

Gender, Age and Locality Based Social Intelligence Differences of B.Ed. (Hons) Students

Asghar Ali Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Malakand, KP, Pakistan. Email: asghar50290100@yahoo.com

Iqbal Ahmad Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Malakand, Chakdara, KP, Pakistan.

Adnan Khan MPhil Scholar, Qortaba University, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

Abstract

Social intelligence has increasingly caught the attention of researchers and scholars in the present times. This research aims at exploring difference in social intelligence mean of male and female university students. Secondly, it explores the effect of age and locality on social intelligence through cross-sectional research design. Data were collected from all (150) students enrolled in semester 8 and 4 BS education course in four public sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP). 71 were female whereas 79 were male in the sample. Data were analysed based on ANOVA test and independent sample t-test through SPSS. The study found no significant difference on gender and locality. But there was a significant relationship related to age. The findings of this study demonstrated that social intelligence increases with age.

Key Words

Intelligence, Social
Intelligence, Gender, Age,
Semester

Introduction

In the past few years social intelligence (SI) has received attention of scholars and researchers as an important construct. Basically, this construct relates to interpersonal intelligence. The construct of social intelligence could be understood with the help of the multiple intelligences theory of Gardner (Ganaie & Hafiz, 2015).

Social intelligence is the collection of cumulative actions of one's own and other members of a social group. It is the ability to manage social change in the society (Ross, 2015). According to Vernon (1933), social intelligence is the ability of individuals to develop social relations, living with others in peace and using different social techniques in the society to solve common issues with the help of insight.

Social intelligence is not an inborn ability of individuals. Rather, it is a learned behavior (Miorandi et al, 2016). Individuals learn this behavior mostly through failures and successes of life experiences. It grows along with growth of social experiences, cooperation and interaction with others in the society (Riggio, 1986).

Social Intelligence is the skill that enables individuals for executing coordination and cooperation in social dealings. Thus, it provides information to comprehend plan for making individuals to acquire personal objectives set in life (Albrecht, 2006). Marlowe (1986) relates social intelligence to social abilities of individuals. In the same way, Goleman's (2006) explains and classifies social intelligence in two categories: social awareness and social talent. Social consciousness consists of empathy, commitment, sense of obligation and sympathy. Social facility consists of self-presentations, social contact, swapping ideas and so on. The writer further says that social awareness is our ability to think about others and social capability is the application of what we can do to create awareness among others.

Social intelligence is associated with emotional intelligence, although both are different constructs. Emotional intelligence refers to the capability of an individual to discern his or her own thought and feeling. Less emotional intelligence (EI) affects social intelligence of individuals. Thus, social intelligence needs social restraints and social skills for apprehending what others feel and individuals with lower emotional intelligence are less able to do this (Riggio, 1986), on the other hand, emotional intelligence is also called intrapersonal intelligence. Emotional intelligence consists of self-awareness which may lead on the part of people to understand one's own-self just as knowing one's own feelings, emotion, fears, shames or guiltiness and so on. These individuals work with an independent mind for achieving their goals. They know their strength, mistake, prospect, and problems in life. They make efforts to reach the stage of self-actualization. These

types of individuals are self-smart (Gardner & Hatch, 1989). However, Suresh (2009) found difference on gender basis among students and teachers on social intelligence. The social intelligence is intimately associated with age. Researchers reported that social intelligence increases with the age (Goleman, 1997). It was predicted that the people who learn when they grow up in progression, get experiences in communicating, treating, giving respect and taking respect from others and understand spending a balanced life (Albrecht, 2004). Age significantly affects the social intelligence (Suresh, 2009). Another study of Dixit and Kaur, (2015) found no significant and prominent difference on gender basis among rural and urban pupils and teacher. A rural student who lives in a village and urban student who lives in a city or a town may have differences.

Fellmann and Redolfi (2017) asserted that female dominate in social intelligence than males. After investigating this situation, the conclusion was that there exists a gap related to social intelligence on the basis of gender. This study was designed for exploring difference in social intelligence on gender basis.

Problem Statement

In this study, we examined gender based differences in social intelligence of students at B.Ed (Hons) level in the Public Sector Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. Moreover, we also examined the differences on social intelligence based on age level and locality among students in Public Sector Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan.

Objectives

In this study we find and explore:

1. Gender based social intelligence among university students.
2. Age based social intelligence among university students.
3. Locality based social intelligence among university students.

Research Questions

What is gender based social intelligence among university students?

1. What is age based social intelligence among university students?
2. What is locality based social intelligence among university students?

Methodology

Research Design

In this study we used quantitative method based on cross sectional survey to explore gender-based difference on social intelligence.

Population

The pupils 2nd semester, 4th semester, 6th semester and eight semester of B.Ed honours in four Public sector Universities, Malakand University, Peshawar University, Abdul Wali Khan University and Swat Universities made the population of this study were 599 subjects

Sample and Sample Size

Universities	Total Sample At The Time Of Visit	Selected sample	Gender		Locality	
			Male	Female	Urban	Rural
Malakand University	174	45	25	20	5	40
Peshawar University	185	45	23	22	41	04
Swat University	60	15	05	10	5	10
Abdul Wali Khan University	180	45	26	19	11	34

A number of 150 students from BS education semester 2 and 4 with age ranging from 18 to 30 years were sampled using simple random sampling. The participants were selected from Malakand University, Swat University, Abdul Wali Khan University and Peshawar University. The selection of such universities was made through convenient sampling technique. Twenty percent students from each semester were selected as subjects from the mentioned universities, in which 45 out of 174 students were taken from Malakand university, 45 out of 185 students were selected from Peshawar university, 45 out of 180 students were taken from Abdul Wali Khan university and only 15 out of 60 students were taken from Swat university due to low strength. In the above sample, 71 were female whereas 79 were male. In this sample, 88 respondents were belonging to the rural areas whereas 62 respondents belonged to the urban areas of the Province.

Research Instrument

An instrument (Tromso Social Intelligence Scale - Questionnaire) was used by the permission of author in this research.

Pilot study

The questionnaire was applied for data collection. Before data collection, the instrument was piloted and test for reliability and validity requirements. For this purpose, it was distributed among 30 students. These were excluded from the major data collection group. Thus, based on the feedback of the experts and results of pilot testing the instrument was finalized for data collection.

Validity and Reliability

As the researcher used a ready-made scale with prior permission of author, so for checking the validity of the instrument in the culture of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan, it was checked by three experts in the field of education. Based on their feedback the instrument was found to be valid for the collection of data in this culture while the reliability of the tool was assessed based on Cronbach's alpha. The Cronbach's alpha value for reliability was found 0.80. The data were collected using a questionnaire with 5-point Likert scale. Questionnaire consisted of twenty-one items. The questionnaire was distributed among the research participants personally by the researchers.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Before analysis, the data were organized and coded. The data were analysed using SPSS by using Independent Samples t-Test and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance).

Table 1. Finding out the Difference between Si on Gender Bases

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Error	S. D	T	Df	P-value
Male	79	3.28	0.47	.414	-1.41	148	0.136
Female	71	3.39					

**Not Significant at $\alpha=.05$*

We found no difference related to social intelligence on gender basis at $\alpha = (0.136 > .05)$ as the mean value for male was 3.28 and female 3.39 and standard deviation was .414. It clarified that social intelligence between both sexes was the same.

Table 2. Social Intelligence on the Basis of Age Level

Groups	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Df	Sig.
Between Groups	5696.213	2848.107	71.487	2	.000
Within Groups	5856.620	39.841		147	
Total	11552.833			149	

**Significant at $\alpha=.05$*

There is a significant difference of social intelligence between the groups with respect to age at significance level ($.000 < .05$) as the mean square between the groups is 5696.213 with degree of freedom 2.

Table 3. Post Hoc (Tukey HSD) Test for Measuring Mean Differences among Groups with Respect to Age

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
18-20	21-25	-11.12000*	1.26239	.000
	25-30	-14.40000*	1.26239	.000
21-25	18-20	11.12000*	1.26239	.000
	25-30	-3.28000*	1.26239	.028
25-30	18-20	14.40000*	1.26239	.000
	21-25	3.28000*	1.26239	.028

The mean difference is significant between the ages (18-20 and 21-25) as the mean difference is -11.12 and (18-20 and 25=30) having mean difference -14.40. Similarly there is significant difference between the ages (21-25 and 25-30) having mean difference -3.2. This shows that social intelligence increases with increasing age or as one gets older.

Table 4. Social Intelligence on the Basis of Locality

Locality	N	Mean	S. D	Std. Error	T	Df	P-value
Urban	62	3.43	.431	0.055	2.392	148	0.18
Rural	88	3.26					

*Not Significant at $\alpha=.05$

There was no significant difference between the social intelligence of urban students and rural students at $\alpha = (0.18 > .05)$ as the mean value for urban students was 3.43 and rural was students 3.26 and standard deviation was .431. It clarified that social intelligence between both sexes was the same.

Discussion

This study clarifies that there is no significant difference on the basis of gender (male and female) regarding social intelligence. The result is not in agreement with the Fellmann and Redolfi (2017) study, who claim that females are dominant than males in social intelligence. Suresh, (2009) claimed no difference on gender basis teachers related to social intelligence. Similarly, Dixit and Kaur (2015) also claimed that there is no significant difference on the basis of gender. While the result of social intelligence with respect to age showed that social intelligence increased with increasing age. This result confirmed that social intelligence was by nature an individual behavior; mostly it is learned from the failure and success of life situations. Social Intelligence grows with experience, cooperating and interacting with other individual (Riggio, 1986). Goleman, (1997) said the social intelligence was related to age. Through research he found that social intelligence increased with increasing age. People who learn well when they grow up slowly attain experiences about communicating, treating, giving respecting and taking respect and spending as healthy life (Albrecht, 2004). Similarly, no significance difference was found on the basis of locality, which is in agreement with Suresh, (2009) who claim that there was no significant difference in social intelligence of students on the basis of locality, i.e. rural and urban students. It is also in agreement with Dixit, & Kaur, (2015) who claim that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of rural and urban pupil teachers.

Conclusions

This study found no significant gender and locality-based difference in social intelligence. It was found that the social intelligence increased with increasing age. Based on this result, it can be argued that social intelligence gets affected with increasing age or when a person grows older. The results of this study are very useful for all teacher training institutes of KP. Also, the results are important for teachers, researchers and educationists in terms of improving the quality of teaching learning process. This study also found that age impacted the growth of social intelligence.

References

- Albrecht, K. (2006). *Social Intelligence: The new science of success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Albrecht, K. (2004). *Social Intelligence. The new science of success: Argumentativeness, effect on social intelligence*. Karl Albrecht international.
- Fellmann, F; Redolfi, E. (2017). Aspects of Sex Differences: Social Intelligence vs. Creative Intelligence, Advances in Anthropology, (7), 4, Volume 7, Issue 4
- Ganaie, MY & Mudasir, H. (2015). *A Study of Social Intelligence & Academic Achievement of College Students of District Srinagar*. Journal of American Science
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. & Hatch, T. (1989). "Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences" (PDF). *Educational Researcher*. 18 (8): 4.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1997). *Emotional intelligence*, New York: Bantam Book Inc
- Marlowe, HA. (1986). *Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78 (1), 52-58.
- Miorandi, D., Maltese, V., Rovatsos, M., Nijholt, A., & Stewart, J. (2016). *Social collective intelligence*. Springer International Pu.
- Riggio, R.E. (1986). *Assessment of basic social skills*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 649-660.
- Ross, H. (2015). *The Man Problem: destructive masculinity in Western culture*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Vernon, P.E. (1933). *Some characteristics of the good judge of personality*. Journal of Social Psychology, 4, 42-57.