

A Study of Social Intelligence of Students of Students Under B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District of Assam

Dipen Patra, Jiban Boruah

Associate Professor, Department of Education, C.K.B. College, Teok.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1306000492>

Received: 06 July 2026; Accepted: 11 July 2026; Published: 20 July 2026

ABSTRACT

The researchers conducted a study on Social Intelligence of Students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district. The researcher has taken the entire population as a sample by using incidental sampling technique. Total number of sample student is 259. The researcher used descriptive survey method for the study. Data's are collected by using 'The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (2001)' constructed and standardized by D.H. Silvera, M. Martinussen and T.S. Dahl. Result of the study showed average level of social intelligence of students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district.

Keywords: Social Intelligence, B.Ed programme, teacher education, teaching experience, postgraduate.

INTRODUCTION

Social intelligence means ability of an individual to react to social situation of daily life. Social intelligence is our ability to understand others and to react in such a way towards them that the end desired should be attained. High social intelligence is possessed by those who are able to handle people well. Way back in 1920, just after the first burst of enthusiasm about new IQ tests, Edward Lee Thorndike, the Columbia University psychologist created the original formulation of 'social intelligence' in his article published on Harper's Monthly Magazine. He has classified intelligence into 3 categories: (a) Concrete intelligence, (b) Abstract intelligence and (c) Social intelligence. He defined social intelligence as "the ability to understand and manage men and women, skills we all need to live well in the world" (Goleman, 2006). After Thorndike, many other psychologist like: David Wechsler, Richard Davidson also tried to define it. By the late 1950s David Wechsler saw social intelligence merely as "general intelligence applied to social situations" (Goleman, 2006). Richard Davidson saw social intelligence in relation with emotional intelligence. He observes that "All emotions are social. You can't separate the cause of an emotion from the world of relationships- our social interaction are what drive our emotions." (Goleman, 2006).

The unclear concept social intelligence was finally refined by great psychologist Daniel Goleman by organizing it into two broad categories: (a) social awareness and (b) social facility.

Social Awareness: Social awareness refers sensing another's inner state, to understanding her feelings and thoughts, to "getting" complicated social situations. It includes: prime empathy, attunement, empathic accuracy and social accuracy.

- **Prime empathy:** Feeling with others; sensing non-verbal emotional signals.
- **Attunement:** Listening with full receptivity; attuning to a person.
- **Empathic accuracy:** Understanding another person's thoughts, feelings, and intentions.
- **Social cognition:** Knowing how the social world works. (Goleman, 2006).

Social Facility: Social facility builds on social awareness and it allow smooth, effective interactions. The spectrum of social facility includes: synchrony, self-presentation, influence and concern.

- **Synchrony:** Interacting smoothly at then on verbal level.
- **Self-Presentation:** Presenting ourselves effectively.
- **Influence:** shaping the outcome of social interaction.
- **Concern:** Caring about others need and acting accordingly (Goleman, 2006).

Thus, social intelligence covers two major abilities of an individual. One is, ability to sensing accurately about others inner thoughts and other is, ability to interact smoothly and correctly according to their inner thoughts.

Significance of the Study

Now a days, educational goals are chosen on the basis of needs of students and society. For selecting educational goals, various research and survey investigations are done and collect information regarding needs of pupils. Through this process our education system is now taken all round development of physical, mental, emotional, social, moral aspects of individual as a main goal. Education is not limited within a boundary of classrooms, books and knowledge of teachers only. Infact, real education is a lifelong process and it is a lifelong collection of experiences. But the amount of knowledge and experiences given by our formal education system is not sufficient for attaining overall development of an individual. For that every students or individual needs to collect more knowledge and experiences from social contact. Thus it requires a sufficient amount of social intelligence from every individual.

Objectives of The Study

The objectives of the study areas follows

- To study the level of Social Intelligence of students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.
- To compare the Social Intelligence of Male and Female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.
- To compare the Social Intelligence of students of With and Without Teaching Experience of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.
- To compare the Social Intelligence of Graduate and Post-graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of the study are-

- There is no significant difference between the Social Intelligence of Male and Female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.
- There is no significant difference between the Social Intelligence of students of With and Without Teaching Experience of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.
- There is no significant difference between the Social Intelligence of Graduate and Post-graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

Conceptual and Operational Definition of The Term Used

Social Intelligence: Psychologist Thorndike defined- “Social intelligence is the ability to understand and manage men and women. It is a skill we all need to build up and maintain interpersonal relationship to live well in the world.” (Goleman, 2006). Increasing social intelligence refer increasing social awareness, social

facility, social skill and social information processing.

In this study, Social Intelligence refers to the score obtained by the respondent of B.Ed students of Jorhat district in the 'Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS)' constructed and standardized by Silvera, Martinussen & Dahl in 2001. Higher the score in the scale means higher the social intelligence level.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Method used

The researcher found descriptive survey method to be the most appropriate for the present study on the basis of the nature and characteristics of the study. Thus, these natures of the present study helped the researcher to choose the descriptive survey method as the most suitable method.

Population

The population of the present study comprises of all the students pursuing B.Ed programme in the institutions of Jorhat district, Assam during the academic session 2020-22. It was found that there were 3 institutions offering B.Ed programme in Jorhat district, Assam in which 300 students were enrolled.

Sample

The population of the study is not large in size, that's why the researcher decided to conduct the study on the entire population. The researcher had chosen all 3 B.Ed institutions by using Purposive Sampling technique. The researcher also used incidental sampling technique for selecting sampled students. Thus, all the students present during the visit of 3 sampled colleges/institutions were included in the sample.

Tools used

In the present study, the data were collected by using the Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS). The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS) was designed by D.H. Silvera, M. Martinussen and T.S. Dahl in the year 2001. The scale consists of 21 items on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. This scale involves three dimensions, those were: Social Awareness, Social Skills and Social Information Processing and each dimension covers 7 items. There are 21 items in the scale of TSIS out of which 10 are positive and 11 are negative items. The possible maximum score of TSIS for each participant is 147, while the minimum is 21. Once numbers are assigned for all of the items in the scale, need to sum all the values to obtain a total scale score.

Table 1: Scoring Key of TSIS

Items	Strongly Agree	Mildly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Favorable (Positive)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Unfavorable (Negative)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Analysis and interpretation of Data

Objectives no. i): To study the level of Social Intelligence of students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

Table 2: Performance level on social intelligence of students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat District

N	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
259	89.74	29.02	-0.16	-1.44

From the Table 2, it is clear that the computed value of Mean and Standard Deviation of the Social Intelligence score of students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district are 89.74 and 29.02 respectively. The computed value of the skewness of the distribution is -0.16 which indicates that the distribution of the Social Intelligence score is negatively skewed. So, the score is massed at higher end of the scale and it indicates that scores of many students are higher than the average score of the group. The value of kurtosis is -1.44 which indicates the distribution is platykurtic i.e the curve is flatter than the normal curve.

Objective no. ii): To compare the Social Intelligence of Male and Female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

The result of the study regarding comparison of the social intelligence of male and female students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district are presented below-

H0 1: There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of male and female students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district.

Table 3: Comparison of the social intelligence of male and female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District

Variables	N	Means	SD	't' value	Df	Significance
Male	121	89.60	30.76	0.94	257	Not significant at .05 level.
Female	138	89.86	27.52			

From the above table, it is evident that for male, N=121, M=89.60, SD=30.76, and for female, N=138, M=89.86, SD=27.52. The 't' value is 0.94 and 'df' is 257.

The table reveals that computed value of 't'=(0.94) is smaller than the tabulated value (1.96) at .05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of male and female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District" is accepted.

Objective no. iii): To compare the Social Intelligence of students of With and Without Teaching Experience of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

The result of the study regarding comparison of the social intelligence of students of with and without teaching experience of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district are presented below-

H02: There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of students of with and without teaching experience of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district.

Table 4: Comparison of the social intelligence of students of with and without teaching Experience of The B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District

Variables	N	Means	SD	't' value	Df	Significance
Teaching experience	149	88.14	28.75	0.37	257	Not significant at .05 level.
Non-teaching experience	110	91.40	29.34			

From the above table, it is evident that for teaching experience, N=149, M=88.14, SD=28.75, and for non-teaching experience, N=110, M=91.40, SD=29.34. The 't' ratio is 0.37 and 'df' is 257.

The table reveals that computed value of t' (0.37) is smaller than the tabulated value (1.96) at .05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis “*There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of students of with and without teaching experience of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District*” is accepted.

Objective no. iv): To compare the Social Intelligence of Graduate and Post-graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

The result of the study regarding comparison of the social intelligence of graduate and post-graduate students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district are presented below-

H0 3: There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of graduate and post-graduate students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district.

Table 5: Comparison of the social intelligence of graduate and post-Graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District

Variables	N	Means	SD	't' value	Df	Significance
Graduate	102	86.36	28.09	0.16	257	Not significant at .05 level.
Post-graduate	157	91.40	29.57			

From the above table, it is evident that for graduate, $N=102$, $M=86.36$, $SD=28.09$, and for post graduate, $N=157$, $M=91.40$, $SD=29.57$. The t' ratio is 0.16 and df is 257.

The table reveals that computed value of t' (0.16) is smaller than the tabulated value (1.96) at .05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis “*There is no significant difference between the social intelligence of graduate and post-graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district*” is accepted.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

On the basis of analysis and interpretation of data, the following findings have been drawn-

i) The study shows that the Mean and Skewness value of 259 sample students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district is 89.74 and -0.16. The negative skewness value indicated that the distribution of the Social Intelligence score is negatively skewed. So, the scores are massed at higher end of the scale and it indicated that scores of many students are higher than the average score of the group. Thus, it indicates an average level of social intelligence of students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

ii) The study shows no significant difference between the social intelligence of male and female students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District.

iii) The study shows no significant difference between the social intelligence of students of with and without teaching experience of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat District.

iv) The study shows no significant difference between the social intelligence of graduate and post-graduate students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district.

Educational implications and Suggestions

The present study found above average level of social intelligence of students of the B.Ed Programme of Jorhat district which is satisfactory but not enough. Thus, it's necessary to take some steps for improving social intelligence more. Since social intelligence is the ability to react to social situation of daily life and understand others inner state, so rather than providing knowledge theoretically in the classroom it's better to make it practical. Practical steps like: organizing various interschool and intercollegiate competitions,

celebrating various occasions together in the educational institutions, inviting experts to deliver lectures time to time, educational tours, visit of various village and other educational institutions etc. These things helps students to meet new new people, collect and share experiences, buildup relationships and make them more socialize.

Suggestions for further study on Social Intelligence

1. The present study has been carried out with only 3 B.Ed institutions of Jorhat district of Assam. Comprehensive studies can be taken up covering all the institutions of Assam.
2. This study has been conducted on the social intelligence of students of the B.Ed programme of Jorhat district. A comprehensive study may be undertaken with the elementary and secondary school students as well as graduate and post-graduate students of various streams.
3. A number of variables are closely related to the concept of social intelligence, like: interpersonal relationship, social awareness, leadership behavior, management quality, self-concept, happiness, emotions, creativity etc. So it will be of utmost importance that further research should involve these variables.
4. Veryless number of studies has been conducted on differently able students. Thus it is an aspect to be looked at in the quest to suggest for future studies.

REFERENCES

1. Ahuja, R.(2012). Research Methods. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
2. Best, J.W., &Kahn,J.V.(2008). Research in Education(10thedn.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
3. Chaube, S.P., & Chaube, A. (2006). Groundwork for Social Psychology. Hyderabad: Neelkamal Publications Pvt. Ltd.
4. Dandapani, S. (2010). A Text Book Of Advanced Educational Psychology(4th revised & enlargrd edn.). New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.
5. Garrett, H.E. (2011). Statistics in Psychology and Education. New Delhi: Parag on International Publishers.
6. Goleman, D. (2006). Social intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationship. London: The Random House Group Ltd.
7. Koul,L.(2009). Methodology of Educational Research (4threvised&enlargededn.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
8. Mangal, S.K. (2013). Advanced Educational Psychology (2ndedn.). Delhi, PHIL earning Pvt. Ltd