



THE EFFECT OF SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS AND LEVEL OF PARTICIPATIONS ON THE MEASURE OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF SPORTS PERSONS

¹Dr. Shamsheer Singh ²Rakesh Kumar

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education, Himachal Pradesh University

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education, Himachal Pradesh University

Abstract: Social intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing tensions, stresses and various complexities. This study examines the difference between high, middle and low socio economic status inter college and inter university sportspersons on the measure of social intelligence. The sample for the study consist of 300 sportspersons (n=150 inter college and n=150 inter university). To study the Socio economic status of subjects the investigator used Socio economic status Scale developed by R.L.Bhardwaj and sample subjects social intelligence, Investigator used Social intelligence Scale developed by Dr. N.K. Chadha, and Usha Ganesan. The data were collected randomly from different colleges of Himachal Pradesh University. To Analyze the data various statistical treatment like average, T-Score, and ANOVA were used. After interpretation of data it has been found that there are significant difference in the social intelligence of high, middle and low socio economic status sportspersons participated at different level.

Keyword: Social Intelligence, Socio Economic Status,

INTRODUCTION

Social Intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing tensions stresses and various complexities. Thorndike defines, “social intelligence as the ability to understand others and act wisely in human relations. It is the human capacity to understand what is happening in the world and responding to that understanding in a personally and socially effective manner”. Social intelligence is the capacity to create positive relationships with others and monitor one’s own, and others feeling and emotions and help in determining school success. It is the person’s ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions (Thorndike, 1920). Kihlstrom and Cantor (1989)

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education, Himachal Pradesh University

² Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education, Himachal Pradesh University

have defined social intelligence as individual's knowledge about social world. Social intelligence includes the ability to initiate, develop and maintain congruent mutually ratifying whole range of inter-personal relationship. There are many factors affecting intelligence level as external and internal factors. The socio-economic status is also one of the important factors affecting social Intelligence. Socio economic status includes both the social and economic status of an individual in the group and society. Socio economic factors play a vital role in an individual's performance in sports. Socio economic status refers to the position that an individual and family with reference to prevailing average standards, cultural possession and participation in group activity of community **Chaudhari, et al.(1998)**. Albert Bandura, give its clear picture by stating that the socioeconomic status involves the characteristics features of both an individual (education, income, and wealth and employment status) and neighborhood (poverty rate, unemployment rate and percentage of families receiving public assistance). The socio economic status make-up of an individual play an important role in their achievements in every life. Socio economic status depends on a combination of variables, including occupation, education, income, wealth and place of residence. Sociologists often use socio economic status as a means of predicting behavior (**Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil, 2002**). **Rani, M. et al., 2019** conclude the study that statistically significant difference with sense of humour on the basis of family type and annual income and non-significant difference existed all the aspects of social intelligence adolescents as per number of siblings and castes. **Gnanadevan (2011)** conducted study on social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socio-economic status. The social intelligence scores of the students differed significantly with respect to caste, mother's education and parent's income but did not differ significantly with respect to gender, father's education, mother's occupation or father's occupation were not significant. **Saxena, S., & Jain, R.K. (2013)**. The study considered the importance of Social Intelligence as a life skill, especially in the present scenario of extreme stress and tension. According to the study's findings, students in the Arts stream showed better Social Intelligence than students in other streams, and female students demonstrated this trait more than male student did. **Sowmyashree, K.N. (2019)**. The authors studied the importance and influence of Social Intelligence as life skill. It can be trained, learned, and improved to handle private life and social connections and achieve victory. According to the study's findings, both government secondary school teachers and private secondary school instructors possessed Social Intelligence, through the latter had acquired it through life skill training. The researchers also observed that these teachers showed higher leadership qualities after taking life skills training sessions. **Chat, S.A. & Kashyap, S. (2015)**. the preset study was aimed to compare social intelligence of male sportspersons and non sportspersons. The result reveal that social intelligence of sportspersons is significantly superior as compare to no- sportspersons at .01 level of significance. It was concluded that participation in competitive sports is beneficial as far as development of social intelligence in collegiate students are concerned. **Mahaboobvali, K., Vardhini, S.V. (2016)**. The present study intended to find out the social intelligence of school teachers. Conclusion of study the teacher occupies an important place in the society. He is the most vital component in the school system, he who shapes and moulds the personality of the children in a desirable manner. **Rayat, S. (2016)**. The present study was undertaken to assess and compare the social intelligence among boxers,

weightlifters and wrestlers. The study revealed that boxers, weightlifters and wrestlers differ in perception of social intelligence. Boxers are more socially intelligent than weightlifters and wrestlers. The boxers possessed higher level of patience, cooperativeness, confidence and sensitivity level than weightlifters and wrestlers. Weightlifters possessed higher level of memory than boxers and wrestlers.

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

1. To identify the difference between high, middle and Low socio economic status inter college and inter university sportspersons on the measure of social intelligence.
2. To identify the difference between Inter College and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Social Intelligence.

HYPOTHESIS

1. The sportspersons belonging to high socio economic status will be better in social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts.
2. The sportspersons participated at inter university level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their inter college sportspersons counterparts.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study investigator had selected the 'Survey Method'. For the purpose of data collection investigator follow the intensive and scientific approach to analysis of the objectives of the study controlled observation towards the solution of problems on empirical evidence. The Sample for the present study were 300 sportspersons, n=150 inter college and n=150 inter university level sportspersons has been selected into three categories high, middle and low based on socio economic status from colleges of affiliated to Himachal Pradesh University. To collect the requisite data for the present study, the investigator had used Socio economic status scale Developed by R.L. Bhardwaj (2014), to delineate socio economic status and social intelligence scale Developed by N.K.Chadha and UshaGanesan(2015), was used for assessing social intelligence. Scoring was done as per the manual and entered into a spread sheet for further statistical analysis.

Analysis and interpretation of the results

Table 1

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Patience)of sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	154459	300	-	-	-
SES	496.804	2	248.402	1.393	N.S.
LP	91.730	1	91.730	.514	N.S.
SES×LP	153.816	2	76.908	.431	N.S.
Error	52437.873	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table1 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of social intelligence (Patience) found $F(2,294)=1.393, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 19.81, Middle 18.06, Low SES as 16.16, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Patience as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 1 which state that “The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts” got rejected.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.514, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Patience was 17.41 and Inter university sportspersons as 18.62. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Patience, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between SES×LP was also found $F(2,294)=.650$, $p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It show that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Patience.

Table 2

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Cooperativeness)of sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	223834	300	-	-	-
SES	746.182	2	373	32.684	<.01
LP	.260	1	.260	.023	N.S.
SES×LP	47.632	2	23.816	2.086	N.S.
error	3356.028	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 2 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Co cooperativeness) found $F(2,294)=32.684$, $p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 29.11, Middle 26.18, Low SES as 25.19, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Co cooperativeness as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 1 which state that "The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts" got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.023$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Co cooperativeness was 26.80 and Inter university sportspersons as 26.86. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Co cooperativeness, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which*

state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts ” got rejected.

The two way Interaction between SES×LP was also found $F(2,294)=2.086$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. It show that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Co cooperativeness.

Table 3

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Confidence Level)of Sportspersons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	114277	300	-	-	-
SES	460.939	2	230.469	30.537	<.01
LP	4.293	1	4.293	.569	N.S.
SES×LP	21.709	2	10.855	1.438	N.S.
error	2218.918	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 3 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Confidence Level) found $F(2,294)=30.537$, $p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 20.92, Middle 18.34, Low SES as 18.33, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Confidence level as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 1 which state that “ The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts ” got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.569$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Confidence level was 51 and Inter university sportspersons as 52.33. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Confidence level, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=1.438$, $p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Confidence level.

Table 4

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Sensitivity) of sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	125633	300	-	-	-
SES	834.042	2	417.021	41.458	<.01
LP	12.921	1	12.921	1.285	N.S.
SES×LP	12.694	2	6.347	.631	N.S.
Error	2957.315	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 4 it is clear that themain effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Sensitivity) on the measure of Social intelligence (Sensitivity) found $F(2,294)=41.458$, $<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately theaverage score of High SES was 22.12, Middle 19.63,Low SES as 17.48, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Sensitivity as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 1 which state that “*

The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts” got accepted.

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=1.285$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Sensitivity was 19.52 and Inter university sportspersons as 19.97. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Sensitivity, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.631$, $p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Sensitivity.

Table 5

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Recognition of Social Environment) of sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	801	300	-	-	-
SES	6.208	2	3.104	7.121	<.01
LP	.453	1	.453	1.039	N.S.
SES×LP	.021	2	.010	.024	N.S.
error	128.154	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 5 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Recognition of Social Environment) found $F(2,294)=7.121$, $p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 1.67, Middle 1.41, Low SES as 1.30, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of

Recognition of Social Environment as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No.1 which state that “ The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts ” got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=1.039$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Recognition of Social Environment was 1.42 and Inter university sportspersons as 1.50. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Recognition of Social Environment, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts ” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.024$, $p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It show that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Recognition of social Environment.

Table 6

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Tactfulness) of sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	9127	300	-	-	-
SES	62.918	2	31.459	29.024	<.01
LP	2.466	1	2.466	2.275	N.S.
SES×LP	2.267	2	1.133	1.046	N.S.
Error	318.670	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 6 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Tactfulness) found $F(2,294)=29.024, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 5.85, Middle 5.36, Low SES as 4.52, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Tactfulness as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No.1 which state that “ The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts ” got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=2.275, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Tactfulness was 5.15 and Inter university sportspersons as 5.34. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Tactfulness, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts ” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=1.046, p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Tactfulness.

Table 7

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Sense of Humour)of Sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	10119	300	-	-	-
SES	143.824	2	71.912	31.737	<.01
LP	10.435	1	10.435	4.605	<.05
SES×LP	4.495	2	2.248	.992	N.S.
error	666.166	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 7 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Sense of Humour) found $F(2,294)=31.737, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 6.24, Middle 5.54, Low SES as 4.23, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Sense of Humour as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No.1 which state that "The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts" got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=4.605, p<.05$ as statistically significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Sense of Humour was 5.13 and Inter university sportspersons as 5.54. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Sense of Humour, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that " The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts" got accepted.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.992, p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Sense of Humour.

Table 8

A 3×2 ANOVA Performed to see the Effect of Socio economic status and Level of Participations on the measure of Social intelligence (Memory)of Sports persons

Source	SS	df	ms	F	p
Total	24184	300	-	-	-
SES	111.852	2	55.926	21.520	<.01
LP	.193	1	.193	.074	N.S.
SES \times LP	3.753	2	1.877	.722	N.S.
Error	764.038	294			

Notation: SES= Socio economic status; LP= Level of participation.

From the table 8 it is clear that the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Memory) found $F(2,294)=21.520, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 9.59, Middle 8.48, Low SES as 8.04, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Memory as compared to their counterparts. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 1 which state that “The sportspersons belonging to high SES will be better in Social intelligence as compared to their middle and low socio economic status sportspersons counterparts” got accepted.*

The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.074, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Memory was 8.68 and Inter university sportspersons as 8.73. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported slightly High level of Memory, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. *Therefore, Hypothesis No. 2 which state that “ The sportspersons participated at Inter University level will be better in social intelligence as compared to their Inter college sportspersons counterparts” got rejected.*

The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.722, p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Memory.

Finding and discussion

The result shown in the table 1, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Patience) found $F(2,294)=1.393, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 19.81, Middle 18.06, Low SES as 16.16, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Patience as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are able to calm endurance under stressful situation, contributing to a greater sense of well-being as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was found $F(1,294)=.514, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Patience was 17.41 and Inter university sportspersons as 18.62. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Patience, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university level are better in Patience as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.650, p>.05$ as statistically non-significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Patience.

The result shown in the table 2, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Co cooperativeness) found $F(2,294)=32.684, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 29.11, Middle 26.18, Low SES as 25.19, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Co cooperativeness as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are ability to interact with other in a pleasant way to be able to view matters from all angles as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.023, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Co cooperativeness was 26.80 and Inter university sportspersons as 26.86. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Co cooperativeness, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university level are better in Co cooperativeness as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=2.086, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Co cooperativeness.

The result shown in the table 3, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Confidence level) found $F(2,294)=30.537, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 20.92, Middle 18.34, Low SES as 18.33, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Confidence level as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are firm trust in oneself and ones chances as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=.569, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Confidence level was 51 and Inter university sportspersons as 52.33. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Confidence level, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university are better in Confidence level as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=1.438, p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Confidence level.

The result shown in the table 4, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Sensitivity) found $F(2,294)=41.458, <.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 22.12, Middle 19.63, Low SES as 17.48, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Sensitivity as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are to be acutely aware of and

responsive to human behavior as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=1.285$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Sensitivity was 19.52 and Inter university sportspersons as 19.97. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Sensitivity, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportsperson participated at inter university level are better in Sensitivity as compared to their inter college level sportsperson counterparts. The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.631$, $p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Sensitivity.

The result shown in the table 5, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Recognition of social Environment) found $F(2,294)=7.121$, $p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 1.67, Middle 1.41, Low SES as 1.30, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Recognition of Social Environment as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are ability to perceive the nature and atmosphere of the existing situation as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=1.039$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Recognition of Social Environment was 1.42 and Inter university sportspersons as 1.50. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Recognition of Social Environment, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university level are better in Recognition of social Environment as compared to their inter college level sportspersons. The two way Interaction between $SES \times LP$ was also found $F(2,294)=.024$, $p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Recognition of social Environment.

The result shown in the table 6, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Tactfulness) found $F(2,294)=29.024$, $p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 5.85, Middle 5.36, Low SES as 4.52, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Tactfulness as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are delicate perception of the right things to say or do as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=2.275$, $p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Tactfulness was 5.15 and Inter university sportspersons as 5.34. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level

of Tactfulness, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportsperson participated at inter university level are better in Tactfulness as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was also found $F(2,294)=1.046, p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Tactfulness.

The result shown in the table 7, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Sense of Humour) found $F(2,294)=31.737, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 6.24, Middle 5.54, Low SES as 4.23, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Sense of Humour as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are capacity to feel and cause amusement, to be able to see the lighter side of life, low anxiety as compared to middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP was found $F(1,294)=4.605, p<.05$ as statistically significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Sense of Humour was 5.13 and Inter university sportspersons as 5.54. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Sense of Humour, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university level are better in Sense of Humour as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between SES × LP was also found $F(2,294)=.992, p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Sense of Humour.

The result shown in the table 8, the main effect of SES was on the measure of Social intelligence (Memory) found $F(2,294)=21.520, p<.01$ as statistically significant. More appropriately the average score of High SES was 9.59, Middle 8.48, Low SES as 8.04, respectively. From the average score it is quite clear that the High SES sportspersons significantly reported Higher level of Memory as compared to their counterparts. It is clearly revealed that High SES sportspersons are ability to remember all relevant issues, name and faces of people as compared to their middle and low SES sportspersons. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was found $F(1,294)=.074, p>.05$ as statistically non significant. More appropriately average score of Inter college sportspersons on the measure of Memory was 8.68 and Inter university sportspersons as 8.73. From the average score, it was found that the interuniversity sportspersons although reported Higher level of Memory, yet the difference between the two groups as reported by ANOVA was statistically non significant. The sportspersons participated at inter university level are better in Memory as compared to their inter college level sportspersons counterparts. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was also found $F(2,294)=.722, p>.05$ as statistically non- significant. It shows that there

was no difference between socio economic status (High, Middle and Low) and Level of Participation, Inter college and Inter University sportspersons on the measure of Memory.

Conclusions

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons do not differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Patience) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP (level of participation) was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Co cooperativeness) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP (level of participation)was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Confidence level) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Sensitivity) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Recognition of social Environment) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Tactfulness) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Sense of Humour) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was statistically significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

It is conclude the High SES sportspersons differ significantly on the measure of Social intelligence (Memory) as compared to their counterparts. The main effect of LP(level of participation) was statistically non significant. The two way Interaction between SES×LP was statistically non- significant.

Reference

Chadha, N.K. & Ganesan, U. (2009). Manual of social Intelligence scale, Agra: National Psychological Cooperation.

Chat, S.A. & Kashyap, S. (2015). Effect of participation in sports on social intelligence of collegiate students. IRJMSH. Vol. 6(4), PP. 339

Chaudhari, V.S., Vaidy, S., Navlakha, N.G., and Mahapatra, B.C. (1998). "Effect of teaching strategies and socio economic status on self concept of the Learner". Indian Psychology Review, 50(4), pp. 216-223.

Gnanadean, R. (2011). Social Intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socio economic status. MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends & Practices. 1; 60-66.

Hirsch ED, Kett Joseph F, Trefil James. (2002). The New dictionary of Cultural Literacy Edn 3, Houghton: Mifflin Company, 7.

Kihlstrom, J.F., and Cantor, N. (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.

Mahaboobvali, K. ; Vardhini, S.V. (2016). Social intelligence of secondary school Teachers. International Journal of Informative & Futuristic Research (IJIFR), vol. 3 (9), PP.3318-3326

Rani, M. ; Sangwan, S.; Deepika and Sumit, (2019). Social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their socio economic status, The Pharma Innovation Journal ; 8(12): 37-40.

Rayat, S. (2016). A Study on Social Intelligence of Boxers, Weightlifters and Wrestlers. International Research Journal of Management Sociology & Humanity (IRJMSH), vol. 7(4), PP.158-162

Saxena, S., & Jain, R.K. (2013). Social Intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to their gender and subject stream. Journal of Research & Method in Education, 1(1), pp. 1-4. www.iosrjournals.org

Sowmyashree, K.N. (2019). Impact of life Skill Training of Social Intelligence among Private School Adolescents, Casirj Vol.10(5), ISSN 2319-9202.

Thorndike, E.L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. Harper's Magazine, 140, pp.227-235.