

Social Intelligence of Perspective Teachers In Relation To Their Gender and Subject Stream

Indu Rathee^a, Neelam Kumari^b

^aAssociate Professor, Tika Ram College of Education, Sonipat, Haryana, India

^bAssistant Professor, G.V.M. College of Education, Sonipat, Haryana, India

Abstract

The present study was conducted to know the social intelligence of male and female perspective teachers of Science and Arts subject streams studying in various Education Colleges of Sonipat city, Haryana. For this purpose descriptive survey method was used. 40 male and 40 female perspective teachers (B. Ed. students) were selected, for the sample by adopting stratified random sampling technique. The data was collected by using Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Dr. N.K. Chadda and Usha Ganeshan. The data was analyzed by using 't' test. The findings of gender and subject stream analysis indicates that female and male, science and arts perspective teachers possess similar social intelligence.

Introduction

Social intelligence is the key element, which makes people succeed in life. Social intelligence is the capacity of the individual to interact effectively, with his environment. The interpersonal relation in various work environments is itself a reflection of social intelligence. Social intelligence is an important developmental aspect of education. It is the person's ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions. It is a mental ability distinct from abstract and mechanical intelligence (Thorndike, 1920). 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". In the late 1950's David Wechsler defined "social intelligence is just general intelligence, applied to social situations". In this view abstract or general intelligence enters into social intelligence. Social intelligence has two key constituents which are distinctly personal and social in nature, one is intrapersonal intelligence and the other is interpersonal intelligence. Intrapersonal intelligence is the person's ability to gain access to his or her own internal, emotional life while interpersonal intelligence is the individual's ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals. Several definitions of social intelligence have been offered by theorists, but all share two common components (a) the awareness of others (b) their response and adaptation to other and the social situations (Goleman, 2006; Kobe, Rester-palmon and Rickers, 2001). One concept of social intelligence referred to it as the "ability to read non-verbal cues or make accurate social inferences" and "one's ability to accomplish relevant objectives in specific social settings" (Brown and Anthony 1990: 197; Ford and Tisak 1983). Social intelligence is defined as the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts and behaviors of persons, including one self, interpersonal situations and to act appropriately upon that understanding (Marlowe, 1986). Social intelligence helps an individual to develop healthy co-existence with other people. Habib (1994) defined it as: "an individual's ability to

behave in social situations, distinguish the psychological conditions of others from their facial expressions, judge human behavior, remember names and faces, understand jokes, participate with others in their free time and have knowledge of proverbs and wisdoms.” According to Zirkel (2000), social intelligence is closely related to one’s own, personality and individual behavior. Those with social intelligence are fully aware of themselves and understand their environment. This enables them to control their emotions, make decisions about their goals in life. Ford and Maher (1998) pointed out the presence of five different dimensions referring to the concept of social intelligence; situational awareness, impact, originality, clarity, and compassion. The combination of these dimensions reflect the individual’s ability to deal with others through verbal and non-verbal behaviors, judge them in different situations, sympathize with them, and express ideas to them very clearly. Educators’ with high levels of social intelligence are able to mould individuals from different age groups to lead a wholesome life (Dincer 2007). Albrecht (2006) considers social intelligence as a pre-requisite for teachers. He is of the view that the educational system and teachers should respect the rules and behaviors associated with high social intelligence.

Social Intelligence is of more importance in the present life style due to growing societies. 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. Professions like teaching demands a high level of social intelligence because it deals with people with whom constant interaction takes place. It is recommended that teachers be made aware of the importance of Social Intelligence. Hence there is need to see whether there is difference in social intelligence of perspective teachers in relation to gender and discipline. Then training for development of such skills can be incorporated in teacher education program.

Objectives of the study

1. To compare the social intelligence of female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.
2. To compare the social intelligence of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.
3. To compare the social intelligence of students belonging to science and arts stream.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.
2. There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.
3. There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.

Methodology

Descriptive survey model was used in the present study.

Sample

For the selection of sample stratified random sampling technique was adopted. The sample consisted of 80 perspective teachers comprising 40 male and 40 female belonging to science and arts subject from the different Education Colleges of Sonapat City.

Tools

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 namely: Patience, cooperativeness, confidence level, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour and Memory. The respondents were instructed to tick mark one out of the three choices as per applicability of the response to them. The total social intelligence score was determined by summing up the scores of all the dimensions.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The response received was analyzed through statistical applications using t-test for comparing the means and finding out whether there is significant difference between the social intelligence of perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.

Table 1: Shows the mean, standard deviation and t- ratio for testing the significant differences between the social intelligence of female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.

Category	N	M	S.D	S.Ed.	t- value	Level of Significance
Female perspective teachers						0.05
Science	20	100.9	5.4	2.13	0.32	Not sig.
Arts	20	101.6	7.85			

Table 1 shows that there is no significant differences between the means of female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream as the obtained t-values (0.32) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean values of the female perspective teachers of science and arts stream is 100.9 and 101.6 respectively. It may be safely concluded that the female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream have similar level of social intelligence. Hence the first hypothesis, “there is no significant difference between the social intelligence of female perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream” is accepted.

Table 2: Shows the mean, standard deviation and t- ratio for testing the significant differences between the social intelligence of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.

Category	N	M	S.D	S.Ed.	t- value	Level of significance
Male perspective teachers						0.05

Science	20	96.2	12	3.55	1.18	Not sig.
Arts	20	100.4	10.4			

Table 2 shows that there is no significant differences between the means of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream as the obtained t-values (1.18) is not significant at 0.05 level of significance. The mean values of the male perspective teachers of science and arts stream is 96.2 and 100.4 respectively. It may be concluded that though there are differences in the mean value of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream still they share the similar level of social intelligence which is clearly depicted from the t-ratio. Hence the second hypothesis, “there is no significant difference between the social intelligence of male perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream” is accepted.

Table 3: Shows the mean, standard deviation and t- ratio for testing the significant differences between the social intelligence of perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream.

Category	N	M	S.D	S.Ed.	t-value	Level of significance
Perspective teachers						0.05
Science	40	98.6	9.63	2.11	1.14	Not sig.
Arts	40	101	9.23			

The calculated t-value 1.14 in table 3 is less than the table value 1.98. The mean value of the perspective teachers belonging to arts stream is higher on social intelligence than the perspective teachers belonging to science stream but it is not significant, so the null hypothesis, “there is no significant difference between the social intelligence of perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream” is accepted.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it is revealed that there exists no significant differences on social intelligence of male and female perspective teachers. The study also depicts that the perspective teachers belonging to science and arts stream have similar social intelligence. This shows that there is no effect of gender and stream of education on the development of social intelligence. Suresh and Bhaskar Rao (2009) conducted study on social intelligence of student teachers. The result shows that the student teachers possessed high level of social intelligence. Gender, qualification, methodology of teaching, background of the student teachers’ possessed high social intelligence with no significance difference between them.

References

1. Albrecht K 2006. Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
2. Babu, M.S. (2007) Social Intelligence and Aggression Among Senior Secondary School Students: A Comparative Sketch. Project Done as a Part and PGDHE of IGNOU, New Delhi.
3. Brown LT, Anthony RG 1990. Continuing the search for social intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(5): 463-470.
4. Dincer K 2007. Educators role as spiritually intelligent leaders in educational institutions. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 4(1). Edwards CH 2008. *Classroom Discipline and Management*.
5. Ford E, Maher A (1998). Self-Awareness and social intelligence: web pages, search engines, in: George M. (ed). *graduated school of education*, vol ,37 , pp.191-218 .
6. Ford ME, Tisak MS 1983. A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(2): 196-206.
7. Habib ST (1994). Building a measure of social intelligence among the students of the University, unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Education / IbnRushd, Baghdad University.
8. Kanikella Suresh and BhaskerRao(2009). "Social Intelligence of Student Teachers." New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House Pvt. Ltd,
9. Kobe, L.M., Reiter-palmon, R. and Rickers, J.D (2001). Self reported leadership experiences in relation to inventoried social and emotional personality and social, 20(2), 154-163.
10. Marlowe, H.A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multi dimensionality and construct independence, *Journal of educational psychology*, 78(1), 52-58.
11. Thorndike EL (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
12. Vasilova, K. and Baumgartner, P. (2004) Why is Social Intelligence Difficult to Measure. Research Supported by Grant Agency VEGA and Centre of Excellence of the Slovak Academy of Science-CEVIT.
13. Wechsler, N. (1958) *The Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence*. 4/e Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.