



ISSN: 2456-0057
IJPNPE 2017; 2(2): 649-650
© 2017 IJPNPE
www.journalofsports.com
Received: 22-05-2017
Accepted: 26-06-2017

Dr. BV Shrigiriwar
Director, Department of
Physical Education and Sports,
Annasaheb Gundewar College,
Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

A comparative study of social intelligence and its sub-factors between university athletes and non-athletes

Dr. BV Shrigiriwar

Abstract

Social intelligence and its essential sub-factors were compared between university athletes and non-athletes. To conduct the study 30 interuniversity athletes (Average age 24.11 years) and 30 university non-athletes (Ave. age 25.12 years) were selected as sample. The selected subjects were pursuing their education from RTM University, Nagpur. Social intelligence scale prepared by Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) was used to assess social intelligence of selected university athletes and non-athletes. This scale has eight dimensions namely patience, cooperativeness, confidence level, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and memory. Analysis of data revealed that confidence, sense of humour and memory, a sub-factor of social intelligence was found to be significantly better in university athletes as compared to university non-athletes. The rest of sub factors of social intelligence did not differ significantly between two study groups. The other noteworthy finding shows that university athletes have superior social intelligence as compared to university students with no active involvement in competitive sport. The overall results indicate significantly better social intelligence in university athletes as compared to non athletes. This is in line with report of world health organization and other scientific studies proclaiming the psycho-social benefits of participation in organized sports.

Keywords: Social intelligence, university athletes, non-athletes

Introduction

Thorndike (1920) [9] defined social intelligence as one's capacity to fit into social interactions. This social interaction is better in person who can understand and manage others in society. Social intelligence is the term used in the context of individual's capacity to adjust to social environment by adjusting with stressors that cause problems in building positive relationship with others. A weak relation with others are major source of stress and health related negative outcomes in an individual that is why social intelligence becomes essential in human life. As per theory of social intelligence propounded by Moss and Hunt (1927) [5] it is the capacity of a person to maintain harmonious relation with others in society. Vernon (1933) [10] in his definition of social intelligence included ability to easily mix and get along with the other members of society, knowledge regarding social matters and issues and ability to detect personality traits of unknown person. Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) incorporated dimensions namely patient, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and memory in their description on social intelligence. Looking at these dimensions it seems that all these factors are reported to be developed through participation in competitive sports. World Health Organization (2003) in their report gave scientific evidence about the physical, psychological and social benefits of regular participation in sports. The report further adds that regular participation in sports enhance social integration. Scientific studies conducted by Pasand (2010) [6], Mehri *et al.* (2012), Singh and Bal (2012) [7], Gahlawat and Gahlawat (2012) [2], Talyabee *et al.* (2013) [8], Baby (2017) [1], Kuan *et al.* (2018) [3] and other have also documented the benefits of regular participation in sports for enhancement of physical, psychological and psychomotor abilities. Hence this study was conducted to assess social intelligence and its sub-factors between university athletes and non-athletes.

Aims and Objective

The objective of the present study was to compare social intelligence and its sub-factors between university athletes and non-athletes.

Corresponding Author:
Dr. BV Shrigiriwar
Director, Department of
Physical Education and Sports,
Annasaheb Gundewar College,
Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that degree of social intelligence and its sub-factors will differ significantly in university students on the basis of their participation in sports.

Methodology

The following methodological steps were taken in order to conduct the present study.

Sample

To conduct the study 30 interuniversity athletes (Average age 24.11 years) and 30 university non-athletes (Ave. age 25.12 years) were selected as sample. The selected subjects were pursuing their education from RTM University, Nagpur.

Tools

Social intelligence scale prepared by Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) was used to assess social intelligence of selected university athletes and non-athletes. This scale has eight dimensions namely patience, cooperativeness, confidence

level, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and memory. Test-retest reliability coefficients for various dimensions of this scale is: Patience 0.94, Cooperativeness 0.91, Confidence 0.90, Sensitivity 0.92, Recognition and social environment 0.95, Tactfulness 0.84, Sense of humour 0.92 and Memory 0.97 respectively. The validity coefficient of this scale is 0.70.

Procedure

60 students of RTM university with 30 interuniversity athletes and 30 non-athletes were selected as sample. Social intelligence scale prepared by Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) was administered and response on each statement for each subject was scored according to method suggested by authors. Independent sample 't' test was used to compare social intelligence between two study groups. Result is shown in table no. 1

Result and Discussion

Table 1: Comparison of dimensions of social intelligence between university athletes and non-athletes

Dimensions of Social Intelligence	Participation in Sports				Mean Difference	't'
	Athletes (N=30)		Non-Athletes (N=30)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Patience	19.30	3.40	17.90	3.28	1.40	1.62
Cooperativeness	23.00	2.87	21.96	3.11	1.03	1.33
Confidence	19.60	3.03	17.60	3.24	2.00	2.46*
Sensitivity	18.90	2.39	19.06	3.39	.16	.22
Recognition of Social Environment	1.70	.59	1.40	.85	.30	1.57
Tactfulness	2.83	.91	3.26	1.33	.43	1.46
Sense of humour	3.43	.72	2.93	1.01	.50	2.19*
Memory	10.20	2.44	8.26	2.83	1.93	2.82**

** Significant at .01 level, * Significant at .05 level

Perusal of entries shown in table 1 revealed that confidence, sense of humour and memory, a sub-factor of social intelligence was found to be significantly better in university athletes as compared to university non-athletes. The rest of sub factors of social intelligence did not differ significantly between two study groups.

Table 2: Comparison of Social Intelligence between University Athletes and Non-athletes

Groups	Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	't'
University Athletes (N=30)	98.96	9.80	6.56	2.25*
Non-Athletes (N=30)	92.40	12.56		

* Significant at .05 level

Perusal of table 2 shows that university athletes have superior social intelligence as compared to university students with no active involvement in competitive sport. This result is supported by t=2.25 at .05 level of statistical significance. The overall results indicate significantly better social intelligence in university athletes as compared to non athletes. This is in line with report of world health organization and other scientific studies proclaiming the psycho-social benefits of participation in organized sports.

Conclusion

On the basis of results, it was concluded that university athletes possesses much more developed social intelligence as compared to university non-athletes.

References

1. Baby M. Assessment of simple visual reaction time of

female non-athletes compared to female athletes. International Journal of Researches in Biosciences, Agriculture & Technology. 2017; 5(7):1-2.
 2. Gahlawat OP, Gahlawat P. A Comparative Study of Player and Non- Player Students in Relation to Mental Health. Journal of Exercise Science and Physiotherapy, 2012; 8(1):43-47.
 3. Kuan YM, Zuhairi NA, Manan FA, Knight VF, Omar R. Visual reaction time and visual anticipation time between athletes and non-athletes. Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine. 2018; (1):135-141.
 4. Mehri A, Maleki B, Sedghi KS. The relationship between mental health and emotional intelligence among athlete and non-athlete male students. Journal of Health and Hygiene. 2014; 2(4):64-84.
 5. Moss FA, Hunt T. Are you socially intelligent? Scientific American. 1927; 137:108-110.
 6. Pasand F. Emotional intelligence in athletes and non-athletes and its relationship with demographic variables. Br J Sports Med. 2010; 44:i56.
 7. Singh S, Bal BS. Study of psychological parameters of sports women and non-sports women collegiate students of India. International Journal of Psychology and Counselling. 2012; 4(8):92-95.
 8. Talyabee SR, Soleimance R, Salimi M. The investigation of personality characteristics in athlete and non-athlete students. European Journal of Experimental Biology. 2013; 3(3):254-256.
 9. Thorndike EL. Intelligence and its use. Harper's Magazine. 1920; 140:227-235.
 10. Vernon PE. Some characteristics of the good judge of personality. Journal of Social Psychology. 1933; 4:42-57.