NVEO
Natural Volatiles &
Essential Oils

Development And Standardization Of Social Intelligence Scale (Sis)

S. Deepa Rani[1] , Dr. K. Vijaya[2]

[1]Ph. D. Research Scholar, Department of Curriculum Planning and Evaluation, Tamil Nadu Teachers Education University,Chennai, TamilNadu,India

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum Planning and Evaluation,TamilNaduTeachersEducation,University,Chennai, TamilNadu,India

Abstract

Social intelligence is the ability to make the intellect out of the actions of others is critical to people's daily functioning. Humans are social experts in the society. Everyone understands that others actions are directed at goals and driven by intentions. Social intelligence helps individuals build relationships and is important to numerous aspects of a person's life. It allows an individual to form friendships and coalitions. Social intelligence refers to a person's ability to understand and administer interpersonal relationships. It is distinct from a person's intelligence level. It includes an individual's ability to understand, and act on, the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of other people. The present research was undertaken to develop and standardization of the social intelligence scale. Attributes of social intelligence were elicited from 100 working women at the college level, in three different sectors like arts and science colleges, educational institution, and engineering colleges. After empirical validation, 100 working women at the college level were asked to rate themselves on the 55 items on a 5-point scale. The study of test social intelligence of working women at the college level is an important one and for which the investigator has decided to develop and standardize a scale to measure it.

Keywords: social intelligence, functioning, working women, interpersonal relationships.

Introduction

Social intelligence was operationally defined in terms Wechsler, (1958) description of intelligence and Thorndike's definition of social intelligence (1920) as social intelligence is

the ability that helps the individual understand social interactions and deal with them purposefully and effectively. Social intelligence manages the required abilities for effective communication based on empathy, self-knowledge, listening, and reading of emotions. Conversational skills are the most basic form of social intelligence. Verbal and non-verbal expressions are the primary platforms for sending any message. The use of the right words, the ideal tone, and clear intention underlie the first step to effective communication. This type of communication very essential for teachers at the college level, if the teacher has socially intelligent she can easily communicate with the students. When the teachers interact with a group, knowing their social rules, customs, and idiosyncrasies is a fundamental skill for socially intelligent people. This facilitates interaction with individual student who belong to different social groups, like people of different ages, countries, religion, or cultural identities in their peers. Women tend to be better at emotional empathy than men, in general. This kind of empathy fosters rapport and chemistry. People who excel in emotional empathy make good counselors, teachers, and group leaders because of this ability to sense in the moment how others are reacting. If the teacher is socially intelligent, they consider the impression that they make on students. Considered one of the most complex elements of social intelligence, managing a reputation requires careful balance a person must thoughtfully create an impression on another person while still being authentic. Social intelligence understands that arguing or proving a point by making students very confident. They don't outright reject another person's ideas, but rather listen to them with an open mind. Even though many tools available on social intelligence, the researcher would like to update the tool to get appropriate results according to the recent development of social intelligence of women teachers at the college level. The Likert type scale is a five-point scale of "Always", "Frequently", "Occasionally", "Rarely", "Never". In this scale 55 items have been collected from the various sources like from the expert's, other web resources, books and so on.

Procedure

This phase of the study aims to explore the phenomena of social intelligence from women teachers at the college level is the population. 37 arts and science college teachers, 38 educational college teachers, and 25 engineering college teachers were selected in the Chennai district through random sampling method. They were asked to list the characteristics

and attributes of a person with social intelligence, according a list of 68 attributes was elicited. The researcher closely examined the list, all those items were excluded, which were ambiguous, repetitive, and slang. After linguistic modification and exclusion of repetition, a list of 55 attributes was finalized for the pilot study.

Pilot study

The main objective of this study is to examine the reliability of the social intelligence of women teachers at the college level. It also aims to detect possible mistakes and to ensure that the scale will elicit the intended information (Webb, 2000). This scale contains 55 items as been administering to the sample of 100 respondents in Chennai district. (During the month of February, 2021) the researcher before the actual collection of data. The respondents of the pilot study were women working in the education field, Arts and Science colleges, and Engineering colleges. Most of the respondents stated that the instructions, statements used in the scale pertaining to variables of the research study and the choices of possible answers used in the questionnaire were understandable and comprehensive. Then their responses have been scored carefully and their marks secured by all the samples have been arranged in the descending order from the highest score to lowest scorer. Then they were subjected to item analysis.

Item Analysis

Item analysis is a process which examines respondent responses to individual test items in order to assess the quality of those items and of the test as a whole. Item analysis is especially valuable in improving items which will be used again in later tests, but it can also be used to eliminate ambiguous or misleading items in a single test administration. After a pilot study the t-value will be done for each item, which forms the basis for item selection in order to build up a final scale. The Likert type scale calls for a graded response to each item on a five-point scale ranging from "Always", "Frequently", "Occasionally", "Rarely", "Never. The individual score for all the hundred respondents were ranked from the highest to lowest score. Then 27 percentages of the subjects with the highest total scores and 27 percentage of the subjects with the lowest total scores were scored out for the purpose of item selection. The high and low groups, were selected, formed the criterion groups and each group was made up of 27

respondents. (Edward. L. Allen, 1957). Each item is followed by five different responses of "Always", "Frequently" "Occasionally", "Rarely", "Never" for the social intelligence scale. Then each item was taken individually and the number of working women who responded "Always", "Frequently", "Occasionally", "Rarely", "Never". The answers were found out both the high and low groups separately. Thus, for all the 55 items, the number of Working women coming under each category was found out separately for both the high and low groups and the t-values of all the 55 items have been calculated with the formula suggested by Allen Edwards (1957). Has been chosen in order to form the final scale (vide: table -I). Then this final scale has been administered to 100 working women in Chennai, district. Tamil Nadu, India, In order to establish the scoring procedure, validity and reliability of this scale have been found.

TABLE: 1 ITEMSELECTEDFORSOCIALINTELLIGENCESCALE(SIS)

ItemNumber	't'Value	Item Selected
1	0.66	NS
2	2.62	S
3	1.99	S
4	0.22	NS
5	2.37	S
6	4.21	S
7	0.65	NS
8	3.27	S
9	0.33	NS
10	3.35	S
11	0.69	NS

12	0.63	NS

Itemanalysis't'valueofpilotstudy

13	5.06	S
14	4.71	S
15	2.89	S
16	0.52	NS
17	2.91	S
18	3.23	S
19	1.98	S
20	4.07	S
21	3.36	S
22	4.25	S
23	2.26	S
24	3.95	S
25	4.88	S
26	1.99	S
27	3.25	S
28	2.23	S
29	2.53	S
30	2.89	S
31	2.45	S
32	4.11	S

33	2.96	S
34	0.64	NS
35	3.31	S
36	2.74	S
37	4.56	S
38	0.61	NS
39	4.23	S
40	5.12	S
41	5.22	S

42	2.12	S
43	0.44	NS
44	2.78	S
45	3.65	S
46	2.27	S
47	2.99	S
48	3.36	S
49	3.34	S
50	0.71	NS
51	0.42	NS
52	0.62	NS
53	0.59	NS
54	5.41	S
55	1.46	NS

Note: S – Selected, NS – Not Selected

Scoring Procedure

On the basis of 't' value only those 40 statements which had a 't' value 1.75 were selected to constitute the final form of social intelligence scale, eliminating 15 statements which were not significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Out of 40 items, 22 items are positive items and remaining 18 items are negative items. An individual score is the sum of the scores of all the 40 items. The scores range from 40 to 200. A Higher score indicates the high level of social intelligence. The details of scoring are given in the following Table: 2

Table 2   ThetableShowing ScoringProcedureforNegativeandPositiveResponses

Response	Positive	Negative
Always	5	1
Very Frequently	4	2
Occasionally	3	3
Rarely	2	4
Never	1	5

Reliability

It is stated that the probability that an item will perform a required function without failure under stated conditions for a stated period of time. The consistency with which a test measures, whatever it measures. The concept of reliability suggests both stability and consistency of measurement. The investigator calculated the reliability analysis and it was given in the following table: 3

Table 3 ThetableshowingthereliabilitymethodandCoefficientvalues

MethodofReliabilityAnalysis	ReliabilityCoefficient
Correlationbetween forms	0.714
Equal-lengthSpearman-Brown	0.793
Guttman Split-half	0.692
Unequal-lengthaaSpearman-Brown	0.681

Method of reliability analysis reliability co-efficient correlation between forms 0.714 equal- length SpearmanBrown 0.793, Gutt Man Split-half 0.692, Unequal length Spearman Brown 0.681.

Validity

Validity reveals the merits of our measurement. This social intelligence scale was given to the experts in order to find out its content validity. The experts agreed that items in the scale provided adequate coverage of the concept. The social intelligence scale also has construct validity. The intrinsic validity is also called as the index of reliability (Guilford, 1954). The formula to be used to determine the intrinsic validity is the square root of its reliability. Thus the validity of this test is

$V = \sqrt{R}$

$V = \sqrt{0.79} = 0.888$

Conclusion

The Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) displays adequate reliability and validity for use in the different population. It provides a groundwork for an investigation of the construct of social intelligence as reported by women teachers at the college level in Chennai district. It further helped in better understanding of the phenomenon of social intelligence from the culturally - specific viewpoint. In this

study having both positive and negative associations of individual characteristics. In the validation of the social intelligence scale could be as 'a capacity of the individual to create, facilitate, and maintain a set of cohesive and cooperative interpersonal relationships which she can manipulate, influence, manage, and control others through effective communication, accurate empathy and social flexibility. Its analysis score significantly influenced their individual sets of social intelligence, in the essential aspects, with that found in the most representative works with different kinds of populations. Between-factor differences suggest that the social intelligence scale has multidimensional properties that are not captured by a single severity score. The results of this work allow us to affirm that the social intelligence scale can be used effectively to assess the different population's of overall psychological well-being.

References

Allen L Edward. (1957). Techniques of attitude scale construction, Appleton Century CroftsInc,New york,pg153-153.

Bar-OnR,FundS.   Theimpactofemotionalandsocialintelligenceonself-perceivedphysicalhealth.Unpublishedmanuscript.2004.

Brown, L. T., & Anthony, R. G. (1990). Continuing the search for social intelligence.

Personality and   Individual Differences, 11, 463-470.

Cattell, R.B., 1963. Theory of Fluid and Cristallized Intelligence: A Critical Experiment. J. Edu. Psychol., 54: 1-22

Cherniss, C., Extein, M., Goleman, D., & Weissberg, R. P. (2006). Emotional intelligence: What does the research really indicate? Educational Psychologist, 41, 239-245.

Dong, Q., Koper, R. J., & Collaco, C. M. (2008). Social intelligence, self-esteem, and intercultural communication sensitivity. Intercultural Communication Studies, 17(2), 162-172.

Goleman, D., 2007. Social Intelligence. The New Science of Human Relationships. New York: Bantam Books., pp: 406.

Guilford, J.P., 1967. The Nature of Human Intelligence. Piaget, J., 2001. Studies in Reflecting Abstraction. Hove, New York: Norton, pp: 261.

Karl, A., 2005. Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success. Jossey-Bass, pp: 304 Kosmitzki, C. and O.P. John, 1993. The Implicit Use of Explicit Conceptions of Social

Intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, 15: 11-23.

Moss, F. A., & Hunt, T. (1927). Are you socially intelligent? Scientific American, 137, 108- 110.

Moss, F.A. and T. Hunt, 1927. Are you Socially Intelligent? Scientific Am., 137: 108-110.

Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromso social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42, 313-319.

Stricker, L. J., & Rock, D. A. (1990). Interpersonal competence, social intelligence, and general ability. Personality and Individual Differences, 11, 833-839.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. Harper's Magazine, 140, 227-235. Wechsler, D. (1958). The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence. (4th ed.).

Baltimore, USA: Williams & Wilkins.

Wechsler, D., 1940. Nonintellective Factors in General Intelligence. Psychological Bulletin, 37: 444- 445

Yermentayeva, A.R., M.D. Aurenova, E. Uaidullakyzy and A. Aiapbergenova, 2014. Social intelligence as a condition for the development of communicative competence of future teachers. J. Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci., 116: 4758-4763.

Zirkel, S. and N. Cantor, 1990. Personal Construal of Life Tasks: Those who Struggle for Independence. J. Person. Soc. Psychol., 58: 172-185.