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THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

Theoretical literature includes relevant concepts, theories and theoretical contexts, and discursive and analytical literature that contain ideas and information relevant to the topic. The purpose of theoretical literature is to assess critically the overall state of knowledge on the topic, and the state of research, thinking and theorizing on the topic. That means it involves understanding the history of research (Punch, 2009). Theoretical overview therefore guides the investigator in areas like origins and definitions of the topic, the key concepts, theories and ideas, and organization of knowledge on the topic.

This chapter presents a conceptual review of literature which is expected to help the investigator in enriching the theoretical framework of the study. It is explained under the following headings.

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Theories and Definitions of Social Intelligence

2.3 Assessing Social Intelligence-Types and Examples of Existing Measures

2.4 Development of Social Intelligence

2.5 Social Intelligence in the Present Study

2.6 Conclusion

2.1 Introduction

The study of the Social Intelligence construct has a long history. Research on Social Intelligence started a few years after Spearman (1904) introduced academic intelligence (Thorndike, 1920). It is commonly assumed that the term 'Social Intelligence'
was introduced by Thorndike in 1920. In fact, the concept was actually mentioned earlier by Dewey (1909, cited in Landy, 2006), who defined Social Intelligence as “the power of observing and comprehending social situations” and later by Lull (1911) in their writings about morality and public education. However, Dewey and Lull’s stance on Social Intelligence was more focused on revising the school curriculum and attempting to engage the student in socially current issues and as such involved in the comprehension of social behaviors and norms. This is in contrast to the proposition of Social Intelligence as an attribute that was suggested by Thorndike in 1920. Thus, Thorndike (1920) was the first person who included Social Intelligence in a model of human intellectual abilities. Since that time, Social Intelligence has taken on many meanings, sometimes very different than Thorndike’s original interpretation of the construct (Walker & Foley, 1973). Therefore, in order to facilitate a meaningful research, a review on historical developments and empirical findings from literatures pertaining to Social Intelligence is required.

2.2 Theories and Definitions of Social Intelligence

It is almost a century before, when Thorndike (1920) included the construct ‘Social Intelligence’ in a model of human intellectual abilities. Thorndike (1920) divided intelligence in to three facets; understanding and managing ideas (abstract intelligence), concrete objects (mechanical intelligence) and people (Social Intelligence). Thorndike (1920) originally defined Social Intelligence as “the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls - to act wisely in human relations”. Thus, Social Intelligence as conceived by Thorndike consisted of cognitive and behavioral elements (i.e.”understanding people” vs “act wisely in human relations”).

Thorndike had a psychometric view of Social Intelligence. The psychometric view describes Social Intelligence as general
intelligence applied to social situations or the ability to understand and manage people measurable by tests. Thorndike required a “genuine situation with real persons” for the measurement of Social Intelligence. It was rare that the behaviour of genuine persons served as stimuli. Therefore, Thorndike subsequently failed to find a way to measure Social Intelligence. Thorndike (1920) noted that “convenient tests of Social Intelligence are hard to devise............ Social Intelligence shows abundantly in the nursery, on the playground, in barracks and factories and salesroom, but it eludes the formal standardised conditions of the testing laboratory. It requires human beings to respond to, time to adapt its responses, and face, voice, gesture, and mien as tools”. Nevertheless, true to the goals of the psychometric tradition, the abstract definitions of Social Intelligence were quickly translated into standardised laboratory instruments for measuring individual differences in Social Intelligence.

Moss and Hunt (1927) defined Social Intelligence as the "ability to get along with others".

Vernon (1933) provided the definition of Social Intelligence as the person’s "ability to get along with people in general, social technique or ease in society, knowledge of social matters, susceptibility to stimuli from other members of a group as well as insight into temporary moods or underlying personality traits of strangers.

Wechsler (1939, 1958) gave barely sufficient attention to the concept of Social Intelligence. Wechsler (1958) viewed "Social Intelligence is just general intelligence applied to social situations". Wechsler acknowledged that the Picture Arrangement subtest of the WAIS (Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale) might serve as a measure of Social Intelligence, because it assesses the individual's ability to comprehend social situations.
Guilford’s (1967) Structure of Intellect Model is the only comprehensive theory based account of Social Intelligence. According to this model, intelligence is composed of three facets: operations, contents and products. The facet operations describe the cognitive requirements people need to accomplish a task. It contains five elements: cognition, memory, divergent production, convergent production, and evaluation. The facet content refers to the properties of the task material and it includes four elements: figural, symbolic, semantic and behavioural. Finally, the product facet comprises six elements, each describing a type of outcome associated with a mental task: units, classes, relations, systems, transformations, and implications.

Guilford considered his system to be an expansion of the tripartite classification of intelligence originally proposed by Thorndike (1920). Thus, the symbolic and semantic content domains correspond to abstract intelligence, the figural domain to practical intelligence, and the behavioral domain to Social Intelligence. Although the model presupposes 120 specific abilities (5 operations x 4 contents x 6 products), only the behavioural content area is relevant to Social Intelligence; hence, the number of independent social abilities is limited to 30 (5 operations x 1 content x 6 products). Social Intelligence thus includes cognition, convergent and divergent production, memory, and evaluation of behavioral contents. These contents mostly consist of nonverbal information about social interactions that allow conclusions about thoughts, desires, feelings, moods, emotions, intentions, and actions of other persons and of ourselves.

Guilford and his colleagues (Hendricks et al., 1969; O'Sullivan et al., 1965) focused on the operational domains of cognition and divergent production to develop tests of Social Intelligence. O'Sullivan and Guilford's efforts resulted in two test
publications, the Six Factor Test (O’Sullivan & Guilford, 1966) and the Four Factor Test (O’Sullivan & Guilford, 1976) of Social Intelligence.

Despite of the extensive efforts, the Guilford approach was unable to yield a meaningful predictions of how well people actually operated in a social world (Goleman, 2006).

Greenspan (1979) proposed a hierarchical model of Social Intelligence. In this model, Social Intelligence consists of three components: social sensitivity, reflected in role-taking and social inference; social insight, including social comprehension, psychological insight, and moral judgment; and social communication subsuming referential communication and social problem solving. Greenspan did not propose specific tests for any of these components of Social Intelligence, but implied that they could be derived from experimental procedures used to study social cognition in general.

Gardner (1983) proposed the theory of multiple intelligences, which was an exception to the general rule that Social Intelligence plays little role in scientific theories of intelligence. Gardner has proposed that intelligence is not a unitary cognitive ability, but that there are different kinds of intelligence, each hypothetically dissociable from the others, and each hypothetically associated with a different brain system. Initially Gardner suggested seven (and later added more) different kinds of intelligence. While most of these proposed intelligences (linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, and bodily-kinesthetic) were cognitive abilities somewhat reminiscent of Thurstone’s primary mental abilities, two were explicitly personal and social in nature. Gardner defined intrapersonal intelligence as the person’s ability to gain access to his or her own internal
emotional life, and interpersonal intelligence as the individual’s ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals.

Gardner’s methods to prove his model were psychological rather than traditional psychometric. For the identification of an intelligence, he used the following criteria:

1. Potential isolation by brain damage
2. The existence of idiots, savants, prodigies and other exceptional individuals
3. An identifiable core operation or set of operations
4. A distinctive development history, along with a definable set of ‘end-state’ performances
5. An evolutionary history and evolutionary plausibility
6. Support from experimental psychological tasks
7. Support from psychometric findings
8. Susceptibility to encoding a symbol system

According to Gardner (1983) “the capacity to know oneself and to know others is an inalienable a part of the human condition as is the capacity to know objects or sounds, and it deserves to be investigated no less than these other ‘less charged’ forms”.

Sternberg’s (1977, 1980, 1984) componential view of human intelligence did not include Social Intelligence. Rather, it was intended to focus on reasoning and problem solving skills as represented by traditional intelligence tests. However, Sternberg’s (1985, 1988) triarchic view of intelligence explicitly represents Social Intelligence. According to the triarchic theory, intelligence is composed of analytical, creative and practical abilities. Practical intelligence is defined in terms of problem-solving in everyday contexts, and explicitly includes Social Intelligence (Sternberg & Wagner, 1986). According to Sternberg, each type of intelligence
reflects the operation of three different kinds of component processes: performance components, which solve problems in various domains; executive metacomponents, which plan and evaluate problem-solving; and knowledge-acquisition components, by which the first two components are learned. Also, Sternberg (1985, 1988) argued that the measurement of all forms of intelligence, especially practical and Social Intelligence, is sensitive to the context which it is assessed.

Ford and Tisak (1983) laid emphasis on the usefulness of adopting a behavioral effectiveness criterion to define Social Intelligence. They selected Social Intelligence measures according to the criterion of behavioral effectiveness in social situations rather than cognitive understanding of them. It was claimed that there is little evidence to support a cognitive conceptualization of Social Intelligence.

Marlowe (1986) argued that Social Intelligence is composed of a set of problem-solving skills that enable the individual to find and to resolve interpersonal problems. Accordingly, Social Intelligence is defined as the ability both to understand the feelings, thoughts and behaviors of oneself and others in interpersonal situations and also to act appropriately upon that understanding (Marlowe, 1986).

In contrast to the psychometric approaches, the Social Intelligence view of personality (Cantor & Fleeson, 1994; Cantor & Harlowe, 1994; Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987, 1989; Cantor & Zirkel, 1990; Synder & Cantor, 1998) does not conceptualize Social Intelligence as a group of traits, on which individuals can be compared and ranked on a dimension from low to high. Rather, the Social Intelligence view of personality is based on the assumption that social behaviour is intelligent and that individual differences in social behaviour are the product of differences in the knowledge. Social behaviour is intelligent means that it is mediated by cognitive
processes of perception, memory, reasoning and problem-solving, rather than being mediated by innate reflexes, conditioned responses, evolved genetic programs, and the like. Rather than asking how socially intelligent a person is compared to some norm, the Social Intelligence view of personality asks what Social Intelligence a person has, which he or she can use to guide his or her interpersonal behaviour. The Social Intelligence approach to personality is less interested in assessing the individual’s repertoire of Social Intelligence, than in seeking to understand the general cognitive structures and processes out of which individuality is constructed, how these develop over the life course of the individual, and how they play a role in ongoing social interactions. For this reason, Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987, 1989; Kihlstrom & Cantor, 1989) did not propose any individual-difference measures by which the person’s Social Intelligence can be assessed.

Based on the various categories of intelligences proposed by Gardner (1983) and others, Albrecht (2004) suggested a simpler model, for the multidimensionality of the intelligence construct, which is useful in business and professional settings. He suggested six primary dimensions of intelligence – Abstract, Social, Practical, Emotional, Aesthetic and Kinesthetic intelligences.

Abstract intelligence involves conceptual reasoning, manipulating verbal, mathematical and symbolic information. Social Intelligence is the ability to interact successfully with others in various contexts. Practical Intelligence involves “Common Sense” capabilities. It is the ability to solve problems and get things done. Emotional Intelligence is Self-insight and the ability to regulate or manage one’s reactions to experience. Aesthetic Intelligence deals with appreciation of form, design and relationships and Kinesthetic Intelligence is the whole-body competence like singing, dancing etc. According to Albrecht, the six primary dimensions of intelligence
are analogous to the six faces of a cube. Each presents a distinct facet, or face, of one’s total competence.

Albrecht (2004) defines Social Intelligence as “the ability to get along well with others and to get them to cooperate”. Social Intelligence is characterized as a combination of a basic understanding of people – a kind of strategic social awareness and a set of skills for interacting successfully with them. Albrecht (2005) proposed a five-part model of Social Intelligence – Situational Awareness or Social Awareness, Presence, Authenticity, Clarity and Empathy (S.P.A.C.E.)

1. Situational Awareness or Social Awareness- It is the ability to read situations, understand the social context that influences behavior and choose behavioral strategies that are most likely to be successful. In other words, it is the ability to observe and understand the context of a situation one may find oneself in, and to understand the ways in which the situation dominates or shapes the behavior of the people in it.

2. Presence- It is the external sense of one’s self that others perceive: confidence, self-respect and self-worth. In other words, it is the impression one sends to others with one’s behavior.

3. Authenticity- It is a way of behaving which engenders a perception that one is honest with one’s self as well as others. In other words, it is the extent to which others perceive one as acting from honest, ethical motives, and the extent to which others sense that one’s behavior is congruent with one’s personal values.

4. Clarity- It is the ability to express one’s self clearly, use language effectively, explain concepts clearly and persuade with ideas. It involves a range of communicating skills such as listening, feedback, paraphrasing, semantic flexibility,
skillful use of language, skill in using metaphors and figures of speech, and the ability to explain things clearly and concisely. In short, it is the ability to express ideas clearly, effectively and with impact.

5. Empathy- More than just an internal sense of relatedness or appreciation for the experiences of others, empathy in this context represents the ability to create a sense of connectedness with others. It is the capacity to get people meet oneself on a personal level of respect and willingness to corporate.

According to Albrecht, each of the five dimensions can be deconstructed into a set of representative behaviors that may range from highly ineffective to highly effective. From the standpoint of interpersonal skills, he classified behavior towards as falling somewhere on a spectrum between “toxic” effect and “nourishing effect”. Toxic behavior makes people feel devalued, angry, frustrated, guilty or otherwise inadequate. Nourishing behavior makes people feel valued, respected, affirmed, encouraged or competent. A continued pattern of toxic behavior indicates a low level of Social Intelligence – the ability to connect with people and influence them effectively. A continued pattern of nourishing behavior tends to make a person much more effective in dealing with others: nourishing behaviours are the indicators of high Social Intelligence. He claims that the biggest single cause of low Social Intelligence is simple lack of social insight.

Albrecht’s model uses a self-assessment tool to measure Social Intelligence as a combination of social skills, self-awareness and interaction style and helps participants select key areas for improvement.

Weis and Süß (2005) proposed a performance model of Social Intelligence that incorporated only cognitive ability requirements.
The Performance Model, representing a structural model of Social Intelligence incorporated social understanding, social memory, social perception, social creativity and social knowledge as cognitive abilities.

According to Weis and Süß (2005), social understanding requires individuals to understand or interpret social stimuli against the background of the given social situation (e.g., understand correctly what a person wants to express via verbal or nonverbal means of communication). The stimuli can vary according to their complexity (e.g., from a simple facial expression to a sequence of interaction between persons) and should allow conclusions about a person’s emotions, thoughts, intentions, motivations or personality traits. Social memory is defined as the storing and recall of objectively given social information that can vary in complexity (e.g. from memory for names and faces to the memory for a sequence of interactions). They defined social perception as the ability to perceive socially relevant information in more or less complex situations and social creativity as the production of as many and as diverse solutions or explanations as possible for a social situation or problem. Social knowledge is defined as the knowledge about the social world (i.e. social rules, social matters etc.) (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Vernon, 1933).

Later, Weis (2008) modified the performance model and postulated a general Social Intelligence factor on a higher-order level. The Modified Performance Model of Weis and Süß (2005) thus represents a hierarchical model of Social Intelligence. In both models, the ability domains of social understanding, social memory, social perception, and social creativity constitute social (cognitive) intelligence in the narrow sense. The structural model of Weis and Süß (2005) also classified social knowledge to the cognitive abilities subsumed under Social Intelligence whereas in the hierarchical model, social knowledge is assigned a special role.
and it is assumed to be positively related to a putative general Social Intelligence factor. Both models claim to predict social behaviour.

Recently, Weis (2008) attempted to measure Social Intelligence as a cognitive performance construct by developing a test battery of Social Intelligence (i.e, the Social Intelligence Test Magdeburg, SIM) based on the performance model of Weis and Süß (2005).

Goleman (2006) proposed a tentative model of Social Intelligence based on Social Neuroscience research. Over the past two decades, Social Neuroscience emerged as a field dedicated to investigating the 'social brain'. The term 'social brain' refers to the network of brain regions that are involved in understanding others. In other words, it is the sum of the neural mechanisms that orchestrate our interactions as well as our thoughts and feelings about people and our relationships.

Goleman organized Social Intelligence into two broad categories, social awareness and social facility. Social awareness includes what a person senses about others and social facility includes what a person then does with that awareness. According to Goleman (2006) social awareness and social facility includes the following domains as shown in table 2.1.
Table 2.1

**Domains of Social Awareness and Social Facility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL AWARENESS</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primal Empathy</td>
<td>Feeling with others; sensing non-verbal emotional signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attunement</td>
<td>Listening with full receptivity; attuning to a person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Accuracy</td>
<td>Understanding another person’s thoughts, feelings and intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognition</td>
<td>Knowing how the social world works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL FACILITY</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synchrony</td>
<td>Interacting smoothly at the nonverbal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-presentation</td>
<td>Presenting ourselves effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Shaping the outcome of social interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Caring about others’ needs and acting accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ingredients of Social Intelligence as suggested by Goleman (2006) can be diagrammatically represented as in figure 2.1

![Diagram of Social Intelligence](image)

**Figure 2.1.** Diagrammatic Representation of Social Intelligence
Both the social awareness and social facility domains range from basic, “low-road” capacities, to more complex “high-road” articulations. The “low-road” traffics in raw feelings. It lets the person immediately feel with someone else. The “high-road” traffics in a considered understanding of what is going on. It can think about what the person feels. The “low-road” operates on automatic, outside one’s awareness, and with great speed whereas, the “high-road” operates with voluntary control, requires effort and conscious intent, and moves more slowly. In Goleman’s model of Social Intelligence, synchrony and primal empathy are purely “low-road” capacities while empathic accuracy and influence mingle “high” and “low”.

Goleman criticized the ideas of Social Intelligence that have too often focussed on “high-road” talents like social knowledge, or the capacity for extracting the rules, protocols and norms that guide appropriate behaviour in a given social setting. A focus on cognition about relationships neglects essential non cognitive abilities like primal empathy and synchrony, and it ignores capacities like concern. According to Goleman, a pure cognitive perspective slights the essential brain-to-brain social glue that builds the foundation for any interaction. The full spectrum of Social Intelligence abilities embraces both high- and low-road aptitudes. Goleman stressed that the talents of the “low-road” must be included in any full account of Social Intelligence. Without them the concept remains cold and dry, valuing a calculating intellect but ignoring a warm heart (Goleman, 2006). He supported the argument that the attempt to eliminate human values from Social Intelligence impoverishes the concept. According to Goleman, a more robust measure of Social Intelligence would assess both “high-road” and “low-road” abilities.

Thus, a review on the historical developments in the conceptualization of Social Intelligence reveals different approaches
that have been used in the attempts to define and conceptualize Social Intelligence. Different researchers have defined Social Intelligence distinctly in different ways over past years. Some definitions emphasize the cognitive components and some emphasize the behavioral components and some both. Definitions of Social Intelligence extracted from literature, emphasizing cognitive and behavioral components are given in the tables 2.2 and 2.3 respectively.

Even though a solid, universally acknowledged definition of Social Intelligence is still missing, researchers have come to the agreement that Social Intelligence is undoubtedly multidimensional in nature. (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 2000; Kang, Day & Meara, 2005; Keating, 1978; Kosmitzki & John, 1993; Marlowe, 1986; Silvera, Martinussen & Dahl, 2001; Vasilóvá & Baumgartner, 2004)

Table 2.2

Definitions Emphasizing Cognitive Components Extracted from Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls.</td>
<td>Thorndike (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of social matters.</td>
<td>Vernon (1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight into the moods or personality traits of strangers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge correctly the feelings, moods and motivation of individuals.</td>
<td>Wedeck (1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement in social situations.</td>
<td>Moss et al. (1955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the mental states behind words and from facial expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory for names and faces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-taking ability.</td>
<td>Feffer (1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to interpret social cues.</td>
<td>O’Sullivan &amp; Guilford (1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to predict what will happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 2.2 continues)
### Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decoding of social cues.</td>
<td>(Sundberg, 1966; Buck, 1976; Barnes &amp; Sternberg, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to create recognizable categories of behavioural acts.</td>
<td>Hendricks et al. (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to imagine many possible outcomes of a setting.</td>
<td>Orlik (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity for other people’s behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to perceive the present mood of other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of rules of social interaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory for names and faces.</td>
<td>Sternberg et al. (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The capacity to know oneself and to know others.</td>
<td>Gardner (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to judge people with respect to feelings, thoughts and behaviours of persons, including oneself.</td>
<td>Marlowe (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals fund of knowledge about the social world.</td>
<td>Cantor &amp; Kihlstrom (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to comprehend observed behaviours in the social context in which they occur.</td>
<td>Wong, Day, Maxwell, &amp; Meara (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing the rules of etiquette.</td>
<td>Wong et al. (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to understand other people.</td>
<td>Silvera, Martinussen &amp; Dahl (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability that covers social understanding, social memory, social perception, social creativity and social knowledge.</td>
<td>Weis &amp; Süß (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3

*Definitions Emphasizing Behavioral Components Extracted from Literature*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to act wisely in human relations.</td>
<td>Thorndike (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along with others.</td>
<td>Moss &amp; Hunt (1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along with others and ease in society.</td>
<td>Vernon (1933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to manipulate the responses of others.</td>
<td>Weinstein (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to deal with people and the applications of means to manipulate the responses of others.</td>
<td>Orlik (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of relevant social goals.</td>
<td>Ford (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to speak effectively, to be appropriately responsive to the interviewers questions, to display appropriate nonverbal behaviors.</td>
<td>Ford &amp; Tisak (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act appropriately upon an understanding of the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of persons, including oneself.</td>
<td>Marlowe (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt to and act accordingly in a variety of social situations.</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Salovey (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in heterosexual interaction.</td>
<td>Wong et al. (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to react to different social situations.</td>
<td>Silvera et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along with others and to get them to corporate.</td>
<td>Albretcht (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Assessing Social Intelligence – Types and Examples of Existing Measures

The literature review reveals the existence of several types of measures dealing with Social Intelligence. From the time of
introduction of the construct, there were inconsistencies in defining it and also the approaches to study Social Intelligence differed significantly. All these resulted in the existence of different types of Social Intelligence measures. They include:

1. **Measures Based on Achievement Characteristics**: They seem to be equivalent to classical intelligence tests put within the social frame. Some examples are given in the table 2.4.

**Table 2.4**

*Measures Based on Achievement Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Social Intelligence</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Subtests, Factors or Dimensions of Social intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| George Washington Social Intelligence Test | Hunt(1928), Moss(1931), Omwake(1949) and Woodward(1955) | • Judgment in social situations  
• Memory for names and faces  
• Observation of human behavior  
• Recognition of the mental states behind words  
• Recognition of mental states from facial expression  
• Social information  
• Sense of humor |
| Six factors Test of Social Intelligence | O'Sullivan (1966) | • Cognition of behavioral units  
• Cognition of behavioral classes  
• Cognition of behavioral relations  
• Cognition of behavioral systems  
• Cognition of behavioral transformations  
• Cognition of behavioral implications |
| Sternberg Triarchic Abilities Test STAT | Sternberg (1993) | • Analytical abilities  
• Creative abilities  
• Practical abilities |
2. Measures Based on Evaluation of Behavior: An example is given in the table 2.5.

Table 2.5

*Measures Based on Evaluation of Behavior*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Social Intelligence</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Subtests, Factors or Dimensions of Social Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActFrequency Approach</td>
<td>Buss and Craik (1983)</td>
<td>• Generation of acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of the nominative acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Act-prototypicality ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-reported/peer-reported evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Measures Based on Evaluation by Others: Social Intelligence, particularly in children is sometimes estimated by measures based on evaluation by others, usually parents, teachers or peers. An example is given in the table 2.6.

Table 2.6

*Measures Based on Evaluation by Others*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Social Intelligence</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Subtests, Factors or Dimensions of Social Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Estimated Social Intelligence (PESI)</td>
<td>Kaukiainen, Björkqvist, Österman, Logerspetz and Forsblom (1995)</td>
<td>• Perception of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Successful achievement of one’s goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Behavioral outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Measures Based on Self-evaluation**: They are the most frequently used type for research purposes. The examples are given in the table 2.7.

Table 2.7

**Measures Based on Self-evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Social Intelligence</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Subtests, Factors or Dimensions of Social Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale</td>
<td>Silvera et al. (2001)</td>
<td>• Social information processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Intelligence Scale</td>
<td>Chadha &amp; Usha (1986,2004)</td>
<td>• Patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-operativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Confidence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition of social environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tactfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sense of humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Intelligence Profile</td>
<td>Albrecht (2004)</td>
<td>• Social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interaction style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the long history of Social Intelligence, researchers could not agree on a general rule concerning how best to assess Social Intelligence. The application of different methods resulted in contradicting validity evidence. This confusion has caused the waxing and waning of research in Social Intelligence.
2.4 Development of Social Intelligence

Discussions in the field of Social Intelligence also included the development of Social Intelligence, i.e., whether it is possible to develop Social Intelligence or it is genetically determined. Many exponents in the field have clearly expressed their views on the issue.

Based on research in general intelligence domain (Denney & Heldrich, 1990) that had revealed that children's fluid abilities are trainable such that it is possible to enhance fluid intelligence, Jones and Day (1996) suggested that it is possible and also is important to develop children’s social fluid abilities of Social Intelligence.

Mathews, Zeidner and Roberts (2002) believed that Social Intelligence may be less genetically determined, and hence, more modifiable than academic intelligence.

Albrecht (2004) understood Social Intelligence as a combination of skills expressed through learned behavior. He suggested that after assessing the impact of one’s behavior on others, i.e. the degree to which one is successful in dealing with others, one can experiment with new behaviours and new interaction strategies. According to him, people who lack insight and competence in dealing with others can make significant improvements in their Social Intelligence status as a result of understanding the basic concepts and assessing themselves against a comprehensive model of interpersonal effectiveness.

Chesnokova and Subbotsky (2005) viewed Social Intelligence as a useful, creative and adaptive capacity. According to them, Social Intelligence is not an innate capacity, it develops at a certain point of an individual life and that it is possible to train and increase Social Intelligence in children.
Kang, Day and Meara (2005) argued that Social Intelligence has a powerful intuitive appeal. People vary in the level of their Social Intelligence and that variation is consistent with one’s experiences with others in social settings and with one’s observations of the social interactions of others.

Goleman (2006) suggested that it is possible to develop Social Intelligence. According to him, genes are not destiny. He posited that “It is biologically impossible for a gene to operate independently of its environment: genes are designed to be regulated by signals from their immediate surround, including hormones from the endocrine system and neurotransmitter in the brain- some of which in turn, are profoundly influenced by our social interactions”. He argued that raising a secure or an empathic child requires not just a necessary set of genes but also sufficient parenting or other apt social experiences. He explained the nurturing nature of Social Intelligence based on Social Neuroscience. He emphasized “neural scaffolding” that describes how once a brain circuit has been laid out, its connections become strengthened with repeated use. “Neural scaffolding explains why a behavioural pattern, once it is established, requires effort to change, But with new opportunities-or perhaps just with effort and awareness – we can lay down and strengthen a new track.” As Social Intelligence involves both the “low-road” and the “high-road”, developing Social Intelligence extends to both. It is possible to train both the “low-road” and the “high-road” abilities. According to Goleman, being a member of a team, socializing or any activity that puts a premium on getting along well with others and gives a person ample opportunity to practice should help in improving one’s Social Intelligence.

Phipps (2007) pointed out that Social Intelligence can be learned. He proposed two approaches that would be helpful for the development of Social Intelligence, Social learning theory and
appreciative inquiry. Social learning theory postulates that significant human experiences create assumptions and behaviours which we carry in to future in an effort to adapt to life’s circumstances. Appreciative inquiry helps the power of positive thinking by engaging our intentions and focusing our attention on ideals and goals. It was found that both methods tap the awesome power of the brain to forge neural pathways for new ideas and strengthen desired social interaction behaviours.

Graham (2008) suggested that Social Intelligence can be developed although genetics plays a role in determining Social Intelligence because of clear links to personality characteristics such as extraversion, dominance, social presence, affiliation and self acceptance. He proposed that developing Social Intelligence means changing the way one acts and interacts with others and then turning these changes in to new habits. This takes focused attention and practice, allowing new neural circuits to form within the basal ganglia of the brain.

Thus, many researchers came up with the view that Social Intelligence can definitely be developed by proper training.

2.5 Social Intelligence in the Present Study

Based on the definitions of Social Intelligence as provided by the previous researchers in the field and expert consensus, the present study includes the following as the dimensions of Social Intelligence.

1. Social Knowledge
2. Social Understanding
3. Social Memory
4. Prosocial Attitude, and
5. Social skills
Each dimension is explained below.

1. **Social Knowledge:** Social Knowledge is defined as knowledge about the social world, i.e. social rules, social matters, etc. (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Vernon, 1933). For the present study, social knowledge means awareness of contemporary issues and social values. The social values considered are love for others, respect for others, secularism and respect for all religion and sense of social responsibility.

2. **Social Understanding:** Social understanding requires individuals to understand or interpret social stimuli against the background of the given social situation (e.g. understand correctly what a person wants to express via verbal or nonverbal means of communication). The stimuli can vary according to their complexity (e.g. from a simple facial expression to a sequence of interactions between persons) and should allow conclusions about a person’s emotions, thoughts, intentions, motivations or personality traits (Weis & Süß, 2005). For the present study, social understanding means accuracy in decoding verbal and nonverbal behaviour.

3. **Social Memory:** Social memory is defined as memory of names and faces (Kotzmitzki & John, 1993; Moss et al., 1955). Weis and Süß (2005) defined social memory as the storing and recall of objectively given social information that can vary in complexity i.e. from memory for names and faces to memory for a sequence of interactions. For the present study, social memory means memory of names and faces.

4. **Prosocial Attitude:** Prosocial attitude is indicated by having an interest and concern for others. For the present study, prosocial attitude includes social interest and social self-efficacy.

**Social Interest:** Social interest is an interest in the interest of mankind.
Social Self-efficacy: Social self-efficacy is the expectancy that one can successfully perform or complete a target behavior in an academic or everyday situation involving social interaction.

5. Social Skills: Social skills are the skills required for managing relationships. For the present study, 12 social skills- Empathy, Communication, Conflict Management, Leadership, Change Catalyst, Building Bonds, Collaboration and Co-operation, Authenticity, Team Capabilities, Observation of Human Behaviour, Basic Manners and Tactfulness, are considered. Each of them is explained below.

**Empathy:** It is the skill of building connections with people (Albrecht, 2005). It involves awareness and consideration of others’ feelings and a sense of connectedness that inspires people to cooperate.

**Communication:** It is the skill of listening openly and sending convincing messages.

**Conflict Management:** It is the skill of negotiating and resolving disagreement.

**Leadership:** It is the skill of inspiring and guiding individuals and group.

**Change Catalyst:** It is the skill of initiating or managing changes.

**Building Bonds:** It is the skill of nurturing instrumental relationship.

**Collaboration and Co-operation:** It is the skill of working with others towards shared goals.

**Authenticity:** It is the degree to which a person is true to one’s own personality, spirit or character. It is the extent to which others perceive oneself as acting from honest, ethical motives and the extent to which others sense that one’s behavior is congruent with one’s own personal values (Albrecht, 2005).
Team Capabilities: It is the skill of creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals.

Observation of Human Behaviour: It is the skill of observing others’ behaviour.

Basic Manners: It is the ability to do the following in social interactions

- Use mannerly words like “please”, “thank you” etc...
- Give compliments regularly to others
- Receive compliments without discounting
- Apologize
- Accept the apology of others
- Introduce others

Tactfulness: It is the delicate perception of the right thing to say or do.

Thus, the present study includes both cognitive as well as behavioural requirements as dimensions of Social Intelligence. But, there is more emphasis on the behavior effectiveness criterion in defining Social Intelligence as suggested by Ford and Tisak (1983), Goleman (2006) and Marlowe (1986).

2.6 Conclusion

The theoretical overview enabled the investigator to trace the history of Social Intelligence research. A strong focus on the theories and definitions of Social Intelligence was useful to explore the dimensionality of the construct. An overview of the existing measures of Social Intelligence was of great use for the investigator in the development of Social Intelligence Test. The review also, provides evidence for the notion that it is possible to enhance Social Intelligence by proper training.

Thus, the theoretical overview empowered the investigator with a strong theoretical support in all areas of the present study.
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