Indian Streams Research Journal

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF PRE SERVICE TEACHERS IN REFERENCE TO FACULTY

Mahesh Kumar Gangal[1] and S. B. Sharma[2]
[1]Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, BanasthaliVidyapith, Banasthali, India.
[2]Research scholar, Faculty of Education, BanasthaliVidyapith, Banasthali, India.

Mahesh Kumar Gangal

ABSTRACT

Social intelligence means ability to understand others and to react in such a way towards them that the ends desired should be attained. A man of social intelligence is much more successful in present times than the other people having fame or academic excellence. To study the social intelligence of arts and science pre service teachers, descriptive survey method of research was used. This study investigates the Social Intelligence of Pre-service Teachers or B.Ed. Students from Secondary Teacher education institutions. For this purpose the sample was selected B.Ed. Students from the Secondary Teacher education institutions of Hisar District of Haryana state. The sample consisted of 600 pre service teachers. Out of 600 pre service teachers, 300 pre service teachers from arts faculty and 300 pre service teachers from science faculty were taken. Social Intelligence Scale by Dr. N.K. Chadda & Mrs. Usha Ganesan was used for the study. The study revealed a significant difference between the social intelligence of arts and science pre service teachers.

KEY WORDS: Social Intelligence, Pre service teachers or B.Ed. Students, faculty (Science and Arts) Secondary Teacher Education Institution.

INTRODUCTION :

As man is a social animal, he feels comfortable in groups and community rather than alone. All extraordinary achievements he acquires, when he is in society. By associating with others in society, he learns to act, interact, adjust, readjust and respond. Earlier man was not much aware of social ethics but slowly when he discovered the things, shared them with others and then invented the new ones,

he realized the importance of getting along with others, cooperation, association and also pleasure of celebration in a group. Social intelligence means ability of an individual to reach to social situations of daily life. Social intelligence would not include the feelings or emotions aroused in us by other people, but merely are ability to understand others and to react in such a way towards them that the ends desired should be attained. High social intelligence is possessed by those who are able to handle people well.

Teachers are the most significant contribution to any educational system. They have a very dynamic role to perform in all respects of education i.e. enrolment, retention and improving learning achievement of the students. The Secondary Education Commission (1953-53) report stated, "We are convinced that the most important factor in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher, his personal qualities, his educational qualifications, his professional training and the place he occupies in the community".

Goleman (1997) believed that "high intelligent quotient (IQ) does not necessarily guarantee success in a person's life". In order to get success in teaching, teacher trainees must have social intelligence and the personality of a teacher is also of paramount importance, whether it is concerned to his physical, psychological, and socio-economic, emotional or intellectual aspects. Teacher trainees must be of a sort of intellectuals, who can observe, analyze and counsel the various drawbacks and talent of students.

Ford and Tisak (1983) defined social intelligence in terms of behavioral outcomes and were successful in supporting a distinct domain of social intelligence. They defined social intelligence as "one's ability to accomplish relevant objectives in specific social settings". It is understood from this statement that social intelligence of teachers cannot be assessed through paper pen test but it is the extent of their success in making positive relationship with the pupils so that behavioral changes can be observed in students. Marlowe (1986) defined social intelligence as "the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of persons, including one self, in interpersonal situations and to act appropriately upon that understanding". It means the teachers must have social intelligence as an important characteristic of their personality because above quoted abilities are the pre requisites for becoming a teacher. It eludes that how much important is for a teacher to be socially intelligent.

Only a high level of Academic intelligence i.e. high IQ does not ensure the success of pupil teacher in teaching profession because effective teaching learning process is closely related to teachers' own behavior, social awareness, feelings, active leadership and positive relationship with pupils. There is need for educational system which equips the students to state their opinions in order to make them understood and try to understand the others before they show any reactions to the behavior. It is difficult to lead a successful life in a society without social intelligence. Social intelligence helps an individual to develop healthy co-existence with other people. Socially intelligent people behave tactfully and prosper in life. Social intelligence is useful in solving the problems of social life and help in tackling various social tasks. Thus social intelligence is an important developmental aspect of education. Teacher trainees must be socially intelligent. They must also have the ability to deal with every kind of situation in the class room and every kind of problem of the students also. A man of social intelligence is much more successful in present times than the other people who have fame or academic excellences of how well you can tackle and handle the situations, conditions and peoples in your surroundings. The social intelligent teachers are able to understand themselves, their virtues.

In the easiest terms, this is the capacity to "coexist with individuals", which it is an expected individuals learn as they grow up, adult, and pick up involvement in managing others. Shockingly, numerous individuals don't keep on learning and develop as their age, and numerous individuals never

gain the mindfulness and aptitudes they have to succeed in social, business and professional situations. Pre service teachers must be socially intelligent. They must also have ability to deal with every kind of situation in the classroom and every problem of student also. A man of social intelligence is much more successful in present times than the other people having fame or academic excellence. As far as the pre service teachers concerned there must be given due weightage to social intelligence in the selection and admission of teacher trainees in educational institutions.

In the present scenario, a teacher is required to be more professionally prepared; result oriented and must be perfect in the concerned subject matter. Teachers should be lifelong learners, able to express their teaching methodology with the new way of learning; be adaptive and flexible in dealing with students comprising different age groups of diverse ethnicity and with a varied range of prior knowledge and socio-economic background. Social intelligent teachers can reduce conflict, create cooperation, replace prejudice and opposition with understanding and organize students towards common goals. Our brains are social fools, primed through evolution for promoting and guiding social interactions and relationships. Social intelligence is reflected through one's conformity to keep up standards, moral and traditions of becoming imbibed with the sense of oneness. In other words, social intelligent teachers have ability to understand, ability to cooperate, ability to share joys and sorrows with students and mixing with them. On the behalf of experience of teacher educator, we can say that the subjects of pre service teachers or B.Ed. students affect their social intelligence.

In the light of above discussion questions arose in the mind of researchers: What is the difference in social intelligence of arts and science pre service teachers? How they differ at different dimensions of social intelligence? The researchers felt that answer to these questions is required to be found in relation to pre service teachers because today's pre service teachers are the constructors of future generations and ultimately the future of the nation.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The presented research deals the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers. Therefore, the study undertaken by the researcher can be stated as under: "social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to faculty"

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF STUDY:

Objectives are the stages or steps to achieve the targets or required results by an individual within the expected timeframe and available resources. Researcher determined the following objectives of this study are formed:

1.3.1 To study the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers.
1.3.2 To study the Patience, Co-operativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour and Memory of social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers.

1.4 HYPOTHESES:

Hypotheses are the tentative statements about the solution of the problem and give the solution based on some logic and required to be verify empirically. In the context of the objectives, the following declarative research hypotheses were proposed:

1.4.1 There is no significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service

teachers.

1.4.2 There is no significant difference in the Patience, Co-operativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory dimensions of social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers.

1.5 RESEARCH METHOD:

Research method helps the researcher in investigating the problem in a systematic way and valid manner. The quality of research also depends upon the appropriateness of the method adopted. Therefore, Descriptive Survey Method of research is used in the present study

1.6 POPULATION:

The population for the present study consisted of pre service teachers or B.Ed. students, studying in all teachers training Colleges of Hisar division of Haryana state.

1.7 SAMPLING AND SAMPLE:

Sampling is the basis of any scientific investigation. Sampling is the process by which a relatively small number of individuals or measures of individual objects or events are selected known as sample. In the present study, sample consisted of 600 pre service teachers or B.Ed. students are taken. Out of 600 pre service teachers, 300 pre service teachers from arts faculty and 300 pre service teachers from science faculty were taken by stratified random sampling technique.

1.8 TOOL USED IN THE STUDY:

Tools are means of collecting the data and the quality of the data depends upon the characteristics of the tools. Research Tool Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and Standardized by Dr. N. K. Chadda & Mrs. Usha Ganesan published by National Psychological Corporation, Agra, has been used in the present study.

1.9 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED IN THE STUDY:

To analyze the data inferential statistical techniques like mean, Standard deviation and t-test to testing the hypothesis related to social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers or B.Ed. students.

1.10 PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA:

The data is collected from the subjects related to the variables and presented in the tables according to the hypothesis. After that using the statistical techniques the data has been analyzed and interpreted so as to establish the generalization and find out the results.

To examine statistically, the Research hypothesis 1.4.1: There is significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers, a null hypothesis has been framed i.e. There is no significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers.

Table No. 01
Social Intelligence of Arts and Science faculty Pre service Teachers

S. No.	Faculty	N	Mean	SD	SED	't' value
1.	Arts	300	106.39	8.45	0.49	3.46
2.	Science	300	102.96	14.93	0.87	

If degree of freedom is 598, the required value for t-test to be significant at .05 level of confidence is 1.98.

By observing the table no. 01 the value of mean, standard deviation and standard error of deviation of Arts faculty pre service teachers calculated as 106.39, 8.45 and 0.49 and of science faculty pre service teachers calculated as 102.96, 14.93 and 0.87. The calculated t-value is 3.46, is found statistically significant because it is more than the tabulated value 1.98 at 0.05 level of confidence. Therefore, the research hypothesis "There is significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers" has been accepted while the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers" has been rejected.

To examine statistically, the Research hypothesis 1.4.2: There is a significant difference in the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty, a null hypothesis has been framed i.e. there is no significant difference in the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty.

TABLE NO: 02
Social Intelligence of Arts and Science faculty Pre service Teachers

S.No.	Dimension	Faculty	N	Mean	SD	SED	't' value
1.	Patience	Arts	300	19.88	3.18	0.18	6.28
		Science	300	17.91	4.41	0.25	
2.	Cooperativeness	Arts	300	26.90	2.41	0.14	6.20
		Science	300	25.35	3.60	0.20	
3.	Confidence	Arts	300	20.50	2.58	0.15	1.00
		Science	300	21.20	12.01	0.67	
4.	Sensitivity	Arts	300	21.21	2.86	0.17	0.64
		Science	300	21.06	2.85	0.16	
5	Recognition of Social Environment	Arts	300	1.01	0.70	0.04	0.76
		Science	300	0.97	0.69	0.03	
6.	Tactfulness	Arts	300	3.98	1.10	0.06	0.18
		Science	300	3.97	1.16	0.06	
7.	Sense of Humour	Arts	300	3.57	1.52	0.09	0.61
		Science	300	3.49	1.54	0.09	
8.	Memory	Arts	300	9.33	1.85	0.10	2.14
		Science	300	9.00	1.90	0.10	

If degree of freedom is 598, the required value for t-test to be significant at .05 level of confidence is 1.98.

As per the observation of the table no. 02, the 't' value of the social intelligence of Arts and Science faculty pre service teachers as per the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory obtained as 6.28, 6.20, 1.00, 0.64, 0.76, 0.18, 0.61 and 2.14 respectively. The 't' value was statistically significant at dimensions Patience, Cooperativeness, memory while it was found insignificant at confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour. Therefore, the research hypothesis "There is a significant difference in the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty," is accepted while the null sub hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty" has been rejected.
As a result, the generalization has been established as there is a significant difference in the dimensions of Patience, Cooperativeness, Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty.

1.11 CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

On the basis of analysis and interpretation, the following findings regarding the social intelligence of arts and science pre service teachers have emerged out. There is significant difference in the social intelligence of arts and science faculty pre service teachers. There is significant difference in the Patience, Cooperativeness, Memory of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty" while "There is no significant difference in the Confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humour of social intelligence of pre service teachers in reference to Arts and Science faculty". The present study is of great importance in the context of admitting the pre service teachers in the teacher training courses. A man who is socially intelligent i.e. who can deal with the different age group of students in different circumstances effectively and interested in his work i.e. who have passion towards teaching can make it effective. Most of the pupils choose teaching profession as a career when they have no other alternative and perform the job without any interest. Therefore, for the success in teaching it is necessary that a teacher must be socially intelligent. This study can be repeated by increasing its sample size for confirming the present study results. We suggest that the research study should be conducted on the social intelligence of M.Ed., B.Ed., S.T.C and Shikshashastri students in reference to faculty.

REFERENCES:-
1.Andreou, Eleni. (2006). Social Preference, Perceived popularity and Social Intelligence: Relations to over and relational Aggression. School Psychology International, 27, pp. 339-351.
2.Best, John W. (1957). Research in Education, Englewood. Chaffs, N. J.; Prentice Hall Inc.
3.Buch, M.B. (Ed.) (1972-78). Second Survey of Research in Education. Centre of Advanced Study in Education. Baroda: Society for Educational Research & Development.
4.Chauhan, S.S. (2010). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
5.Ford, M.E., &Tisak, M.S. (1983).A further search for social intelligence. Journal of Educational Psychology. 75, 196-206.

6.Gangal, Mahesh Kumar and Sharma, S.B. (2015) A study of teaching interest of teachers trainees of Sirsa city, Inquisitive Teacher, A Peer Reviewed Biannual Journal of Multidisciplinary Researches, A publication of S.R.S.D. Memorial Shiksha Shodh Sanathan, Agra, India, Vol. 02, Issues 01, June 2015, Page No. 55-58.

7.Garrett. H.E. (2006). Statistics in Psychology and Education. Noida (India): Kalyani Publishers.

8.Goleman, D. (1997). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books Inc.

9.Goleman, Daniel. (2006). Social intelligences leader: Educational leadership, Association for supervision and curriculum development, 64, pp.76-81.

10.Government of India (1953).Report of the secondary education commission 1952-53. New Delhi: Ministry of Education, p.155.

11.Karl, Albrecht. (2006). Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success. John Wiley & Sons.

12.Koul, Lokesh. (2009). Methodology of Educational Research. Noida: Vikas Publishing House.

13.Marlowe, H.A. (1986). Social Intelligence: Evidence for multi dimensionality and construct independence. Journal of Educational Psychology. 78(1), 52-58.

14.Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and Its Use. Harper's Magazine 140: p. 227–235.

15.Wechsler, D. (1958). The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence, 4th ed. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

16.http:// www.karlalbrecht.com/siprofile/siprofiletheory.html

17.http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_intelligence.html