 **Ünal TÜRKÇAPAR** [1]
 **Dzhıparkul ABDYRAKHMANOVA** [2]

[1] The School of Physical Education and Sports, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey

[2] The School of Physical Education and Sports, Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University, Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

**Corresponding author:** Ü. Türkçapar

*e-mail: turkcaparunal@hotmail.com*

# The Students of The School of Physical Education and Sports' Examination of The Social Intelligence Levels According to Different Variables

**Abstract**

The aim of this research is to investigate the social intelligence levels of individuals studying at Kyrgyzstan Turkey Manas University, College of Physical Education and Sports. In the research, a descriptive screening model has been used. The study group consists of 77 male and 25 female participants studying in the 2019-2020 academic year at Kyrgyzstan Turkey Manas University, College of Physical Education and Sports. For the data of the research, "Personal Information Form", prepared by the researcher, was used, and to determine the social intelligence levels of the participants, Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS), developed by Silvera et al. (2001) was used. This scale is prepared to reveal the level of social intelligence and consists of 21 items. The analysis of the data was done in SPSS 21.0 statistics package program. Normality analyses have been performed to determine whether the data obtained showed a normal distribution. Independent samples t-test has been used for binary group comparisons and one way Anova test was used for group comparisons of more than two. p significance level was accepted as 0.05 (p < 0.05). As a result, it has been confirmed that there has been no significant difference in gender, age, department and location.

**Keywords:** Social intelligence, communication, physical education, education.

**INTRODUCTION**

To be able to produce right and effective solutions to the challenges faced in life and to develop solutions are important skills for human psychology and social competence. In addition, it is important to establish an effective communication with other individuals in the environment in which they interact and to be able to manage the feelings and thoughts of the other person by anticipating them, to facilitate social life and to influence the environment. Communication is a dynamic process. Internal and external factors affect this process. As internal factors affecting the communication process, curiosity, ambition for success, jealousy, anger and feeling of exclusion occurring in the inner world of the individual can be counted. In addition to all these, elements such as the past life of the individual, the culture he/she is in, the level of intelligence, the level of knowledge, and personal characteristics are also internal factors that affect communication. External factors affecting communication are a set of events and phenomena that occur in the external world of the individual. These can be listed as the sounds that exist or suddenly develop in the environment where the communication takes place, the temperature of the environment, the words chosen in the content of the message and the body language used (Dumangöz, 2019). Social intelligence, being one of these concepts, has been examined under three sub-headings, social information processing (ability of understanding feelings, thoughts, expectations and body language), social awareness (ability of being adapted to social environments) and social skills (mastery in human relations). This integrity is called as the social intelligence (Silvera, Martinussen and Dahl, 2001).

People have to be social entities in order to survive throughout their lives. As a natural result of this, both emotionally and socially, people constantly interact with each other. According to Dumangöz (2021), a relationship is a mutual bond, contact, relationship and relevance between at least two people. In the case of a long-term mutual relationship, we can talk about a relationship. Therefore, social intelligence plays a major role in managing interpersonal relationships well. The study of social intelligence began with Thorndike (1920) 's description of social intelligence as the ability to understand people and the ability to act wisely in relation with people. This definition covers both the cognitive dimension and the behavioral dimension. Cognitive dimension is the ability to understand people. Behavioral dimension means the ability to act wisely in human relationships (Doğan et al., 2009).

Intelligence includes the ability to plan logically, solve problems, think abstractly, understand complex ideas, learn quickly, and benefit from experience. Social intelligence, on the other hand, is a person's capacity to understand, discern, and meet the emotions, wants, and needs of the people around him/her, such as a teacher, a therapist, or a marketer (Tural, 2009). Moss and Hunt (1927) described social intelligence as the ability to get along well with others. Extending the scope of social intelligence, Vernon (1933) defined social intelligence as the ability of individual to get along well with others and to understand the moods of others, and stated that social intelligence covers one's level of comfort in social environments, understanding others, and how much information one has about social issues (İlhan and Çetin, 2014).

Recently, the most popular approach to the concept of social intelligence is the approach put forward by Goleman (1999). The origin of this approach is the four skills that Hatch and Gardner describe as parts of interpersonal intelligence. The first of these is social analysis. Social analysis means that the person is aware of his / her problems, knows his / her feelings and has insight. Understanding what other people feel and acting in harmony with other people also play an important role in the functionality of social intelligence. In this way, the person can establish intimacy with others around. In addition, Goleman (1999) also emphasized that people with high social intelligence also use body language very well. The second skill is to organize groups. The leader should have the ability to motivate and energize his/her colleagues. The third skill is to establish a personal connection. This skill includes the ability to build positive relationships with others and to respond appropriately to others by recognizing their point of view. In this way, the person will be able to communicate with others easily and properly in social settings. The final skill is to find solutions by discussing. This includes peacekeepers' ability of preventing conflicts. They are the ones who lead the way in resolving the conflict by preventing it (Günaydın, 2017).

If the individual is capable of analyzing the character of people the right way, he or she may be called an individual with a high level of social intelligence. In addition, individuals with high levels of social intelligence have the ability to make sense of the changes in other people's instant moods, desires and desires, happiness and anger, and the behavior of others and adjust their own behavior accordingly. On the other hand, individuals with low levels of social intelligence are not able to communicate with other people adequately and effectively.

These individuals cannot demonstrate their performance that exists potentially. Therefore, the social life of the individual is negatively affected by this deficiency (Kaya et al., 2016). As a result of Phipps's (2007) research, the concept of social intelligence was significantly associated with the concepts of communication and innovation (Akman and Akman, 2017).

People have to be social entities in order to survive throughout their lives. As a natural result of this, both emotionally and socially, people constantly interact with each other. Therefore, it is aimed to examine the social intelligence levels of individuals involved in university education, which has an important place in one's life.

Determining the dominant and non-dominant intelligence areas of the students helps them to know themselves better, to realize their strengths, weaknesses and developmental aspects, and to make the right choice of special occupation or profession (Çeliköz, 2016).

**METHOD**

**Research Design**

The research is in descriptive method, and social intelligence levels of individuals studying at the university are examined.

The research is in the screening model. Screening models are research approaches made on a selected sample group from the universe that includes large groups, aiming to examine a situation that exists in the past or in the present as it exists. The event, individual or object that is the subject of research, is tried to be defined in its own conditions and as it exists (Karasar, 1994).

**Research Group**

The study group of this research consists of 77 male and 25 female students, the total number of participants being 102, studying in 2019-2020 academic year at Kyrgyzstan Turkey Manas University, College of Physical Education and Sports, the department of Physical Education Teaching and Coaching.

**Data Collection Tools**

The "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researcher has been used to determine the demographic characteristics of the College of Physical Education and Sports

students participating in the study. This form consists of questions about gender, age, department of education and place of residence.

The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS), developed by Silvera et al (2001), has been used to determine the social intelligence levels of participants in the study. This scale is prepared to reveal the level of social intelligence and consists of 21 items. It is a Likert-type scale of 5. The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale assesses social intelligence in three separate areas. The first of these is Social Information Processing, the second one is Social Skills, and the third is Social Awareness. In addition, it reveals the total level of social intelligence. The 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20 and 21. Articles of the scale have been reversely encoded.

**Analysis of Data**

Frequency distributions have been made to provide descriptive information about the individuals involved in the study. Normality analyses have been performed to determine whether the data obtained showed a normal distribution. Independent Samples T Test has been used for binary group comparisons and One Way Anova test was used for group comparisons of more than two.

**FINDINGS**

Table 1. Analysis results by gender variable of the research group

| Gender | N | Avg. | SD | t | P |
|--------|---|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Male | 77 | 65.6753 | 8.80407 | | |
| | | | | 1.015 | 0.312 |
| Female | 25 | 63.6800 | 7.62518 | | |

According to Table 1, there is no statistically significant difference in social intelligence score averages according to the gender variable of the research group (p<0.05).

Table 2. Analysis results by department variable of research group

| Department | N | Avg. | SD | t | P |
|------------|---|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Teaching | 54 | 66.3704 | 7.59169 | | |
| | | | | 1.495 | 0.138 |
| Coaching | 48 | 63.8542 | 9.39214 | | |

According to Table 2, there is no statistically significant difference in social intelligence score averages according to the department variable of the research group ($p<0.05$).

Table 3. Analysis results by age variable of the research group

| Age | N | Avg. | SD | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 21 | 63.3333 | 10.19967 | | |
| 20 | 27 | 66.2593 | 9.82380 | 1.467 | 0.228 |
| 21 | 25 | 63.2400 | 5.93914 | | |
| 22 | 29 | 67.2069 | 7.57995 | | |

According to Table 3, there is no statistically significant difference in social intelligence score averages according to the age variable of the research group ($p<0.05$).

Table 4. Analysis results by department variable of the place of residence

| Place of Residence | N | Avg. | SD | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dormitory | 9 | 64.5556 | 1.94365 | | |
| Student House | 11 | 68.3636 | 6.03776 | | |
| Family | 43 | 65.4419 | 9.53515 | 0.893 | 0.472 |
| Home Alone | 12 | 66.5833 | 6.77507 | | |
| Other | 27 | 63.0741 | 9.57129 | | |

According to Table 4, there is no statistically significant difference in social intelligence score averages according to the place of residence variable of the research group ($p<0.05$).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The research has been tried to be evaluated according to the variables taken to be evaluated in the light of literature information.

It has been concluded that social intelligence score averages do not differ according to the variable of gender. Indeed, as a result of a study conducted by Doğan, Totan and Sapmaz (2009) to evaluate the relationship between self-esteem and social intelligence of university students, no significant differences in social intelligence levels between female and male participants were found. However, Saxena and Jain (2013) found in their study that female students had a higher social intelligence than male students. Doğan (2006), Doğan and Çetin (2008) examined the differences in social intelligence according to gender and found that the

averages were high in favor of male students, but they concluded that it was nonsensical at the level of 0.05. When the literature was examined, it has been also found that the social intelligence averages of females were higher than the social intelligence averages of males (Silvera et al., 2001). According to the results of the research conducted by Sivrikaya et al. (2017) on a total of 117 elite shooters, a significant difference was found between the gender variable and interpersonal social intelligence.

Our study concluded that there has been no significant difference in social intelligence score averages according to the age variable of the participants. In the research conducted by Ülker (2016) to analyze social intelligence and communication skills of vocational high school students from the point of different variables, it was found that there was no significant relationship between age and social intelligence, social information processing, social skills and social awareness.

It has been concluded that social intelligence score averages do not differ according to the variable of department being studied. Likewise, as a result of the research conducted in 2015, Kadakal Dölek concluded that there was no significant differentiation between sex and communication skills of university students, and that the scores of TSIS did not differ significantly according to the department studied. In the research conducted by Ülker (2016), it has been found out that the levels of social intelligence, social information process, social skills and social awareness did not differ according to the faculty and department studied. In their study Naseri, Badriazarin and Najafzade (2014) found that there was a relationship between the skills and abilities of high school first-and second-grade teachers and their social intelligence. They also concluded that there is an important relationship between the skills and abilities of physical education teachers in all aspects of their social intelligence. Nagra (2014) conducted a study to determine secondary school students' levels of social intelligence in relation to school and gender varieties. As a result of her research, it was observed that the social intelligence levels of the students were average, and there were meaningless differences in their levels of social intelligence in relation to type of school and gender.

It has been concluded that social intelligence score averages do not differ according to the variable of place of residence. This can be interpreted as, the fact that most of the participants reside in dormitories within the university's facility in terms of residence, these

participants come from the same social environment, and live inside the same school culture could cause this situation.

**REFERENCES**

Akman, Y., Imamoğlu Akman, G. (2017). Examination of Teachers ' Multicultural Education Attitude According to Social Intelligence Perception. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 7*(1), 34-48.

Çeliköz, M. (2016). *Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesinde öğrenim görmekte olan öğretmen adaylarının baskın zeka (çoklu zeka) dağılımlarının incelenmesi*. I. Uluslararası Uzaktan Eğitim Araştırmaları Konferansı, İstanbul.

Doğan, T., Çetin B. (2008). Study of the Relationship of Social Intelligence Levels of University Students with Depression and Some Variables. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 5*(2), 1-19.

Doğan, T., (2006). *Study of the Relationship of Social Intelligence Levels of University Students with Depression and Some Variables*. Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sakarya.

Doğan, T., Totan, T., Sapmaz, F. (2009). Self-Esteem and Social Intelligence in College Students. *Sakarya University Journal of Education Department, 17*, 235-247.

Dumangöz, P.D. (2019). Spor ve İletişim. Selçuk Bora Çavuşoğlu (Ed.). *Spor Yönetiminde Temel Alanlar*, 1-20. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Dumangöz, P.D. (2021). *Liderlik, İlişki ve İletişim Üçgeninde Spor*. Ankara: Akademisyen Yayınları.

Goleman, D. (1999). *Emotional Intelligence at Work*. Istanbul: Varlik Publications.

Günaydın, Ş. (2017). *An Examination of the Effect of Positive Psychology Lecture Given for A While on Students ' Emotional Intelligence and Social Intelligence* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Üsküdar University the Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

İlhan, M., ve Çetin, B. (2014). Kültürel Zekâ Ölçeği'nin Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29*(2), 94-114.

Kadalak Dölek, A., (2015). *Examination of Communication Skills of University Students in terms of Different Variables*. Atatürk University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Erzurum.

Karasar, N. (1994). *Scientific Research Method: Concepts, Principles, Techniques*. Ankara: 3A Research Training Consultancy Ltd.

Kaya, N., Turan, N., Kanberova, H. A., Cenal, Y., Kahraman, A., ve Evren, M. (2016). Communication Skills and Social Intelligence Levels According to Art Characteristics of Nursing Students. *Journal of Education and Research in Nursing, 13*(1), 50-58.

Nagra, V. (2014). Social Intelligence and Adjustment of Secondary School Students. *Indian Journal of Research*, *3*(4), 86-87.

Naseri, S., Badriazarin, Y. and Najafzade, M. R. (2014), The Relationship Between Social Intelligence and Capabilities and Skills of PE Teachers in Tabriz. *Journal of Science and Today's World*, 3(9), 435-439.

Phipps, C. J. (2007). Social Intelligence: the Heart and Science of Human Relationships. *Social Intelligence Styles, 1*, 4-5.

Saxena, P. and Jain, R. K., (2013). Social Intelligence of Undergraduate Students In Relation To Their Gender and Subject Stream. *IOSR Journal of Research Method in Education*, *1*(1), 14.

Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42*(4), 313-319.

Silvera, D., H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001), "The tromso social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence". *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313-31.

Sivrikaya, K., Aydın, S. ve Dumangöz, P.D. (2017). Elit atıcıların çoklu zeka özelliklerinin cinsiyet, kullandıkları silah türü ve yaş faktörlerine göre karşılaştırılması. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 3*(2), 79-94.

Tural, M. (2009). *Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu bölümlerinde okuyan öğrencilerin çoklu zeka kuramına göre karşılaştırılması* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Ülker, Ç. (2016). *Examination Of Social Intelligence And Communication Skills Of Vocational School Students In Terms Of Different Variables*. Master's Thesis, Nişantaşı University Institute Of Social Sciences, Istanbul.