



COMPARISON OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG ATHLETES AND SWIMMERS

Dr. Sanjay Kumar

ABSTRACT

The present study was undertaken to assess and compare the social intelligence among athletes and swimmers. For this present study, total one hundred sixty sportsmen of different districts of Himachal Pradesh state in India were randomly drawn to act as subjects. Out of these, eighty male athletes, eighty male swimmers were selected to act as subjects. Only those sportsmen were selected, who participated in state or national level competitions. In order to measure social intelligence of subjects, Social Intelligence Scale developed and standardized by N.K. Chandha and Ms. Usha Ganesan (1986) was adopted. Mean and standard deviation, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey Post Hoc Test were used as statistical techniques. The findings of the study revealed that athletes and swimmers differ in perception of social intelligence. Athletes are more socially intelligent than swimmers. The athletes possessed higher level of patience, cooperativeness, confidence and sensitivity level than swimmers. Swimmers possessed higher level of memory than athletes.



KEY WORDS: - Social Intelligence, Athletes, Swimmers.

INTRODUCTION:

Social Intelligence is the capacity to coexist well with others, and to get them to help out you. Once in a while alluded to straightforwardly as "relationship building abilities". It incorporates a consciousness of circumstances and the social elements that oversee them, and an information on association styles and methodologies that can enable an individual to accomplish their destinations in managing others. It additionally includes a specific measure of self-understanding

and one's very own cognizance discernments and response designs. From the angle of relational aptitudes, "Karl Albrecht" arranges conduct toward others as falling some place on a range between "dangerous" impact and "sustaining" impact. Lethal conduct causes individuals to feel cheapened, irate, disappointed, blameworthy or in any case insufficient. Feeding conduct causes individuals to feel esteemed, regarded, attested, energized

or able. A proceeded with example of harmful conduct shows a low degree of social knowledge - the powerlessness to interface with individuals and impact them successfully. A proceeded with example of sustaining conduct will in general make an individual considerably more successful in managing others; supporting practices are the markers of high social knowledge.

Social researcher "Ross Honeywill" believes that social knowledge is an accumulated proportion of self and social mindfulness, advanced social convictions and perspectives, and a limit and hunger to oversee complex social change. Therapist, "Nicholas Humphrey" accepts that it is social knowledge, instead of quantitative insight, that characterizes who we are as people.

As originally coined by Thorndike (1920), the term referred to the person's ability to understand and manage other people, and to engage in adaptive social interactions. In view of Campbell and McCord (1996) social intelligence is just general intelligence applied to social situations. Arjun and Laxmi (1997) highlighted that different components of social intelligence were highly relevant to adjustment process. Khan *et al.* (2011) found that there was no significant difference of social intelligence between first group and second group of physical education students except tactfulness. Emotional problems will often affect college work and playground situations and make it difficult to concentrate in both areas.

METHODOLOGY Selection of Subjects :- For the present study, total one hundred sixty (160) sportsmen of different districts of Himachal Pradesh state in India were randomly drawn to act as subjects for the study. Eighty male athletes, eighty male swimmers were selected to act as subjects. Only those sportsmen were selected, who participated in inter college or state level or national level competitions.

Statistical Techniques:- In order to measure social intelligence of subjects, Social Intelligence Scale developed and standardized by N.K. Chandha and Ms. Usha Ganesan (1986) was adopted. The scale covers the eight dimensions of social intelligence as follows – patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and memory. In the present study the investigator used mean and standard deviation as statistical techniques to draw mean of total scores of each variable of subjects. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to find out significance differences among subjects. Tukey's Post-hoc test was used for multiple comparisons between subjects.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Social Intelligence of Athletes and Swimmers .

| Dimensions of social Intelligence | Athletes (N=80) | | Swimmers (N=80) | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Patience | 20.24 | 2.75 | 18.65 | 2.82 |
| Cooperativeness | 25.94 | 2.29 | 23.79 | 2.91 |
| Confidence | 21.29 | 2.12 | 18.72 | 3.00 |
| Sensitivity | 21.26 | 2.44 | 19.36 | 2.48 |
| Recognition of Social Environment | 1.00 | .857 | 1.07 | .792 |
| Tactfulness | 3.28 | 1.18 | 3.05 | 1.05 |
| Sense of Humor | 3.11 | 1.33 | 2.74 | 1.31 |
| Memory | 8.22 | 1.58 | 9.04 | 1.62 |
| Overall Social Intelligence | 104.30 | 7.42 | 96.30 | 8.62 |

Table 2. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) among Athletes and Swimmers with respect to Social Intelligence

| Groups | Sum of Square | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--|---------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Patience | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 143.40 | 2 | 71.70 | 9.63* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 1764.49 | 237 | 7.44 | | |
| Total | 1907.89 | 239 | | | |
| Cooperativeness | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 276.77 | 2 | 138.39 | 16.99* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 1929.88 | 237 | 8.14 | | |
| Total | 2206.65 | 239 | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 355.40 | 2 | 177.70 | 21.69* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 1941.53 | 237 | 8.19 | | |
| Total | 2296.93 | 239 | | | |
| Sensitivity | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 160.00 | 2 | 80.00 | 11.97* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 1584.33 | 237 | 6.68 | | |
| Total | 1744.33 | 239 | | | |
| Recognition of Social Environment | | | | | |
| Between Groups | .758 | 2 | .379 | .575 | .563 |
| Within Groups | 156.238 | 237 | .659 | | |
| Total | 156.996 | 239 | | | |
| Tactfulness | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 2.058 | 2 | 1.029 | .784 | .46 |
| Within Groups | 311.238 | 237 | 1.313 | | |
| Total | 313.296 | 239 | | | |
| Sense of Humor | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 7.500 | 2 | 3.750 | 2.217 | .111 |
| Within Groups | 400.962 | 237 | 1.692 | | |
| Total | 408.462 | 239 | | | |
| Memory | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 31.408 | 2 | 15.704 | 5.602* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 664.387 | 237 | 2.803 | | |
| Total | 695.796 | 239 | | | |
| Overall Social Intelligence | | | | | |
| Between Groups | 3744.40 | 2 | 1872.20 | 25.92* | 0.00 |
| Within Groups | 17120.99 | 237 | 72.24 | | |
| Total | 20865.39 | 239 | | | |

* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 3. Multiple Comparisons (Tukey Post Hoc Test) among Athletes and Swimmers regarding Social Intelligence and their subscales

| | Categories | Mean Difference | Sig. |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Patience | Athletes- Swimmers | 1.59* | .001 |
| Cooperativeness | Athletes- Swimmers | 2.15* | .000 |
| Confidence | Athletes- Swimmers | 2.56* | .000 |
| Sensitivity | Athletes- Swimmers | 1.862* | .000 |
| Recognition of Social Environment | Athletes- Swimmers | -.07 | .829 |
| Tactfulness | Athletes- Swimmers | .23 | .430 |
| Sense of Humour | Athletes- Swimmers | .38 | .164 |
| Memory | Athletes- Swimmers | -.81* | .007 |
| Overall Social Intelligence | Athletes- Swimmers | 8.00* | .000 |

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The perusal of table 3 also reveals that the mean difference regarding confidence between athletes and swimmers is 2.56 and found significant at 0.05 level. It shows that athletes are more confident in comparison to swimmers.

The result from table 3 reveals that the mean difference regarding sensitivity between athletes and swimmers is 1.862 and found significant at 0.05, level. Athletes found higher sensitivity level in comparison to swimmers. The F-value for athletes and swimmers regarding tactfulness came out to be 0.784 ($p > 0.05$) which is insignificant at 0.05 level. It reveals that there is no significant difference regarding tactfulness between athletes and swimmers. The results from tables 2 shows that F-value came out to be 2.217 ($p > 0.05$) between athletes, swimmers and regarding sense of humour, which is insignificant at 0.05 level. It reveals that there is no significant difference regarding sense of humour between athletes and swimmers. The results from table 2 also shows that F-value came out to be 5.602 ($p < 0.05$) between athletes and swimmers regarding memory is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. It reveals that there is significant difference regarding memory level between athletes and swimmers. The athletes and swimmers differ on perception of memory. It is evident from table number 1 that the mean score for athletes is lower than swimmers regarding memory level. Athletes found lower level of memory in comparison to swimmers. The results from table 2 shows that there is significant difference regarding social intelligence between athletes and swimmers. The athletes and swimmers differ in perception of social intelligence. The table 1 shows that mean score for athletes regarding social intelligence is higher than swimmers. Athletes are more socially intelligent than swimmers. The athletes possessed higher level of patience, cooperativeness, confidence and sensitivity level than swimmers. Hooda (2009) argued that social Intelligence as predictor of positive psychological health and found a positive correlation between social intelligence and psychological health.

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that athletes and swimmers differ in perception of social intelligence. Athletes are more socially intelligent than swimmers. The athletes possessed higher level of patience, cooperativeness, confidence and sensitivity level than swimmers. Swimmers possessed higher level of

memory than athletes. Athletes and swimmers did not differ on recognition of social environment, tactfulness and sense of humour.

REFERENCES

- Arjun A, Laxmi R 1997. A study on nature of relationships between social intelligence, social adjustment and general mental ability of school students. *Indian Journal of Psychological*, 5, 13-18.
- Babu M, S. (2013). Social intelligence and aggressive behaviour in relation to classroom climate among upper primary school students of Delhi and Kerala. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Education, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
- Campbell JM, McCord DM 1996. The WAIS-R Comprehension and Picture Arrangement subtests as measures of social intelligence: Testing traditional interpretations. *Journal of Psycho-educational Assessment*, 14, 240-249.
- Cantor N, and Kihlstrom JF 1989. Social intelligence and cognitive assessments of personality. In R.S. Wyer & T.K. Srull (Eds.). *Advances in social cognition*, 2, 1-59. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Chadha NK, Ganeshan U 1986. Manual for Social Intelligence. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Honeywill, Ross 2015, "The Man Problem: destructive masculinity in Western culture" *Palgrave Macmillan, New York*.
- Hooda D 2009. Social Intelligence as predictor of positive psychological health. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35, 143-150.
- Khan Z, Khan NM, Haider Z 2011. A Study on Social Intelligence of the students of Physical Education. *International Journal of Sports Science and Physical Education*, 2, (1), 5-11.
- Moss FA Hunt T 1927. Are You Socially Intelligent? *Scientific American Journal*, 137, 108-110.
- Thorndike EL 1920. Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.



Dr. Sanjay Kumar