

Relationship Between Wisdom and Social Intelligence Among Senior Secondary School Students

Sunita Devi

Research Scholar & Assistant Prof.
B. P. S. M. V., Khanpur Kalan, Sonapat (Hr.)

Received August 12, 2017

Accepted Sept. 01, 2017

ABSTRACT

The concept of wisdom is considered to be the integration of knowledge, traits, mind, emotion, and virtue and Social intelligence is the capacity of a man to understand the feelings and emotions of other and react according to the circumstances. The present study was conducted to identify the relationship between Wisdom and social intelligence among senior secondary school students. The data was collected by using Monika Ardel's 3D Wisdom scale (2005) and Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) constructed and standardized by Chadda and Ganesan (2009). 100 male and 100 female senior secondary school students were selected. Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviations and t- test were applied for analysis of data. The results revealed that Cognitive wisdom is positively correlated with sense of humor and Affective wisdom is positively correlated with recognition of social environment. But Reflective wisdom is negatively correlated with recognition of social environment among male senior secondary school students. Cognitive wisdom is negatively correlated with Confidence and Sense of humor among female senior secondary school students. This study work was original.

Key words: Wisdom, Social Intelligence, senior secondary school students.

Introduction

The concept of wisdom is considered to be the integration of knowledge, traits, mind, emotion, and virtue. Erik Erikson (1968) suggested that wisdom is the highest human achievement after overcoming various life crises at each development stage and accomplishing issues related to each developmental stage of life. Although wisdom is generally considered an asset of maturity, developing with age, we often encounter youth with wisdom beyond their years (Piechowski, 2006).

The cognitive wisdom is individual's ability to understand life. It contains an individual's capabilities such as knowledgeable, veteran, intelligent, practical, and conscientious qualities when comprehending the events and nature of life (Ardelt, 2000).

The reflective wisdom dimension refers to the meta-cognition including introspective and intuitive qualities which assess the degree of overcoming subjectivity and ridge by examining experience with different perspectives (Ardelt, 2003).

The affective wisdom dimension refers to the reality of positive emotions (empathy and compassion) and behaviors such as understanding, empathetic, peaceful, and gentle characteristics toward others in wisdom (Ardelt, 2003).

Social Intelligence

Social intelligence as a personality trait as well as a performance characteristic may be regarded as an important social competence of a teaching profession and a significant predictor of successfulness of a teacher in their profession. Social intelligence is the person's ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions (Thorndike, 1920). Social intelligence is a mental ability distinct from abstract and mechanical intelligence (Thorndike, 1920). Ford and Tisak (1983) defined social intelligence in terms of behavioral outcomes and were successful in supporting a distinct domain of social intelligence.. 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. These concepts of social intelligence are incorporating internal & external perceptions, social skills and other psychosocial variables, (Taylor,1990). Pro-social attitude is indicated by having an interest and concern for others, social performance skills is demonstrated in appropriate interaction with other, empathetic ability refers to one's ability to identify with others.

The design and the study of social intelligence has been part of general debate about intelligence, although its study has been more controversial and less investigated. Thorndike (1920) used the notion of social intelligence to clarify that intelligence could manifest itself in different facets (Landy, 2005), and characterized social intelligence as the ability to accomplish interpersonal tasks.

The test involves following eight components. Their meaning is discussed as follows :

- **Patience** : Patience reflects calm endurance under stressful situation. The term connotes tolerance, compassion etc.
- **Cooperativeness** : Cooperativeness concept is related to ability of an individual to work together.
- **Confidence Level** : Confidence is essential ability for each individual to perform any tasks. From trust in one self and ones chance is confidence.
- **Sensitivity**: Sensitivity is ability to respond to affective changes in interpersonal environment.
- **Recognition of Social Environment**: Recognition of social environment is ability to recognise existence of self and others in the context of social environment. "
- **Tactfulness** :Tactfulness is skill in dealing with delicate or dsituation
- **Sense of Humour**: It is defined as "Capacity to feel and cause amusement; to be able to see the lighter side of life".
- **Memory** : Memory is psychological experience related to maintenance and appreciation through mental images.

Objectives

- To find out the relationship between wisdom and social intelligence among girls senior secondary school students.
- To find out the relationship between wisdom and social intelligence among boys senior secondary school students.

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant relationship between wisdom and social intelligence among girls senior secondary school students.
2. There is no significant relationship between wisdom and social intelligence among boys senior secondary school students.

Methodology

In research, there are numerous methods and procedures to be applied such as Historical Method, Experimental Method, Survey Method, Descriptive Method and Case study Method.

Sample:

A sample of 200 senior secondary school students was taken on the basis of randomly from different schools of Sonipat district. Out of 200 students, 100 were taken girls and 100 were taken boys.

Data collection Tools: Following tools will be used in the study:-

- 3D Wisdom Scale (Monika Ardel,2003)
- Social Intelligence Scale (Chadha,N.K.& GanesanUsha,2005)

Results and findings

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX (GIRLS STUDENTS OF SE.SEC.SCHOOL)

	CW	AW	RW	Pa	CO-	CON	SENSITI	S.ENV	TACt	S.HU	MEM	
CW	X											
AW	.307**	X										
RW	.218*	.195	X									
P	.050	-.073	.251*	X								
CO-	-.059	-.014	-.093	.205*	X							
CON	-.213*	-.035	.047	.088	.161	X						
SEN	.062	-.046	.004	-.075	-.285**	.183	X					
S.ENV	-.196	-.044	.084	.048	.075	.005	-.137	X				
TACT	-.185	.062	.119	.234*	.066	.080	.072	.344**	X			
S.HM	-.205*	.011	.035	-.003	.138	.018	.043	.295**	.531**	X		
MEM	-.090	-.087	.013	.266**	.127	.051	-.165	.010	.227*	.051	X	X.

$r = .197^* > 0.05$

$r = .257^{**} > 0.01$

a) INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THREE MEASURES OF WISDOM:-

Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation among three measures of wisdom of girls secondary school students ranged from -0.218 to 0.307. Only two of total three correlations are

significant at or above 0.05 level of significance. Cognitive wisdom is positively correlated with Affective wisdom ($r=0.307$) which is significant at 0.01 level. Significant correlations between cognitive and affective wisdom may be because of their association with each other. Cognitive wisdom is negatively correlated with reflective wisdom ($r=-0.218$) which is significant at 0.05 level. Significant negatively correlations between cognitive and reflective wisdom may be because of their negative association with each other.

b) INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG EIGHT MEASURES OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE:-

Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation among eight measures of social intelligence of girls senior secondary school students ranged from -0.205 to 0.531. Only six of total twenty eight correlations are significant at or above 0.05 level of significance. Patience is positively correlated with co-operative ($r=.205$) which is significant at 0.05 level. Patience is also positively correlated with tactful and sense of humour ($r=.234$ & $.266$) which is respectively significant at 0.05 level and $r=.266$ which is significant at 0.01 level. Co-operativeness is negatively correlated with sensitivity ($r=-0.285$) which is significant at 0.01 level. Recognition of social environment is positively correlated with tactfulness and sense of humour ($r=0.344$ & 0.295) both are significant at 0.01 level. Tactfulness is positively correlated with sense of humour and memory ($r=.531$ & $.227$) which is significant respectively at 0.01 level and 0.05 level.

c) INTER CORRELATION BETWEEN THREE MEASURES OF WISDOM AND EIGHT DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation between three measures of wisdom and eight of social intelligence between girls senior secondary school students ranged from -0.205 to 0.213. Only two of total twenty four correlations are significant at or above 0.05 level of significance. Cognitive wisdom is negatively correlated with confidence and sense of humour ($r=-0.213$ & -0.205) both are negatively significant at 0.05 level.

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX (BOYS STUDENTS OF SE.SEC.SCHOOLS)

	CW	AW	RW	PATIE N	CO-	CON	SENSITI	S.ENV	TAC	S.HU	MEM	
CW	X											
AW	0.561**	X										
RW	0.424**	0.590**	X									
P	0.048	0.061	0.075	X								
CO-	0.118	-0.135	-0.039	0.410**	X							
CON	0.018	0.016	-0.033	0.398*	0.481*	X						
SEN	0.027	-0.063	0.147	0.350*	0.308*	0.597*	X					
S.E NV	-0.188	-0.338**	0.229*	0.011	-0.103	-0.022	0.082	X				
TAC T	-0.008	0.027	-0.087	0.039	0.015	-0.044	0.017	0.296*	X			
S.H M	0.661*	-0.134	-0.195	0.047	-8.9E-	0.047	0.094	0.406*	0.577*	X		
ME M	-0.130	-0.067	-0.040	0.056	0.07	0.198*	0.173	0.028	0.143	0.18	X	X

$r = .197^* > 0.05$

$r = .257^{**} > 0.01$

a) INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THREE MEASURES OF WISDOM DIMENSIONS:-

Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation among three measures of wisdom of boys secondary school students ranged from .424 to 0.595. Only three of total six correlations are significant at 0.01 level of significance. Cognitive wisdom is positively correlated with Affective wisdom ($r=0.561$) which is significant at 0.01 level. Significant correlations between cognitive and affective wisdom may be because of their association with each other. Cognitive wisdom is positively correlated with reflective wisdom ($r=.424$) which is significant at 0.01 level.

Affective wisdom is positively correlated with Reflective wisdom ($r=0.595$) which is significant at 0.01 level. Significant correlations between Affective and Reflective wisdom may be because of their association with each other.

b) INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG EIGHT MEASURES OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE:- Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation among eight measures of social intelligence of boys senior secondary school students ranged from .198 to 0.597. Only ten of total twenty eight correlations are significant at or above 0.05 level of significance. Patience is positively correlated with co-operative ($r=.410$) which is significant at 0.01 level. Patience is also positively correlated with confidence and sensitivity ($r=.398$ & $.350$) which is respectively significant at 0.01 level. Co-operativeness is positively correlated with confidence and sensitivity ($r=-0.481$ & 0.308) which is significant at 0.01 level.

Confidence is positively correlated with sensitivity and memory ($r=.597$ & $.198$) which is respectively at or above 0.05 level. Recognition of social environment is positively correlated with tactfulness and sense of humour ($r=0.296$ & 0.406) both are significant at 0.01 level. Tactfulness is positively correlated with sense of humour ($r=.577$) which is significant at 0.01 level.

c) INTER CORRELATION BETWEEN THREE MEASURES OF WISDOM AND EIGHT DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

Inspection of inter correlation matrix reveals that inter correlation between three measures of wisdom and social intelligence of boys senior secondary school students ranged from 0.229 to 0.661. Only three of total twenty four correlations are significant at or above 0.05 level of significance. Cognitive wisdom is positively correlated with sense of humour ($r=0.661$) which is positively significant at 0.01 level. Affective wisdom is positively correlated with recognition of social environment ($r=0.338$) is significant at 0.01 level. Reflective wisdom is negatively correlated with recognition of social environment ($r=-0.229$) which is significant at 0.01 level of significant.

Conclusion

On The bases of the findings of the present study the author suggestions were that finding provides significant hints about the relevance of wisdom and social intelligence among secondary school students. It prove that Individuals who are socially intelligent appear to experience better patience, cooperativeness, sensitivity, recognition, tactfulness, confidence level, sense of humour, a rich and meaningful life as well as have enhanced social problem-solving abilities. Schools must try to encourage and inculcate social qualities in the students so that they are better adjusted to the environment. Teachers are the role models for their students hence they should be effectively trained to help their students avail maximum benefits and make better adjustments in their life. According to the author same study was not found with same variable. But the author wanted to work on these variable. So this study work was original.

References

- Ames, R. T. (2002).** Mencius and a Process Notion of Human Nature. In A. K. L. Chan (Ed.), *Mencius: Contexts and Interpretations* (pp. 72-90). Honolulu: University of Hawai Press.
- Ardelt, M. (2000).** Intellectual versus wisdom-related knowledge: The case for different kind of learning in the later years of life. *Educational Gerontology: An International Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 771-789.
- Baltes, P. B., & Smith, J. (2008).** The fascination of wisdom: Its nature, ontogeny, and function. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 56-64.
- Bennion, L., & Adams, G. R. (1986).** A revision of the extended version of the objective measure of ego Identity status: An identity instrument for use with late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 183-198.
- Bennion, L., & Adams, G. R. (1986).** A revision of the extended version of the objective measure of ego Identity status: An identity instrument for use with late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 183-198.
- Chandler, H. M. (1991).** Transcendental meditation and awaking wisdom: A 10-year longitudinal study of self development. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 5048B. Clayton,
- Good, M., & Adams, G. R. (2008).** Linking academic social environments, ego-identity handbook of wisdom: Psychological perspectives (pp. 139-159). New York: Hangeek University, Seoul. *International Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 771-789. Jordan (Eds.), *A handbook of wisdom: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 3-31).
- Kunzmann, U., & Baltes, P. B. (2005).** The psychology of wisdom: Theoretical and empirical challenges. In R. J. Sternberg & J. Jordan (Eds.), *Handbook of wisdom: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 110-135). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- N.K.Chadha & Usha Ganesan, 2005,** *Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)*, National Psychological Corporation, Agra New York: Cambridge University Press. on Aging, 25, 275-324.
- Pasupathi, M., & Staudinger, U. M. (2001).** Do advanced moral reasoners also show wisdom? Linking moral reasoning and wisdom-related knowledge and judgement. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25, 401-415.

Pasupathi, M., Staudinger, U. M., & Baltes, P. B. (2001). Seeds of wisdom: Adolescents' knowledge and judgment about difficult life problems. *Developmental Psychology, 37*, 351-361.

Piechowski, M. M. (2006). "Mellow out," they say. If I only could: Intensities and Press. psychological comparisons. *Child Development, 52*, 129-144. psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, Psychology, 37, 351-361.

Skoe, E. E., & Marcia, J. E. (1991). The development and partial validation of a carebased measure of moral development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 37*, 289-304. 96Society for Research on Adolescence, San Diego, CA.

Staudinger, U. M. (2001). Wisdom, psychology of. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 24, pp. 16510-16514). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Staudinger, U. M., & Baltes, P. B. (1996). Interactive minds: A facilitative setting for wisdom-related performance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 746-762.

Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things.

~ Peter F. Drucker