

25.

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR GENDER

Younes Illahi Bhat^{1*} Sheeraza Akhtar²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Continuing Education & Extension, Barkatullah University Bhopal, M.P.

²Research Scholar, Department of Persian, University of Kashmir.

Abstract: Social Intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing tensions stresses and various complexities. It can be learned, developed and used as an effective life skill for managing personal life, interpersonal relationships and achieving success in all the walks of life.

The present study was conducted to know the social intelligence of college students of district pulwama, j&k. The sample for the present study consisted of 5% from the total population of all colleges of district pulwama. The study was conducted on a sample of 410 college students which was further divided into different groups of male-female and rural-urban dichotomy. For this purpose descriptive survey method was used. The college students were in the age group of 19 - 21 years. The sample has been selected on the basis of random sampling technique. The data was collected by using Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Chadda and Ganesan (2009). The data was analyzed by using 't' test

Key words: Social Intelligence, College Students, and Gender

INTRODUCTION: It is social intelligence or the richness of our qualitative life, rather than our quantitative intelligence, that truly makes human what they are. According to Social Scientist Ross Honey Will, "Social Intelligence is an aggregated measure of self and social awareness, evolved social beliefs and attitudes and a capacity and appetite to manage complex social change." It can be described as a combination of abilities: the first is a basic understanding of people (i.e. a kind of strategic social awareness) and the second is the skills needed for interacting successfully with them, in other words, the ability to get along with others and to encourage them to cooperate with you. Social Intelligence can be thought of encompassing five dimensions: Presence, Clarity, Awareness, Authenticity and Empathy. People with high Social Intelligence are often said to have "Nourishing Behaviours" which make others around them feel valued, loved, respected and appreciated. These people are very appealing to

others and are often described as having a "Magnetic Personality." Conversely people low in Social Intelligence are often described as "Toxic" they cause others to feel angry, devalued, frustrated, inadequate or guilty.

Research on the concept of social intelligence began when Thorndike (1920) put forth the idea that intelligence could be separated into three facets. These facets included social, mechanical and abstract intelligences. The defining factor separating these facets is the type of subjects or stimuli, individuals must interact with. Mechanical intelligence refers to an individual's ability to interact competently with machines and other physical things. Abstract Intelligence concerns an individual's performance using ideas and other non-tangible objects. Social Intelligence pertains to individual's interaction with people in an intelligent manner. Thorndike's theory states that a socially intelligent person will be able to understand others and that he or she will be able to use this information to act wisely in human relations.

Guilford (1967) created a model of general intellect. It outlines the basic concepts of cognition which can be generalized to any type of intelligence, even social intelligence.

Several definitions of social intelligence have been offered by theorists, but all share two common components (a) the awareness of others and (b) their response and adaptation to others and the social situations Goleman (2006), Kobe, Reiter-Palmon and Rickers (2001) Marlowe (1986) suggested that individuals who are socially intelligent appear to experience a rich, meaningful life, as opposed to truncated affective experiences. Furthermore, aspects of social intelligence have been found to be associated with enhanced social problem solving abilities Jones and Day (1997) experienced leadership Kobe et al (2001) Weis and Sub (2007) showed that social understanding and social knowledge were separate constructs of social intelligence. Additionally, their model showed support for existence of an underlying general social intelligence and possibly a hierarchical model of social intelligence.

It is difficult to lead a successful life in a society without social intelligence. Social intelligence helps an individual to develop healthy co-existence with other people. Socially intelligent people behave tactfully and prosper in life. Social intelligence is useful in solving the problems of social life and help in tackling various social tasks. Thus social intelligence is an important developmental aspect of education. Several studies have shown that social intelligence is multidimensional and distinguishable from general intelligence domains (Jones and Day, 1997; Marlowe, 1986; Weis et al.). These concepts of social intelligence are incorporating internal & external perceptions, social skills and other psychosocial variables, (Taylor,1990). Marlowe's (1986) model of social intelligence comprised five domains- personal attitude, social performance skills, empathetic ability, emotional expressiveness and confidence. Pro-social attitude is indicated by having an interest and concern for others, social performance skills is demonstrated in appropriate interaction with other, empathetic ability refers to one's ability to identify with others, emotion expressiveness describes one's emotionality towards others and confidence in social situations is based on one's comfort level in social situations Weis and Sub(2007) showed that social undertaking and social knowledge were separate constructs of social intelligence. Willimann, fedt and Amelang (1997) viewed supporting harmony and restoring equilibrium between individuals as acts of being socially intelligent.

Each person has an individual profile of characteristics and abilities that result from predispositions, learning and development. These manifest as individual differences in intelligence, creativity and many more. Social intelligence refers to the ability to read other people and understand their intentions and motivations. People with this intelligence are usually clued into the differences between what others say and what they really mean. As a result, socially intelligent types may sometimes be accused of being mind readers. People who successfully use this type of intelligence can be masterful conversationalists. This can be due to a combination of excellent listening skills and the ability to meaningfully engage others. People who are socially intelligent can usually make others around them feel comfortable and included. They also tend to enjoy interacting with a variety of people.

- I. **Objectives of the Study:** The objectives of the present study were as follow-
1. To study social intelligence and academic achievement of college students.
 2. To compare male and female college students on various dimensions of social intelligence.

3. To compare rural and urban college students on various dimensions of social intelligence.

II. **Hypotheses:**

1. The present study is based on the following hypotheses-
2. Male and female college students differ significantly on various dimensions of social intelligence.
3. Rural and urban college students differ significantly on various dimensions of social intelligence.

III. **Method and Procedure :** The present study was designed to study the social intelligence of college students. As such, the descriptive method of research was employed to carry out this piece of research work. The details regarding sample, tools and statistical treatment are reported as follows:

IV. **Sample:** The sample for the present study consisted of 5% from the total population of all colleges of district Pulwama. The study was conducted on a sample of 410 college students which was further divided into different groups of male-female and rural-urban dichotomy. The college students were in the age group of 19 - 21 years. The sample has been selected on the basis of random sampling technique. The breakup of the sample is given as sampling technique. The breakup of the sample is given as follows:

| S. No | Name of the College | Total Enrollment | Sample Taken (5%) |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Govt. College Pulwama. | 6021 | 301 |
| 2 | Govt. Degree College for | 560 | 28 |
| 3 | Govt. Degree College Pampore | 452 | 22 |
| 4 | Govt. Degree College Tral | 1159 | 59 |
| Total | | | 410 |

V. **Tool used;**The following tool was employed for the purpose of collecting data from the selected subjects:

Chadha and Ganesan Social Intelligence Scale (1986);The data for the present study was collected with the help of N. K. Chadda and UshaGanesan Social Intelligence Scale (1986) which intends to assess the social intelligence of college students. It measures social intelligence in eight areas- patience, cooperativeness, confidence level, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour, and memory.

VI. **Statistical Treatment;**The data collected was subjected to the following statistical

treatment .mean, S.D, t-test, and percentage.

Result and Discussion: In the present endeavour, the investigator has made an attempt to analyze and interpret the data of the present study by using different statistical techniques.

Table No. 1:Mean comparison of Male and Female College Students on various dimensions of Social Intelligence

Table No.1shows the mean comparison of male and female college students on various dimensions of social intelligence. It is evident from the table that on the dimensions of Patience (t.value 5.64>0.01), Cooperativeness (t.value 4.07>0.01), Confidence (t.value 9.35>0.01), Sensitivity (t. value 3.50>0.01), Recognition of social environment (t.value 20.00>0.01), Tactfulness

(t.value 12.00>0.01), Sense of humour (t.value 20.50>0.01), and Memory (t.value 15.80>0.01), the two groups differ significantly.

The table further indicates that male college students have been found confident, tactful, and have good memory than female college students, whereas female college students have been found to be more patient, cooperative, sensitive, recognized social environment, and have good sense of humour than male college students. On the composite score it has been found that the two groups viz. male and female college students differ significantly at 0.01 level. It indicates that female college students have higher social intelligence than male college students. Therefore, hypothesis No.1 which reads as “Male and Female college students differsignificantly on various dimensions of social intelligence”, stands accepted

Table No.2:Mean comparison of Rural and Urban College Students on various dimensions of Social Intelligence

| S. No. | Dimensions | Group | N | Mean | S.D | t. Value | Level of Significance |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | . Patience | Rural | 197 | 20.83 | 1.52 | 3.35 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 20.36 | 1.42 | | |
| 2. | Co-operativeness | Rural | 197 | 23.95 | 1.75 | 7.11 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 25.16 | 1.76 | | |
| 3. | Confidence | Rural | 197 | 20.01 | 1.46 | 3.35 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 20.48 | 1.43 | | |
| 4. | Sensitivity | Rural | 197 | 20.51 | 1.49 | 6.07 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 21.36 | 1.49 | | |
| 5. | Recognition of Social Environment | Rural | 197 | 1.14 | 0.08 | 14.28 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 1.24 | 0.08 | | |
| 6. | Tactfulness | Rural | 197 | 3.02 | 0.22 | 26.81 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 3.61 | 0.25 | | |
| 7. | Sense of Humour | Rural | 197 | 3.13 | 0.22 | 15.00 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 3.43 | 0.24 | | |
| 8. | Memory | Rural | 197 | 7.73 | 0.56 | 21.00 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 8.57 | 0.60 | | |
| Total | | Rural | 197 | 99.24 | 7.25 | 6.01 | Significant at 0.01 |
| | | Urban | 213 | 103.63 | 7.27 | | |

Table No.2 Reveals the mean comparison of rural and urban college students on various dimensions of social intelligence. It is evident from the table that on the dimensions of Patience (t.value 3.35>0.01), Cooperativeness (t.value 7.11>0.01), Confidence (t.value 3.35>0.01), Sensitivity (t.value 6.07>0.01), Recognition of social environment (t.value 14.28>0.01), Tactfulness (t.value 26.81>0.01), Sense of humour (t.value 15.00>0.01), and Memory (t.value 21.00>0.01), the two groups differ significantly

The table further indicates that rural college students have been found to be more patient and confident than urban college students, whereas urban college students have been found cooperative, sensitive, recognized to social environment, tactful, humourous and have good memory than rural college students. On the total score it has been found that the two groups viz. rural and urban college students differ significantly at 0.01 level. It shows that urban college students have better social intelligence than rural college students. Therefore, hypothesis No.2 which reads as "Rural and Urban College students differ significantly on various dimensions of Social Intelligence", stands accepted.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, A. (2002)**, Study of relationship of academic achievement of boys and girls with intelligence, socio-economic status, size of the family and birth order of the child. *Indian Journal of Educational Research* Vol.21. pp. 75-76.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (1996)**, "Research in Education" Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Bhargava, R (2006)**, Behaviour Psychology, ABD Publishers, Jaipur, India.
- Bosewell, C. and Cannon. S (2009)**, Introduction to nursing research: incorporating evidence-based practice second edition. UK: Jones and Bartlett learning.
- Brown, William F., Holtzman, Wayne H.** journal of educational psychology, Vol.46(2) 75-84.
- Busari, A.O (2000)**, Stress inoculation training and self statements monitoring techniques in the reduction of test anxiety among adolescent underachievers in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ibadan.
- Butcher, H. J. (1968)**, Human Intelligence-Nature and Assessment, London: Methuen.
- Cantor, N. and Harlow. R. (1994)**, Social Intelligence and Personality: Flexible Life –task pursuit In, R. J. Sternberg and P. Ruzgis (Eds.), Personality and Intelligence Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cantor, N. and Kihlstrom, J. F. (1989)**, Social Intelligence and Cognitive assessments of personality, In R. S. Wyer and T.K Srul (Eds), Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.
- Chapin, F.S (1942)**, Preliminary standardization of a social impact scale. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 214-225.
- Cottrell, R. R. and Mckenzie, J.F (2011)** Health Promotion and Education Research Methods: Second Edition. UK: Jones and Bartlett learning.
- Cronbach, L.J. and Gleser, G.C. (1954)**. Review of „The Study of Behaviour“ *Psychometrika*, 19,329-333.
- Crown, Anne. K (2013)** An empirical analysis of three intelligences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol 45(2), pp. 105-114.
- Dharma, Surya (1994)** factors that influence student academic in Pennsylvania Public Schools, University of Pittsburgh, pp. 215 Doll, E.A (1935) A genetic scale of social maturity. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 5, pp. 180-88
- Dong, Q, Koper, R.J, Collaco, C.M (2008)**. Social Intelligence, Selfesteem and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity. *Intercultural Communication Studies. Vol-II, Issue- XVII.*
- Edwards, A.L. (1957)**. Manual of Personal Preference Schedule, New York: The Dryden Press, INC.
- Gardener, H. (1983)** Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences, New York: Basic books.
- Goleman, D (1995)** Emotional, Intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ? Bantam Books, New York, NY, U.S.A.
- Goleman, D (2006)** Social Intelligence: The new science of Human Relationships. New York: Bantam Books.
- Grewal Paul (1990)**, Relationship between study habits and Academic Achievement Indian Education review. In M. B. Buch (Ed.) fifth survey of education Research New Delhi: NCERT.
- Guilford, J.P (1967)**The nature of Human Intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guilford, J.P. (1958)**. Three Faces of Intellect. *American Psychologist*, 14, 469-479.
- Hamid, R. (2010)**Mental health and academic achievement of Ladhaki and Kashmiri adolescent girls. Unpublished M.Phil dissertation. Kashmir University, Hazratbal.
- Hooda, D, Sharma, N.R and Yadava. A (2009)** Social Intelligence as a predictor of positive psychological health. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology. Vol-35, No.1* pp. 143-150
- Houser, J. (2007)** Nursing Research: reading, using, and creating evidence. Second Edition. UK: Jones and Bartlett learning.
- Humphreys, L.G. (1971)**. Theory of Intelligence. In R. Cancro (Ed.). *Intelligence Genetic and Environmental Influences* (31-55), New York, Grune and Stratton.
- Iroegbu, O.M (1992)**The impact of family background factors on academic achievement. *Journal of Technical education*, vol 1, pp. 197-92.
- Jackson, N. Neil, A. and Bevan, R. (1973)**. An Evaluation of forced choice and „true false“ item formats in personality assessment. *Journal of Personality Researches*, 7(1), 21-30.
- Jain, Shikha and Mishra, Pushpa (1998)** Impact of socialization on Academic Achievement. Study of adolescents, *Indian Journal of Psychometric and Education*, vol. 29 (1), pp. 39-42.
- Jones, K. and Day J.D. (1997)** Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-Social Intelligence from Academic

Intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89 (3), pp. 486-497.

Khan, Z, Khan, N.A, Haider, Z. (2011) A Study on Social Intelligence of the students of physical education. *International Journal of Sports Sciences and Physical Education*. (IJSSPE) Vol-II, Issue-I.

Kobe, L.M, Reiter-Palmon, R and Rickers J.D (2001) Self-report the leadership experiences in relation to inventoried Social and Emotional Intelligence. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality and Social*, 20 (2), pp. 154-163.

Kohli, T. K. (1975) Characteristic Behavioural and Environmental correlates of Academic Achievement of over and Under Achievers at different levels of intelligence. Punjab University, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis pp. 48.

Krishnan, S.S (1993) Relationship between self-concept and academic achievement of college students. Cited in M.B. Buch Fifth survey of educational research, New Delhi: NCERT.

Larose, Simon; Bernier, Annie, Tarabulsy, George, M. (2005), Attachment state of mind, learning dispositions and academic performance during the college transition. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol 41, pp. 281-289.

Macphail A. H (1924)The Intelligence of College Students; Warwick and York / Education, pp. 176.

Mainstream Science on Intelligence (1994) An editorial statement published in the Wall Street Journal; Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

Marlowe, H.A (1986) Social Intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78 (1), pp. 52 -58.

Meijs, N, Antonius. H. N. Cillessen, Ron. H. J. Scholte, Segers. E, Spijkerman. R (2008) Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement as predictors of adolescent popularity; *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Department of Psychology, University of Connecticut, Storrs/USA.

Mitzel, E. Harold (1982), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. Fifth Edition, New York: A Division of Macmillan Publishers.

Moss, F.A and Hunt, T (1927) Are you socially intelligent? *Scientific American*, 137, pp. 108-110

Moss, F.A, Hunt, T, Omwake, K.T, and Ronning M.M (1927) *Social Intelligence test*, Washington, DC: Centre for psychological service

Nafialiankim Caroline (1988), An investigation in to the attitude and study Habits related to achievement in Mathematics of class IX students in Shillong. In M.B. Buch (Ed) *Fifth survey of Educational Research* New Delhi: NCERT.

Nuthana (2007) Gender analysis of academic achievement among high school students. PG dissertation, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. Department of Human Development, College of Rural Home Science.

Patel, M.R. (1996), Study habits of pupils and its Impact upon their Academic Achievement. *The progress of Education*, Vol. LXXI (4), 74-76.

Reis G., M. Hahn and D. Barkowski. (1984) The Development of Achievement related level of Aspiration and Self-evaluation in Primary school. *Psychologies in Erziehung and Unterricht*, 31(3) pp. 188-196.

Robert H. Vela Jr. B.A and M.S. (2003) The role of emotional intelligence in the academic achievement of first year college students. Texas A and M University-Kingville Chairman of Advisory Committee. Dr. Darwin B. Nelson.

Safaya, R. and Shaida, B.D. (1963) *Principles and techniques of education*, DhapatRai and Sons Com, New Delhi.

Sembiyan, R, Visvanathan, G and Dr P. C. Naga Subramani. (2011). A Study on the attitude towards regionalism of college students in relation to Social Intelligence. *Indian Streams Research Journal (ISRJ)* Vol-I, Issue-IX.

Sharma. A (1989) A Comparative study of values, intelligence, and academic achievement, Abstracts of Research studies conducted by teacher education institutions in India, Volume 3., D.R. Goel, R. C. Madhavi.

Sternberg, R.J, Wagner, R (Eds) (1986) *Practical Intelligence: Nature and Origins of competence in the everyday world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J. (Eds.) (2000) *Handbook of Intelligence*, second edition, Cambridge, U.K, Cambridge University Press P/359-379.

