



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.03
TPI 2019; 8(12): 37-40
© 2019 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 22-10-2019
Accepted: 24-11-2019

Meera Rani
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, CCS Haryana
Agricultural University, Hisar,
Haryana, India

Dr. Sheela Sangwan
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, CCS Haryana
Agricultural University, Hisar,
Haryana, India

Deepika
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, CCS Haryana
Agricultural University, Hisar,
Haryana, India

Sumit
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, CCS Haryana
Agricultural University, Hisar,
Haryana, India

Corresponding Author:
Meera Rani
Department of Human
Development and Family
Studies, CCS Haryana
Agricultural University, Hisar,
Haryana, India

Social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their socio-economic status

Meera Rani, Dr. Sheela Sangwan, Deepika and Sumit

Abstract

Social Intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing tensions stresses and various complexities. This study examines the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their socio-economic status. Adolescence is considered as the most important intermediate period of life, as adolescents face an intense disorder because of the cognitive, biological and social changes taking place in this period. Social intelligence is an aggregated measure of self and social awareness, evolved social beliefs and attitudes, and a capacity to manage complex social change. The study was conducted in Hisar district of Haryana state where two Government Senior Secondary Schools from rural area and three from urban area were selected. Self-prepared questionnaire was used to delineate socio-economic variables and Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) by Chadha and Ganesan (2004) was used for assessing social intelligence. The results revealed that statistically significant differences with sense of humour on the basis of family type and annual income. Further results revealed that non-significant differences existed in all the aspects of social intelligence of adolescents as per number of siblings and castes.

Keywords: Social Intelligence, adolescents, socio-economic variables, family structure, family size, caste, number of sibling, annual income

Introduction

Adolescence is considered as a bridging period from childhood to adulthood. It is a period of rapid changes in almost all developmental dimensions (Katoch, 2013) [7]. 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) [11]. It is also the mental ability to understand the motives, emotion, intension and actions of other people and to motivate and influence the behaviour of people. Elias (1997) [3] point out that the social intelligence is an important determinant of children and adolescent's healthy psychological development and adequate psychological adjustment across the lifespan. High social intelligence helps to maintain a state of harmony in oneself and finally be more self-confident in dealing with the challenges of living and learning in educational institutions (Saxena and Jain, 2013) [9]. The level of intelligence differs among individuals. 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.

Hence the present investigation was undertaken to find out the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their socio-economic factors like family size, number of sibling, family structure, caste and annual income. Therefore, the present study has been planned with the following objective:

Objectives of the Study

- To study the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their family size
- To study the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their number of sibling
- To study the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their family structure
- To study the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their caste
- To study the social intelligence of adolescents in relation to their annual income

Review of Literature

Kaur and Kalaramna (2004) ^[8] conducted the study to assess the existing levels of interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status and found that socio-economic status and home environment affect social intelligence. Shows that with the increase in socio-economic status, the level of recognition of social environment (0.324***), tactfulness (0.293***), sense of humour (0.254**) and memory (0.544***) also increased in males and the relationship was found significant. Similar was the case as far as females were concerned but there was an inverse and significant relationship between socioeconomic status and patience in females (-0.247**) and there was non-significant relationship of patience with socio-economic status of males. The other dimensions i.e. cooperativeness, confidence and sensitivity was non-significantly related with socioeconomic status of both males and females. This shows that with the increase in socio-economic status, the level of patience in females decreased.

Vyrost and Kyselova (2006) ^[12] investigated interconnections between social intelligence, wisdom, values and interpersonal personality traits and they found the close mutual relations between social intelligence and wisdom related knowledge.

Gnanadevan (2007) ^[5] studied that 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.

Ten and Volman (2007) ^[10] highlighted that social intelligence are important for preparing young people to mature and succeed in future for their adults roles within the family, workplace and community.

Dhingra and Tiakala (2016) ^[2] concluded that no significant difference in patience, tactfulness, sense of humour, dimensions of social intelligence and overall social intelligence in relation to gender of the students; there exist significant difference in cooperativeness, confidence level and sensitivity dimensions of social intelligence in relation to

gender of students; the mean score of boys and girls in cooperativeness dimension (29.56 and 30.39) shows that girls are more cooperative than boys; the mean score of boys and girls in confidence level dimension (22.19 and 20.80) shows that boys are more confident than girls. The mean score of boys and girls in sensitivity dimension (30.32 and 31.79) shows that girls are more sensitive than boys, there exist no significant difference in social intelligence of students in relation to family income. Thus, family income has no role in social intelligence of the students; and there exist no significant difference in social intelligence of students in relation to number of siblings except confidence level, more the numbers of siblings higher the confidence. Further, shows that gender, family income do not have significant difference in their social intelligence.

Research Methodology

The study was conducted in Hisar district of Haryana state where two Government Senior Secondary Schools from rural area and three from urban area were selected. From each school 30 boys and 30 girls of 13-15 year (240 adolescents) were included in final sample. Self-prepared questionnaire was used to delineate socio-economic variables and Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) by Chadha and Ganesan (2004) ^[1] was used for assessing social intelligence.

Results

The results of the present investigation in accordance with the objectives, inferred through the use of prescribed methodology and standard tools. The results have been presented under the following heads:

Comparison of social intelligence of adolescents as per number of siblings

A glance at Table 1 reflects adolescents' social intelligence on the basis of number of siblings. Statistically non-significant differences existed in all the aspects of social intelligence of adolescents as per number of siblings.

Table 1: Social intelligence of adolescents as per number of siblings

Aspects of social intelligence	Up to 2 siblings Mean \pm SD	3 siblings Mean \pm SD	4 & above siblings Mean \pm SD	F value
(a) Patience	20.49 \pm 1.89	20.4 \pm 2.03	19.93 \pm 1.95	1.43
(b) Cooperativeness	26.21 \pm 2.62	26.41 \pm 2.89	26.14 \pm 2.51	0.26
(c) Confidence	21.19 \pm 1.63	21.2 \pm 1.88	20.99 \pm 1.76	0.24
(d) Sensitivity	22.29 \pm 2.19	22.14 \pm 2.13	22.69 \pm 2.03	1.73
(e) Recognition of social environment	0.58 \pm 0.67	0.66 \pm 0.75	0.45 \pm 0.58	2.39
(f) Tactfulness	2.89 \pm 1.21	3.24 \pm 1.9	3.31 \pm 1.22	2.35
(g) Sense of humour	3.49 \pm 1.49	3.35 \pm 1.19	3.24 \pm 1.25	0.69
(h) Memory	3.84 \pm 1.88	3.57 \pm 1.97	3.68 \pm 1.85	0.34
(i) Overall social intelligence	100.75 \pm 5.72	100.64 \pm 6.98	100.72 \pm 6.87	0.01

*Significant at 5% level

Note: Means in the same row that do not share superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ using Duncan multiple difference comparison

Comparison of social intelligence of adolescents as per family size

Table 2 shows respondents' social intelligence on the basis of family size. Results divulged statistically significant differences for the tactfulness ($F=3.02$, $p < 0.05$). Non-

significant differences existed in other aspects of social intelligence. Further, from the examination of mean scores, it is evident that adolescents of medium sized families had better tactfulness aspect as compare to small and large sized families.

Table 2: Social intelligence of adolescents as per family size

Aspects of social intelligence		Small Mean \pm SD	Medium Mean \pm SD	Large Mean \pm SD	F value
(a)	Patience	20.52 \pm 1.66	19.94 \pm 2.6	20.41 \pm 1.68	1.91
(b)	Cooperativeness	26.05 \pm 2.98	26.33 \pm 2.64	26.3 \pm 2.44	0.29
(c)	Confidence	21.27 \pm 1.47	21.02 \pm 1.74	20.86 \pm 2.29	0.51
(d)	Sensitivity	22.42 \pm 2.16	22.46 \pm 2.9	22.0 \pm 2.15	0.60
(e)	Recognition of social environment	0.55 \pm 0.75	0.55 \pm 0.66	0.59 \pm 0.57	0.04
(f)	Tactfulness	2.77 \pm 1.14 ^a	3.27 \pm 1.15 ^b	3.24 \pm 1.27 ^a	3.02*
(g)	Sense of humour	3.55 \pm 1.52	3.26 \pm 1.24	03.41 \pm 1.5	0.90
(h)	Memory	3.85 \pm 1.99	3.65 \pm 1.90	3.59 \pm 1.70	0.22
(i)	Overall social intelligence	100.95 \pm 6.8	100.71 \pm 6.81	100.24 \pm 6.57	0.10

*Significant at 5% level

Note: Means in the same row that do not share superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ using Duncan multiple difference comparison**Comparison of social intelligence of adolescents as per caste category**

Caste wise mean difference in social intelligence and its aspects has been presented in Table 3. Data unveils non-

significant differences for all aspects of social intelligence as per adolescents' caste. Mean scores shows that adolescents of general caste category had better overall social intelligence.

Table 3: Social intelligence of adolescents as per caste category

Aspects of social intelligence		SC Mean \pm SD	BC Mean \pm SD	General Mean \pm SD	F value
(a)	Patience	20.11 \pm 1.89	20.44 \pm 2.19	19.78 \pm 2.0	1.22
(b)	Cooperativeness	26.33 \pm 2.50	25.9 \pm 3.14	26.29 \pm 2.79	0.41
(c)	Confidence	21.5 \pm 1.82	21.3 \pm 1.69	21.2 \pm 1.69	0.01
(d)	Sensitivity	22.38 \pm 2.10	21.97 \pm 2.12	22.78 \pm 2.8	1.67
(e)	Recognition of social environment	0.57 \pm 0.66	0.51 \pm 0.68	0.53 \pm 0.67	0.17
(f)	Tactfulness	3.21 \pm 1.17	3.0 \pm 1.17	3.27 \pm 1.22	0.65
(g)	Sense of humour	3.26 \pm 1.23	3.21 \pm 1.26	3.67 \pm 1.37	1.83
(h)	Memory	3.69 \pm 1.99	3.72 \pm 1.88	3.61 \pm 1.59	0.04
(i)	Overall social intelligence	100.81 \pm 6.44	100.3 \pm 7.46	100.86 \pm 6.65	0.23

*Significant at 5% level

Note: means in the same row that do not share superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ using Duncan multiple difference comparison**Comparison of social intelligence of adolescents as per family structure**

The mean scores attained by respondents of nuclear and joint family for their aspect of social intelligence has been presented in Table 4. The results revealed statistically significant differences with sense of humour ($F = 2.05^*$) at

0.05 level of significance on the basis of family type. Non-significant differences existed in other aspects of social intelligence. Adolescents from the nuclear families had better social intelligence comparatively to their counterparts as indicated by mean scores.

Table 4: Social intelligence of adolescents as per family structure

Aspects of social intelligence		Nuclear Mean \pm SD	Joint Mean \pm SD	Z value
(a)	Patience	20.6 \pm 1.99	20.67 \pm 1.50	1.34
(b)	Cooperativeness	26.26 \pm 2.67	26.08 \pm 2.81	0.21
(c)	Confidence	21.8 \pm 1.68	20.25 \pm 3.5	0.94
(d)	Sensitivity	22.45 \pm 2.09	21.42 \pm 2.19	1.59
(e)	Recognition of social environment	0.54 \pm 0.67	0.75 \pm 0.62	1.12
(f)	Tactfulness	3.18 \pm 1.19	3.33 \pm 0.98	0.53
(g)	Sense of humour	3.36 \pm 1.28	2.83 \pm 0.83	2.05*
(h)	Memory	3.71 \pm 1.90	2.92 \pm 1.51	1.76
(i)	Overall social intelligence	100.81 \pm 6.61	98.50 \pm 7.10	1.10

*Significant at 5% level

Comparison of social intelligence of adolescents as per annual income

Comparison of adolescent's social intelligence on the basis of annual income is depicted in Table 5. Result shows significant difference in sense of humour ($F = 5.11^*$, $p < 0.05$). Non-

significant differences existed in other aspects of social intelligence. Adolescents having annual family income ranging from ₹150001- 250000 had better sense of humour as compared to adolescents having annual family income from ₹ 800001- 150000 and ₹ 45000- 80000.

Table 5: Social intelligence of adolescents as per annual income

Aspects of social intelligence	₹45000-80000 Mean ± SD	₹80001-150000 Mean ± SD	₹150001-250000 Mean ± SD	F value
(a) Patience	20.3±2.01	20.39±1.72	19.83±2.14	0.61
(b) Cooperativeness	26.22±2.65	26.53±2.69	26.67±2.58	0.29
(c) Confidence	21.04±1.81	20.95±1.68	21.67±1.3	0.42
(d) Sensitivity	22.38±2.10	22.50±2.08	22.17±2.79	0.09
(e) Recognition of social environment	0.54±0.67	0.63±0.63	0.50±0.55	0.30
(f) Tactfulness	3.17±1.13	3.13±1.36	3.50±1.5	0.26
(g) Sense of humour	3.21±1.24 ^a	3.76±1.26 ^{ab}	4.33±1.51 ^b	5.11*
(h) Memory	3.55±1.91	4.24±1.67	4.17±2.14	2.34
(i) Overall social intelligence	100.28±6.84	102.21±5.37	102.83±5.56	0.18

*Significant at 5% level

Note: Means in the same row that do not share superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$ using Duncan multiple difference comparison

Discussion

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 because every society has certain customs, traditions, norms and ideals, the fulfillment of which is the primary responsibility of man, so that he can reside well in the society. Individual who are socially intelligent appear to experience better patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, recognition, tactfulness, confidence level and sense of humour, a rich and meaningful life. Schools must try to encourage and inculcate social qualities in the students so that they are better adjusted to the environment. Teachers are the role models for their students hence they should be effectively trained to help their students' maximum benefits and make better adjustments in their life.

Significant difference were in aspects of social intelligence tactfulness with family size. Family structure and annual income found significant differences with aspect of social intelligence sense of humour. Non-significant differences were existed in number of siblings and caste. These results are also supported by Gnanadevan (2007) [5] studied that 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. Gakhar and Bains (2009) [4] found that arts students are more socially intelligent than science students. Sjoberg (1990) who revealed that adolescents who come from homes were better adjusted and socially more intelligent, they were confident about their abilities and competent. Social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socio-economic status. Social Intelligence of higher secondary students was found to be high. The social intelligence scores of higher secondary students were found to differ significantly with respect to caste, mother's education and parent's income. Differences with respect to gender, father's education and mother's occupation were not significant. (Gnanadevan 2011) [6]

Conclusion

The present study concluded that statistically significant differences with sense of humour on the basis of family type and annual income. Further results revealed that non-significant differences existed in all the aspects of social intelligence of adolescents as per number of siblings and castes. Therefore, social intelligence is one of the most fundamental components of human intelligence. It has enabled the human species to develop various kinds of social relations- from the intimate bonds between lovers and spouses

to the caring relation between parents and their children. Social intelligence is of more importance in the present life due to growing pressures, anxieties, tension and various complexities.

References

1. Chadha NK, Ganesan U. Manual of social intelligence scale, Agra National Psychological cooperation, 2009.
2. Dhingra K, Tiakala. Social intelligence of Higher Secondary School students in Nagaland, Research paedia. 2016; 3:46-54.
3. Elias MJ. The Missing Piece. Education Week. 1997; 17:1-36.
4. Gakhar SC, Bain. A study of social intelligence and achievement motivation of students of arts and science stream. Journal of Educational Studies. 2009; 7:56-59.
5. Gnanadevan R. Social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socioeconomic status. Journal of Community Guidance and Research. 2007; 24:340-346.
6. Gnanadevan R. Social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their socio-economic status. MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends & Practices. 2011; 1:60-66.
7. Katoch A. A study of emotional intelligence of adolescent students in relation to the type of school. International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences. 2013; 2:28-36.
8. Kaur H, Kalaramna A. Study of interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status among male & female, Journal of Human Ecology. 2004; 2:137-140.
9. Saxena S, Jain KR. Social intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to their gender and subject stream. Journal of Research and Method in Education. 2013; 1:1-4.
10. Ten DG, Volman M. Educating for adulthood or for citizenship: Social competence as an educational goal. European Journal of Education. 2007; 42:281-298.
11. Thorndike EL. Intelligence and its uses. Harper's Magazine. 1920; 140:227-235.
12. Vyrost J, Kyselova M. Personality correlates of social intelligence. Studia Psychologica. 2006; 48:207-212.