



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com
**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
 ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)**

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/4341
 DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4341>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS MALE SPORTSPERSON.

Pradip Saini¹ and Dr. Yuwraj Shrivastava².

1. M.Phil. Student, Dr. C.V. Raman University, Kota Bilaspur C.G.
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education, Dr. C.V. Raman University, Kota Bilaspur C.G.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 26 March 2017
 Final Accepted: 21 April 2017
 Published: May 2017

Key words:-

Social intelligence, sports achievement

Abstract

In the present study social intelligence of high and low achiever male sportspersons was compared. 50 male sportspersons (Average age 23.41 years) who took part in national level individual and team events as well as who came in first four positions in these event were chosen and grouped as high achiever male sportspersons. To fulfil the objectives of the study, 50 intercollegiate male sportspersons (Average age 22.15 years) of team and individual sport were selected and grouped in as low achiever male sportspersons. Purposive sampling method was used in the presented study for selection of sportspersons. To measure social intelligence of the selected subjects, social intelligence scale prepared by Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) was used. It was found that social intelligence of male sportspersons did not vary significantly on the basis of their sports achievement. It was concluded that social intelligence is not a potent variable that affect sports achievement of male sportspersons.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2016,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Social intelligence is the person's ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions [Thorndike, 1920]. It is made of inter and intra personal intelligence. Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) included dimensions such as patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and memory while describing social intelligence. In modern day psychology it has been emphasized that success in achieving certain goals is dependent to an extent on social intelligence.

It has also been observed that psycho-social characteristics of high achiever sportspersons have been extensively studied by researchers such as Meyers et al. (1999), Shrivastava et al. (2010), Szabo et al. (2014), Hasan et al. (2015) but none centered on social intelligence of elite sportspersons. Hence the present study was planned to compare social intelligence of high and low achiever male sportspersons.

Hypothesis:-

It was hypothesized that high achiever male sportspersons will show more magnitude of social intelligence as compared to low achiever male sportspersons.

Methodology:-

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

Sample:-

To conduct the study 50 male sportspersons (Average age 23.41 years) who took part in national level individual and team events as well as who came in first four positions in these event were chosen and grouped as high achiever male sportspersons. To fulfil the objectives of the study, 50 intercollegiate male sportspersons (Average age 22.15 years) of team and individual sport were selected and grouped in as low achiever male sportspersons. Purposive sampling method was used in the presented study for selection of male sportspersons.

Tools:-

Social Intelligence Scale:-

To measure social intelligence of the selected subjects, social intelligence scale prepared by Chadha and Ganeshan (1986) was used. It consists of dimensions such as patience (08 items), cooperativeness (11 items), confidence level (08 items), sensitivity (09 items), recognition of social environment (03 items), tactfulness (07 items), sense of humour (08 items), and memory (12 items). 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. Validity : This social intelligence scale has a validity coefficient of 0.70.

Procedure:-

The selected high and low achiever male sportspersons for the present study were subjected to the aforementioned tool in a laboratory like condition. Response obtained on statements of social intelligence scale was scored off as per guidelines given in manual. After scoring social intelligence scores between high and low achiever male sportspersons was compared with the help of independent sample 't' test. Results shown in table 1.

Result and Discussion:-

Table 5:- Comparison of Social Intelligence between High and Low Achiever Male Sportspersons

Groups	High Achiever Male Sportspersons		Low Achiever Male Sportspersons		Mean Diff.	't'
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Social Intelligence	107.58	6.76	107.68	5.32	0.10	0.08(NS)

NS Not Significant

Perusal of statistical entries reported in table 5 reveal non significant difference in social intelligence of male sportspersons on the basis of their sports achievement. Calculated $t=0.08$ depicted in table 5 indicate that social intelligence of high achiever male sportspersons ($M=107.58$) and low achiever male sportspersons ($M=107.68$) did not differ significantly with each other. Results showed that there exists statistically non-significant difference in social intelligence of male sportspersons on the basis of their sports achievements. This is expected because entire sample comprise of male sportspersons taking part in competitive sports. Since participation in competitive sports enhance social skills hence the result is not surprising.

Conclusion:-

On the basis of results and associated discussion it was concluded that social intelligence of male sportspersons can not be predicted by their high or lower level of sports achievements.

References:-

1. Chadda, N. K. and Usha Ganeshan (1986). Social Intelligence Scale. National Psychological Corporation.
2. Hasan, M.; Singh, A.K. and Singh, J. (2015). Achievement motivation of indian field hockey players at three different levels of competitions. Journal of Physical Education Research, Volume 2, Issue I, pp.71-81.
3. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. Intelligence, 27, 267-298.
4. Shrivastava, P.; Venugopal, R. and Singh, Y. (2010). A Study of Personality Dimensions in Sports Performance. Journal of Exercise Science and Physiotherapy, Vol. 6, No. 1: 39-42.

5. Szabo, A.; Szucs, A.; Gaspar, Z. and Sule, K. (2014). Anxiety and affect in successful and less successful elite female basketball players: in-situ sampling before six consecutive games. LASE Journal of Sport Science, 5(2), 76-91.
6. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. .235-Harper's Magazine, 140, 227