

Received: October 2023 Accepted: December 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58262/ks.v12i1.302>

The Degree of Social Intelligence of Volleyball Coaches in Jordan from the Players Point of View

Mahmoud Aied Hatamleh^{1*}, Zeyad Hussin Al- Zoubi², Basheer Ahmad Alawan³, Ahmad Abed Alwahab Akour⁴, Faleh Sultan Abu Eid⁵

Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view. The study population consisted of all volleyball players for professional clubs in Jordan, numbering (252) male and female players, and a random stratified sample of it consisted of (214) male and female players, by 85%, and the study relied on the correlational descriptive approach. To achieve the objective of the study. A questionnaire was used to collect data after confirming its validity and stability: it measures the score of social intelligence. The scientific coefficients of the study instrument were calculated by extracting arithmetic averages, standard deviations, and t-test. One Way Analysis, Four Way ANOVA, and MANOVA. The most important results of the study were that the total degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the point of view of the players is average, and the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences with regard to the degree of social intelligence attributed to the variables (gender, scientific qualification, and practical experience), and the existence of statistically significant differences due to the player's status and in favor of the players of the national teams. The researchers recommend supporting and developing social intelligence through courses, training programs, activities, and seminars, in addition to benefiting from the social intelligence scale to detect social intelligence among coaches of various sports.

Keywords: Social Intelligence, Volleyball, Players.

Introduction

Human intelligence occupied a large part of the attention of researchers in the educational, human and biological sciences, and the methods of scientists varied in determining the characteristics of intelligence, but they faced a basic problem, which is to determine the nature of this intelligence, is it a single mental ability or it is a set of independent abilities, so the outlook remained specific for a long period of time in terms of mental, verbal and mathematical abilities and neglected the abilities of creativity and spatial, personal, natural and social abilities. Many theories emerged in response to the narrow view of intelligence confirming that human intelligence includes multiple mental abilities independent of each other, which can be called multiple intelligences, including social intelligence. Some may have a distinct mental intelligence that may be described as genius, but it lacks social intelligence, so don't be surprised when some of them fail in their working lives.

¹Department of Coaching and Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. P. O box 330127/zarqa 13133. ORCIDID: 0000-0002-3648-9157, Email: mahoud_1969@yahoo.com

²Deanship of Student Affairs, German Jordanian University, Amman, Jordan.

³Faculty of Educational Sciences, Al-Balqa' Applied University, Amman, Jordan.

⁴Department of Coaching and Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. P. O box 330127/zarqa 13133

⁵Department of Coaching and Sport Management, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. P. O box 330127/zarqa 13133

Where the personality of the individual is integrated in his physical, mental, emotional and social abilities, and without the social characteristic cannot grow as a living social person has the ability to adapt to the environment and understand individuals and their attitudes, thoughts, feelings, temperaments and motives, and proper behavior in different social situations and this understanding depends on the social intelligence of the individual, as it plays an important role in the life of the individual on the basis of which he builds his hopes and future. (Kiosk,2020).

The beginning of interest in social intelligence appeared at the hands of Thorndike in 1920 when he pointed to the existence of a manifestation of personality, characterized by what is known from the forms of practical intelligence, or abstract intelligence, called social intelligence, and then scientists were interested in studying the capabilities of this type of intelligence, and the components on which it is based, and the measures that can be relied upon in measuring it (Al-Zoabi, 2011).

Social intelligence is the ability of the individual to get rid of embarrassing life situations and is the ability of the person to convince those around him and adapt to them and is to plan to reach the individual's self-goals, and social intelligence may come out to multiple meanings, it is sometimes said that this person is a diplomat or the owner of etiquette, that is, he tries not to collide with people and does not confront them with what they hate, and social intelligence is considered as any means of life that can be used positively and can be exploited in a negative way (Ghobari and Abu Shaira, 2010).

As a result of the multiplicity of trends interested in the subject of social intelligence, there are many definitions according to the areas of interest of researchers in the subject, where Al-Mutairi (2000) defined it as the ability of the individual to act with others with courtesy and tact. El-Desouky (2003) also believes that social intelligence is the ability of the individual regarding his relationship with others and the ability to understand their feelings and internal feelings or their emotional and mental state and good dealings with them and his ability to influence them and be affected by them,

Goleman (2006) hypothesized that social intelligence is a combination of cognitive and emotional components that work together simultaneously. While Albrecht (2006) defined it as the ability of an individual to deal well with others, Buzan (2007) found that social intelligence is the ability of an individual to coexist with others and relate to them.

Juchniewicz (2008) reviewed several definitions of social intelligence and found that the overall definitions focus on the following aspects: the individual's ability to harmonize with others, his deep knowledge of the social environment around him, and the use of his social knowledge to solve his problems, in addition to the individual's ability to use his feelings, thoughts, behavior, and understanding of himself and others in order to solve various problems facing him.

Despite the multiplicity of definitions that dealt with social intelligence, they focus in their entirety on the ability of the individual to understand human and social relations and the ability to adapt and communicate with the surrounding society.

Gardner noted that the basis of intelligence in human relations is the ability to respond appropriately to the psychological state, tendencies, moods, and desires of others, and that the key to self-knowledge in the intelligence of personal relationships is to recognize private feelings and the ability to distinguish between them and rely on them in directing behavior (Al-Harbi, 20 Abu Halawa (2005) believes that social intelligence combines personal emotions and emotions in their social context, it is the mental ability that works during the interaction between the mental and social side of the personality, and includes the ability to perceive, evaluate and express emotions, and includes the ability to understand emotions and social knowledge, and the ability

to generate and access feelings and understand others and how to deal with them, and also includes the ability to regulate emotions in a way that promotes social and mental development, the individual is socially intelligent, emotional or emotional. 14). He is considered an individual better than others in recognizing his emotions and the emotions of others and has a great ability to express his emotions accurately to prevent misunderstanding of others and misunderstanding of others. In view of the many effects of social intelligence in building social relations between individuals, so its importance appears in the sports field, especially for the sports coach, where the sports coach is one of the main and important pillars in the training process and is chosen as a coach for the team on many factors, the most important of which is his ability to reach the players at the best level, because the coach spends with his players long periods through which he can affect them and their feelings and make them melt into one crucible In order to motivate them and increase their interaction in order to support the team and improve the performance, and in return the coach can extract the potential and multiple talents of the players to benefit from them in the interest of the team as a whole. (Smart, 2002)

While the concept of intelligence has been limited to many researchers for a relatively long time to the concept of cognitive intelligence, it has become necessary to focus on other forms of intelligence, including social intelligence because of its important role in human life, which is reflected in its relations with the surrounding society.

Our contemporary society faces many problems in various political, economic, and social aspects, which lead to individuals living under various pressures, which led to the difficulty of adapting to different life circumstances. Which may result in weakness in social intelligence and lack of knowledge of ways and methods of developing social intelligence among individuals, knowing the level of social intelligence has the greatest impact in determining the needs and trends of individuals, both positive and negative, social intelligence is represented in good behavior in social situations and the ability to establish distinguished social relations with others, and for the lack of research and investigation of this topic as far as researchers know, and the importance of social relations for individuals, especially volleyball coaches under study And the possibility of harnessing the human mind to visualize and optimize the growth of social relations, and to know the ability of coaches to exploit their intelligence to communicate with other players, administrators and club presidents, the researchers decided to study this topic on its dimensions and knowledge of what volleyball coaches in Jordan have of the level of social intelligence.

The study aimed to find out the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view, by answering the following questions:

1. What is the degree of social intelligence of volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view?
2. Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the arithmetic averages of the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view due to variables (gender, educational qualification, player status, years of playing experience)?

The importance of this study lies in the importance of the variables it dealt with and the extent of their impact on the lives of coaches, who constitute an important segment of the sports community, and the importance of the study can be summarized in the following points:

1. Increasing the awareness of sports coaches with the level of social intelligence and self-efficacy they possess, which pushes them to strive for development and reach the highest levels of self-fulfillment and personal satisfaction.
2. Benefiting the administrations of sports clubs from the results of this study by identifying the degree

of social intelligence of their coaches, knowing the strengths and weaknesses, focusing on the strengths, and addressing the weaknesses.

3. Considering the results of this study, training programs can be designed for sports coaches that provide them with the concepts and applications of social intelligence.
4. This study may arouse the interest of researchers to conduct studies on social intelligence and its relationship to variables not addressed in this study as well as samples other than the study sample.

Study limits and limitations

The limits of the study were as follows:

- Objective limit: The study focused on investigating the level of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view.
- Time limit: The study tool was applied during the year 2022/2023.
- Human limit: represented by the players of professional volleyball clubs in Jordan.

The determinants of the results of the study were the degree of honesty of the tool used, their stability, the objectivity of the study sample filling out the tool, and the degree of representation of the study sample to its community.

Method and Procedures

Study Methodology

The study relied on the correlational descriptive (survey) approach based on collecting the required data from a representative sample of the study population, as the most appropriate approach for the purposes of the study.

Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all players of professional volleyball clubs in Jordan, where the total study population reached (252) male and female players, including (144) male and female players, and (108) female players, who were monitored through the general statistics of the Jordan Volleyball Federation. A representative sample of the study population was selected according to the stratified random method, where the study sample reached (214) male and female players, with a percentage of (85%), including (118) players and (96) female players.

Table 1: Distribution of Study Population Members and Sample.

Players of professional volleyball clubs	Study population		Study sample		Percentage of sample of the population
	Male	Female	Male	female	
	144	108	118	96	85%
	252		214		

Description of the characteristics of the study sample

1- Distribution of the study sample according to its variables.

The frequencies and percentages of the distribution of the study sample members were calculated according to their variables as shown in Table (2).

Table 2: Distribution of Study Sample Members According to its Variables.

Sex variable	No.	Percentage
Male	118	55%
Female	96	44%
Sum	214	100%
Qualification	No	
Bachelor	168	78%
Master or PhD	46	21%
Total	214	100%
Work Experience	No	
Less than 5 years	74	34%
5-10 years	85	39%
More than 10 years	55	25%
Total	214	100%
Player Attribute	No	
Club Player	178	83%
National Player	36	16%
Total	214	100%

It is clear from Table (2) that most of the members of the study sample are males, as their number reached (118) players, by (55.14%) of the total sample, while the number of females reached (96) players, with a percentage of (44.86%) of the total sample. Also, most of the members of the study sample are holders of academic qualification (bachelor's), where their number reached (168) with a percentage of (78.5%), while the number of the sample of master's or doctorate reached (46) individuals, with a percentage of (21.5%).

The most members of the study sample were those with experience (5-10 years) and their number reached (85) with a percentage of (39.7%), followed by those with experience (less than 5 years) and their number was (74) with a percentage of (34.6%), then those with experience more than 10 years and their number reached (55) with a percentage of (25.7%).

Study Tool: To achieve the objective of the study, the researchers developed and prepared a questionnaire: to measure the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan, and it consisted of (17)) items distributed over two areas: interaction with others, and influence on others.

Procedures for correcting and interpreting the study tool: The degree of social intelligence was determined according to five levels by evaluating the arithmetic average of each paragraph as follows:

The upper limit for the alternatives of the study tool (5) degrees and the minimum for the alternatives of the study tool (1) degrees, and by subtracting the upper limit of the minimum is equal to (4) degrees, and then dividing the difference by (5) The length of the category was (0.80) and therefore the averages for estimating the responses of the study sample members on the tool were as follows:

1. (1.80) represents a very low-grade score.
2. (1.81 – 2.60) represents a low-grade score.
3. (2.61 – 3.40) represents an average grade.
4. (3.41 – 4.20) represents a high-grade score.
5. (4.21-5) represents a very high-grade score.

The validity of the study tool: To verify the validity of the tool, the method of virtual honesty, and the method of internal consistency sincerity, were adopted as follows:

1- Apparent honesty: (Arbitrators' Sincerity)

The apparent truthfulness was verified by presenting the two tools in their initial form, as in Annex (1), to a committee of arbitrators numbering (20) arbitrators, with experience and competence in the field of education, physical education, and educational administration from Jordanian university professors. Where their suggestions and necessary amendments were taken on the paragraphs of the fields of study, and because of this procedure (17) items were reached to measure social intelligence.

2- Indications of the sincerity of internal consistency:

To ensure the validity of the study tool, the researchers applied the tool to an exploratory sample consisting of (20) members of the study sample, and the correlation coefficient was calculated between each paragraph of the areas of social intelligence and the total degree of the field, and Table (3) shows the results of that.

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients Indicate the Sincerity of Internal Consistency Between Each Paragraph of the Areas of Social Intelligence and the Total Degree of the Field.

Interact with others		Influence others	
Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient	Paragraph Number	Correlation Coefficient
1	0.55**	1	0.60**
2	0.60**	2	0.70**
3	0.58**	3	0.55**
4	0.65**	4	0.51**
5	0.70**	5	0.67**
6	0.66	6	0.54**
7	0.59**	7	0.59**
8	0.76**		
9	0.50**		
10	0.56**		

* = Significance at (0.01)

It is clear from Table (3) that the coefficients of consistency of the paragraphs of the field of interaction with others ranged between (0.50-0.76) and all of them are statistically significant at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$), and all the coefficients of consistency of paragraphs of the field of influence in others were all statistically significant at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$) and the consistency values ranged between (0.50-0.70), where these values indicate a degree of honesty for the study tool and its measurement of the trait prepared to measure it.

The researchers also calculated the validity of the internal consistency of the domains of social intelligence and their correlation with the tool according to the Pearson correlation coefficient, and Table (5) shows the results of this.

Table 4: Correlation Coefficients "Internal Consistency" Between Each Domain of Social Intelligence and the Overall Score of the Instrument.

Domain	Correlation Coefficient Internal Consistency
Dealing with others	0.777 **
Influencing others	0.793**

* = Significance at (0.01)

Table (4) shows that all areas of social intelligence were statistically significant at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.01$), where the values of the consistency coefficients ranged between (0.77 - 0.79), and this indicates

the validity of the fields of the tool and its measurement of the trait that was developed to measure.

Stability of the Study Instrument

To verify the stability of the study tool, the researchers applied the study tool to a sample of (30) members of the study population. The use of Cronbach's alpha stability coefficient for the study instrument is illustrated by Table 5.

Table 5: Stability Coefficients for Each Area of Social Intelligence, Combined Domains, and Level of Social Responsibility.

Domain	Correlation Coefficient
Dealing with others	0.78
Influencing others	0.80
all	0.81

Table (5) shows that the stability coefficient for the fields of social intelligence ranged between (0.78-0.80) and the total stability coefficient was (0.81).

Study Variables: The Study Includes the Following Variables

Dependent Variables: they Are as Follows

1- The degree of social intelligence.

Independent Variables: They are as Follows

- Social awareness: It has two categories (males) (females)
- Academic qualification: It has two levels (bachelor's or below) (bachelor's or master's) - Work experience: It has three levels (less than 5 years) (5-10 years) (more than 10 years)
- Player status: It has two levels (national team, club player).

Statistical Processing

To reach the results of the study, the researchers adopted the following statistical methods: (Pearson correlation coefficient, Cronbach alpha coefficient, frequencies, arithmetic averages, and standard deviations. One Way Anova analysis, t-test, quadruple variance analysis (Four Way ANOVA), multiple variance analysis (MANOVA)

Results of the Study

First: The results related to the first question: What is the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view?

To answer this question, the arithmetic averages, standard deviations, and percentages were calculated in descending order for each area of social intelligence according to the responses of the study sample of professional volleyball club players in Jordan, and Table (6) shows the results of this.

Table 6: Arithmetic Averages in Descending Order and Standard Deviations for the Two Domains of Social Intelligence Among Volleyball Coaches in Jordan from the Players' Point of View.

Ranking	Number	Domain	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Score
2	1	Dealing with others	3.30	0.60	Medium
1	2	Influencing others	3.23	0.66	Medum
		all	3.25	0.60	Medum

It is clear from Table (6) that the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the point of view of the players came with an average degree, as the arithmetic mean of their responses was (3.25) and a standard deviation of (0.60), as the field of interaction with others won the highest arithmetic average (3.30), and a standard deviation (0.60) and an average degree, while the area of influence on others came with an arithmetic mean (3.23) and a standard deviation (0.66) in the last place, and an average degree of approval.

First Domain: Interaction with Others: The arithmetic averages and standard deviations of all domain statements were calculated, as shown in Table (7):

Table 7: Arithmetic Averages in Descending Order, Standard Deviations, and Degree of Agreement for Domain Statements of Interaction with Others.

Rank	Phrase Number	Statement	Arithmetic Deviation Mean		Normative approval score
1	1	The trainer is keen to advise others.	3.68	1.03	high
2	10	The trainer establishes interactive social relationships with others.	3.36	1.02	Medium
3	7	The coach takes the initiative to provide a helping hand to others.	3.27	1.02	Medium
4	8	The trainer could make judgments that suit different situations.	3.23	1.00	Medium
5	6	The trainer is keen to participate in social events for employees.	3.24	1.00	Medium
6	9	To those working with him to work with The coach cares about meeting the needs of others.	3.23	1.01	Medium
7	2	The coach listens to the opinions of others.	3.20	1.05	Medium
8	3	The coach speaks positively to others.	2.61	1.08	Medium
9	4	The coach could understand the feelings of others	3.14	1.01	Medium
		Overall average of the domain	3.23	0.66	Medium

It is clear from Table (7) that the arithmetic means of the phrases of the field of interaction with others from the point of view of the players amounted to (3.23) and a standard deviation (0.66), and the degree of approval average, and the arithmetic averages of the field phrases ranged between (2.61-3.68). The coach is keen to provide advice to others, in the first place among the members of the study sample with an arithmetic average of (3.68) and a standard deviation (1.03), and a high degree of approval, as the phrase (10): "The trainer establishes interactive social relationships with others" in second place "The coach has the ability to understand the feelings of others", in the penultimate place with an arithmetic average of (3.14) and a standard deviation (1.01) and an average degree of approval, and the statement (5): "The coach seeks to harmonize with others", came in last place with an arithmetic average of (2.61) and a standard deviation

(1.04) and an average degree of approval.

Second Domain: Influence on Others

Table 8: The Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of All Domain Statements

Rank	Phrase Number	Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Deviation	Normative approval score
1	1	The trainer is keen to advise others.	3.68	1.03	Medium
2	10	The trainer establishes interactive social relationships with others.	3.36	1.02	Medium
3	7	The coach takes the initiative to provide a helping hand to others.	3.27	1.02	Medium
4	8	The trainer could make judgments that suit different situations.	3.23	1.00	Medium
5	6	The trainer is keen to participate in social events for employees.	3.24	1.00	Medium
6	9	To those working with him to work with The coach cares about meeting the needs of others.	3.23	1.01	Medium
		Overall average of the domain	3.30	0.60	Medium

It is clear from Table (8) that the arithmetic means of the expressions of the field of influence on others as a whole from the point of view of the players was (3.30) with a standard deviation of (0.60), and with an average degree of approval, and the arithmetic averages of the field statements ranged between (2.60-3.60). The statement (1): "The trainer has the ability to inspire others", ranked first among the members of the study sample with an arithmetic average of (3.60) and a standard deviation of (0.95), and an average degree of approval, as came paragraphs (4):

The phrase (3): "The trainer can influence the behavior of others" ranked second among the members of the study sample with an arithmetic average of (3.42) for them, and a standard deviation of (0.93, 0.96) respectively, and an average degree of approval for both, as the phrase (5): "The trainer has the ability to influence the attitudes of others", in the penultimate place with an arithmetic average of (3.33) and a standard deviation (1.00) and an average degree of approval, while the phrase came: (7): The trainer contributes to supporting the professional growth of his employees", in last place

This result, according to the researchers' point of view, may be due to the fact that a large percentage of volleyball coaches in Jordan are from the younger generation whose habits and behaviors differ from the adult coaches who have more family and social relations with society as they are married and socially responsible, and have more social experience and life experiences, and in the same context, the results of the study of (Jeloudar & Yunus. 2011) That the level of social intelligence increases with the age of individuals, and that the level of social intelligence among teachers came to a moderate degree, a result consistent with the result of the current study. This interpretation is also consistent with the findings of the study of Yahyaazadeh & Coodarzi (2012), whose results showed that the level of social intelligence among teachers is affected by the age variable, as this study found that teachers of older age groups are characterized by extroversion and openness to experience.

The results of this study also differed with ability (2007), Aminpoor, (2013) and Asqul (2009) in which the level of social intelligence was low.

The results related to the second question: Is there a statistically significant difference at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the arithmetic averages of the social intelligence score of volleyball coaches in Jordan and the players' point of view attributed to variables (gender, educational qualification, player status, and years of playing experience)?

Table 9: Arithmetic Averages and Standard Deviations of the Degree of Social Intelligence Among Volleyball Coaches in Jordan from the Point of View of the Players According to the Variables of the Study (Gender, Educational Qualification, Player Character, and Years of Experience in Playing).

Variable	Level	Number	Averages	Deviations
sex	Male	118	3.29	0.60
	Female	96	3.25	0.61
Qualification	Bachelor's degree and less	168	3.45	0.61
	Graduate	46	3.21	0.61
Player Capacity	Club Player	178	3.25	0.52
	National Player	36	3.36	0.25
Years of gaming experience	less than 5 years	74	3.32	0.60
	5-10 years	85	3.25	0.61
	More than 10 years	55	3.34	0.52
all		214	3.25	0.60

It is noted from Table (9) that there are apparent differences between the arithmetic averages of the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the point of view of the players according to the study variables (gender, educational qualification, player quality and years of experience in playing), and to verify the significance of the apparent differences, a quadruple variance analysis was performed for their responses, as in Table (10):

Table 10: Quadruple Variance Results of (Four Way ANOVA) Analysis of the Degree of Social Intelligence Among Volleyball Coaches in Jordan

Contrast source	Sum of squares	degrees of freedom	Mean of squares	Value of P level	significance
Sex	0.22	1	0.22	0.60	0.44
Qualification	0.25	1	0.25	0.69	0.41
Player Attribute	1.08	1	1.08	3.03	0.08
Years of experience in playing toys	1.44	2	0.72	2.01	0.14
Error	94.26	264	0.36		
Total	97.72	269			

The results of Table (10) indicate that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the arithmetic averages of the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the point of view of the players as a whole according to all study variables (gender, educational qualification, player character, and years of playing experience), based on the calculated P values, and with a significance level greater than (0.05) for all of them.

To find out whether there are differences or not in the scale domains regarding the study variables (gender, educational qualification, player status, and years of experience in playing), the arithmetic averages and standard deviations were calculated according to those variables, as shown in Table (11):

Table 11: Arithmetic Averages of the Degree of Social Intelligence of Volleyball Coaches in Jordan According to Study Variables (Gender, Educational Qualification, Player Character, and Years of Experience in Playing).

Variable	level	Statistical	Interaction with others	Influence on others
sex	female	Number	118	118
		Arithmetic mean	3.27	3.32
		Standard deviation	0.64	0.62
	male	Number	96	96
		Arithmetic mean	3.18	3.27
		Standard deviation	0.68	0.57
Qualification	Bachelor and less	Number	168	168
		Arithmetic mean	3.20	3.29
		Standard deviation	0.67	0.61
	Graduate	Number	46	46
		Arithmetic mean	3.29	3.33
		Standard deviation	0.65	0.57
Player status	national team player	Number	36	36
		Arithmetic mean	3.28	3.39
		Standard deviation	0.64	0.54
	Club Player	Number	178	178
		Arithmetic mean	3.18	3.21
		Standard deviation	0.69	0.63
Years of experience	less than 5 years	Number	74	74
		Arithmetic mean	3.12	3.21
		Standard deviation	0.68	0.51
	5-10 years	Number	85	85
		Arithmetic mean	3.19	3.21
		Standard deviation	0.69	0.64
	More than 10 years	Number	55	55
		Arithmetic mean	3.30	3.40
		Standard deviation	0.63	0.59
No	210	214	214	

It is noted from Table (11) that there are apparent differences between the arithmetic averages of the two fields of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan according to the variables of the study and to verify the significance of the apparent differences, a multiple variance analysis (MANOVA) was performed for their responses, as in Table (12):

Table (12): Results of Multiple Variance Analysis (MANOVA) for the two domains of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan according to the study variables (gender, educational qualification, player character, and years of playing experience).

The researchers attribute this result, which was shown by the results, that there are no statistically significant differences in the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the point of view of the players, according to gender variables, educational qualification, and years of experience, to that there is a similarity in judging the degree of social intelligence in males and females, and this result can be attributed to the vision, mission, and core values of sports coaches, especially volleyball coaches, seek to prepare efficient and skilled coaches, qualified and have the capabilities and Efficient competitive quality, This result is consistent with the study of each of Al-Freihat, (2017), Khalidi (2007), and Abed (2015), while it differed with the results of the study of Al-Zaq (2009), Al-Mikhlaifi (2010) and Alwan (2012).

With regard to the variable of the player's characteristic, it was found that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the field of interaction with others, based on the calculated P value and the level of significance of (0.23), while it was found that there were statistically

significant differences at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the field of influence on others, based on the calculated P values of (5.66), and the level of significance of (0.02) and in favor of the national team players.

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the national team players have social experiences, social intelligence, and greater ability to interact with their peers from other players and have a greater ability to influence them and thus they can judge in a better way than club players on coaches as well as for dealing with a larger number of coaches.

Conclusions

1. The degree of social intelligence of volleyball coaches in Jordan came from the point of view of the players to an average degree.
2. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of social intelligence of volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view due to the gender variable, academic qualification, years of play and the player's capacity in the field of interaction with others.
3. The results of the study showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree of social intelligence among volleyball coaches in Jordan from the players' point of view attributed to the gender variable.

Recommendations

1. Designing training programs and courses that support social intelligence among volleyball coaches to acquire the abilities to deal with administrators and players and a good understanding of their behaviors, tendencies, and interests, and to guide and guide them.
4. Benefiting from the social intelligence scale, and this is by applying it to coaches of various sports, which leads to the detection of trainers with low social intelligence to take appropriate measures and work to raise the degree of social intelligence they have.
- 5- Conducting many studies and research using the social intelligence scale of the sports coach extracted from this study and applying it to a large segment of coaches in all sports activities and of both sexes in all governorates of the Kingdom.
6. The use of the social intelligence scale of the sports coach (the number of researchers) within the criteria for selecting coaches of sports teams in various sports clubs.

References

- Abu Halawa, Mohammed Al Said, (2005) The Status of Social Intelligence within the Framework of the Human Personality System, Faculty of Education, Alexandria University, Egypt.
- Al-Mikhlafi, Abdul Hakim. (2010), Academic self-efficacy and its relationship to some personality traits among students, A field study on a sample of Sana'a University students, Damascus University Journal, 26(1):481-514.
- Al-Mutairi, Khaled. (2000). Social intelligence among outstanding people. Exploratory comparative study between mentally and non-outstanding students at the secondary stage in Al-Kuwaib schools.
- Albrecht, K. (2006), Social intelligence: The new science of success, John Wiley & Sons, us
- Al-Harbi, Badr bin Faihan, (2014), Social intelligence and its relationship to psychological security among students of Qassim University, Master Thesis, um Al-Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.

- Alwan, Sally, (2012). Self-efficacy among students at the University of Baghdad. *Journal of Psychological Research, University of Baghdad*. 33(1):224-248
- El-Desouky, Mohamed Ghazi, (2003). Social Intelligence, Identification and Measurement, *Journal of the World of Education in Cairo*, 3(9), 207-218.
- Ghobari, Thaer Ahmed and Abu Shaira, Khaled Mohammed, (2010), *Mental Abilities between Intelligence and Creativity*, 1st Edition, Arab Society Library for Publishing and Distribution, Amman.
- Goleman ,D. (2006), *Social Intelligence*, Bantam Dell, New York.
- Jeloudar, S., & Yunus, A., (2011). Exploring the Relationship between Teachers Socials Intelligence and Classroom Discipline Strategies, *International journal of psychological studies*, 3(2):149-155
- Juchniewicz, J. (2008), *The Influence of Social Intelligence on Effective Music Teaching*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, USA.
- Khalidi, Abdullah. (2007). Self-efficacy among secondary school students in the city of Nazareth in logic considering variables. Unpublished master's thesis. Yarmouk University. Irbid
- Kiosk, Dina, (2020). The level of social intelligence of the sports coach considering some demographic variables. *Scientific Journal of Physical Education and Sports, Alexandria University* (14):195-214
- Zaq, Ahmed, (2009). Perceived academic self-efficacy among students at the University of Jordan considering the variable of gender, college, and academic level, *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, Bahrain*. 10(2): 38-58