

Relationship Between Social Intelligence and Decision Making Among Higher Secondary School Students

Dr. R. Selvaraj

Assistant Professor of Education Computer Science, Lady Willingdon Institute of Advanced Study in Education, Kamarajar Salai, Triplicane, Chennai. 5.

Abstract

This Study aims to find out the relationship between social intelligence and decision making among higher secondary school students with reference to selected variables. 300 higher secondary students were taken as sample. Survey was conducted. Result shows that there is a Positive linear relationship between two variables, Social-intelligence and Decision-making among higher secondary school students. Social intelligence significantly impacts decision- making processes. Individuals with high social intelligence possess a greater ability to understand and manage social situations, which positively influences their decision-making style and outcomes. This study may enrich the educators and may serve a database for the future research.

Keywords: Social Intelligence and Decision Making.

Introduction

Social Intelligence (SI) is the ability to get along well with others, and to get them to cooperate with you. Sometimes referred to simplistically as "people skills," SI includes an awareness of situations and the social dynamics that govern them and knowledge of interaction styles and strategies that can 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.

Developing social intelligence is crucial for navigating interpersonal relationships effectively and achieving success in both personal and professional settings. It enhances communication, builds stronger relationships, and facilitates conflict resolution, ultimately leading to greater well-being and career advancement. Social intelligence enables individuals to

understand and respond to the emotions and needs of others, fostering deeper connections and trust. This is vital for building meaningful relationships with family, friends, as well as for creating a positive work environment.

Socially intelligent individuals are better communicators. They can tailor their message to different audiences, listen actively, and express themselves clearly, leading to more effective interactions and collaborations.

Developing decision-making skills enables individuals to adapt to changing circumstances and make necessary adjustments, whether in personal life or professional projects.

By making well-considered choices, individuals can align their actions with their aspirations and increase their chances of reaching their desired outcomes.

Need for the study

Social intelligence equips individuals with the skills to navigate disagreements and conflicts constructively. They can understand different perspectives, manage their emotions, and find mutually agreeable solutions. In the professional realm, social intelligence is a valuable asset. It supports teamwork, leadership, and adaptability, contributing to career advancement and organizational success. Understanding and managing emotions, both one's own and those of others, is a key component of social intelligence. This can lead to greater emotional stability, resilience, and overall well-being. Navigating Diverse Environments: In today's interconnected world, social intelligence is essential for navigating cultural diversity, promoting inclusivity, and fostering understanding in various social settings.

Developing decision-making skills is crucial because it empowers individuals to navigate life's challenges effectively and achieve their goals. Strong decision-making skills lead to better outcomes in both personal and professional settings by enabling informed choices, problem-solving, and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances.

Developing decision-making skills enables individuals to adapt to changing circumstances and make necessary adjustments, whether in personal life or professional projects.

By making well-considered choices, individuals can align their actions with their aspirations and increase their chances of reaching their desired outcomes.

In essence, developing decision-making skills is an investment in oneself, leading to personal and professional growth, improved outcomes, and a greater ability to navigate the complexities of life.

OBJECTIVES

1. To find out the level of social intelligence among the total sample.
2. To find out the level of decision making among the total sample.
3. To find out the difference in social intelligence based on
 - a. Gender
 - b. Medium of instruction
 - c. Types of school
 - d. Locality
4. To find out the difference in decision making based on
 - a. Gender
 - b. Medium of instruction
 - c. Types of school
 - d. Locality
5. To find out the difference in relationship between higher secondary school students Social intelligence and decision making.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference between Male and Female students with respect to their Social intelligence.
2. There is no significant difference between Male and Female students with respect to their decision making.
3. There is no significant difference between Tamil and English medium students with respect to their Social intelligence.

4. There is no significant difference between Tamil and English medium students with respect to their decision making.
5. There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their Social intelligence.
6. There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their decision making.
7. There is no significant difference among Government, Government aided and Private students with respect to their Social intelligence.
8. There is no significant difference among Government, Government aided and Private students with respect to their decision making.
9. There is no significant difference in the decision making based on their Parent's monthly income.
10. There is no significant relationship between Social intelligence and Decision making among higher secondary school students.

METHOD OF STUDY

Survey Method was adopted to study the Social intelligence, and decision making among higher secondary school students.

VARIABLES

- **SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE**
- **DECISION MAKING**

SAMPLING TECHNIQUE AND SAMPLE

Normative Survey was carried out for this study. Sample from Government, Government- Aided and Private higher secondary school students in Karur Districts were taken and random sampling technique was adopted.

The present study was conducted on a representative sample of 300 students.

TOOLS USED.

Social intelligence scale

Constructed and Standardized by Daicy Rani and Preamkumar (2011)

Decision making scale:

Constructed and Standardized by the investigator (2023)

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

1. Descriptive Analysis
2. Inferential analysis

Correlation analysis

HYPOTHESIS 1

There is no significant difference between male and female students with respect to their Social intelligence.

TABLE 1

DETAILS OF ‘T’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE SOCIAL-INTELLIGENCE BASED ON GENDER

Gender	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Male	150	73.21	11.52	2.216	0.148	S
Female	150	70.41	10.337			

Interpretation

The mean score of social-intelligence in Female students (70.41) is less than the Male Students (73.21) and the value of ‘p’ is less than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Thus, there is a significant difference between male and female students with respect to their social intelligence.

HYPOTHESIS 2

There is no significant difference between male and female students with respect to their Decision making

TABLE .2

DETAILS OF ‘t’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE DECISION MAKING BASED ON GENDER

Gender	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Male	150	20.49	3.313	1.504	0.013	S
Female	150	21.02	2.723			

Interpretation

The mean score of Decision making in Female students (21.02) is greater than the Male students (20.49) and the value of ‘p’ is less than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Thus, there exists a significant difference between male and female students with respect to their decision making.

HYPOTHESIS 3

There is no significant difference between Tamil and English Medium students with respect to their social-intelligence.

TABLE .3

DETAILS OF ‘T’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE SOCIAL-INTELLIGENCE BASED ON MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

Medium of instruction	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Tamil	155	71.53	10.084	1.989	0.049	S
English	145	73.62	11.960			

Interpretation

The mean score of social-intelligence in Female students (73.12) is greater than the Male students (71.53) and the value of ‘p’ is less than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Thus, there is a significant difference between Tamil and English medium students with respect to their social intelligence.

HYPOTHESIS 4

There is no significant difference between Tamil and English Medium students with respect to their

Decision making.

TABLE. 4
DETAILS OF ‘t’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE DECISION MAKING BASED ON MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

Medium of instruction	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Tamil	155	20.83	2.978	0.444	0.759	NS
English	145	20.88	3.111			

Interpretation

The mean score of Decision making in Female students (20.88) is greater than the Male students (20.83) and the value of ‘p’ is greater than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Thus, there is no significant difference between Tamil and English medium students with respect to their decision making.

HYPOTHESIS 5

There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their Social-intelligence.

TABLE 5
DETAILS OF ‘t’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE SOCIAL-INTELLIGENCE BASED ON LOCALITY

Locality	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Rural	186	73.16	11.221	2.695	0.041	S
Urban	114	71.25	10.698			

Interpretation

The mean score of social-intelligence in Female students (71.25) is less than the Male students (73.16) and the value of ‘p’ is less than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is rejected.

Thus, there is a significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their social-intelligence.

HYPOTHESIS 6

There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their Decision making.

TABLE .6
DETAILS OF ‘t’ TEST FOR THE VARIABLE DECISION MAKING BASED ON LOCALITY

Locality	Sample	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	P-value	Remarks
Rural	186	20.55	2.959	1.497	0.221	NS
Urban	114	21.10	3.148			

Interpretation

The mean score of decision-making in Female students (21.10) is greater than the Male students (20.55) and the value of ‘p’ is greater than 0.05. So the null hypothesis is accepted.

Thus, there is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students with respect to their decision-making.

HYPOTHESIS 7

There is no significant difference among Government, Government-Aided and Private Students with respect to their Social-intelligence.

TABLE .7
‘F’ VALUE FOR THE VARIABLE SOCIAL-INTELLIGENCE BASED ON TYPES OF SCHOOL

Source of variation	df	Sum of square	Mean square	‘F’ ratio	P-value	Remarks
Between Groups	2	34.107	17.053	0.140	0.870	NS
Within Groups	297	36249.44	122.052			

Interpretation

Since the obtained ‘P’ value is greater than 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis. Thus, there is no significant difference between Government, Government-Aided and Private Students with respect to their Social-intelligence.

HYPOTHESIS 8

There is no significant difference among Government, Government-Aided and Private Students with respect to their Decision-making.

TABLE .8
‘F’ VALUE FOR THE VARIABLE DECISION-MAKING BASED ON TYPES OF SCHOOL

Source of variation	df	Sum of square	Mean square	‘F’ ratio	P-value	Remarks
Between Groups	2	123.627	61.813	6.960	0.001	S
Within Groups	297	2637.61	8.881			

Interpretation

Since the obtained ‘P’ value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis. Thus, there is a significant difference between Government, Government-Aided and Private Students with respect to their Decision-making. L

HYPOTHESIS 9

There is no significant relationship between Social-intelligence and Decision-making among higher secondary school students.

TABLE 9
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DECISION MAKING OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS-TOTAL SAMPLE

Variable	Sample	'r' value	Level of Significance
Social-intelligence	300	0.71	S
Decision-making			

From the above table, Social intelligence and Decision making variables were strongly correlated. Hence the correlation coefficient of 0.71 indicates a strong positive linear relationship between two variables, Social-intelligence and Decision-making among higher secondary school students.

CONCLUSION

Social intelligence significantly impacts decision-making processes. Individuals with high social intelligence possess a greater ability to understand and manage social situations, which positively influences their decision-making style and outcomes. This includes better understanding of social cues, managing emotions, and building relationships, all of which are crucial for making effective decisions in interpersonal and group contexts.

This awareness allows individuals to anticipate how their decisions might be perceived and how they might affect others, leading to more thoughtful and appropriate choices.

Social intelligence encompasses the ability to build and maintain positive relationships. Strong relationships can provide valuable information, diverse perspectives, and support during the decision-making process. Social intelligence is associated with more rational and less avoidant decision-making styles.

This means that individuals with high social intelligence are more likely to make decisions based on careful analysis, logical reasoning, and consideration of all relevant factors.

They are also less likely to avoid making decisions altogether, which can lead to missed opportunities and negative consequences.

By understanding and managing their own emotions and those of others, individuals can avoid making hasty or emotionally charged decisions that may not be in their best interest.

In essence, social intelligence acts as a crucial foundation for making informed, effective, and socially responsible decisions, particularly in complex and dynamic environments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Akelaitis, Arturas (2013) study is to reveal the peculiarities of social skills expression of senior high school age students in physical education classes.
2. Alrub, Mohammad Abo (2012) aimed to find out how the effectiveness of the curriculum biography of the Prophet in the development of social intelligence skills of Al-Hussein Bin Talal University
3. Anne M.; Garza Mitchell (2016) decision makers at community colleges and understand how they make decisions. Specifically, this article focuses on the role of the community college president's personal values in decision making.
4. Akhani, Panna and Jasore Meera (2001), "Academic Achievement, Study Involvement, Feeling of Ioneliners among 100 children of employed and unemployed mothers". Indian psychology Abstracts and Review, Vol.8, No.2, P.409.

5. **Asha, Bhat Nagar (1982)** Study Involvement inventory, national psychological corporation, Agra 1982/Tiwari, study habits and scholastic performance at three levels of Education.
6. **Astin (1999)**, Student Involvement: A development theory for higher education. Journal of college student Development. 40(5), 518-529. (Reprinted from Astin, A. (1984). Student Involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Retrieved November 14, 2009.
7. **Bakadorova, Olga; Raufelder, Diana (Sep 2014)** European Journal of Psychology of Education. The Mediating Role of Socio-Motivational Support in the Association between Individual School Self-Concept and Achievement Motivation amongst Adolescent Students. v29 n3 p.347-366.
8. **Bhatnagar, (1983)** predictors of student Involvement in studies. Agra, National psychological-corporation.
9. **Chao, Chiangnan (2016)** examines Chinese students' decision making considerations for coming to the U.S. for their higher education. Due to the large number of Chinese students in the U.S, it is an interesting topic for educators 10. Carroll, J.B., (1983) A model of Learning. Teachers college Record. Vol.64, 723-733.
10. **Dennis, Lindsay R. (2015)** describe the decision-making framework and guide the reader through the framework using an illustrative case approach.
11. **Elmelegy, Reda Ibrahim (2015)** decision-making quality in Egyptian general secondary schools and determine the requirements of quality decision-making. It depends on the descriptive method in order to acknowledge the basics of the SBM and its relationship with the quality of decision-making.
12. **Elliott, Julian G.; Tudge, Jonathan Jun (2012)** Multiple Contexts, Motivation and Student Engagement in the USA and Russia European Journal of Psychology of Education, v27 n2 p161-175 Jun 2012.
13. **Findlay, Nora M (2015)** this study sought to understand the application of values by principals as they engage in student disciplinary decision making within legally fixed parameters of their administrative discretion.
14. **Gresch, Helge (2013)** decision-making competence, a computer-based programme was developed that trains secondary school students (grades 11-13) in decisionmaking strategies.
15. **Growns, S. (2001)**. Quantitative methods in educational research. London: continuum.
16. **Hariri, Monypenny (2014)** relationships between school principal leadership styles and school principal decision-making styles are significant.
17. **Hwang, Gwo-Jen; Hung, Chun-Ming; Chen, Nian-Shing Apr 2014** Improving Learning Achievements, Motivation and Problem-Solving Skills through a Peer Assessment-Based Game Development Approach Educational Technology Research and Development, v6 n2 p129-145 Apr 2014.
18. International Journal of Education and Research. New Frontiers in Education. Vol.43, No.3, July – September, 2011.
19. **Hter, Ilhan (2010)** A Study on the Efficacy of Project-Based Learning Approach on Social Studies Education: Conceptual Achievement and Academic Motivation Educational Research and Reviews, v9 n15 p487-497.
20. Jonassen, David H (2012) Decision making is the most common kind of problem solving. It is also an important component skill in other more ill-structured and complex kinds of problem solving, including policy problems and design problems.

21. Jones, Charles (2015) conducted study on the decision-making processes of sports coaches through the writings of the sociologist Harold Garfinkel.
22. Koedinger, Kenneth R. (2016) study design was to include multiple kinds of assessments, including standardized test items and items measuring complex problem solving and use of representations.
23. Klauda, Susan Lutz; Guthrie, John T (Feb 2015), Comparing Relations of Motivation, Engagement, and Achievement among struggling and Advanced Adolescent Readers Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, v28 n2 p239-269
1. **25. Vertsberger, Dana (2016)** conducted study on the various types of support young adults consider using when making career decisions and located factors that affect their intentions.
2. **26. Verma, B.P. and Kumar, R., (1996)** Study Involvement and Learning Styles of women students as related to Residential Background, Academic stream, and Type of Institution. Indian Educational Review. Vol.31(2), 99-111.
3. **27. Zhang, Xin; Anderson (2016)** examined the influence of contrasting instructional approaches on children's decision-making competence.

WEBLIOGRAPHY

1. <https://people.ucsc.edu/~vktonay/migrated/psyc166/tatmetanalysis.pdf>
2. http://www.ncert.nic.in/departments/nie/der/publication/pdf/T_Yolila.pdf
3. <https://www.google.co.in/>
4. <https://www.academicjournals.org/>
5. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
6. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/study_involvement
7. <http://www.brainyquotes.com/quotes/topics/topic-learning.html>
8. <http://www.spd.org/spd/diss/baker.html>
9. <http://www.emotionhonesty.com/arthazadoles.html>
10. <http://www.musesmuse.com/coumnistsgreylogs/archives/00000056>