

**A STUDY ON THE SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND
CREATIVITY SCALE AMONG THE ENGLISH
LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

J. PRABHAVATHI*

ABSTRACT

Social Intelligence is the ability to get along well with others and to get them cooperate with us. Sometimes it is referred to as people skills. Social Intelligence includes an awareness of situations and the social dynamics that govern them, and a knowledge of interaction styles and strategies that could help a person achieve his or her objectives in dealing with others. It also involves a certain amount of self insight and a consciousness of one's own perceptions and reaction patterns.

Creativity refers to the invention or origination of any new thing that has value. The word 'new' here may refer to the individual creator or the society or domain within which novelty occurs. This paper focuses on an attempt of the study of the Social Intelligence and the creativity scale among the language teachers.

Key words: Social Intelligence, Creativity Scale, society, knowledge, education, effectiveness.

* ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (SENIOR GRADE), DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, PSG COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, PEELAMEDU, COIMBATORE.

INTRODUCTION

Intelligence has two different meanings. In its most familiar meaning, intelligence has to do with the individual's ability to learn and reason. In this meaning underlies common psychometric notions such as intelligence testing, intelligence quotient and the like. In its less common meaning, intelligence has to do a body of information and knowledge. As originally coined, the term referred the individual's ability to understand and manage other people and to engage in adaptive social interactions. More recently, however, some has redefined social intelligence to refer to the individual's find of knowledge about social world.

Social intelligence was originally validated through its correlations with adults occupational status, the number of extracurricular activities pursued by college students and supervisor ratings of employees' ability to get along with people.

Social intelligence plays a little role in scientific theories of intelligence. There are different kinds of intelligence, each hypothetically dissociable from the others and each hypothetically associated with a different brain system. Linguistic, logical, mathematical, spatial, musical and bodily kinesthetic are cognitive abilities. Each form of intelligence is encoded in a unique symbol system by which ability in question could be manipulated and transmitted by a culture or some of proposed intelligence. The existence of symbol systems is fairly obvious: written language, mathematical and musical notations are some clear examples.

The English language contains a large vocabulary of words that could represent peoples' cognitive, emotional and motivational states, behavioural dispositions and other psychological characteristics. Structures like the classic fourfold classification of temperament – melancholic, phlegmatic, choleric and sanguine and the other five personality dimensions – neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience are commonly employed to capture and communicate the gist of another person's personality.

Creativity is modifiable, deliberate process that exists to some degree in each individual. It proceeds through an identifiable process and is verified through the uniqueness and utility of the produced codes. Creativity means to do something unique and different from what others have done. There are various mental ability scores to be studied, such as aptitude and achievement.

The research was to find the relation and significance of the social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers, based on their educational qualification, gender, rural and urban area, age group, and family.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

An attempt was made in this study to outline the influence of social intelligence on the creativity scale of the English language teachers. This study tried to assess the influence of personal variable such as gender, age, community, education and socio- economic status on social intelligence and the creativity scale. The findings of this study will be of universe help and use to all the language teachers in understanding the significance of social intelligence in education and this kind of knowledge will guide the teacher community in their teaching activities.

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the linkage of Social Intelligence with that of Creativity Scale. It is presumed that a significant relationship may exist between social intelligence and the creativity scale, study has been made to explore, understand and explain the concept of Social Intelligence and Creativity Scale. Efforts have been taken to identify the factors which influence the Social Intelligence and the Creativity Scale of the English language teachers.

OBJECIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of the study was to find out whether Social Intelligence and the Creativity Scale of the English language teachers are correlated. Of course the specific objectives were

1. To find out the influence of the social intelligence of the English language teachers on their creativity scale.
2. To identify the influence of locality Urban / Rural on the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
3. To identify the influence of various dimensions of social intelligence on the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
4. To investigate the effect of gender on social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.

5. To investigate the effect of residence on social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
6. To study the social feelings of the English language teachers.
7. To study the productivity of the English language teachers.
8. To study the effect of the number of dependents of the English language teachers on their social intelligence and their creativity scale.
9. To study the influence of the educational qualifications – PG / UG on the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
10. To study the effect of the social and human values on the creativity scores of the English language teachers.

METHODOLOGY USED IN THE STUDY

The Methodology used in the study was of a descriptive research by nature, normative survey technique.

It is discussed under the following headings as the design of the study, sample and instrumentation.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The investigator used the correlation design in this study. The correlation design is aimed at the discovery of finding the relationship between the level of Social Intelligence and the creativity scores of the English language teachers. Correlational studies show the researcher the magnitude of the relationship between two variables. Further this investigation made an attempt to find out the relationship between social intelligence and personal variables.

TOOLS

The investigator used two questionnaires to find the social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.

Questionnaire I

Questionnaire I used by the investigator was of social intelligence which contained thirty six situations / content / conditions. The subject has to put a tick mark to the appropriate statement

among the three answers given. The questions carried the marks like 5, 10 and 15 according to the response.

Questionnaire II

Questionnaire II was to analyze creativity scale of the English language teachers which contained initiative figures of three kinds of activities. The subjects are to draw different objects from the given initiative strokes and shapes etc. They were asked to give appropriate title for each drawing. Novel responses and apt titles were given more score. The imaginative power, the aesthetic sense and socialization were given due score.

SAMPLE

The study attempts of the English language teachers in schools and colleges. The convenience as available sample method was used. The sample was selected from the English language teachers at different levels of education.

INSTRUMENTATION

The schools and colleges are considered as more conducive place for the cultivation of certain non-academic goals that are more needed in the present day adjustment to the environment with the increasing importance of educational institutions in their direction in the face of the diminishing role of the family. In socialization it would be more appropriate to expect the present day educationalists to collect more varied experiences through their exposure to the diversified value complexes and attitude orientations in the multi-dimensional educational setting for developing such non-academic goals.

The environment provided in the educational institutions is an increasingly important area for socialization and that of creativity. The frame work for the integrated conceptual virtues of social intelligence was adopted from the psycho – social structure. Greenberger formulated it which comprises of general characteristics which represent the most common types of demands made by all societies on the individuals and at the same time specific categories which are culture, specific attributes of individuals that enable them to meet their demands.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The results of the different measures obtained from various statistical treatments are analyzed and discussed. They furnish major correlation analysis of the study and the three most significant statistics – mean, standard deviation and t-test of sample. This analysis helps to study the influence of variables on Social Intelligence and the Creativity Scale of the English language teachers.

This research study was an attempt to study the effect of social intelligence on the creativity scale of the English language teachers. The main objective of this study was two fold.

1. First one was to find out the effectiveness of social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
2. Second one was to find out how the English language teachers differ in various dimensions of their social intelligence like self-confidence, social feeling, productivity, social values and human values and also in their measures of creativity scores regarding their gender, educational qualification and age.

CERTAIN GENERAL HYPOTHESIS TESTED IN THE STUDY

1. There is a positive correlation between the social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
2. The English language teachers in the urban and the rural areas do not differ significantly in their social intelligence scores.
3. The English language teachers do not differ significantly in their creativity scores in accordance with their residential area – whether urban or rural.
4. There is no significant difference between the male and the female English language teachers in their social intelligence scores.
5. The creativity scores of the English language teachers do not have significant difference based on their gender group.
6. According to the educational qualification group as under graduates and post graduates, the English language teachers do not differ in their scores of social intelligence tests.
7. The creativity scores of the English language teachers are not significantly different based on their group of post graduate and under graduate educational qualifications.

8. The English language teachers do not show any significant difference in their social intelligence scores based on the number of dependents in their family.
9. There is no significant difference among the English language teachers in their creativity scores based on the number of dependents in their family.
10. The score of social intelligence tests do not show any significant difference among the English language teachers based on their age group as early adult and middle age.
11. Based on the age group as early adult and the middle age of the English language teachers there is no significant difference in the creativity scores they have obtained in the tests.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of data and findings, it is concluded that

There is significant positive correlation between the social intelligence and the creativity scale of the English language teachers. The higher the social intelligence level, the higher is the creativity scale and vice versa.

- ❖ The locality of the English language teachers does not have any significant influence on the social intelligence measures.
- ❖ The locality of the English language teachers does not affect their creativity scores.
- ❖ Gender is not a determining factor for the social intelligence scores and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
- ❖ Educational qualification as under graduation and post graduation is not a deterministic factor for the social intelligence scores and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
- ❖ The total number of the dependents in the family of the English language teachers is not a determining factor which affects their social intelligence scores and the creativity measures.
- ❖ Age is not a deterministic factor for the social intelligence scores and the creativity scale of the English language teachers.

- ❖ Employment is not a deterministic factor for the social intelligence scores and the creativity measures of the English language teachers.
- ❖ Men and women do not differ in their self confidence and self direction.
- ❖ Qualification of the English language teachers is not a deterministic factor for their social intelligence and their creativity scale.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the foregone discussions, findings and conclusions it is recommended that

- ❖ Necessary steps must be taken to enhance the creativity scale of the English language teachers.
- ❖ All student teachers are to be given proper orientation for higher creativity scores.
- ❖ The research was done on the basis of samples of hundred and fifty English language teachers. There are various dimensions to measure the social intelligence and the creativity scores. In this study only a few dimensions were selected. Future researchers could view the same in different angles for their study.

Further research might be done with the other teachers and also with the other professionals as social intelligence plays a vital role in the society.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.R. (1976). *Language, memory, and thought*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Asch, S.E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, **41**, 258-290.
- Broom, M.E. (1928). A note on the validity of a test of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **12**, 426-428.
- Brown, L.T., & Anthony, R.G. (1990). Continuing the search for social intelligence. *Personality & Individual Differences*, **11**, 463-470.

- Bruner, J.S., & Tagiuri, R. (1954). The perception of people. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. The 634-654). Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley.
- Cantor, N., & Harlow, R. (1994). Social intelligence and personality: Flexible life-task pursuit. In R.J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Personality and intelligence* (pp. 137-168). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1987). *Personality and social intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1989). Social intelligence and cognitive assessments of personality. In R.S. Wyer & T.K. Srull (Eds.), *Advances in Social Cognition*. Vol. 2 (pp. 1-59). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Doll, E.A. (1947). *Social maturity scale*. Circle Pines, Mn.: American Guidance Service.
- Flavell, J.H. (1974). The development of inferences about others. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *Understanding other persons* (pp. xxx-xxx). Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, Basil, & Mott.
- Ford, M.E., & Tisak, M.S. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **75**, 196-206.
- Gallup, G.G. (1998). Self-awareness and the evolution of social intelligence. *Behavioural Processes*, **42**, 239-247.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hendricks, M., Guilford, J.P., & Hoepfner, R. (1969). Measuring creative social intelligence. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 42.
- Hoepfner, R., & O'Sullivan, M. Social intelligence and IQ. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, **28**, 339-344.
- Hunt, T. (1928). The measurement of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **12**, 317-334.
- Kaess, W.A., & Witryol, S.L. (1955). Memory for names and faces: A characteristic of social intelligence? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **39**, 457-462.

- Keating, D.K. (1978). A search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **70**, 218-233.
- Kosmitzki, C., & John, O.P. (1993). The implicit use of explicit conceptions of social intelligence. *Personality & Individual Differences*, **15**, 11-23.
- Lowman, R.L., & Leeman, G.E. (1988). The dimensionality of social intelligence: social abilities, interests, and needs. *Journal of Psychology*, **122**, 279-290.
- Marlowe, H.A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **78**, 52-58.
- Marlowe, H.A., & Bedell, J.R. (1982). Social intelligence: Evidence for independence of the construct. *Psychological Reports*, **51**, 461-462.
- Moss, F.A., Hunt, T., Omwake, K.T., & Ronning, M.M. (1927). *Social Intelligence Test*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Psychological Service.
- Neisser, U. (1979). The concept of intelligence. *Intelligence*, **3**, 217-227.
- O'Sullivan, M., Guilford, J.P., & deMille, R. (1965). The measurement of social intelligence. *Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, University of Southern California*, No. 34.
- Riggio, R.E., Messamer, J., & Throckmorton, B. (1991). Social and academic intelligence: Conceptually distinct but overlapping constructs. *Personality & Individual Differences*, **12**, 695-702.
- Sechrest, L., & Jackson, D.N. (1961). Social intelligence and the accuracy of interpersonal predictions. *Journal of Personality*, **29**, 167-182.
- Shanley, L.A., Walker, R.E., & Foley, J.M. (1971). Social intelligence: A concept in search of data. *Psychological Reports*, **29**, 1123-1132.
- Spearman, C. (1927). *The abilities of man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Smith, C. (1985). Social intelligence and decoding skills in nonverbal communication. *Social Cognition*, **3**, 168-192.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Wagner, R. (Eds.). (1986). *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, E.H. (1990). The assessment of social intelligence. *Psychotherapy*, **27**, 445-457.
- Taylor, E.H., & Cadet, J.L. (1989). Social intelligence, a neurological system? *Psychological Reports*, **64**, 423-444.

- Thorndike, E.L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, **140**, 227-235.
- Thorndike, R.L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **27**, 231-233.
- Thorndike, R.L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, **34**, 275-285.
- Walker, R.E., & Foley, J.M. (1973). Social intelligence: Its history and measurement. *Psychological Reports*, **33**, 839-864.
- Whiten, A., & Byrne, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Machiavellian intelligence II: Extensions and evaluations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

