
Social Intelligence of Undergraduate students of Bareilly district about their Gender and Locality

¹Mohini Singh Vishen

¹Assistant Professor, Madan Mohan Malviya P G College Bhatpar Rani Deoria UP

Received: 15 Feb 2024 Accepted & Reviewed: 25 Feb 2024, Published : 29 Feb 2024

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the social intelligence of male and female undergraduate students in urban and rural areas of Bareilly City. For this purpose, a descriptive survey method was used. The data was collected using the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Chadda and Ganeshan (2009). A stratified disproportionate random sampling technique was used to select 60 male and 60 female undergraduate students. The data were analyzed by using the test. The finding of gender analysis indicates that female students possess more social intelligence than male students, and research area-wise indicates that urban students have greater social intelligence than students of rural areas.

Keywords: Social Intelligence, Undergraduate students, gender, and locality.

Introduction

As Thorndike (1920) points out, intelligence can be viewed as having three facets: the understanding of abstract ideas (abstract intelligence), the knowledge of concrete objects (mechanical intelligence), and the understanding of people (social intelligence). Socially intelligent people can understand and manage others and engage in adaptive social interactions (Thorndike, 1920). In addition to intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, social intelligence has two distinct components: distinctly personal and social. Interpersonal intelligence refers to the ability to notice and make distinctions between others, while intrapersonal intelligence refers to the ability to access one's inner and emotional life.

Theorists have offered several definitions of social intelligence, but all share two standard components (a) the awareness of others and (b) their response and adaptation to other and social situations (Goleman, 2006; Kobe, Rester-palmon and Rickcrs, 2001). Social intelligence is a mental ability distinct from abstract and mechanical intelligence (Thorndike, 1920). Ford and Tisak (1983) defined *social intelligence* as a behavioral outcome and succeeded in supporting a distinct domain of social intelligence. They described it as one's ability to accomplish relevant objectives in specific social settings."

Marlowe (1986) equated social intelligence to social competence. According to him, it refers to the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of persons, including oneself, interpersonal situations and to act appropriately upon that understanding." (1982, P-15) It is not easy 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 helps solve the problems of social life and helps in tackling various social tasks. A key aspect of education is the development of social intelligence. Social intelligence is multidimensional and distinct from general intelligence domains in several studies (Jones & Day, 1997; Marlowe, 1986; Weis et al.). Social intelligence includes perceptions, social skills, and other psychosocial variables (Taylor, 1990). A model of social intelligence developed by Marlowe (1986) had five personal attitudes, social skills, empathetic abilities, emotional expressiveness, and confidence. Interest and concern for others indicate a pro-social attitude; social performance skills are demonstrated by inappropriate interactions; empathetic ability is the ability to identify with others; emotional

expressiveness describes one's emotionality towards others, while confidence in social situations depends on one's level of comfort. Weis and Sub (2007) found that social undertakings and social knowledge were separate constructs of social intelligence. Willimann felt, and Amelang (1997) viewed supporting harmony and restoring equilibrium between individuals as acts of being socially intelligent. A review of the related literature on social intelligence reveals that the construct of social intelligence has drawn a lot of attention.

For students to perform well academically, their intelligence is essential (Panigrahi, 2005), and social intelligence is positively related (Brown & Anthony, 1990). Bailey (1968) studied the assessment of social intelligence among fifth-grade students using friendship rating, which revealed that social intelligence (peer acceptance) co-varies with academic achievement. Social intelligence is higher among higher achievers (Saxena & Panigrahi, 2009). Throckmorton, Riggio, and Messmer (1991) demonstrated that academic and social intelligence are conceptually distinct but overlap.

Singh (2007) found no significant difference in social intelligence between high-creative boys and high-creative girls or between low-creative boys and low-creative girls. In a study conducted by Kaur and Kalaramna (2004), they assessed the existing levels of inter-relationship between home environments, social intelligence, and socioeconomic status. Kyselova and Vyroost (2006) examined the relationship between social intelligence, wisdom, values, and interpersonal characteristics. There is a close relationship between social intelligence and wisdom-related knowledge. According to Chesnokova (2005), social intelligence develops in stages with age. Gnanadevan (2007) concluded that the social intelligence scores of the students differed significantly concerning caste, mother's education, and parent's income but did not differ considerably concerning gender, father's education, mother's occupation, or father's occupation. Science students are more socially intelligent than arts students, according to Gakhar and Bains (2009).

Research has been conducted on social intelligence concerning academic achievements (Bailey, 1968; Brown & Anthony, 1990; Riggio, Messmer & Throckomorton, 1991; Saxena & Panigrahi, 2009). The effect of some other variables on social intelligence has also been studied, such as creativity (Singh, 2007), home environment and socio-economic status (Kaur & Kalaramna, 2004), wisdom, values, and interpersonal personality traits (Vyroost & Kyselova, 2006), age (Chesnokova, 2005), caste, gender, parents and parent's occupation (Gnanadevan, 2007). However, it was felt that studying the effect of gender and subject stream on social intelligence was necessary. The literature review reveals that this relationship has not been explored yet; hence the present investigation was undertaken to determine undergraduate students' social intelligence concerning their gender and subject streams.

Objectives of the study: -

The study's main objective was to know undergraduate students' social intelligence status about their gender and locality. The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

- 1: To study the social intelligence of undergraduate students about gender
- 2: To study the social intelligence of undergraduate students concerning their Locality.

Hypotheses: - The present study is based on the following hypotheses:

- 1: There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of undergraduate students based on gender.
- 2: There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of undergraduate students based on their locality.

Methodology- In this study, a descriptive survey method was used. For participants, the selection of sample stratified disproportionate random sampling technique was adopted. The sample consisted of 120 first-year college students comprising 60 males and 60 females belonging to science and arts subjects from the degree colleges of Bareilly city, Uttar Pradesh. Measures Social intelligence scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Chadda and Ganeshan (2009) was used to assess the social intelligence of undergraduate students. The scale has eight dimensions: Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence level, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humor, and Memory. Respondents were instructed to check one of three options based on the applicability of their responses. The total social intelligence score was calculated by adding the scores from each dimension.

Statistics:- Mean, standard deviation, and "t" test was used to analyze the data.

S.No.	Variables	Group	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	T- Ratio
1	Patience	Male	21.23	1.83	2.22**
		Female	22.11	2.46	
2	Cooperativeness	Male	25.83	2.51	2.47**
		Female	27.14	3.25	
3	Confidence	Male	22.11	3.11	0.11
		Female	22.17	2.79	
4	Sensitivity	Male	20.29	2.66	2.70**
		Female	21.73	3.15	
5	Recognition of Social Environment	Male	0.92	0.69	2.60**
		Female	1.26	0.74	
6	Tactfulness	Male	4.07	1.18	.82
		Female	4.23	0.94	
7	Sense of humor	Male	3.99	1.43	.90
		Female	4.21	1.22	
8	Memory	Male	10.29	1.41	2.09**
		Female	9.64	1.95	
		Male	109.35	8.14	

9	Total	Female	111.67	9.13	1.46
---	-------	--------	--------	------	------

Table 1 Values of Mean, SD, and t-ratio to show the difference in social intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to gender.

*= .01, **= .05

The result and Discussion table indicate a significant difference between male and female undergraduate students' overall social intelligence. Out of eight dimensions, a significant difference was observed in patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, recognition of the social environment, and memory between male and female students. However, there was no statistically significant difference between male and female students in confidence, tactfulness, and sense of humor dimensions. According to the table, females possess a greater level of social intelligence than males. Additionally, compared to men, women are more patient, sensitive, cooperative, and aware of their social context. Confidence level, tactfulness, and sense of humor are the areas where men and women do not significantly differ. This result contrasts the observations made by Gnanadevan (2007), who did not find any gender differences.

Table 2 Values of means standard deviation and t-ratio to show the difference in social intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to their Locality.

S.No.	Variables	Group	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	T-test
1	Patience	Rural	20.47	2.24	1.62
		Urban	21.09	1.93	
2	Cooperativeness	Rural	26.87	2.35	1.83
		Urban	27.81	3.21	
3	Confidence	Rural	21.88	2.88	2.19**
		Urban	22.98	2.59	
4	Sensitivity	Rural	21.47	2.65	2.73**
		Urban	22.82	2.76	
5	Recognition of Social Environment	Rural	0.94	0.58	3.05**
		Urban	1.34	0.83	
6	Tactfulness	Rural	3.41	0.81	1.90
		Urban	3.74	1.07	
		Rural	3.87	1.32	

7	Sense of humor	Urban	3.74	1.07	.59
8	Memory	Rural	9.81	1.28	2.73**
		Urban	8.82	2.49	
9	Total	Rural	107.66	7.83	1.39
		Urban	109.77	8.67	

*=.01, **=.05

It is clear from Table no-02 that science and arts undergraduate students do differ in overall social intelligence. The significant difference is also found in dimensions-patience, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, and Memory, but not in patience, cooperativeness, and sense of humor. It means that urban undergraduate students are more socially intelligent than science students. Marlowe (1986) suggested that socially intelligent individuals experience rich, meaningful lives instead of truncated, affective experiences. Furthermore, aspects of social intelligence are associated with enhanced social problem-solving abilities (Jones & Day, 1991), experienced leadership (Kobeetal, 2001), and positive interpersonal experience (Cheng et al.). At the same time, they possess better patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, recognition of the social environment, and tactfulness. However, science undergraduate students have better memory power than their counterparts. At the same time, no significant difference is observed in their confidence level and sense of humor. Gakhar and Bains (2009) also found arts students more socially intelligent than science stream students.

References-

- [1] Bailey, J.A (1968) Social intelligence, achievement, and the elementary school child. www.eric.ed.gov
- [2] Brown and Anthony (1990) Continuing the search for social intelligence.
- [3] Personality and individual difference, 2(5) 463-470.
- [4] Chadda, N.K., and Ganesan, U. (2009) Manual of the social intelligence scale, Agra National Psychological cooperation.
- [5] Chesnokova, O. (2005), Cunning and social intelligence in children. www.lancs.ac.uk
- [6] Gakhar, S.C., and Bains, (2009) A study of social intelligence and achievement motivation of students of arts and science stream. Journal of educational studies, 7(2) 56-59.
- [7] Gnanadevan, R. (2007) Social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socio-economic status, Journal of Community Guidance and Research, 24(3) 340-346.
- [8] Kaur, H, and Kalaramna, A. (2004) Study of the interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence, and socio-economic status among males & females, Journal of Human Ecology, 16(2), 137-140.
- [9] Panigrahi, M.R. (2005) Academic Achievement in relation to intelligence & socio-economic status of high school students. Edutracks, 5(2), 26-27.
- [10] Riggio, R.E.; Messmer, J. and Throckmorton, B. (1991) Social and academic intelligence: conceptually distinct but overlapping constructs. Personality and Individual Differences, 695-700.
- [11] Saxena S. and Panigrahi S. (2009) Social intelligence of high and low achieves undergraduate students. Journal of Educational Studies, 7(2), 31-34.
- [12] Singh, S. (2007) Emotional intelligence, social intelligence, adjustment and personality differentials of adolescents with high & low creativity Ph.D.Thesis P.U.Chamdigarth

- [13] Vyrost, J. and Kyselova, M. (2006) Personality correlate of social intelligence. *Studia Psychologica* 48(3), 207-212.
- [14] Weis, S. & Sub, H (2007) Reviving the search for social intelligence. A multi-trait, multi-method study of its structure and construct validity personality and individual differences. 142, P-2, 3.
- [15] Wong, C.T., Day, J.D., Maxwell, S.E. and Meara, M.M. (1995) a multi-trait multi-method study of academic and social intelligence in college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(1), 117-133.
- [16] Willmann, E., Feldt, K., and Amelang, M. (1997) prototypical behavior pattern of social intelligence. An intercultural comparison between Chinese and German subjects, *International Journal of Psychology*, 32(5), 329-346.
- [17] Taylor, E.H. (1990) the assessment of social intelligence, *psychotherapy*, 27(3), 445-457.
- [18] Kobe, L.M., Reiter-salmon, R. and Rickers, J.D (2001) Self-reported leadership experiences in relation to inventoried social and emotional personality and social, 20(2), 154-163.
- [19] Marlowe, H.A. (1986) Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence, *Journal of educational psychology*, 78(1), 52-58.
- [20] Jones, K. and Day, J.D. (1997) Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of educational psychology*, 89(3), 486-497.
- [21] Cheng, C., Chiu, C, Hong, Y., and Cheung, J.S. (2001) Discriminative facility and its role in the perceived qualities of interactional experiences, *Journal of Personality*, 69(5), 765-786.
- [22] German, D. (2006) *Social intelligence: The new science of humor relationship*, Newyork: Bantam Books.