

Means		**Mean Difference**	**P-value (Sig.)**
Point Guard [21.90]	Shooting Guard [18.70]	3.20*	.001
	Small Forward [18.20]	3.70*	.000
	Power Forward [20.20]	1.70	.067
	Center [20.10]	1.80	.053
Shooting Guard [18.70]	Point Guard [21.90]	3.20*	.001
	Small Forward [18.20]	.50	.584
	Power Forward [20.20]	1.50	.105
	Center [20.10]	1.40	.130
Small Forward [18.20]	Point Guard [21.90]	3.70*	.000
	Shooting Guard [18.70]	.50	.584
	Power Forward [20.20]	2.00*	.033
	Center [20.10]	1.90*	.042
Power Forward [20.20]	Point Guard [21.90]	1.70	.067
	Shooting Guard [18.70]	1.50	.105
	Small Forward [18.20]	2.00*	.033
	Center [20.10]	.10	.913
Center [20.10]	Point Guard [21.90]	1.80	.053
	Shooting Guard [18.70]	1.40	.130
	Small Forward [18.20]	1.90*	.042
	Power Forward [20.20]	.10	.913

Significant at 0.05

1. It has been observed from the table-4 that mean difference between point guard and shooting guard male basketball players was found 3.20. The P-value (Sig.) .001 showed that the point guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Empathy than their counterpart Shooting Guard female basketball players.

2. The mean difference between point guard and small forward male basketball players was found 3.70. The P-value (Sig.) .000 showed that the point guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Empathy than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

3. The mean difference between point guard and power forward male basketball players was found 1.70. The P-value (Sig.) .067 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Empathy though not significantly than their counterpart Power Forward female basketball players.

4. The mean difference between point guard and center female basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .053 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Empathy though not significantly than their counterpart center female basketball players.

5. The mean difference between shooting guard and small forward female basketball players was found 0.50. The P-value (Sig.) .584 revealed that shooting guard had exhibited better Empathy though not significantly than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

6. The mean difference between shooting guard and power forward female basketball players was found 1.50. The P-value (Sig.) .105 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Empathy than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

7. The mean difference between shooting guard and center female basketball players was found 1.40. The P-value (Sig.) .130 revealed that Center had exhibited better Empathy though not significantly than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

8. The mean difference between small forward and power forward female basketball players was found 2.00. The P-value (Sig.) .033 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Empathy than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

9. The mean difference between small forward and center female basketball players was found 1.90. The P-value (Sig.) .042 revealed that center had exhibited better Empathy though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

10. The mean difference between power forward and center female basketball players was found 0.10. The P-value (Sig.) .913 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Empathy than their counterpart center female basketball players.

Table 5. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Self Motivation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	31.000	4	7.750	.982	.427
Within Groups	355.000	45	7.889		
Total	386.000	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-5 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Self Motivation among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .381 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 6. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Emotional Stability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	25.480	4	6.370	.787	.540
Within Groups	364.300	45	8.096		
Total	389.780	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-6 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Emotional Stability among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .381 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 7. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Managing Relations

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	36.920	4	9.230	2.133	.092
Within Groups	194.700	45	4.327		
Total	231.620	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-7 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Managing Relations among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .381 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 8. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Integrity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	20.000	4	5.000	1.648	.179
Within Groups	136.500	45	3.033		
Total	156.500	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-8 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Integrity among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .179 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 9. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Self-Development

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	38.880	4	9.720	3.807*	.009
Within Groups	114.900	45	2.553		
Total	153.780	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-9 that significant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Self-Development among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .009 was found smaller than 0.05 level of significance (p<0.05). Since the obtained F-value was found significant, therefore, least significant difference (LSD) Post-hoc test was employed to study the direction and significance of difference between paired means among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) on the sub-parameter Self-Development. The results of LSD Post-hoc test have been presented in Table-10.

Table 10. Analysis of Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Self-Development

Means		Mean Difference	P-value (Sig.)
Point Guard [8.40]	Shooting Guard [6.40]	2.00*	.008
	Small Forward [7.00]	1.40	.056
	Power Forward [8.80]	.40	.578
	Center [7.50]	.90	.214
Shooting Guard [6.40]	Point Guard [8.40]	2.00*	.008
	Small Forward [7.00]	.60	.406
	Power Forward [8.80]	2.40*	.002
	Center [7.50]	1.10	.131
Small Forward [7.00]	Point Guard [8.40]	1.40	.056
	Shooting Guard [6.40]	.60	.406
	Power Forward [8.80]	1.80*	.015
	Center [7.50]	.50	.488
Power Forward [8.80]	Point Guard [8.40]	.40	.578
	Shooting Guard [6.40]	2.40*	.002
	Small Forward [7.00]	1.80*	.015
	Center [7.50]	1.30	.076
Center [7.50]	Point Guard [8.40]	.90	.214
	Shooting Guard [6.40]	1.10	.131
	Small Forward [7.00]	.50	.488
	Power Forward [8.80]	1.30	.008

***Significant at 0.05*

1. It has been observed from the table-10 that mean difference between point guard and shooting guard male basketball players was found 2.00. The P-value (Sig.) .008 showed that the point guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Development than their counterpart Shooting Guard female basketball players.

2. The mean difference between point guard and small forward male basketball players was found 1.40. The P-value (Sig.) .056 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

3. The mean difference between point guard and power forward male basketball players was found .40. The P-value (Sig.) .578 revealed that had Power Forward exhibited better Self-

Development though not significantly than their counterpart Point Guard female basketball players.

4. The mean difference between point guard and center female basketball players was found .90. The P-value (Sig.) .214 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart center female basketball players.

5. The mean difference between shooting guard and small forward female basketball players was found 0.60. The P-value (Sig.) .406 revealed that small forward had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

6. The mean difference between shooting guard and power forward female basketball players was found 2.40. The P-value (Sig.) .002 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Development than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

7. The mean difference between shooting guard and center female basketball players was found 1.10. The P-value (Sig.) .131 revealed that Center had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart shooting guard female basketball players.

8. The mean difference between small forward and power forward female basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .015 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Self-Development than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

9. The mean difference between small forward and center female basketball players was found .50. The P-value (Sig.) .488 revealed that center had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

10. The mean difference between power forward and center female basketball players was found 1.30. The P-value (Sig.) .076 revealed that power forward had exhibited better Self-Development though not significantly than their counterpart center female basketball players.

Table 11. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Value Orientation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	30.720	4	7.680	4.425*	.004
Within Groups	78.100	45	1.736		
Total	108.820	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-11 that significant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Value Orientation among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .004 was found smaller than 0.05 level of significance ($p<0.05$). Since the obtained F-value was found significant, therefore,

least significant difference (LSD) Post-hoc test was employed to study the direction and significance of difference between paired means among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) on the sub-parameter Value Orientation. The results of LSD Post-hoc test have been presented in Table-12.

Table 12. Analysis of Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Value Orientation

Means		**Mean Difference**	**P-value (Sig.)**
Point Guard [9.00]	Shooting Guard [9.00]	.00	1.000
	Small Forward [7.40]	1.60*	.009
	Power Forward [7.20]	1.80*	.004
	Center [7.70]	1.30*	.032
Shooting Guard [9.00]	Point Guard [9.00]	.00	1.000
	Small Forward [7.40]	1.60*	.009
	Power Forward [7.20]	1.80*	.004
	Center [7.70]	1.30*	.032
Small Forward [7.40]	Point Guard [9.00]	1.60*	.009
	Shooting Guard [9.00]	1.60*	.009
	Power Forward [7.20]	.20	.736
	Center [7.70]	.30	.613
Power Forward [7.20]	Point Guard [9.00]	1.80*	.004
	Shooting Guard [9.00]	1.80*	.004
	Small Forward [7.40]	.20	.736
	Center [7.70]	.50	.401
Center [7.70]	Point Guard [9.00]	1.30*	.032
	Shooting Guard [9.00]	1.30*	.032
	Small Forward [7.40]	.30	.613
	Power Forward [7.20]	.50	.401

***Significant at 0.05*

1. It has been observed from the table-12 that mean difference between point guard and shooting guard male basketball players was found .00. The P-value (Sig.) 1.000 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited Equal Value Orientation though not significantly than their counterpart Shooting Guard female basketball players.

2. The mean difference between point guard and small forward male basketball players was found 1.60. The P-value (Sig.) .009 revealed that Point Guard female basketball players

had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

3. The mean difference between point guard and power forward male basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .004 showed that the point guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

4. The mean difference between point guard and center female basketball players was found 1.30. The P-value (Sig.) .032 revealed that Point Guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart center female basketball players.

5. The mean difference between shooting guard and small forward female basketball players was found 1.60. The P-value (Sig.) .009 revealed that shooting guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

6. The mean difference between shooting guard and power forward female basketball players was found 1.80. The P-value (Sig.) .004 showed that the shooting guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

7. The mean difference between shooting guard and center female basketball players was found 1.30. The P-value (Sig.) .032 showed that the shooting guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Value Orientation than their counterpart Center female basketball players.

8. The mean difference between small forward and power forward female basketball players was found .20. The P-value (Sig.) 0.15 revealed that small forward had exhibited better Value Orientation though not significantly than their counterpart Power Forward female basketball players.

9. The mean difference between small forward and center female basketball players was found .30. The P-value (Sig.) .613 revealed that center had exhibited better Value Orientation though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

10. The mean difference between power forward and center female basketball players was found .50. The P-value (Sig.) .401 revealed that center had exhibited better Value Orientation though not significantly than their counterpart center power forward female basketball players.

Table 13. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Commitment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	3.320	4	.830	1.029	.403
Within Groups	36.300	45	.807		
Total	39.620	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-13 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Commitment among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .403 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 14. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Altruistic Behaviour

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	22.920	4	5.730	3.961*	.008
Within Groups	65.100	45	1.447		
Total	88.020	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-14 that significant differences were found with regard to the sub-parameter Altruistic Behaviour among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .008 was found smaller than 0.05 level of significance ($p<0.05$). Since the obtained F-value was found significant, therefore, least significant difference (LSD) Post-hoc test was employed to study the direction and significance of difference between paired means among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) on the sub-parameter Altruistic Behaviour. The results of LSD Post-hoc test have been presented in Table-15.

Table 15. Analysis of Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence on the sub-parameter Altruistic Behaviour

Means		Mean Difference	P-value (Sig.)
Point Guard [7.20]	Shooting Guard [8.50]	1.30*	.020
	Small Forward [7.00]	.20	.712
	Power Forward [8.70]	1.50*	.008
	Center [7.90]	.70	.200
Shooting Guard [8.50]	Point Guard [7.20]	1.30*	.020
	Small Forward [7.00]	1.50*	.008
	Power Forward [8.70]	.20	.712
	Center [7.90]	.60	.271
Small Forward [7.00]	Point Guard [7.20]	.20	.712
	Shooting Guard [8.50]	1.50*	.008
	Power Forward [8.70]	1.70*	.003
	Center [7.90]	.90	.101
Power Forward [8.70]	Point Guard [7.20]	1.50*	.008
	Shooting Guard [8.50]	.20	.712
	Small Forward [7.00]	1.70*	.003
	Center [7.90]	.80	.144
Center [7.90]	Point Guard [7.20]	.70	.200
	Shooting Guard [8.50]	.60	.271
	Small Forward [7.00]	.90	.101
	Power Forward [8.70]	.80	.144

***Significant at 0.05*

1. It has been observed from the table-15 that mean difference between point guard and shooting guard male basketball players was found 1.30. The P-value (Sig.) .020 revealed that Point Guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Altruistic Behaviour than their counterpart Shooting Guard female basketball players.

2. The mean difference between point guard and small forward male basketball players was found .20. The P-value (Sig.) .712 revealed that Point Guard had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

3. The mean difference between point guard and power forward male basketball players was found 1.50. The P-value (Sig.) .008 showed that the power forward female basketball

players had demonstrated significantly better Altruistic Behaviour than their counterpart point guard female basketball players.

4. The mean difference between point guard and center female basketball players was found .70. The P-value (Sig.) .200 revealed that center had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart Point Guard male basketball players.

5. The mean difference between shooting guard and small forward female basketball players was found 1.50. The P-value (Sig.) .008 revealed that shooting guard female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Altruistic Behaviour than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

6. The mean difference between shooting guard and power forward female basketball players was found .20. The P-value (Sig.) .712 revealed that shooting guard had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart power forward female basketball players.

7. The mean difference between shooting guard and center female basketball players was found .60. The P-value (Sig.) .271 revealed that shooting guard had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart Center female basketball players.

8. The mean difference between small forward and power forward female basketball players was found 1.70. The P-value (Sig.) .003 showed that the power forward female basketball players had demonstrated significantly better Altruistic Behaviour than their counterpart small forward female basketball players.

9. The mean difference between small forward and center female basketball players was found .90. The P-value (Sig.) .101 revealed that center had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart small forward male basketball players.

10. The mean difference between power forward and center female basketball players was found .80. The P-value (Sig.) .144 revealed that power forward had exhibited better Altruistic Behaviour though not significantly than their counterpart center male basketball players.

Table 16. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Emotional Intelligence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	1142.520	4	285.630	2.314	.072
Within Groups	5555.500	45	123.456		
Total	6698.020	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-16 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the parameter Emotional Intelligence among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) 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 17. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results among Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center Female Basketball Players with regard to the Will to Win

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value (Sig.)
Between Groups	17.920	4	4.480	1.130	.354
Within Groups	178.400	45	3.964		
Total	196.320	49			

**Significant at 0.05*

It can be seen from table-17 that insignificant differences were found with regard to the parameter Will to Win among basketball players (Point Guard, Shooting Guard, Small Forward, Power Forward and Center) as the P-value (Sig.) .354 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.

Conclusion

Summarizing from the above findings we can say that significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Emotional Intelligence i.e., Self-awareness, Empathy, Self-development, Value orientation and Altruistic behaviour. However no-significant no significant differences were found among female basketball players on the sub-variables of Emotional Intelligence i.e., Self-motivation, Emotional stability, Managing relations, Integrity and Commitment. Conculdingly from the above findings that insignificant differences were present among female basketball players on the sub-variables of will to win.

The study will be considerably helpful to comprehend the Emotional Intelligence and Will to win 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 Emotional Intelligence and Will to win variables in their training schedule from the very initial stages.

REFERENCES

Goleman D (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. Bantam, New York.

Goleman D (1999). The Human Task of a Project Leader. PM Network Journal, 13, 38-41.

Hanin YL (2000). IZOF-based emotions-profiling: Step-wise procedures and forms. In YL Hanin (Ed.), Emotions in sport, 303–313. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hyde A, Pethe S, & Dhar U (2001). *Publication manual for emotional intelligence scale.* National Psychological Corporation, 4/230, Kacheri Ghat, Agra, India.

Kumar DR & Shukla PS (1988). *Publication manual for Indian adaptation of will to win questionnaire*. Kumar Publications Co., 4/148, Kalimahal, Varanasi, India.

Kumar P, Kanojia R, Kumar K (2009). *Relationship of achievement motivation and will to win to the performance of sprinters.* Proceedings of India International Congress in Sports Psychology. Lakshmibai National University of Physical Education, Gwalior.

Kumar R, Kang HS (2011). A study of will to win of boxers with reference to their level of participation. *An International Multidisciplinary Research Journals, 1*(3), 100-107.

Mayer JD, Salovey P, Caruso D (2000). Selecting a Measure of Emotional Intelligence: The Case for Ability Scales. In: Bar-On, R. and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), Handbook of Emotional Intelligence. Cambridge University Press, Ney York, pp: 396-420.

Paul BW (1960). Building a Champion Football Teams. NJ: Englewood Cliffs.

Petrides KV, Furnham A, Martin GN (2004). Social Psychol. 144, 149-162.