



A STUDY ON SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Mrs. Shobha Jadhav

Adhyapak Mahavidyalya, Aranyeshwar, Pune-9

Abstract

The study was intended to find the social intelligence of college students in Pune, Nashik and Ahmednagar districts of Maharashtra. Random Sampling Technique was used to compose a sample of 469 student teachers. Mean, standard deviation and t value were calculated for the analysis of data. The result revealed that overall status of social intelligence of the selected student teachers was ranged from low to average.

Keywords: *Student teachers, social intelligence*



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

1. Introduction

In teaching- learning process everybody is acquainted with the word ‘Academic intelligence’. Generally intelligence means to perceive and retain knowledge and apply it to its self or other instances of knowledge. But to become successful in life different types of intelligence is required. One of them is Social intelligence. Social Intelligence is the capacity to effectively negotiate complex social relationships and environment.

Social Intelligence is equivalent to interpersonal intelligences. One of the types of intelligence identified in Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligence and closely related to theory of mind. The original definition by Edward Thorndike in 1920 is ‘the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human relation.’ More recently popular science writer Daniel Goleman has drawn on social neuroscience research to propose that social intelligence is made up of social awareness (including empathy, attunement, empathic accuracy and social cognition) and social facility (including synchrony ,self presentation , influence and concern). Goleman’s research indicates that our social relationships have a direct effect on our physical health and the relationship the deeper the impact. Effect include blood flow , breathing , mood such as fatigue & depression and weakening of the immune system. Thorndike and Goleman contribute in the field of social intelligence.

2.Statement of the problem-

A study on social intelligence of student teachers.

3.Objective of the study-

- 1) To compare the social intelligence of student teachers according to their-
 - a) Faculty
 - b) Locale
 - c) Gender
-

4.Hypothesis of the study-

- HO₁:** There is no significant difference in the social intelligence between male and female student teachers.
- HO₂:** There is no significant difference in the social intelligence between urban and rural student teachers.
- HO₃:** There is no significant difference in the social intelligence between the science and non-science student teachers.
-

5.Sample of the study-

In this present study 469 students studying the B. Ed, course were taken as sample. The random sampling technique has been used in the selection of sample. The samples were collected from the colleges situated in Pune, Nashik, Ahmednagar district of Maharashtra.

6.Tool used-

The following tool was used in the present investigation. Social Intelligence Scale by Chadha N.K.and Usha Ganeshan (1986)

7.Method of the study-

Normative survey method was employed. The tool is administered to the samples of 469 students. The data was collected and subjected to statistical analysis to arrive at a conclusion.

8.Statistical Technique-

The following statistical techniques have been used in the present study for the analysis of collected data.

1. Mean
 2. S.D.
 3. 't' test
-

9.Analysis and Interpretation-

Results of comparison between group (Male & Female) in Level of Social Intelligence

Social Intelligence		Gender	N	Mean	SD	SIL	t	Sig
A	Patience	Male	124	20.55	±2.5	High	0.960	p>0.05
		Female	289	20.30	±2.20	High		
B	Cooperativeness	Male	124	26.02	±3.04	Average	4.88	p<0.001
		Female	289	27.54	±2.52	Average		
C	Confidence	Male	124	20.81	±2.75	High	1.80	p>0.05
		Female	289	21.31	±2.17	High		
D	Sensitivity	Male	124	21.39	±2.38	Average	1.10	p>0.05
		Female	289	21.12	±2.28	Average		
E	Recognition of social environment	Male	124	0.96	±0.77	Low	1.12	p>0.05
		Female	289	0.87	±0.71	Low		
F	Tactfulness	Male	124	4.05	±1.39	Low	1.5	p>0.05
		Female	289	4.26	±1.18	Low		
G	Sense of humour	Male	124	3.60	±1.44	Low	1.09	p>0.05
		Female	289	3.78	±1.60	Low		
H	Memory	Male	124	8.23	±2.42	Low	1.67	p>0.05
		Female	289	8.65	±2.13	Low		
	Total	Male	124	105.65	±16.49	Average	1.30	p>0.05
		Female	289	107.87	±14.38	Average		

Results of comparison between rural and urban student teachers in level of Social Intelligence

Social Intelligence		Gender	N	Mean	SD	SIL	t	Sig
A	Patience	Urban	274	20.31	±2.33	High	0.960	p>0.05
		Rural	139	20.46	±2.27	High		
B	Cooperativeness	Urban	274	27.13	±2.82	Average	0.52	p>0.05
		Rural	139	26.98	±2.69	Average		

C	Confidence	Urban	274	20.98	± 2.35	High	1.10	p>0.05
		Rural	139	21.31	± 2.39	High		
D	Sensitivity	Urban	274	21.10	± 2.35	Average	1.13	p>0.05
		Rural	139	21.38	± 2.23	Average		
E	Recognition of social environment	Urban	274	0.83	± 0.72	Low	2.82	p<0.05
		Rural	139	1.05	± 0.74	Low		
F	Tactfulness	Urban	274	4.17	± 1.22	Low	0.89	p>0.05
		Rural	139	4.28	± 1.30	Low		
G	Sense of humour	Urban	274	3.71	± 1.54	Low	0.29	p>0.05
		Rural	139	3.76	± 1.59	Low		
H	Memory	Urban	274	8.51	± 2.34	Low	0.03	p>0.05
		Rural	139	8.52	± 2.00	Low		
—	Total	Urban	274	107.06	± 7.97	Average	0.37	p>0.05
		Rural	139	107.43	± 7.95	Average		

Results of comparison between science & Non-science student teachers in Level of Social Intelligence

Social Intelligence		Gender	N	Mean	SD	SIL	t	Sig
A	Patience	Science	148	20.65	± 2.21	High	1.82	p>0.05
		Non-science	265	20.32	± 2.47	High		
B	Cooperativeness	Science	148	27.17	± 3.02	Average	0.45	p>0.05
		Non-science	265	26.89	± 2.58	Average		
C	Confidence	Science	148	21.03	± 2.39	High	0.85	p>0.05
		Non-science	265	21.12	± 2.59	High		
D	Sensitivity	Science	148	21.22	± 2.42	Average	0.12	p>0.05
		Non-science	265	21.35	± 2.20	Average		
E	Recognition of social environment	Science	148	0.97	± 0.76	Low	1.53	p>0.05
		Non-science	265	0.91	± 0.74	Low		

F	Tactfulness	Science	148	4.14	± 1.31	Low	0.77	$p > 0.05$
		Non-science	265	4.13	± 1.27	Low		
G	Sense of humour	Science	148	3.79	± 1.65	Low	0.55	$p > 0.05$
		Non-science	265	3.70	± 1.39	Low		
H	Memory	Science	148	8.55	± 2.46	Low	0.17	$p > 0.05$
		Non-science	265	8.41	± 2.39	Low		
	Total	Science	148	107.06	± 7.97	Average	0.65	$p > 0.05$
		Non-science	265	107.55	± 8.30	Average		

10. Major Findings-

Comparison of “Social intelligence” between male and female student teachers is summarized below:

- Although male student teachers scored higher level of “**patience**” than the females, but real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(203.05) = 0.96, p > 0.05$].
- Male student teachers scored **lower** level of “**cooperativeness**” than the females statistically [alpha level $t(198.6) = 4.88, p < 0.001$].
- The level of “**confidence**” in **male** student teachers was higher than the females; however inferential statistics indicates that such difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(191.05) = 1.80, p > 0.05$].
- The result indicates that although male student teachers scored **higher** level of “**sensitivity**” than the females, but real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 1.10, p > 0.05$].
- Although male student teachers scored **higher** level of “**recognition of social environment**” than the females, but real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 1.12, p > 0.05$].

- The level of “**tactfulness**” in **male** and female student teachers was high however real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 1.58, p > 0.05$].
- The level of “**sense of humour**” in **male** and female student teachers was high, but real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 1.09, p > 0.05$].
- Both the male and female student teachers scored low in “**memory**” and no statistically significant difference was evident in them [alpha level $t(208) = 1.67, p > 0.05$].
- The overall level of “**social intelligence**” in **male** and female student teachers was average and the real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(206) = 4.88, p > 0.05$].

The result summarized above indicates that both the male and female student teachers possessed a similar status of “social intelligence”; however, the status was ranged from low to average level.

II) Findings on Strata-wise “Social intelligence” in Survey

Comparison of “Social intelligence” between Urban & Rural student teachers is summarized below:

- Both the urban and rural student teachers possessed an average level of “**patience**” and their real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.55, p > 0.05$].
- The level of “**cooperativeness**” in **urban and rural** student teachers was average and similar, and no significant difference was evident between them [alpha level $t(411) = 0.52, p > 0.05$].
- The “**confidence**” level of both the **urban and rural** student teachers was average and possess a similar trend [alpha level $t(411) = 1.10, p > 0.05$].

- The level of “**sensitivity**” in both the **urban and rural** student teachers was average and there was no statistically significant difference [alpha level $t(411) = 1.13, p > 0.05$].
-

- The level of “**recognition of social environment**” in both the **urban and rural** student teachers was low but such level of **rural** student teachers was **higher** than the **urban** [alpha level $t(411) = 2.87, p < 0.05$].
-

- The “**tactfulness**” ability of both the **urban and rural** student teachers was low and no significant difference was seen statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.89, p > 0.05$].
 - The status of “**sense of humour**” in both the **urban and rural** student teachers was low and their real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.29, p > 0.05$].
-

- Although **urban** student teachers scored **higher** level of “**memory**” than the **rural**, but real difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.03, p > 0.05$].
-

- Average status of “**social intelligence**” was evident among the **urban and rural** student teachers and **no statistically significant** difference was seen between them [alpha level $t(411) = 0.45, p > 0.05$].
-

The result summarized above indicates that both the urban and rural student teachers possessed a similar status of “social intelligence”; however, the status was ranged from low to average level.

III) Findings on Subject-wise “Social intelligence” in Survey

Comparison of “Social intelligence” between the subject-wise (science & non-science) student teachers is summarized below:

-
- The level of “**patience**” in both **science and non-science** student teachers was although high, but there was no statistically significance between them [alpha level $t(411) = 1.82, p > 0.05$].
-
- The “**cooperativeness**” ability of both the **science and non-science** student teachers possessed average status; however, the difference was statistically **non-significant** [alpha level $t(271) = 0.45, p > 0.05$].
-
- The level of “**confidence**” among **science and non-science** student teachers was found average and their difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.85, p > 0.05$].
-
- Although the “**sensitivity**” level of both **science and non-science** student teachers possessed average status, however, their difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.12, p > 0.05$].
-
- The level of “**recognition of social environment**” of the **science** student teachers was **low**, whereas higher status was evident among the **non-science students** [alpha level $t(411) = 1.53, p < 0.05$].
-
- Low status of “**tactfulness**” was evident among both the **science and non-science** student teachers, however, their difference was **not significant** statistically [alpha level $t(411) = 0.77, p > 0.05$].
-
- The status of “**sense of humour**” in both the **science and non-science** student teachers was low, and there was no statistically significant differences in this ability [alpha level $t(411) = 0.55, p > 0.05$].
-
- The “**memory**” status of both the **science and non-science** student teachers was found low and likely there was no statistically significant difference in “**memory**” between them [alpha level $t(265) = 0.17, p > 0.05$].
-

- The overall result on “**social intelligence**” revealed that both **science and non-science** student teachers had average status and no significant difference was evident between them [α level $t(411) = 0.65, p > 0.05$].

Thus, result of survey study indicates that **overall status of social intelligence of the selected student teachers was ranged from low to average.**

11. Conclusion-

Based on the results, this investigation draws following conclusion:

Overall status of social intelligence among the student teachers studying in Savitribai Phule Pune University resides in the range of low to average which needs to be improved. Moreover, social intelligence does not differ irrespective of sex (males and females), strata (urban and rural) and subjects (science and non-science). Thus, there is a requisite of specific need-based innovative common programme (SIP i.e., Social Intelligence Programme) to improve overall social intelligence level among the student teachers.

12. Suggestion-

Since inculcation of social intelligence among the student teachers is essential, every Teacher Training Institutions is required to assess the social intelligence status regularly. However, the teacher training institutions affiliated Savitribai Phule Pune University should incorporate this newly developed SIP in the syllabi so that student teachers can enhance their ability in social intelligence. Thus, the large population of student teachers is benefitted.

13. References-

- Best, J.W. & Kahn JV, (2006), Research in Education New Delhi, Prentice Hall at India*
Gay L.R., Airasian peter (1996) Educational Research New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India
Mangal S.K (2008), statistics in psychology & Education New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India
Misra K.S.(2007), Emotional Intelligence: Concept, Measurement and Research
Isk me path net/km education
www.ejkm.com/issue/download
www.isk me org
www.ktu.IT/IL/mokslas/zurnlai/inreka
www.oecd.org/dataoecd/46/20/2074931,
www.jhuccp.org/what wdo/projects.
www.emeralsinsight.com/doi/abs/10.11.08/095135