SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH RESPECT TO GENDER

Juttu Swapna

PhD Research Scholar, Faculty of Education, Osmania University, Hyderabad

Telangana State, Email: juttu.swapna@gmail.com

Abstract

Social intelligence is the ability to understand and mange men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human and social relations existing in day to day life. The present study was conducted on 420 secondary school teachers from Medchal and Ranga Reddy district of Telangana State. The result reveals that there was a significant difference in social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender.

Key Words: *Social intelligence, secondary school teachers.*

Introduction

Social intelligence refers to the ability to read other people and understand their intentions and motivations. Social intelligence is the art of building, sustaining and managing the costs of those relationships through 'vigilant trust'. This is not trust as a 'warm fuzzy' but trust set within a framework of mutual expectations and a shared understanding that each will keep an eye on the other. People with this intelligence are usually clued into the differences between what others say and what they really mean. As a result, socially intelligent types may sometimes be accused of being mind readers. People who successfully use this type of intelligence can be masterful conversationalists. This can be due to a combination of excellent listening skills and the ability to meaningfully engage others. People who are socially intelligent can usually make the people around them feel comfortable and included. They also tend to enjoy interacting with a variety of people.

Social intelligence can be defined as the intelligence that lies behind group interactions and behaviors'. This type of intelligence is closely related to cognition and emotional intelligence,

and can also be seen as a first level in developing systems of intelligence.

Types of social intelligence

    i.   Verbal and non-verbal fluency.

    ii. Knowledge of social rules and roles.

    iii. Listening skills.

    iv. Understanding how other people's emotions work.

    v.   Playing social roles efficiently.

    vi. Self-Image and impression management.

Components of Social Intelligence

According to Goleman, social intelligence consists of two components that again comprise several subcategories: Social awareness – primal empathy, attunement, empathic accuracy, social cognition, and social facility – synchrony, self- presentation, influence, concern.

Social intelligence for students

Social Intelligence plays very important role in student's educational development. It gives the capacity to know oneself and to know others, is as inalienable a part of the human condition as is the capacity to know objects or sounds, and it deserves to be investigated no less than these other "less charged" forms.

Objectives of the Study

To study the social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender

Hypothesis of the Study

There is no significant difference between social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender

Sample of the Study

Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the sample. Secondary school teachers constituted the sample. The sample for the study was 420. Survey method was adopted. In Telangana state there are 33 districts. Out of which Medchal Malkajgiri was chosen for the study.

S.No	District	Management	Gender	Sample (Teachers)	
1	Medchal & Ranga Reddy	Government	Male	105	210
			Female	105	
		Private	Male	105	210
			Female	105	
Total Sample				**420**	

Tool of the Study

Social Intelligence Scale was developed by N. K. Chadha and Usha Ganesan (2009). It measures social intelligence in eight areas- patience, cooperativeness, confidence level, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humour, and memory.

Table 3.1: showing the dimensions of Social Intelligence

S.No	Dimensions	No. of Items
1	Patience	08
2	Co-operativeness	11
3	Confidence	08
4	Sensitivity	09
5	Recognition of Social Environment	03
6	Tactfulness	07
7	Sense of Humour	08
8	Memory	12
Total		**66**

Their operationally defined structure was as under:

i. Patience---- Calm endurance under stressful situations.

ii. Co-operativeness---- Ability to interact with others in a pleasant way to be able to view matters from all angles.

iii. Confidence Level---- Firm trust in oneself and ones chances.

iv. Sensitivity---- To be acutely aware of and responsive to human behaviour.

v. Recognition of Social Environment---- Ability to perceive the nature and atmosphere of the existing situation.

vi. Tactfulness---- Delicate perception of the right thing to say or do.

vii. Sense of Humor---- Capacity to feel and cause amusement; to be able to see the lighter side of life.

viii. Memory---- Ability to remember all relevant issues; names and faces of people.

Reliabilty: The reliability of the scale was established by the split half method and Test – Retest method.

Validity: Empirical validity and Cross validation was established for the tool.

Analysis and Interpretation

Hypothesis – 1: There is no significant difference between social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender

To test the above hypothesis t test has been employed to find out the difference between male and female teachers. Results of the statistical computation were presented in the following table.

Table - 1: Showing social intelligence - gender wise

Social Intelligence	Gender	N	Mean	S. D	t	df	sig
Patience	*Male*	210	46.81	3.11	0.88		0.84
	Female	210	47.47	2.15			
Cooperativeness	*Male*	210	49.32	2.86	6.97		0.05*
	Female	210	49.74	1.59			
Confidence	*Male*	210	49.38	1.37	0.52		0.95
	Female	210	45.43	2.14			
Sensitivity	*Male*	210	43.50	2.69	3.92		0.55
	Female	210	47.31	1.52			
Recognition of Social Environment	*Male*	210	47.63	1.54	6.46	1, 418	0.05*
	Female	210	42.52	1.77			
Tactfulness	*Male*	210	46.18	1.02	6.39		0.05*
	Female	210	48.01	1.35			
Sense of Humour	*Male*	210	46.97	1.37	4.14		0.15
	Female	210	41.69	1.87			
Memory	*Male*	210	45.41	1.89	2.42		0.68
	Female	210	45.36	1.05			
Overall Social Intelligence	*Male*	210	46.90	1.98	6.67		0.05*
	Female	210	45.94	1.68			
	Total	**420**	**46.42**	**1.83**			

Patience: In Patience the mean score of male teachers was 46.81 and that of female teachers was 47.47. The obtained t value 0.88 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically not significant. Based on the mean scores of male and female teachers it was observed that the patience among female secondary school teachers appear to be better than that of male secondary school teachers.

Cooperativeness: In Cooperativeness the mean score of male teachers was 49.32 and that of female teachers was 49.74. The obtained t value 6.97 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore it may be inferred from the mean scores that cooperativeness among female secondary school teachers was better than that of male secondary school teachers and it was statistically proved.

Confidence: In Confidence the mean score of male teachers was 49.38 and that of female teachers was 45.43. The obtained t value 0.52 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically not significant. Based on the mean scores of male and female teachers it may be said that the confidence of male teachers appear to be better than that of female teachers.

Sensitivity: In Sensitivity the mean score of male teachers was 43.50 and that of female teachers was 47.31. The obtained t value 3.92 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically not significant. Based on the mean scores female secondary school teachers appears to be better than that of male secondary school teachers in sensitivity.

Recognition of Social Environment: In Recognition of Social Environment the mean score of male teachers was 47.63 and that of female teachers was 42.52. The obtained t value 6.46 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore it may be in inferred from the mean scores that recognition of social environment among male teachers appear to be better than that of female teachers and it was statistically proved.

Tactfulness: In Tactfulness the mean score of male teachers was 46.18 and that of female teachers was 48.01. The obtained t value 6.39 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore it may be concluded that female teachers were better than that of male teachers in tactfulness and it was statistically proved.

Sense of Humour: In Sense of Humour the mean score of male teachers was 46.97 and that of female teachers was 41.69. The obtained t value 4.14 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically not significant. However based on the mean scores male teachers appear to be better than that of female teachers in sense of humour.

Memory: In Memory the mean score of male teachers was 45.41 and that of female teachers was 45.36. The obtained t value 2.42 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically not significant. However, based on the mean scores it may be said that male teachers appear to be better than that of female teachers in memory.

Overall Social Intelligence: In overall social intelligence the mean score of male teachers was 46.90 and that of female teachers was 45.94. The obtained t value 6.67 with a df of 1, 418 was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore it may be concluded that male teachers appear to be better than that of female teachers in the overall social intelligence and it was statistically proved.

Hence hypothesis "There is no significant difference between social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender" is **rejected** as majority of sample i.e. secondary school teachers had differences in social intelligence with respect to gender.

Findings (Social Intelligence Dimensions)

1. Patience: Female secondary school teachers were better than that of male secondary school teachers.

2. Cooperativeness: Female teachers were better than that of male secondary school teachers.

3. Confidence: Male teachers were better than that of female teachers.

4. Sensitivity: Female teachers were better than that of male teachers.

5. Recognition of social environment: Male teachers were better than that of female teachers.

6. Tactfulness: Female teachers were better than that of male teachers in tactfulness.

7. Sense of Humour: Male teachers were better than that of female teachers.

8. Memory: Male teachers were better than that of female teachers.

9. Overall Social Intelligence: Male teachers were better than that of female teachers in the overall social intelligence and it was statistically proved.

Conclusion

Social intelligence is the ability to get along well with others, and to get them to cooperate with you. Sometimes referred to simplistically as "people skills," social intelligence includes an awareness of situations and the social dynamics that govern them and knowledge of interaction styles and strategies that can help a person achieve his or her objectives in dealing with others. It also involves a certain amount of self-insight and a consciousness of one's own perceptions and reaction patterns. Social intelligence is the ability to understand and mange men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human and social relations existing in day to day life. It is the ability to deal with and adjust to other persons trails considered to be measurable aspect of social intelligence are the following : sense of humor memory for names and faces, common sense in social relations, recognition of the mental stage of the speaker and common observation of social behavior. The result of the study reveals that there is a significant difference in social intelligence among secondary school teachers with respect to gender.

References

Cantor, N. and Kihlstorm, Y. F. (1989). *Social Intelligence and Cognitive Assessments of Personality*. In R. S. Wyer and T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Advances in Social Cognition*. Hillsdale, N. J. : Eribaum, Vol. 2, 1-59.

Chesnokova, O. and Sub bostsky, E. (2005). *Cunning and Social Intelligence in Children If you we so Clever Why Aren't You Cunning* Retrieved From http:/www.lanes.uk./staff/chesnoks/cunning.pdf

Collin's English Dictionary (2017). *Advanced English Dictionary*. HarperCollins Publishers. https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/efficacy

Dane Archer (1980). *How to Expand Your Social Intelligence Quotient* Publisher, M. Evans.

Dautenhatin, K. & Fdmonds, B. (1999). *Social Intelligence, Computational and Mathematical Organizational Theory*, Vol. 5, 199-202.

George, Marcus L (2020) *Effective Teaching and Examination Strategies for Undergraduate Learning during COVID-19 School Restrictions: Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, v49 n1 p23-48 Sep 2020.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Gupta, B.M. (1997). *Role of induction Programme in Teacher Effectiveness. Journal of Indian Education*, Vol. 22, Feb. N.C.E.R.T., New Delhi.

Halder, U. K. & Roy, R. R. (2018a). *Job Satisfaction and Teacher Effectiveness of Secondary School Teachers. International Journal of Innovative Research Explorer*, 5(4): 47-61.

Hunt, T. (1928). *The Measurement of Social Intelligence. Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. (12), 317-334. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, v3 n2 p85-90 Jun 2014

Jayaramanna, K. (2001). *A Study of Teacher Effectiveness in Relation to Work Orientations and Academic Achievement of Students*, Ph.D Thesis, Andhra University.

Josheph, B. (2013). *Teacher Effectiveness and Professional Competency among Higher Secondary School Teachers in Kottayam District, Kerala*. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh.

Kaur, M. (2012). *Teacher effectiveness in relation to role commitment of secondary school teachers. Vision Research Journal of Education*, 3(1), 86-93.

Khatal, Mohan N. (2010). *Psychological Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness. International Referred Research Journal*, Vol. LII.

Kiadese, A.L. (2011). *An assessment of the teaching effectiveness of prevocational subjects teachers in Ogun State Nigeria. International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education.* 3(1) 5-8.

Koedel, Cory; Parsons, Eric; Podgursky, Michael; Ehlert, Mark(2015), *Teacher Preparation Programs and Teacher Quality: Are There Real Differences across Programs? Education Finance and Policy*, v10 n4 p508-534 Fall 2015

Koon, J. & Murray, H. G. (1995). *Using multiple outcomes to validate student ratings of overall teacher effectiveness. Journal of Higher Education*, 66, 61-81.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology. Methods and techniques (2nd Revised Ed).* New Delhi. New Age International Publishers.

Maslow A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

McMillan, M.S. (1987). *The Relationship of Teacher Temperament Effectiveness in the Classroom, International Dissertation Abstract, Vol.49 (1), 62-A.*

Meijs, Noortje; Cillessen, Antonius H. N.; Scholte, Ron H. J.; Segers, Eliane; Spijkerman, Renske(2010), *Social Intelligence and Academic Achievement as Predictors of Adolescent Popularity, Journal of Youth and Adolescence, v39 n1 p62-72 Jan 2010*

Mishra, C.P. (1999). *Teachers Effectiveness of Elementary School Teachers in Relation to their Attitude towards Teaching, Level of Aspiration and Job Satisfaction, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Education, Kurukshetra: Kurukshetra University.*

Papanastasiou, E. (1999). *Teacher evaluation. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.*

Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2001). *Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning. Educational Psychologist, 36, 89-102.*

Prasad, Himadri and Prasad Dharmedra, (2005) *Towards Professionalism in Education, University News, 43(18) May 02- 08.*

Rabindranath Tagore (1994), *"The English writing of Rabindranath Tagore: A miscellany". p. 64, Sahitya Academy*

Radha Rani Roy & Ujjwal Kumar Halder(2018), *Teacher Effectiveness: A Self-Report Study on Secondary School Teachers, IJRAR- International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, [Volume 5 I Issue 3 I July – Sept 2018] e ISSN 2348 –1269, Print ISSN 2349-5138 http://ijrar.com/*

Roman, Tiffany (2020) *Supporting the Mental Health of Teachers in COVID-19 through Trauma-Informed Educational Practices and Adaptive Formative Assessment Tools Roman, Tiffany Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, v28 n2 p473-481 2020.*

Sivasakthi Rajammal, T. and Muthumanickam (2012) *a study on the teacher effectiveness of school teachers, R International Journal of Current Research, Vol. 4, Issue, 02, pp.222-226, February, 2012*

Suresh Prabu. Dr (2015) *Study on Academic Stress among Higher Secondary Students International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, Vol. 4 Issue 10, October. 2015, PP.63-68. ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714*

Susan J. Rosenholtz (1985). *Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence, American Journal of Education, 93(3): 352–388.*

Wadleigh, Linda L.(2013) *The Combined Effect of Teacher Effectiveness Characteristics on Value-Added Student Achievement in Junior High School Mathematics, ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Houston-Clear Lake.*

Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality. Princeton, NJ: The Milken Family Foundation and Educational Testing Service.*