

Social Intelligence of Adolescents: A Study of Himachal Pradesh

Ruchi Thakur, Shubhangana Sharma and Raj Pathania

*Department of Human Department, CSKHPKV, Palampur 176 062, Himachal Pradesh, India
E-mail: ruchithakur26@gmail.com*

KEYWORDS Age. Gender. Adolescence. Social Intelligence. Kangra District

ABSTRACT This study was to find out the social intelligence of adolescents and the correlation between ecological variables and social intelligence of the respondents. A study was conducted in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh. Two blocks namely Panchrukhi and Bhawarna were randomly selected. Four schools were selected from each block. Survey was done on 200 adolescents falling in the age group of 13-19 years under each block. Social Intelligence was assessed by Social Intelligence Scale. The results of the study revealed that most of males and females respondents were with optimistic social intelligence dimensions such as patience, co-operativeness and confidence. Contrary to this, high percentage of males and females respondents showed negative response of social intelligence dimensions such as recognition of social environment, tactfulness and sense of humour. But, males and females respondents showed an affirmative relationship with memory. A significant correlation was found between social intelligence dimensions and ecological variables of respondents.

INTRODUCTION

Intelligence most often refers to practical problem-solving ability, verbal ability, social competence, and effective adaptation to ones environment and to new situations and change within it. "Social intelligence is the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, to act wisely in human relations; it is equivalent to interpersonal intelligence, it deals with knowledge of social situations and more properly called social cognition." Thorndike (1920) also believed that intelligence is an unformed factor because we can't judge somebody's abilities by considering just his intelligence. Thorndike (1920) believed there are three kinds of intelligence: Social intelligence, Concrete intelligence, Abstract intelligence. According to Thorndike's definition of social intelligence, an intelligent person is the one who has the ability to understand the others and to make a good relationship with them (Thorndike 1936 cited in Shoja Heidari 2009).

Howard Gardner (1993) states that his intelligences recognize multiple facets of cognition and attempt to acknowledge people's different strengths and styles, creating a definition of intelligence that is broader and more applicable to the "plurality of intellect" (Gardner 1993). Initially, Gardner identified seven intelligences: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intra-personal. Gardner states that traditional schooling is not always appropriate for students' particular distributions of intelligences.

Albrecht (2005) defines social intelligence (SI) as the ability to get along well with others while winning their cooperation. Social Intelligence is a combination of sensitivity to the needs and interests of others, sometimes called your "social radar," an attitude of generosity and consideration, and a set of practical skills for interacting successfully with people in any setting. Social Intelligence provides a highly accessible and comprehensive model for describing, assessing, and developing social intelligence at a personal level. Dealing with social situations depends upon the person's ability. Socialization of the child starts when the child is born. So the present study has been undertaken with the following.

Objectives

1. To assess the social intelligence of adolescents.
2. To find out the factors affecting the social intelligence of adolescents.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh. Two blocks namely Panchrukhi and Bhawarna were randomly selected. Four schools from each block were selected randomly from the list of schools. A list of schools adolescents in this school belonging to age group of 13-19 years was procured. Samples of 200 adolescents from blocks were selected. The data were collected between October 2009

to January 2010. Manual of Social Intelligence (Chadha and Ganesan 2009) was administered to each adolescent to assess the Social Intelligence Dimensions. Eight dichotomous modes of social intelligence have been included in the scale which may be enumerated as under:

1. Patience
2. Co-operativeness
3. Confidence
4. Sensitivity
5. Recognition of social environment
6. Tactfulness
7. Sense of humour
8. Memory

An interview schedule was used to collect background information of the respondents. Data was analyzed in terms of frequency, percentage and co-efficient of correlation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dimensions of Social Intelligence of Respondents

The data on various dimensions of Social Intelligence dimensions have been given in Table 1 These are explained under the following heads:

Patience Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

A perusal of data on patience of the respondents in Table 1 depicted that less than half of male respondents (48.38%) had high level of patience followed by 20.16 per cent male respondents who had very high level of patience. However, 14.51 per cent male respondents had average level of patience. Male respondents who had low level of patience were found to be 14.51 per

cent. A very few male respondents (2.41%) showed very low level of patience.

Most of the female respondents (55.26%) were having high level of patience which was followed by very high level of patience in 21.05 per cent in female respondents. Average patience level was observed in 13.15 per cent female respondents. However, 7.89 per cent and 2.63 per cent female respondents had low and very low levels of patience respectively.

Co-operativeness Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Most of the male respondents (37.90%) were found having average co-operativeness followed by high level of co-operativeness (28.22%). There were 16.12 per cent male respondents who had low level of co-operativeness. However, only 12.09 per cent male respondents showed a very high level of co-operativeness. Only 5.64 per cent of male respondents were those who had very low level of co-operativeness.

Most of the female respondents (38.15%) had high level of co-operativeness which was followed by very high level of co-operativeness in female respondents (27.63%). There were 25.00 per cent female respondents with average level of co-operativeness, however, only 6.57 per cent and 2.63 per cent female respondents were observed at low and very low level of co-operativeness respectively.

Confidence Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Data further revealed that a very high level of confidence was observed in more than half of male respondents (52.41%) followed by 35.48

Table 1: Frequency distribution of relationship between dimensions of social intelligence and levels of respondents

Male(N=124)	Female(N=76)	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Total
<i>Patience</i>	Male	3(2.41)	18(14.51)	18(14.51)	60(48.38)	25(20.16)	124(62.00)
	Female	2(2.63)	6(7.89)	10(13.15)	42(55.26)	16(21.05)	76(38.00)
	Total	5(2.50)	24(12.00)	28(14.00)	102(51.00)	41(20.50)	200(100.00)
<i>Co-operativeness</i>	Male	7(5.64)	20(16.12)	47(37.90)	35(28.22)	15(12.09)	124(62.00)
	Female	2(2.63)	5(6.57)	19(25.00)	29(38.15)	21(27.63)	76(38.00)
	Total	9(4.50)	25(12.50)	66(33.00)	64(32.00)	36(18.00)	200(100.00)
<i>Confidence</i>	Male	3(2.41)	5(4.03)	7(5.64)	44(35.48)	65(52.41)	124(62.00)
	Female	2(2.63)	2(2.63)	2(2.63)	16(21.05)	54(71.05)	76(38.00)
	Total	5(2.50)	7(3.50)	9(4.50)	60(30.00)	119(59.50)	200(100.00)
<i>Sensitivity</i>	Male	27(21.77)	38(30.64)	34(27.41)	19(15.32)	6(4.83)	124(62.00)
	Female	18(23.68)	42(55.26)	12(15.78)	4(5.26)	0(0.00)	76(38.00)
	Total	45(22.50)	80(40.00)	46(23.00)	23(11.50)	6(3.00)	200(100.00)

Note: Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages of respondents.

per cent male respondents who had high level of confidence. Only 5.64 per cent of male respondent were found having average level of confidence. Whereas, only 4.03 per cent and 2.41 per cent male respondents were observed at low and very low level of confidence respectively.

Further most of the female respondents (71.05%) were at a very high level of confidence followed by 21.05 per cent female respondents who had high level of confidence. Average confidence was observed in 2.63 per cent female respondents. Similarly 2.63 per cent female respondents were at low level of confidence and very low level of confidence.

Sensitivity Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Data in Table 1 further indicated that less than one- third male respondents (30.64%) were at low level of sensitivity. 27.41 per cent male respondents were at average level of sensitivity followed by 21.77 per cent male respondents at very low level of sensitivity. High level of sensitivity was observed in 15.32 per cent male respondents. However, percentage of male respondents with very high level of sensitivity was only 4.83 per cent.

More than half of female respondents (55.26%) showed a low level of sensitivity followed by 23.68 per cent female respondents at very low level of sensitivity. Average level of sensitivity was observed in 15.78 per cent female respondents. Only 5.26 per cent female respondents were highly sensitive. However, none of the female respondent was found with very high level of sensitivity. Results of the present study clearly show that majority of males and females respondents were having positive social intelli-

gence dimensions such as patience, co-operative-ness and confidence. This implies that most of respondents can manage well in stressful situations. Buss (2000) also reported that co-operation was not only a way to increase happiness but also a way to avoid unhappiness due to regular involvement in competition. Confidence was found to be positive in respondents, the reason for this may be that it deals with the ability to develop firm trust in oneself and ones chances. These results are also supported by Steinberg (1990) who revealed that adolescents who come from homes were better adjusted and socially more intelligent, they were confident about their abilities and competent in areas of achievement. Swart (1996) also of the same view and revealed that more successful students were found to be socially intelligent, able to validate one’s feelings.

Dimensions of Social Intelligence of Respondents on Point Scale

The data on dimensions of Social Intelligence dimensions at three levels of respondents have been given in Table 2 these are explained under the following heads:

Social Environment Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

A cursory glance at the data in Table 2 further showed that almost all the male respondents (96.77%) had low level of recognition of social environment. However, remaining 3.22 per cent male respondents were found with average recognition in social environment.

Similarly most of the female respondents (86.84%) were with low level of recognition of

Table 2: Frequency distribution of relationship between dimensions of social intelligence and levels of respondents

<i>Male=124Female=76</i>		<i>Low</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Recognition of Social Environment</i>	Male	120(96.77)	4(3.22)	0(0.00)	124(62.00)
	Female	66(86.84)	10(13.15)	0(0.00)	76(38.00)
	Total	186(93.00)	14(7.00)	0(0.00)	200(100.00)
<i>Tactfulness</i>	Male	104(83.87)	20(16.12)	0(0.00)	124(62.00)
	Female	51(67.10)	25(32.89)	0(0.00)	76(38.00)
	Total	155(77.50)	45(22.50)	0(0.00)	200(100.00)
<i>Sense of Humour</i>	Male	114(91.93)	10(8.06)	0(0.00)	124(62.00)
	Female	72(94.73)	4(5.26)	0(0.00)	76(38.00)
	Total	186(93.00)	14(7.00)	0(0.00)	200(100.00)
<i>Memory</i>	Male	38(30.64)	86(69.35)	0(0.00)	124(62.00)
	Female	5(6.57)	71(93.42)	0(0.00)	76(38.00)
	Total	43(21.50)	157(78.50)	0(0.00)	200(100.00)

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages of respondents.

social environment. Only 13.15 per cent female respondents showed average recognition of social environment.

Tactfulness Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Another dimension of social intelligence that is, tactfulness was observed low in almost all the male respondents (83.8%). However, 16.12 per cent male respondents were at average level of tactfulness.

Low level of tactfulness was observed in 67.10 per cent female respondents. On the other hand female respondents with average tactfulness were 32.89 per cent.

Sense of Humour Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Data further revealed that sense of humour was low in almost all the male respondents, that is, in 91.93 per cent males. Only 8.06 per cent of male respondents were having average sense of humour.

Almost similar trend was observed in female respondents. Most of the female respondents (94.73%) were found with low sense of humour. There were only 5.26 per cent female respondents who had average sense of humour.

Memory Area of Social Intelligence of the Respondents

Memory of most of the male respondents (69.35%) was at an average. However, 30.64 per cent male respondents were with low memory.

Almost all the female respondents (93.42%) were having an average memory. Only 6.57 per cent female respondents were having low memory.

Relationship between the Social Intelligence of Respondents and Ecological Variables

Results of correlation between social intelligence dimension and ecological variable have been presented in Table 3. A keen examination of results showed that patience had a statistically significant positive correlation with caste of respondents. However, a negative correlation was observed between patience and religion of respondents.

On the other side co-operativeness was found to be statistically significantly correlated with sex and family type of respondents. Other dimension of social intelligence, that is, confidence had a significant positive correlation with sex of the respondents. Negative correlation was found on religion of respondents. Sensitivity showed significant positive correlation with sex and family type of respondents. Whereas, a negative correlation was observed between sensitivity and religion of respondents. Further the ability of respondents for recognition of social environment was found significantly correlated with qualification of father of the respondents. However, it showed a negative correlation with type of family of respondents.

Sex, qualification of father, family type and residence area (rural/urban) of the respondents had a statistically significant correlation with tactfulness of the respondents. However, sense of

Table 3: Correlation between ecological variables and social intelligence of the respondents

<i>Variables/ Categories</i>	<i>Patience</i>	<i>Co-operativeness</i>	<i>Confidence</i>	<i>Sensitivity</i>	<i>Recognition of social environment</i>	<i>Tactfulness</i>	<i>Sense of Humour</i>	<i>Memory</i>
Age	0.010	0.010	-0.019	-0.00004	-0.093	0.052	-0.075	-0.128
Sex	0.114	0.228**	0.130**	0.234**	0.109	0.236**	-0.116	0.163**
Occupation of father	-0.109	-0.021	-0.027	0.054	0.055	-0.020	-0.080	0.033
Qualification of father	0.023	-0.051	-0.066	-0.025	0.133**	0.208**	0.036	0.075
Occupation of mother	0.007	-0.043	-0.001	0.087	-0.074	-0.032	0.009	-0.164**
Qualification of mother	0.017	0.030	0.050	0.088	0.061	0.059	-0.009	0.006
Family income	0.084	-0.071	-0.027	0.011	0.037	0.027	0.013	0.130**
Family type	0.074	0.126**	0.066	0.127**	-0.152**	0.121**	-0.017	0.030
Caste	0.196**	0.055	0.002	0.086	0.039	0.107	-0.070	0.023
Religion	-0.165**	-0.030	-0.162**	-0.155**	0.078	-0.018	0.045	0.078
Rural/Urban	0.071	0.062	0.073	0.005	0.024	0.269**	-0.025	0.109
Ordinal position	0.233	0.021	0.029	0.013	0.063	-0.082	0.083	0.067

** Significant at 5% level

humour of respondents did not show significant correlation with any of the ecological variables of respondents. Memory was found to be significantly correlated with sex and family income of respondents. However, a negative correlation was observed between memory and mothers occupation of the respondents. Gnanadevan (2007) also concluded that the social intelligence scores of the students differed significantly with respect to caste, mothers' education and parents income but did not differ significantly with respect to gender, fathers education, mothers occupation or fathers occupation. Chesnokova (2005) observed that the development of social intelligence with age goes through stages. Saxena and Jain (2013) also found that gender analysis indicates that female student's possess more social intelligence than male students and analysis of stream indicates that arts students are having greater social intelligence than students of other streams.

CONCLUSION

The present study concluded that majority of the respondents were having optimistic social intelligence dimensions such as patience, co-operativeness and confidence. However, sensitivity was found to be negative in males and females respondents. Contrary to this, high percentage of males and females respondents showed negative response of social intelligence dimensions such as recognition of social environment, tactfulness and sense of humour. But, males and females respondents showed a positive relationship with memory.

A significant correlation was found between social intelligence dimensions and ecological variables of respondents. Patience showed a significant positive correlation with caste of respondents. However, a negative correlation was observed between patience and religion of respondents. Co-operativeness had a significant positive correlation with sex and family type of respondents. Confidence also exhibited a significant positive correlation with sex of respondents, but had a negative correlation with religion of respondents. Sensitivity was found to be significantly positively correlated with sex and family type of respondents. Recognition of social environment depicted a significant positive correlation with respondents' father qualification. On the other side, tactfulness illustrated a significant positive correlation with sex, qualification of father, family type and residence area (rural/ur-

ban) of respondents. Memory was found to be significantly correlated with sex and family income of respondents. However, it showed a negative correlation with respondents' mother occupation. 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; from the fanatic following of a religious sect to the formal status in a large-scale organization. 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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank sincerely the principals, teachers and students of the selected schools of Kangra District (Panchrukhi and Bhawarna) for their cooperation and support.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht K 2005. *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success Book Description*. New York: Pfeiffer Publisher.
- Buss DM 2000. The evolution of happiness. *American Psychologist*, 55: 15-23.
- Chadha NK, Ganesan U 2009. *Manual of Social Intelligence Scale*. Agra: National Psychological Cooperation.
- Chesnokova O 2005. Cuning and Social Intelligence in Children. From <www.lancs.ac.uk> (Retrieved on 30 November 2013).
- Gardner H 1993. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- 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.
- Saxena S, Jain KR 2013. Social intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to their gender and subject stream. *Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 1(1): 1-4.
- Shoja Heydari M 2009. *A Study on the Relation of Emotional Intelligence on the Students' Academic Performance*. Thesis. Iran: Isfahan University.
- Steinberg L 1990. Interdependency in the family: Autonomy, conflict and harmony. In: NS Lamborn Mouts, LSD Steinberg, SM Dornbusch (Eds.): *Patterns of Competence and Adjustment among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian,*

- Indulgent and Neglectful Families. *Journal of Child Development*, 62: 1049-1065.
- Swart A 1996. *Relationship Between Well-being and Academic Performance*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- Thorndike EL 1920. Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140: 227-235.
- Thorndike RL 1936. Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 27: 231-233.