

Social Intelligence among High and Low Delinquency Prone Adolescents

MARIA MAQBOOL*¹, NILOFER KHAN² AND N.A. NADEEM³

¹Research Scholar and ^{2&3}Senior Professor

^{1&2}Institute of Home Science, University of Kashmir, Srinagar (J&K) India

³School of Education, Central University of Kashmir, Srinagar (J&K) India

ABSTRACT

Social Intelligence is the human capacity to understand what is happening in the world and responding to that understanding in a personally and socially effective manner. The present study titled as “Social Intelligence among high and low delinquency prone adolescents” was conducted on 240 adolescents in the age group of 12-19 years. Social Intelligence scale devised by Chadda and Ganeshan was used for data collection in order to find out the differences between two groups. Results of the study revealed that majority of high delinquents had average social intelligence, while as, majority of low delinquents had high Social Intelligence. Significant difference between high and low delinquents was found on patience, co-operativeness, sensitivity dimensions of Social Intelligence. Furthermore, Insignificant difference on confidence, recognition of social environment, tactfulness, sense of humor, and memory was found between high and low delinquents. On overall social intelligence, low delinquents scored more than high delinquents, which indicates that low delinquents had more social intelligence than high delinquents.

Key Words : Adolescents, Social intelligence, Delinquents

INTRODUCTION

Social intelligence as one of the new areas in Psychology, in the recent decades, owing to its appealing and widespread aspects has attracted the attention of psychologists, and psychiatrists, as well as other experts in various fields.

Social Intelligence is an inclusive term that embraces a wide range of skills and personal features and refers to interpersonal and intrapersonal skills that transcend specific areas of the previous knowledge such as intelligence and technical or professional skills. It can further be defined as the ability to establish relationship with oneself and others, capacity to judge about other's feelings, ability to sympathize, and being skilled in decoding non-verbal signs.

Social scientist Ross Honeywill believes social intelligence is an aggregated measure of self and social

awareness, evolved social beliefs and attitudes, and a capacity and appetite to manage complex social change. Psychologist, Nicholas Humphrey believes that it is social intelligence, rather than quantitative intelligence, that defines who we are as humans. From the standpoint of interpersonal skills, Karl Albrecht classifies behavior toward Social Intelligence is one of the cluster of “intelligences”, according to the theory of multiple intelligences advanced by Professor Howard Gardner of Harvard University. Gardner's “MI” theory has become widely accepted in recent years. The old idea that a person's potential in life can be measured and predicted by a single number- his or her “IQ” score-has lost a great deal of credibility during the last decade or so. Many researchers now accept Gardner's proposition that intelligence is multidimensional, and may believe that each of the key dimensions of intelligence can continue to increase throughout one's life, given the appropriate

experiences, challenges and growth opportunities. Professor Gardner has proposed various categories of intelligence over the years of his research, typically suggesting seven of them. In as much as he and others have recently been rearranging the categories and in some cases debating about how much intelligence we have, Karl Albrecht has taken the liberty of recasting them into a simpler model which is useful in business and professional settings. According to Karl Albrecht's simplified interpretation, we can think of human beings as having six primary dimensions of intelligence.

Review of literature:

Dhandha and Ninaniya (2017) conducted a study on 300 adolescents and found a significant difference in social intelligence among students from different blocks of Haryana.

Mahaboobvali and Vardhini (2016) found significant differences in social intelligence in general and patience, cooperativeness, confidence, sensitivity, recognition of social environment, memory dimensions in specific among secondary school teachers in relation to their gender and age.

Froeling (2016) reiterated that social intelligence is a predictor of unpopularity and unpopular children are likely to become maladjusted during adolescence. Maladjustment can indulge them to make associations with antisocial peers, which in turn may lead to deviant behavior.

Sultana (2015) found that high social intelligence is associated with empathy, care, understanding, optimism while as low social intelligence is mediated with pessimism, carelessness, non-cooperativeness, less confidence.

Jones (2013) assessed the relationship between social intelligence and clinical performance in nursing students. The results revealed that scores of social intelligence in staff nurses had a positive correlation with performance levels and variables of retention. Clinical staff nurses having high social intelligence scores exhibited higher performance had longer careers, and

greater retention of job.

Maher (2009) found that juvenile delinquents had less intelligence as compared to that of non-delinquents. Furthermore, family size and number of siblings have impact on the chances of delinquency.

Objectives:

- To assess the different levels of social intelligence between high and low delinquents.
- To study and compare high and low delinquents on various dimensions of social intelligence.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was designed to study social intelligence among high and low delinquent adolescents.

Sample group:

Adolescents in the age group 12-19 were taken for the study.

Tools used:

Social Intelligence scale devised by Chadda and Ganeshan was used. The scale is comprised of 66 items with 8 different dimensions viz. Patience, Co-operativeness, Level of confidence, Sensitivity, Recognition of Social Environment, Tactfulness, Sense of Humor, and Memory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the distribution of high and low delinquents on the various levels of social intelligence. The above table depicts that 35.9% high delinquents had high social intelligence followed by 55.8% high delinquents who had an average social intelligence, only 8.3% high delinquents had low social intelligence. In case of low delinquents, 60% had high social intelligence followed by 39.1% respondents who had average social intelligence, only 0.9% low delinquents had low social intelligence.

The Table 2 shows the significant difference between high and low delinquents on patience,

Table 1 : Distribution of different levels of Social Intelligence between high and low delinquents					
Levels	High delinquents		Low delinquents		
	N	%age	N	%age	
High	43	35.9%	72	60.0%	
Average	67	55.8%	47	39.1%	
Low	10	8.3%	1	0.9%	
Total	120	100.0%	120	100.0%	

Table 2 : Mean comparison between high and low delinquent adolescents on various dimensions of Social Intelligence (N=120 each)

Dimensions		N	Mean	S.D.	SEM	t-value	Level of Significance
Patience	High	120	18.64	2.899	.167	2.61	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Low	120	19.24	2.788	.161		
Co-operativeness	High	120	24.93	3.197	.185	3.74	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Low	120	25.80	2.872	.166		
Confidence	High	120	19.28	2.552	.147	1.07	Insignificant
	Low	120	19.51	2.644	.153		
Sensitivity	High	120	20.16	3.108	.179	3.0	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Low	120	20.95	3.077	.178		
Recognition of social environment	High	120	1.04	.785	.045	0.67	Insignificant
	Low	120	1.00	.767	.044		
Tactfulness	High	120	3.48	1.260	.073	0.49	Insignificant
	Low	120	3.43	1.501	.087		
Sense of Humor	High	120	2.97	1.411	.081	1.19	Insignificant
	Low	120	3.11	1.537	.089		
Memory	High	120	8.22	2.509	.145	1.06	Insignificant
	Low	120	7.99	2.732	.158		
Overall Social Intelligence	High	120	98.72	10.453	.603	2.72	Sig. at 0.01 level
	Low	120	101.01	9.906	.572		

cooperativeness and sensitivity dimensions of social intelligence. It was found that low delinquents had more patience, sensitivity and were more cooperative. Insignificant difference was found on confidence, recognition of social environment, tactfulness and memory dimensions of social intelligence. On overall social intelligence it was found that low delinquents had more social intelligence than high delinquents.

Major Findings of the study:

– More than half i.e.55.8% high delinquents had average social intelligence followed by 35.9% who had high social intelligence, low SI was found in 8.3% high delinquents.

– In case of low delinquent adolescents, majority i.e.60% respondents had high social intelligence, average SI was found in 39.1% and only 1 respondent had low social intelligence.

– Significant difference was found between high and low delinquents on patience dimension of Social intelligence. Results showed that low delinquents had more patience than high delinquents.

– On cooperativeness dimension significant difference was found between high and low delinquents. Low delinquents were found to be more cooperative than high delinquents.

– Insignificant difference on the dimension of confidence was found between high delinquents and low delinquents.

– Significant difference between high and low delinquents on sensitivity was found. The mean score of low delinquents was more than high delinquents.

– On the dimension of recognition of social environment and tactfulness insignificant difference was found between two groups.

– Insignificant difference was found on sense of humor and memory dimensions of SI among high and low delinquents.

– On overall social intelligence significant difference was found between two groups. The results showed that low delinquents had more social intelligence than high delinquents.

REFERENCES

- Dhanda, R.B. and Ninaniya, P. (2017). Dimensions of Social Intelligence of Adolescents. *J. Humanities & Social Sci.*, **22** (3) : 56-57.
- Gardner and Howard (1983). *Frames of mind. The theory of multiple intelligence.* N.Y: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1985). *Emotional Intelligence.* N.Y: Bantan Books.

- Habib (2013). A study of relationship between social intelligence and organizational performance (case study: Ardabil regional water company's managers). *Internat. J. Organization Leadership*, **2**(10): 1-10.
- Hassan, Aminpoor (2013). A study on relationship between social intelligence and happiness in Payame Noor University students. *Scholars Research Library, Annals Biological Research*, **4**(5):165-168.
- Jones, K. and Day, J.D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive – social intelligence from academic intelligence. *J. Educational Psychology*, **89**(3) : 486-497.
- Lisette, Froeling (2016). Social Intelligence as a predictor of unpopularity. The moderating effecting of ethnicity. *J. General Social Sciences*.
- Mahaboobavali, K. and Vardhini, S.V. (2016). Social Intelligence of Teachers with respect to their gender and age. *Internat. J. Indian Psychology*, **3** (2).
- Maher, M. (2006). Factors influencing intelligence among adolescents. *J. Adolescents*, **2** : 63-64
- Sultana, N. (2015). Social Intelligence: A key to employee success at work place. *Internat. J. Applied Services Marketing Perspectives*, **4** : 1722-1724.
