
Social Intelligence of Higher Secondary School Students in Nagaland

Dr. Kapil Dhingra

Assistant Professor
IASE F/ O Education,
Jamia Millia Islamia,
New Delhi-110025

Tiakala

Research Scholar
IASE F/ O Education,
Jamia MilliaIslamia,
New Delhi-110025

Abstract

The paper is an attempt to study the social intelligence of the higher secondary school students in Nagaland. A self-developed questionnaire was used for data collection and t-test and ANOVA was used to analyze data. The findings are: there exist 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 is 29.56 and 30.39, thus girls are more cooperative than boys; the mean score of boys and girls in confidence level dimension is 22.19 and 20.80, thus boys are more confident than girls; the mean score of boys and girls in sensitivity dimension is 30.32 and 31.79, thus 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.

Key Words: Social Intelligence, Higher Secondary School, Adolescent

Introduction

With the growing complexities in the present life style demands our effective interpersonal skills to adjust and understands each other which can also be termed as Social Intelligence (SI).

Buzan(2002) defines social intelligence “It is simply a degree to which we get along with and relate to other people around us”. Social Intelligence according to Thorndike (1920) is an ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions. Social intelligence shows the quality of good adjustment with other persons, situations and environment (Mathur, 2007). Thus, SI may be defined as the ability to get along well with others, and to get them to cooperate with us.

Review of Related Literature

Gnanadevan (2007) in his study “social intelligence of higher secondary school students in relations to their social economic status” found that gender do not have significant difference in their social intelligence. Students whose parents vary in their income do have significant difference in their level of social intelligence.

Jayasree (2010) found that female have higher social competence than their male counter parts.

Sembiyan and Visvanathar (2012) found significant difference between social intelligence of boys and girls. No significant difference in the social intelligence of the college students belonging to nuclear and joint family.

Saxena and Kumar (2013) has found that female student possess higher social intelligence than male students.

Need of the Study

In various fields today, importance is given to the capacity and skills of an individual to interact effectively with his environment. An individual’s personality is determined by his interactions with his environment. Hence, developing one’s social skills or social intelligence holds great importance for each individual. As we all know, socialization of an individual starts from his/her home and family environment. Thus, mutual relationship and interactions between parents and children, and siblings develops and enhances an individual’s social intelligence. On the other hand, with the fast growing life style on recent times where relations with the society and even with the family are being shrunken into a molecular form, there the child’s social interaction limit to his father and mother (Alex,2013) thereby development of social intelligence becomes less. Besides, socio-economic status of a family also influences on the social intelligence of an individual (Kaur &Kalaramna, 2004). As an adolescent, each child seeks for popularity, recognitions among their peer groups according to their family status. Children from high income family tend to be more confident where as those children from lower income family tends to have low self-esteem affecting their social intelligence. Furthermore, social intelligence plays an important role in development of the student. Thus, keeping the above mentioned background in mind the researcher has taken up the present study. The

findings of the study will enable the parents and teachers to deal effectively with their children at home and at school and, it further helps each individual to have an effective interaction among themselves in order to develop their social intelligence.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the Social Intelligence of students in relation to their gender
2. To study the Social Intelligence of students in relation to their family income
3. to study the Social Intelligence of students in relation to their number of siblings

Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant different between Social Intelligence of boys and girls.
2. There is no significant different between Social Intelligence of students in relation to their family income
3. There is no significant different between Social Intelligence of students in relation to their number of siblings

Operational Definition of Key Term

Social intelligence in the present study means the ability to have effective interpersonal relationships in social situations.

Population of the Study

The population of the present study comprised of students studying in all 142 higher secondary schools of all 11 districts of Nagaland. Diverse nature and poor transport system in Nagaland become force of constraint.

Target Population of the Study

It is difficult to access all the districts of Nagaland. So, the district which has less than six percent of higher secondary schools in total is rejected from target population. The target population comprised of three districts. In this process 29.58 % of total higher secondary were excluded.

Table 1 Target Population: Higher Secondary Schools

Sl. No.	District Name	All District	Inclusion Percentage
1	DIMAPUR	51	35.92
2	KOHIMA	32	22.54
3	MOKOKCHUNG	17	11.97
All Districts		100	70.43

Sample of the Study

Out of three target districts from sampling two districts were selected randomly. For this purpose two random numbers were generated in Microsoft Excel between one and three. The numbers generated were serial two and three. Hence, district serial number two i.e. Kohima and district serial number three i.e. Mokokchung were selected for the study.

Table 2 Research Sample: Higher Secondary Schools

Sl. No.	District Name	School Managements		Total Schools
		Dept. of Education	Pvt. Unaided	
1	KOHIMA	1	4	5
2	MOKOKCHUNG	1	5	6
Total		2	9	11

Table 3 Research Sample: Students

Sl. No.	District	Name of Schools	Number of Students		
			Boys	Girls	Total
1	KOHIMA	Mezhur Higher Secondary School	29	29	58
		Northfield Higher Secondary School	17	17	34
		Model Higher Secondary School	24	24	48
		RGHSS	24	24	48
		Chandmari Higher Secondary School	55	55	110
		Total	149	149	298
2	MOKOKCHUNG	Jubilee Memorial Higher Secondary School	19	19	38
		Town Higher Secondary School	20	20	40
		Model English Higher Secondary School	15	15	30
		Mayangnokcha Govt. Higher Secondary School	40	40	80
		Queen Mary Higher Secondary School	28	28	56
		Edith Douglas Higher Secondary School	43	43	86
Total			165	165	330
Grand Total			314	314	628

Tool Used

The quality of data depends upon the effectiveness of the tools. The researcher has used following tool to collect valid and reliable data.

- i. Social Intelligence Scale (SIS): Self developed.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection is one of the most important and rigorous exercise in the research. Before going to the field the investigator has incurred the permission letter for data collection forwarded and signed by supervisor and the Head of the department. Prior to the actual day of administering the tools, the investigator has approached the principals of each selected concerned schools along with the permission letter from the department and has sought permission from the schools for administering the tools. After getting approval from the principals of the school the investigator has visited the schools on the following days for administering the questionnaires to the students. The investigator first established a rapport with the students by introducing herself and the purpose for meeting them and then followed by explaining the instructions for filling the questionnaires. During the process, the investigator has helped the students clarified with few words and sentences which they had found it difficult. While collecting back the filled questionnaires from the students the investigator has checked upon each students copy in order to make sure that none of the questions were left unanswered. All the principal and concerned teachers have given necessary help to the investigator throughout the test.

Following plan was followed for the purpose of data collection

Statistical Procedures Used to Analyze the Data

For proper analysis and interpretation of data, statistical techniques like Measure of Central Tendency (i.e. mean), t-test and ANOVA were employed. Statistical Package used for the analysis the data were MS Excel and SPSS-20 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

Analysis and Interpretation

- **Social Intelligence of boys and girls**

Table 4 Social Intelligence and Gender of the Students

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	t value	p value
Patience	Boys	177	26.82	4.21	.31	1.39 (NS)	.65
	Girls	178	27.48	4.59	.34		
Cooperativeness	Boys	177	29.56	4.06	.30	2.07*	.039
	Girls	178	30.39	3.45	.25		
Confidence level	Boys	177	22.19	4.31	.32	2.94**	.003
	Girls	178	20.80	4.60	.34		

Sensitivity	Boys	177	30.32	4.79	.36	2.89**	.004
	Girls	178	31.79	4.81	.36		
Tactfulness	Boys	177	26.88	3.79	.28	1.04 (NS)	.297
	Girls	178	26.44	4.09	.30		
Sense of Humour	Boys	177	30.77	4.04	.30	.887 (NS)	.376
	Girls	178	31.15	3.97	.29		
SocialIntelligence	Boys	177	167.31	16.28	1.22	.748 (NS)	.455
	Girls	178	168.61	16.50	1.23		

There exist no significant difference in Patience, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour dimensions of social intelligence and overall Social Intelligence in relation to gender of the students (Table-4). Furthermore, there exist significant difference in Cooperativeness, Confidence level and Sensitivity dimensions of social intelligence in relation to gender of students (Table-4).

Table 4 further reveals that i. the mean score of boys and girls in cooperativeness dimension is 29.56 and 30.39, thus girls are more cooperative than boys; ii. The mean score of boys and girls in confidence level dimension is 22.19 and 20.80, thus boys are more confident than girls; and iii. the mean score of boys and girls in sensitivity dimension is 30.32 and 31.79, thus girls are more sensitive than boys.

- **Social Intelligence of students in relation to their family income**

Table 5 Social Intelligence in relation to family income

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Patience	Between Groups	448.409	22	20.382	1.05 (NS)	.402
	Within Groups	6443.377	332	19.408		
	Total	6891.786	354			
Cooperativeness	Between Groups	350.051	22	15.911	1.11 (NS)	.324
	Within Groups	4722.720	332	14.225		
	Total	5072.772	354			
Confidence level	Between Groups	546.656	22	24.848	1.23 (NS)	.213
	Within Groups	6662.076	332	20.066		
	Total	7208.732	354			
Sensitivity	Between Groups	243.970	22	11.090	.45 (NS)	.985
	Within Groups	8102.903	332	24.406		
	Total	8346.873	354			
Tactfulness	Between Groups	548.684	22	24.940	1.66 (NS)	.32
	Within Groups	4971.389	332	14.974		
	Total	5520.073	354			

Sense of Humour	Between Groups	369.463	22	16.794	1.04 (NS)	.404
	Within Groups	5318.903	332	16.021		
	Total	5688.366	354			
Social Intelligence	Between Groups	5208.779	22	236.763	.87 (NS)	.628
	Within Groups	89817.588	332	270.535		
	Total	95026.366	354			

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.

- **Social Intelligence of students in relation to their number of siblings**

Table 6 Social Intelligence and Number of Siblings

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Patience	Between Groups	171.729	10	17.173	.879 (NS)	.553
	Within Groups	6720.057	344	19.535		
	Total	6891.786	354			
Co-operativeness	Between Groups	90.736	10	9.074	.627 (NS)	.791
	Within Groups	4982.035	344	14.483		
	Total	5072.772	354			
Confidence level	Between Groups	400.463	10	40.046	2.023*	.030
	Within Groups	6808.269	344	19.791		
	Total	7208.732	354			
Sensitivity	Between Groups	157.957	10	15.796	.664 (NS)	.758
	Within Groups	8188.916	344	23.805		
	Total	8346.873	354			
Tactfulness	Between Groups	299.847	10	29.985	1.976 (NS)	.035
	Within Groups	5220.226	344	15.175		
	Total	5520.073	354			
Sense of Humour	Between Groups	181.583	10	18.158	1.134 (NS)	.335
	Within Groups	5506.783	344	16.008		
	Total	5688.366	354			
Social Intelligence	Between Groups	3669.011	10	366.901	1.382 (NS)	.187
	Within Groups	91357.356	344	265.574		
	Total	95026.366	354			

There exists no significant difference in social intelligence of students in relation to number of siblings except confidence, more the number of siblings higher the confidence.

Major Findings

- There exist 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 is 29.56 and 30.39, thus girls are more cooperative than boys
- The mean score of boys and girls in confidence level dimension is 22.19 and 20.80, thus boys are more confident than girls.
- The mean score of boys and girls in sensitivity dimension is 30.32 and 31.79, thus girls are more sensitive than boys.
- There exists 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.
- There exists no significant difference in social intelligence of students in relation to number of siblings except confidence. More the number of siblings higher the confidence.

Discussion and Conclusion

Man is social animal. He has to establish himself in society. Likewise students are part of the society. In order to establish themselves in society they should be socially intelligent. Thus, social intelligence is one of the most important aspect of the personality and it can help to lead a successful life. The finding that gender, family income do not have significant difference in their social intelligence is in the consonance of Gnanadevan (2007) whereas Sembian and Visvanathar (2012) found contrary finding for gender. Moreover, Jayasree (2010) found that female have higher social competence than their male counter parts.

References

- Alex, P. (2013). Relationship between social intelligence and cores of life skills: A study on higher secondary school students. *Conflux Journal of Education*, 1 (2) 118-127.
- Buzan, T. (2002). *The power of social intelligence*. Harper Collins Publishers, London.
- Gnanadevan, R. (2007). Social intelligence of higher secondary students in relation to their social- economic status. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, 24(3) 340-346.
- Jayasree, P. G. (2010). A study of interpersonal behavior style and social competence among higher secondary school students. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(2) 32-34.
- Kaur, H.,and Kalaramna, A. (2004). Study of interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status among male and female. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 16(2), 137-140.

- Cantor, N., and Kihlstorm, J.F. (1987). *Personality and Social Intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mathur, S. (2007). *Manual for Social Intelligence Scale*. National psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Saxena, S., and Jain, R. K. (2013). Social intelligence of undergraduate students in relation to their gender and subject stream. *Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 1(1) 01-04.
- Sembayan, R., and Visvanathan, G. (2012). A study on social intelligence of college students. *International Journal of Current Research*, 4(1) 231-232.

