

A STUDY ON SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF B.Ed. STUDENTS BASED ON GENDER AND TYPE OF MANAGEMENT

Mr. Chandrasekar K

M.Ed. Scholar, Meston College of Education, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Dr. (Mrs.) G. Jemima

ESD Co-ordinator cum Assistant Professor of Mathematics

Meston College of Education, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

DOI: doi.org/10.34293/0973-4546-Mar26-001

Abstract

Social Intelligence plays a central role in the teaching profession, as effective teaching is fundamentally a social activity that requires constant, skilled interaction with students, colleagues and parents. The ability to understand social situations, respond empathetically and communicate with clarity and sensitivity is essential for creating positive learning environments. The present study examines Social Intelligence among B.Ed. students, with special reference to two presage variables, gender and type of management. The study adopted the descriptive survey method and collected data from 250 B.Ed. students studying in colleges of education in Chennai district affiliated to TNTEU during the academic year 2025–2026. The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS) was used to measure Social Intelligence. Independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA were proposed for data analysis. The findings revealed that female students showed significantly higher Social Intelligence than male students, and significant differences were also found across type of management, with self-financing college students obtaining the highest mean score. The study highlights the need for structured social competence development in teacher education programmes.

Keywords: *Social Intelligence, Teacher Education, Type of Management, B.Ed. Students*

Introduction

Social Intelligence also helps teachers in managing classroom dynamics effectively. Teaching often presents complex interpersonal challenges, including conflict resolution, motivating disengaged students and collaborating with colleagues from diverse professional backgrounds. Furthermore, Social Intelligence enhances the quality of teacher-student relationships, which research consistently identifies as one of the most significant predictors of student engagement and academic achievement.

Socially intelligent teachers can communicate sensitively with parents about their children's progress, participate constructively in school governance and contribute to a positive institutional culture. For B.Ed. students, who are on the threshold of entering the teaching profession, the development of Social Intelligence is particularly important. It prepares them to manage real classroom interactions with confidence and empathy, build meaningful professional relationships and perform their responsibilities with social awareness and interpersonal effectiveness.

In the present paper, Social Intelligence is treated as the major study variable, while gender and type of management are treated as the two presage variables because they are background characteristics that exist prior to the learning process and may influence educational outcomes.

Need for the Study

In the present era, the teaching profession has become increasingly demanding, requiring not only strong subject knowledge and pedagogical skills but also advanced social competencies and a stable sense of personal identity. Social Intelligence enables teachers to understand and manage complex social interactions, build meaningful relationships with students and colleagues and navigate the interpersonal demands of professional life with sensitivity and skill.

Goleman D (1995) emphasized that social and interpersonal competencies are among the most important determinants of professional success, particularly in people-oriented professions such as teaching. Without adequate Social Intelligence, prospective teachers may struggle to build rapport with students, manage classroom conflicts effectively or communicate sensitively with parents and colleagues.

Literature Review

Few studies related to Social Intelligence were reviewed for the present study. These studies provided valuable insights into the causes, patterns, and impact of Social Intelligence on students' age and type of management.

Goleman D (1995) in his seminal work on Emotional Intelligence examined the relationship between social and emotional competencies and professional success across multiple occupational contexts. Drawing from empirical studies and educational observations, Goleman argued that Social Intelligence, as a component of emotional competence, is a stronger predictor of professional effectiveness than cognitive intelligence in many social and service-oriented professions including teaching. He found that individuals with higher Social Intelligence demonstrated better leadership, more effective communication and stronger professional relationships.

Selvam S.G.P (2013) carried out a study to investigate the Social Intelligence of B.Ed. student teachers in Tamil Nadu in relation to gender, locality and type of institution. Using the Social Intelligence Scale on a sample of 350 student teachers, the findings indicated that female student teachers possessed significantly higher Social Intelligence than their male counterparts. Urban students demonstrated higher Social Intelligence, and students from aided institutions showed comparable Social Intelligence to those from self-financing colleges.

Krishnamurthy S and Rajan P (2021) conducted a study to examine the Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students studying in government-aided and self-financing colleges in Chennai in relation to type of management and locality. Using the Social Intelligence Scale on a sample of 320 B.Ed. students, the study found that students from government-aided colleges demonstrated significantly higher scores in cooperativeness and patience, while students from self-financing colleges showed higher confidence and recognition of social environment. Urban students outperformed rural students in overall Social Intelligence.

Research Gap

Social Intelligence has been studied in different contexts, but very few studies have focused on B.Ed. students in Chennai, especially with reference to presage variables like gender and type of management. Existing studies also show inconsistent findings, which creates a need for a context-specific study on Social Intelligence among prospective teachers. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill this gap by examining Social Intelligence among B.Ed. students in relation to gender and type of management.

Objectives of the Study

- To analyze the differences in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to gender.
- To analyze the differences in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to type of management.

Hypotheses of the Study

- H₀₁: There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to Gender.
- H₀₂: There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to type of management.

Methodology

The investigator conducted the study through survey method and the collected data was analysed for the differences in the mean scores and relationship between the variables. The population of the study is B.Ed., students. The data was collected from 250 B.Ed., students. The study focuses on examining Social Intelligence among B.Ed., students with respect to gender and type of management.

Tool Used

Social Intelligence Scale

The tool used for the study is The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS), developed by Silvera, Martinussen and Dahl (2001). It is designed to measure the level of Social

Intelligence among individuals. The scale consists of 21 items rated on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 = Describes me extremely poorly, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 = Describes me extremely well.

Findings

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to Gender.

Table 1 Independent ‘t’ Test to Show the Significant Difference in the Mean Scores of Social Intelligence with Respect to Gender

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	t value	P value	LOS
Social Intelligence	Male	74	87.8	10.2	-3.32	0.001	S**
	Female	176	92.7	11.0			

Note: S - Significant at 0.05 level; S** - Significant at 0.01 level; NS – Not Significant*

The above table reveals that there is a significant difference in Social Intelligence among B.Ed. students with respect to gender, as the obtained t-value (-3.32) is significant at the 0.001 level ($p = .001$). The mean scores indicate that female students (Mean = 92.7) possess higher Social Intelligence compared to male students (Mean = 87.8). Hence, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to Gender” is rejected.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to type of management.

Table 2 One Way ANOVA to Show the Significant Difference in the Mean Scores of Social Intelligence with Respect to Type of Management

Variable	Management	N	Mean	SSB	SSW	F	df	P value	LOS
Social Intelligence	Government	74	84.9	4547	25639	21.9	2,247	<.001	S**
	Government Aided	96	92.8						
	Self-Financing	80	95.3						

Note: S - Significant at 0.05 level; S** - Significant at 0.01 level; NS – Not Significant*

The above table 4.4 and figure 4.4 reveals that there is a significant difference in Social Intelligence among B.Ed. students with respect to type of management, as the obtained

F-value (21.9) is significant at the 0.001 level ($p < .001$). The mean scores indicate that students from self-financing colleges (Mean = 95.3) possess the highest Social Intelligence, followed by government-aided college students (Mean = 92.8), and government college students (Mean = 84.9). Hence the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in Social Intelligence of B.Ed. students with respect to Type of Management” is rejected.

Discussion

The present study found a statistically significant difference in Social Intelligence with respect to gender ($t = -3.32$, $p = .001$). Female students (Mean = 92.7) demonstrated significantly higher Social Intelligence than male students (Mean = 87.8). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

This finding is supported by the study of Kaur (2010), which reported that female B.Ed students demonstrated significantly higher Social Intelligence, attributing this to greater emphasis on interpersonal sensitivity, social responsiveness, and cooperative behaviour in the socialization of girls. The higher Social Intelligence among female students may reflect the greater opportunities for social learning and interpersonal engagement that are typically embedded in the social development of girls from an early age.

The present study found a statistically significant difference in Social Intelligence with respect to type of management ($F = 21.9$, $p < .001$). Students from self-financing colleges (Mean = 95.3) demonstrated the highest Social Intelligence, followed by government-aided college students (Mean = 92.8) and government college students (Mean = 84.9). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

This finding is supported by the study of Krishnamurthy and Rajan (2021), which reported significant differences in Social Intelligence across institutional types. These patterns may be attributed to the more communicative, interactive, and confidence-building learning environments typically available in self-financing colleges, including greater exposure to extracurricular activities, personality development programmes, and diverse social interactions.

Educational Implications

The social competence and personal confidence of future teachers have direct impacts on their teaching effectiveness, professional relationships, classroom culture, and long-term career satisfaction. The significant gender differences in both Social Intelligence, with female students outperforming male students, suggest the need for gender-sensitive interventions in teacher education. Male student-teachers may benefit from targeted Social Intelligence development programmes that address specific dimensions such as sensitivity, cooperativeness, and social responsiveness.

The significant differences in both Social Intelligence across institutional types, with government college students scoring consistently lower, highlight the need for equity-focused interventions in teacher education. Mentoring partnerships between different types of institutions can help share best practices in social competence development and personal confidence building.

Conclusion

The study reveals that gender and type of management emerge as key influencing factors for both Social Intelligence. Female students demonstrate significantly higher Social Intelligence than their male counterparts. Students from self-financing colleges demonstrate the highest levels of Social Intelligence, followed by those from government-aided and government colleges.

The study reiterates that Social Intelligence is the foundation to developing effective, confident, and socially capable educators. By prioritizing Social Intelligence development in B.Ed. programmes, educational institutions can contribute to the cultivation of professionally competent and personally confident teachers who are not only academically skilled but also socially adept and emotionally resilient. Such efforts will ensure that the next generation of teachers can inspire, connect, and lead with both knowledge and interpersonal excellence.

References

1. Albrecht, K. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of success*. Jossey-Bass.
2. Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
3. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
4. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
5. Kaur, A. (2010). *Social intelligence and academic achievement among B.Ed. students (Unpublished master's dissertation)*. Punjab University.
6. Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2011). Social intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (pp. pp. 564–581). Cambridge University Press.)
7. Krishnan, A., & Raman, S. (2021). *Self-esteem of B.Ed. students in Tamil Nadu in relation to birth order and family type (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Bharathidasan University.
8. Selvam, S. G. P. (2013). *Social intelligence of B.Ed. student teachers in Tamil Nadu (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Bharathidasan University.
9. Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2011). Social intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (pp. 564–581). Cambridge University Press.
10. Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2014). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale: A self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42(4), 313–319.