

## Study of Interrelationship Between Home Environment, Social Intelligence and Socio-economic Status Among Males and Females

Harpreet Kaur and Ashu Kalaramna\*

*Department of Human Development College of Home Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana 141 004, Punjab, India*

**KEYWORDS** Cooperativeness. Patience. Sensitivity. Tactfulness

**ABSTRACT** The present study was undertaken to assess the existing levels of inter-relationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status across various age levels and two sexes. The data was collected from randomly selected four high schools in the villages of Ludhiana – I block of Ludhiana district. Home environment was assessed by using Mishra's Home Inventory, Social Intelligence was assessed by using Chadha and Genesan's (1986) Social Intelligence Scale and to know the socio-economic status, Kulshreshta's Socio-Economic Status Scale (1981) was used. Results revealed that socio-economic status has got effect on social intelligence. Home environment also showed positive impact on social intelligence.

Among the various social groups, the home occupies the first and the most significant place for the development of the individual. Fraster (1959), Wilson (1978), Dasen (1980) and Maria and Piper (1980) concluded that early home environment is a significant prediction of mental development and at the same time the home is of extraordinary importance in the development of social intelligence. It does not only provide the hereditary transmission of basic potential for his development but also provides environmental conditions and personal relationships (Kundu, 1977). The foremost duty of the parents is to provide their child with need satisfaction by creating a home, a climate conducive for their healthy social adjustment. If the overall home environment favours the development of good social attitudes, the chances over that children will become socially more intelligent. Children from favourable environment homes are found to be warm-hearted, outgoing and socially more intelligent than children from unfavourable homes (Rani, 1998).

Socio-economic status is a very important and basic parameter to study any characteristic prevailing in the society because this is what determines and influences one's place in social setup.

The socio-economic status influence not only the physical setting where the home and neighbourhood are located but also the intelligence process. Thus, the intelligence behaviour could be the product of the socio-economic status to

which individual belongs (Vijayalakshimi, 1996). Children from high socio-economic status because of their superior environment are more confident and sure of themselves as compared to children who come from lower class families. Children from low socio-economic status start out with feelings of inferiority and inadequacy and these in turn affect their social intelligence. So, the present study was carried out to find out the interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status in both the sexes.

### METHODOLOGY

The present study was undertaken to assess the interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status. The sample comprised of 160 adolescents randomly selected from four high schools located in the villages of Ludhiana – I block of Ludhiana district. Chadha and Ganesan's (1986) Social Intelligence Scale was used to assess social intelligence. To know the socio-economic status, Kulshreshta's Socio-Economic Status Scale (1981) was used. Home Environment was assessed by using Mishra's Home Environment Inventory (1989). The objective was achieved by working out the co-efficient of correlation between all these parameters.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic status is very important and

---

*Address for correspondence:* Dr. Ashu Kalaramna,

basic parameters to study any characteristic prevailing in the society because this is that which determines and influences one's place in social set up. The coefficient of correlation (*r*-value) between different dimensions of social intelligence and socio-economic status according to the sex have been presented in Table 1. The table 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 to be significant at 1 percent level of significance. Similar was the

case as far as females were concerned but there was an inverse and significant relationship between socio-economic 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 socio-economic status of both males and females. This shows that with the increase in socio-economic status, the level of patience in females decreased. Thus, overall it can be concluded that in order to acquire better level of social intelligence, socio-economic status needs to be raised. Sharma (1980) also found that high socio-economic group demonstrated more sociability, emotional stability, thoughtfulness in comparison to low socio-economic group.

A cursory look at Table 2 shows that there exists a positive and significant relationship between control and cooperativeness, control and confidence. If an increase was made in the existing level of control of males, there would be an increase in the cooperativeness and confidence of males. This result is an agreement that with that of Steinberg (1990) who showed that adolescents who come from homes characterized as authoritative are better adjusted and socially more intelligent, they are confident about their abilities, competent in areas of achievement and

**Table 1: Interrelationship between social intelligence and socio-economic status**

| Dimensions of social intelligence     | Socio-economic status |                      |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
|                                       | Males                 | Females              |
| A – Patience                          | 0.090 <sup>NS</sup>   | -0.247**             |
| B – Cooperativeness                   | -0.148 <sup>NS</sup>  | 0.000 <sup>NS</sup>  |
| C – Confidence                        | -0.132 <sup>NS</sup>  | -0.096 <sup>NS</sup> |
| D – Sensitivity                       | -0.083 <sup>NS</sup>  | -0.030 <sup>NS</sup> |
| E – Recognition of Social Environment | 0.324***              | 0.226**              |
| F – Tactfulness                       | 0.293***              | 0.395*** G           |
| – Sense of Humour                     | 0.254**               | 0.256**              |
| H – Memory                            | 0.544***              | 0.405***             |

\*\* - at 5% level of significance

\*\*\* - at 1% level of significance

NS – non-significant

**Table 2: Interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status: males.**

|                                | Dimensions of Social Intelligence |                 |            |             |                                   |             |                |          |                       |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------|-----------------------|
| Dimensions of home environment | Patience                          | Cooperativeness | Confidence | Sensitivity | Recognition of social environment | Tactfulness | Sense of humor | Memory   | Socio-economic status |
|                                | (A)                               | (B)             | (C)        | (D)         | (F)                               | (G)         | (H)            | (I)      |                       |
| A – Control                    | -0.048                            | 0.309***        | 0.316***   | 0.040       | 0.010                             | -0.066      | -0.005         | 0.0001   | -0.013                |
| B – Protectiveness             | 0.017                             | 0.021           | 0.226**    | -0.033      | -0.083                            | -0.073      | 0.093          | -0.222** | 0.104                 |
| C – Punishment                 | -0.087                            | -0.317***       | 0.049      | 0.023       | 0.015                             | 0.248**     | -0.437***      | -0.224** | 0.037                 |
| D – Conformity                 | -0.091                            | 0.057           | 0.249**    | -0.045      | 0.0001                            | 0.087       | -0.077         | 0.262**  | -0.149                |
| E – Social Isolation           | -0.074                            | -0.107          | 0.076      | -0.044      | -0.238**                          | 0.033       | 0.038          | 0.233**  | 0.134                 |
| F – Reward                     | -0.003                            | 0.242**         | -0.043     | 0.083       | 0.074                             | 0.228**     | -0.100         | 0.113    | -0.011                |
| G – Deprivation of Privileges  | -0.262**                          | -0.221**        | 0.009      | -0.075      | -0.019                            | 0.029       | 0.031          | 0.369*** | 0.094                 |
| H – Nurture                    | -0.033                            | 0.027           | 0.244**    | 0.001       | -0.092                            | -0.056      | -0.023         | 0.040    | -0.060                |
| I – Rejection                  | -0.245**                          | -0.047          | 0.030      | -0.221**    | 0.005                             | 0.047       | -0.051         | 0.055    | -0.324***             |
| J – Permissiveness             | -0.059                            | 0.233**         | 0.096      | -0.452***   | 0.010                             | 0.056       | 0.082          | -0.027   | -0.154                |

\*\* - at 5% level of significance

\*\*\* - at 1% level of significance

**Table 3: Interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status: females.**

| <i>Dimensions of home environment</i> | <i>Dimensions of Social Intelligence</i> |                        |                   |                    |                                          |                    |                        |               | <i>Socio-economic status</i> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
|                                       | <i>Patience</i>                          | <i>Economic status</i> | <i>Confidence</i> | <i>Sensitivity</i> | <i>Recognition of social environment</i> | <i>Tactfulness</i> | <i>Sense of humour</i> | <i>Memory</i> |                              |
|                                       | (A)                                      | (B)                    | (C)               | (D)                | (F)                                      | (G)                | (H)                    | (I)           |                              |
| A – Control                           | -0.056                                   | -0.003                 | -0.230**          | 0.260**            | -0.042                                   | 0.247**            | 0.039                  | 0.072         | -0.265**                     |
| B – Protectiveness                    | 0.311***                                 | 0.190                  | 0.047             | 0.256**            | -0.003                                   | 0.241**            | 0.254**                | 0.073         | 0.172                        |
| C – Punishment                        | 0.033                                    | -0.224**               | -0.018            | -0.113             | -0.295**                                 | -0.114             | 0.154                  | -0.028        | -0.137                       |
| D – Conformity                        | 0.280**                                  | 0.365***               | 0.055             | -0.123             | -0.105                                   | -0.018             | 0.142                  | 0.145         | 0.040                        |
| E – Social Isolation                  | -0.030                                   | -0.051                 | -0.053            | 0.055              | 0.088                                    | -0.012             | 0.126                  | -0.002        | -0.044                       |
| F – Reward                            | 0.288***                                 | 0.343***               | 0.498***          | 0.142              | -0.051                                   | 0.191              | 0.118                  | -0.090        | -0.031                       |
| G – Deprivation of Privileges         | -0.221**                                 | -0.073                 | -0.019            | -0.002             | -0.070                                   | 0.242**            | 0.095                  | -0.017        | -0.145                       |
| H – Nurturance                        | -0.053                                   | 0.240**                | -0.142            | 0.143              | 0.090                                    | 0.274**            | 0.268**                | 0.017         | 0.235**                      |
| I – Rejection                         | 0.004                                    | 0.049                  | -0.031            | -0.063             | -0.102                                   | -0.068             | -0.006                 | -0.234**      | -0.397***                    |
| J – Permissiveness                    | -0.299***                                | 0.175                  | -0.236**          | -0.274**           | 0.036                                    | 0.236**            | 0.204                  | 0.111         | -0.011                       |

\*\* - at 5% level of significance

\*\*\* - at 1% level of significance

less likely than their peers to get into trouble. Protectiveness of males showed different impact i.e. positive on confidence and negative on memory. This shows that with the increase in protectiveness, there would be an increase in confidence and the same would result in a decline in memory of males. The table also highlights that the increase in punishment to males resulted in lack of cooperativeness (-0.317\*\*\*), sense of humour (-0.437\*\*\*), and memory (-0.224\*\*) whereas the same resulted in raising the level of tactfulness (0.248\*\*). The finding of Salzinger et al (1993) also showed that family violence yielded socially maladjusted children, abused children were rated by peers as more aggressive and less cooperative, and by parents and teachers as more disturbed. Their social networks showed more insularity, a typicality and negativity. The positively significant coefficients highlighted that increasing the level of conformity led to the increase in the level of confidence (0.249\*\*) and memory (0.262\*\*) while the impact of increase in social isolation led to the decline in the recognition of social environment (0.238\*\*) and increase in memory (0.233\*). The increase in level of reward cooperativeness (0.242\*\*) and increase in tactfulness (0.228\*\*), while decline in patience (-0.262\*\*) and cooperativeness

(-0.221\*\*) were recorded with the increase in level of deprivation of privileges and this increase contributed towards increase in memory (0.369\*\*\*). Nurturance caused increase in confidence (0.244\*\*) whereas rejection stood for decline in patience (-0.245\*\*) and sensitivity (-0.221\*). The increase in permissiveness led to decline in sensitivity (-0.452\*\*\*), on one hand and increase in cooperativeness (0.233\*\*) on the other hand. The increase in socio-economic status led to decline in the level of rejection. The results are in concordance with Biswas (1981) who found that adolescents from high socio-economic group were high on social desirability scale and had more stabilization friendship relationships and were less rejected by their peers.

It is evident from Table 3 that increasing the control on females led to increase in their sensitivity (0.260\*\*) and tactfulness (0.247\*\*) while the same led to decline in their confidence (-0.230\*). Protectiveness resulted in increasing the patience (0.311\*\*\*), sensitivity (0.256\*\*) and tactfulness (0.241\*\*) and sense of humour (0.254\*\*) while punishment caused decline in cooperativeness (-0.224\*\*) and recognition of social environment (-0.295\*). The increase in conformity resulted in increase in patience (0.280\*\*) and cooperativeness (0.365\*\*\*).

Social isolation was found to be non-significantly correlated with all the dimensions of social intelligence.

The analyses further reveals that reward contributed positively and significantly towards patience (0.288\*\*), cooperativeness (0.343\*\*\*) and confidence (0.498\*\*\*) of females whereas deprivation of privileges led to decline in patience (-0.221\*\*) and increase in tactfulness (0.242\*\*). The increase in the level of nurturance of females led to increase in cooperativeness (0.240\*\*), tactfulness (0.274\*\*) and sense of humour (0.268\*\*) while rejection led to decline in memory (-0.234\*\*). Permissiveness was found to be negatively but significantly related with patience (-0.299\*\*\*), confidence (-0.236\*\*) and sensitivity (-0.274\*\*) while it was positively and significantly related with tactfulness (0.236\*\*) in females.

The table also contains the value of correlation coefficient of socio-economic status with home environment. It shows that there is a positive and significant relation between socio-economic status and nurturance. According to Conger et al (1994) who showed that financial strain increases parent's feelings of depression and causes conflict between parents and adolescents over money. This in turn make parents more irritable, which adversely affects the quality of their parenting and such a family climate makes adolescents harsher, socially inactive and they indulge in anti-social behavior.

Overall, it can be concluded that a number of dimension of home environment contributed significantly to various dimensions of social intelligence. Therefore, in order to raise the level of social intelligence, the increase/decrease in different dimensions of home environment needs to be made accordingly. One has to fix the priorities of social intelligence as the same dimension of home environment may lead to diverse affect on various dimensions of social intelligence. As

the case was of punishment to males, that increase in the level of punishment to males resulted in increase in tactfulness but the same may lead to decline in sense of humour, memory and cooperativeness. Thus, there should be a rational combination of efforts to increase the level of social intelligence of adolescents.

## REFERENCES

- Biswas, C.: *Interpersonal relationship in classroom situation as reflected on social disability scale*. Indian Dissertation Abstract **10**: 131-35 (1981).
- Chadha, N.M. and Ganesan U.: *Social Intelligence Scale*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra (1986).
- Conger, R.D., Elder, G., Lorenz, M. and Simons, R.L.: *Families*. In: Steinberg, L. (ed.) *Adolescence*. Pp 134-73. McGraw Hill, Inc. New York. (1994).
- Desan, P.R.: *Individual differences and cultural differences*. Bulletin de Psychologia. **33**:12-15 (1980).
- Fraser, E.: *Home environment and the school*. University of London Press, London (1959).
- Kulshreshta, S.P.: *Socio-economic Status Scale* (Form B). National Psychological Corporation, Agra (1981).
- Kundu, C.L.: *Personality development: A critique of Indian Studies*. Rohtak, Visual Publication (1977).
- Maria, K.R. and Piper, M.C.: *Effect of early home environment on the mental development of Down Syndrome Infants*. *A J. Mental Deficiency*. **85**(1):39-44 (1980).
- Mishra, K.S.: *Home Environment Inventory*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra (1989).
- Rani, S.: A study of public school children's psychological development in relation to home environment. *J. Indian Ed*. 16-23(1998).
- Sharma, S.: Influence of socio-economic background on development of term-per mental characteristics among college female students. *Ind. J. Psychol*. **55** (1-2):26-32 (1980).
- Steinberg, L.: Interdependency in the family: Autonomy, conflict and harmony. In: Mounts, N.S., Lamborn, S.D., Steinberg, L. and Dornbusch, S.M. – Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Dev*. **62**:1049-65 (1990).
- Vijayalakshmi: A comparative study of intellectual abilities of tribal and non-tribal students. *Ind. Psychol. Rev*. **46**:41-43 (1996).
- Wilson, S.R.: Synchronies in mental development: An epigenetic perspective. *Science*. **202**:439-57 (1978).